6897

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FIRST SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

---

1 EDWARD VII., 1901

VOL. LIV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTH DAY OF FEBRUARY TO THE TWELFTH DAY OF APRIL, INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1901

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR WILFRID LAURIER

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

AT THE OPENING OF THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE NINTH PARLIAMENT

1901

CABINET FORMED JULY 13, 1896

President of the Privy Council (Premier)	Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER, P. C., G. C. M. G., K.C., D.C.L. *(Oxon.)*
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT, G.C.M.G.
Secretary of State	Hon. R. W. SCOTT, K.C., LL.D.
Minister of Justice	Hon. DAVID MILLS, K.C., LL.D.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. Sir L. H. DAVIES, K.C.M.G., K.C.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. F. W. BORDEN, B.A., M.D.
Postmaster General	Hon. WM. MULOCK, K.C., M.A., LL.D.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. S. A. FISHER, B.A.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. J. I. TARTE.
Minister of Finance	Hon. W. S. FIELDING.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. A. G. BLAIR.
Minister of the Interior	Hon. C. SIFTON.
Minister of Customs	Hon. WM. PATERSON.
Minister of Inland Revenue	Hon. M. E. BERNIER.
*Without Portfolio	Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND.
Without Portfolio	Hon. R. R. DOBELL.

(The above form the Cabinet.)

Solicitor General	Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK, K.C.

*Acting Postmaster General.

Clerk of the Privy Council	JOHN J. MCGEE.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Hon. LOUIS PHILIPPE BRODEUR	Speaker.
PETER MACDONALD, M.P.	Deputy Speaker.
Sir JOHN G. BOURINOT, K.C.M.G.	Clerk of the House.
LAPLANTE, Mr. J. B. R	Clerk-Assistant.
Lieut.-Col. HENRY ROBERT SMITH	Sergeant-at-Arms.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

ALBERT HORTON	Chief Reporter.
STEPHEN ABBOTT E. JOSEPH DUGGAN J. O. MARCEAU THOS. P. OWENS ALPHONSE DESJARDINS A. C. CAMPBELL GEORGE SIMPSON	Reporters.
CHAS. W. BOYCE	Assistant to Chief Reporter.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIRST SESSION, NINTH PARLIAMENT

1901

ALCORN, GEORGE OSCAR—Prince Edward.
ANGERS, CHARLES—Charlevoix.
ARCHAMBAULT, JOSEPH ELOI—Berthier.

BALL, GEORGES—Nicolet.
BARKER, SAMUEL—Hamilton.
BAZINET, CHARLES—Joliette.
BELCOURT, NAPOLEON A.—Ottawa.
BELL, JOHN W.—Addington.
BELL, ADAM CARR—Pictou.
BENNETT, WILLIAM H.—Simcoe, E.R.
BERNIER, HON. MICHEL E.—St. Hyacinthe.
BICKERDIKE, ROBERT—Montreal, St. Lawrence.
BIRKETT, THOMAS—Ottawa.
BLAIN, RICHARD—Peel.
BLAIR, HON. ANDREW GEORGE—St. John (City).
BORDEN, HON. FREDERICK W—King's, N.S.
BORDEN, BOBERT L.—Halifax.
BOURASSA, HENRI—Labelle.
BOURBONNAIS, AUGUSTIN—Soulanges.
BOYD, NATHANIEL—Macdonald.
BRITTON, BYRON MOFFATT—Kingston.
BROCK, WILLIAM REES—Toronto Centre.
BRODER, ANDREW—Dundas.
BRODEUR, HON. LOUIS PHILIPPE—Rouville.
BROWN, JAMES P.—Chateauguay.
BRUCE, FRANK C.—Hamilton.
BRUNEAU, ARTHUR AIMÉ—Richelieu.
BUREAU, JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.

CALVERT, WILLIAM SAMUEL—Middlesex, W.R.
CALVIN, HIRAM A.—Frontenac.
CARGILL, HENRY—Bruce, E. R.
CARROLL, HENRY G.—Kamouraska.
CARSCALLEN, ALEXANDER W.—Hastings, N. R.
CARTWRIGHT, HON. SIR RICHARD, G.C.M.G.—Oxford, S.R.
CASGRAIN, THOMAS CHASE—Montmorency.
CHAMPAGNE, LOUIS N.—Wright.
CHARLTON, JOHN—Norfolk, N.R.
CHRISTIE, THOMAS—Argenteuil.
CLANCY, JAMES—Bothwell.
CLARE, GEORGE A.—Waterloo, S.R.
CLARKE, EDWARD FREDERICK—Toronto, West.
COCHRANE, EDWARD—Northumberland, Ont., E.R.
COPP, ALBERT J. S.—Digby.
CORBY, HENRY—Hastings, W.R.
COSTIGAN, HON. JOHN—Victoria, N.B.
COWAN, MAHLON K.—Essex, S.R.
CULBERT, JOHN—Brockville.

DAVIES, HON. SIR LOUIS HENRY, K.C.M.G.—Queen's West, P.E.I.
DAVIS, THOMAS OSBORNE—Saskatchewan.
DÉCHENE, ARTHUR M.—L'Islet.
DELISLE, MICHEL SIMEON—Portneuf.
DEMERS, LOUIS JULIEN—Lévis.
DEMERS, L. PHILIPPE—St. John and Iberville.
DESMARAIS, ODILON—Montreal, St. James.
DOBELL, HON. RICHARD REID—Quebec, West.
DOUGLAS, JAMES M.—Assiniboia, East.
DUGAS, FRANÇOIS O.—Montcalm.
DYMENT, ALBERT EDWARD—Algoma.

EARLE, THOMAS—Victoria, B.C.
EDWARDS, WILLIAM C.—Russell.
EMMERSON, HENRY R.—Westmoreland.
ERB, DILMAN KINSEY—Perth, S.R.
ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR C.—Two Mountains.

FIELDING, HON. WILLIAM STEVENS—Shelburne and Queen's (N.S.)
FISHER, HON. SYDNEY ARTHUR—Brome.
FITZPATRICK, HON. CHARLES—Quebec County.
FLINT, THOMAS BARNARD—Yarmouth.
FORTIER, EDMOND—Lotbinière.
FORTIN, THOMAS—Laval.
FOWLER, GEORGE W.—King's, N.B.
FRASER, DUNCAN C.—Guysborough.

GALLERY, DANIEL, Montreal, St. Anne.
GALLIHER, WILLIAM ALFRED—Yale and Cariboo.
GANONG, GILBERT W.—Charlotte.
GAUVREAU, CHARLES AUGUSTE—Témiscouata.
GEOFFRION, VICTOR—Chambly and Verchères.
GERMAN, WILLIAM MANLY—Welland.
GIBSON, ALEXANDER, JR.—York, N.B.
GIRARD, JOSEPH—Chicoutimi and Saguenay.
GILMOUR, JAMES—Middlesex, E.R.
GODBOUT, JOSEPH—Beauce.

GOULD, ISAAC J.—Ontario, W.R.
GOURLEY, SEYMOUR E.—Colchester.
GUTHRIE, HUGH—Wellington, S.R.

HACKETT, EDWARD—Prince West, P.E.I.
HAGGART, HON. JOHN GRAHAM—Lanark, S.R.
HALE, FREDERICK H.—Carleton, N.B.
HALLIDAY, JAMES—Bruce, N.R.
HARWOOD, HENRY S.—Vaudreuil.
HENDERSON, DAVID—Halton.
HEYD, CHARLES BERNHARD—Brant, S.R.
HOLMES, ROBERT—Huron, W.R.
HORSEY, EDWARD H.—Grey, N.R.
HUGHES, JAMES J.—King's, P.E.I.
HUGHES, SAMUEL—Victoria, Ont., N.R.
HYMAN, CHARLES S.—London.

INGRAM, ANDREW B.—Elgin, E.R.

JOHNSTON, ALEXANDER—Cape Breton.
JOHNSTON, ROBERT—Cardwell.
JOHNSTON, THOMAS GEORGE—Lambton, W.R.

KAULBACH, CHARLES E.—Lunenburg.
KEMP, ALBERT E.—Toronto, East.
KENDALL, ARTHUR S.—Cape Breton.
KENDREY, JAMES—Peterborough, W.R.
KIDD, EDWARD—Carleton, Ont.

LANCASTER, EDWARD A.—Lincoln and Niagara.
LANG, JOHN—Peterborough, E.R.
LARIVIÈRE, ALPHONSE A, C.—Provencher.
LAURIER, R. CHARLEMAGNE—L'Assomption.
LAURIER, RT. HON. SIR WILFRID, G.C.M.G.—Quebec, East.
LAVELL, JOHN REEVE—Leeds and Grenville.
LAVERGNE, LOUIS—Drummond and Arthabaska.
LEBLANC, OLIVER J.—Kent, N.B.
LEFURGEY, ALFRED A.—Prince East, P.E.I.
LEGRIS, JOSEPH H.—Maskinongé.
LEMIEUX, RODOLPHE—Gaspé.
LENNOX, HAUGHTON—Simcoe, W.R.
LEWIS, WILLIAM J.—Albert.
LOGAN, HANCE J.—Cumberland.
LOVELL, HENRY—Stanstead.
LOY, GEORGE M.—Beauharnois.

MACDONALD, PETER—Huron, E.R.
MACKIE, THOMAS—Renfrew, N.R.
MACLAREN, ALEXANDER F.—Perth, N.R.
MACLAREN, WILLIAM SCOTT—Huntingdon.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM F.—York, Ont., E.R.
MCCARTHY, LEIGHTON GOLDIE—Simcoe, N.R.
MCCOLL, JOHN B.—Northumberland, Ont., W.R.
MCCOOL, CHARLES ARTHUR—Nipissing.
MCCORMICK, GEORGE—Muskoka and Parry Sound.
MCCREARY, WILLIAM F.—Selkirk.
MCEWEN, GEORGE—Huron, S.R.
MCGOWAN, JOHN—Wellington, C.R.
MCGUGAN, MALCOLM—Middlesex, S.R.
MCINTOSH, JOHN—Sherbrooke.
MCISAAC, COLIN F.—Antigonish.
MCKINNON, D. A.—Queen's, E.R. (P.E.I.)
MCLENNAN, ANGUS—Inverness.
MCLEOD, ANGUS—Ontario, N.R.
MADORE, JOSEPH ALEXANDRE C.—Hochelaga.
MALOUIN, ALBERT—Quebec Centre.
MARCIL, CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MARCIL, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARTINEAU, PIERRE R.—Montmagny.
MATHESON, JOSEPH—Richmond, N.S.
MAXWELL, GEORGE RITCHIE—Burrard.
MEIGS, DANIEL B.—Missisquoi.
MIGNAULT, ROCH MOÏSE S.—Yamaska.
MONET, DOMINIQUE—Laprairie and Napierville.
MONK, FREDERICK D.—Jacques Cartier.
MORIN, JEAN BAPTISTE—Dorchester.
MORRISON, AULAY—New Westminster.
MULOCK, HON. WILLIAM—York. Ont., N.R.
MURRAY, THOMAS—Pontiac.

NORTHRUP, WILLIAM BARTON—Hastings, E.R.

OLIVER, FRANK—Alberta.
OSLER, EDMOND BOYD—Toronto, West.

PARMELEE, CHARLES H.—Shefford.
PATERSON, HON. WILLIAM—Wentworth and N. Brant.
POPE, RUFUS H.—Compton.
PRÉFONTAINE, RAYMOND—Maissonneuve and Terrebonne.
PRINGLE, ROBERT A.—Cornwall and Stormont.
PRIOR, HON. EDWARD G.—Victoria, B.C.
PROULX, ISIDORE—Prescott.
PUTTEE, ARTHUR W.—Winnipeg.

REID, JAMES—Restigouche.
REID, JOHN D.—Grenville, S.R.
RICHARDSON, MATTHEW KENDALL—Grey, S.R.
RICHARDSON, ROBERT L.—Lisgar.
ROBINSON, JABEL—Elgin, W.R.
ROBINSON, JAMES—Northumberland, N.B.
ROCHE, WILLIAM—Halifax.
ROCHE, WILLIAM J.—Marquette.
RODDICK, THOMAS G.—Montreal, St. Antoine.
ROSAMOND, BENNETT—Lanark, N.R.
ROSS, JEAN AUGUSTE—Rimouski.
ROSS, HON. WILLIAM—Victoria, N.S.
ROSS, WILLIAM—Ontario, S.R.
ROUSSEAU, JEFFREY ALEXANDRE—Champlain.
RUSSELL, BENJAMIN—Hants.

SCHELL, JACOB T.—Glengarry.
SCOTT, WALTER—Assiniboia, West.
SEAGRAM, JOSEPH E.—Waterloo, N.R.
SHERRITT, JOHN—Middlesex, N.R.
SIFTON, HON. CLIFFORD—Brandon.
SIMMONS, OLIVER—Lambton, E.R.
SMITH, ERNEST D.—Wentworth, S.R.
SMITH, RALPH—Vancouver.
SPROULE, THOMAS S.—Grey, E.R.
STEPHENS, GEORGE—Kent, Ont.

SUTHERLAND, HON. JAMES—Oxford, N.R.
SUTHERLAND, ROBERT FRANKLIN—Essex, N.R.

TALBOT, ONÉSIPHORE ERNEST—Bellechasse.
TARTE, HON. JOSEPH ISRAEL—Montreal, St. Mary.
TAYLOR, GEORGE—Leeds, S.R.
THOMPSON, ANDREW THORBURN—Haldimand and Monck.
TISDALE, HON. DAVID—Norfolk, S.R.
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TOLMIE, JOHN—Bruce, W.R.
TOLTON, EDWIN—Wellington, N.R.
TUCKER, JOSEPH JOHN—St. John, N.B , City & Co.
TUPPER, HON. SIR CHARLES HIBBERT, K.C.M.G.—Pictou.
TURCOT, GEORGE—Megantic.
TURGEON, ONÉSIPHORE—Gloucester.

VROOMAN, ADAM E.—Victoria, Ont., S.R.

WADE, FLETCHER BATH—Annapolis.
WALLACE, N. CLARKE—York, Ont., W.R.
WARD, HENRY ALFRED—Durham, E.R.
WILMOT, ROBERT D.—Sunbury and Queen's.
WILSON, URIAH—Lennox.
WRIGHT, A. A.—Renfrew, S.R.

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

BALL, GEORGES—Nicolet.
CHAMPAGIE, L. N.—Wright.
CHARLTON, JOHN—Norfolk, N.
CLARKE, E.F.—Toronto, W.
EARLE, THOS.—Victoria, B.C.
FORTIN, THOS.—Laval.
HOLMES, ROBT.—Huron, W.
LARIVIÈRE, A A. C.—Provencher.
MACDONALD, J.—Huron, E.
MCCREARY, W. F.—Selkirk.
MONET, D.—Laprairie and Napierville.
RICHARDSON, R. L.—Lisgar.
ROCHE, WM.—Marquette.
RUSSELL, B.—Hants.
SCOTT, WALTER—Assiniboia, W.
SUTHERLAND, R. F.—Essex, N.
TAYLOR, GEO.—Leeds and Grenville.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIRST SESSION, NINTH PARLIAMENT

1901

ADDINGTON—John William Bell.
ALBERT—William J. Lewis.
ALBERTA—Frank Oliver.
ALGOMA—Albert Edward Dyment.
ANNAPOLIS—Fletcher Bath Wade.
ANTIGONISH—Colin F. McIsaac.
ARGENTEUIL—Thomas Christie.
ASSINIBOIA, EAST—James M. Douglas.
ASSINIBOIA, WEST—Walter Scott.

BAGOT—Joseph Edmond Marcil.
BEAUCE—Joseph Godbout.
BEAUHARNOIS—George M. Loy.
BELLECHASSE—Onésiphore Ernest Talbot.
BERTHIER—Joseph Eloi Archambault.
BONAVENTURE—Charles Marcil.
BOTHWELL—James Clancy.
BRANDON—Hon. Clifford Sifton.
BRANT, S. RIDING—Charles Bernhard Heyd.
BROCKVILLE—John Culbert.
BROME—Hon. Sydney Arthur Fisher.
BRUCE, E. RIDING—Henry Cargill.
BRUCE, N. RIDING—James Halliday.
BRUCE, W. RIDING—John Tolmie.
BURRARD—George Ritchie Maxwell.

CAPE BRETON—Alexander Johnston. Arthur S. Kendall.
CARDWELL—Robert Johnston.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Frederick Harding Hale.
CARLETON (O.)—Edward Kidd.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—Victor Geoffrion.
CHAMPLAIN—Jeffrey Alexandre Rousseau.
CHARLEVOIX—Charles Angers.
CHARLOTTE—Gilbert W. Ganong.
CHATEAUGUAY—James P. Brown.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Joseph Girard.
COLCHESTER—Seymour E. Gourley.
COMPTON—Rufus Henry Pope.
CORNWALL AND STORMONT—Robert A. Pringle.
CUMBERLAND—Hance J. Logan.

DIGBY—Albert J. S. Copp.
DORCHESTER—Jean Baptiste Morin.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Louis Lavergne.
DUNDAS—Andrew Broder.
DURHAM, E. RIDING—Henry Alfred Ward.
DURHAM, W. RIDING—

ELGIN, E. RIDING—Andrew B. Ingram.
ELGIN, W. RIDING—Jabel Robinson.
ESSEX, N. RIDING—Robert Franklin Sutherland.
ESSEX, S. RIDING—Mahlon K. Cowan.

FRONTENAC—Hiram A. Calvin.

GASPÉ—Rodolphe Lemieux.
GLENGARRY—Jacob T. Schell.
GLOUCESTER—Onésiphore Turgeon.
GRENVILLE, S. RIDING—John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. RIDING—Thomas S. Sproule.
GREY, N. RIDING—Edward H. Horsey.
GREY, S. RIDING—Matthew Kendall Richardson.
GUYSBOROUGH—Duncan C. Fraser.

HALDIMAND AND MONCK—Andrew Thorburn Thompson.
HALIFAX—Robert L. Borden. William Roche.
HALTON—David Henderson.
HAMILTON—Samuel Barker. Frank C. Bruce.
HANTS—Benjamin Russell.
HASTINGS, E. RIDING—William B. Northrup.
HASTINGS, N. RIDING—Alexander W. Carscallen.
HASTINGS, W. RIDING—Henry Corby.
HOCHELAGA—J. Alexandre Camille Madore.
HUNTINGDON—William Scott Maclaren.
HURON, E. RIDING—Peter Macdonald.
HURON, S. RIDING—George McEwen.
HURON, W. RIDING—Robert Holmes.

INVERNESS—Angus McLennan.

JACQUES CARTIER—Frederick D. Monk.
JOLIETTE—Charles Bazinet.

KAMOURASKA—Henry George Carroll.
KENT (N.B.)—Oliver J. LeBlanc.
KENT (O.)—George Stephens.
KING'S (N.B.)—George W. Fowler.
KING'S (N.S.)—Hon. Frederick W. Borden.

KING'S (P.E.I.)—James J. Hughes.
KINGSTON—Byron Moffatt Britton.

LABELLE—Henri Bourassa.
LAMBTON, E. RIDING—Oliver Simmons.
LAMBTON, W. RIDING—Thomas George Johnston.
LANARK, N. RIDING—Bennett Rosamond.
LANARK, S. RIDING—Hon. John Graham Haggart.
LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE—Dominique Monet.
L'ASSOMPTION—R. Charlemagne Laurier.
LAVAL—Thomas Fortin.
LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, N. RIDING—John Reeve Lavell.
LEEDS, S. RIDING—George Taylor.
LENNOX—Uriah Wilson.
LÉVIS—Louis Julien Demers.
LINCOLN AND NIAGARA—Edward A. Lancaster.
LISGAR—Robert Lorne Richardson.
L'ISLET—Arthur M. Déchene.
LONDON—Charles S. Hyman.
LOTBINIÈRE—Edmond Fortier.
LUNENBURG—Charles Edwin Kaulbach.

MACDONALD—Nathaniel Boyd.
MAISONNEUVE—Raymond Préfontaine.
MARQUETTE—William J. Roche.
MASKINONGÉ—Joseph H. Legris.
MEGANTIC—George Turcot.
MIDDLESEX, E. RIDING—James Gilmour.
MIDDLESEX, N. RIDING—John Sherritt.
MIDDLESEX, S. RIDING—Malcolm McGugan.
MIDDLESEX, W. RIDING—William Samuel Calvert.
MISSISQUOI—Daniel B. Meigs.
MONTCALM—François O. Dugas.
MONTMAGNY—Pierre R. Martineau.
MONTMORENCY—Thomas Chase Casgrain.
MONTREAL, ST. ANNE—Daniel Gallery.
MONTREAL, ST. ANTOINE—Thomas G. Roddick.
MONTREAL, ST. JAMES—Odilon Desmarais.
MONTREAL, ST. LAWRENCE—Robert Bickerdike.
MONTREAL, St. MARY—Hon. Joseph Israel Tarte.
MUSKOKA—George McCormick.

NEW WESTMINSTER—Aulay Morrison.
NICOLET—Georges Ball.
NIPISSING—Charles Arthur McCool.
NORFOLK, N. RIDING—John Charlton.
NORFOLK, S. RIDING—Hon. David Tisdale.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—James Robinson.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E.R.—Edward Cochrane.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W.R.—John B. McColl.

ONTARIO, N. RIDING—Angus McLeod.
ONTARIO, S. RIDING—William Ross.
ONTARIO, W. RIDING—Isaac J. Gould.
OTTAWA (City) { Napoleon A. Belcourt. / Thomas Birkett.
OXFORD, N. RIDING—Hon. James Sutherland.
OXFORD, S. RIDING—Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, G.C.M.G.

PEEL—Richard Blain.
PERTH, N. RIDING—Alexander Ferguson MacLaren.
PERTH, S. RIDING—Dilman Kinsey Erb.
PETERBOROUGH, E. RIDING—John Lang.
PETERBOROUGH, W. RIDING—James Kendrey.
PICTOU { Adam Carr Bell. / Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, K.C.M.G.
PONTIAC—Thomas Murray.
PORTNEUF—Michel Simeon Delisle.
PRESCOTT—Isidore Proulx.
PRINCE, EAST (P.E.I.)—Alfred A. Lefurgey.
PHINCE, WEST (P.E.I.)—Edward Hackett.
PRINCE EDWARD—George Oscar Alcorn.
PROVENCHER—Alphonse A. C. LaRivière.

QUEBEC, CENTRE—Albert Malouin.
QUEBEC, EAST—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G.
QUEBEC, WEST—Hon. Richard Reid Dobell.
QUEBEC (County)—Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick.
QUEEN'S, EAST (P.E.I.)—D. A. McKinnon.
QUEEN'S, WEST (P.E.I.)—Hon. Sir Louis Henry Davies, K.C.M.G.

RENFREW, N. RIDING—Thomas Mackie.
RENFREW, S. RIDING—A. A. Wright.
RESTIGOUCHE—James Reid.
RICHELIEU—Arthur Aimé Bruneau.
RICHMOND (N.S.)—Joseph Matheson.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)—Edmund William Tobin.
RIMOUSKI—Jean Auguste Ross.
ROUVILLE—Hon. Louis Philippe Brodeur.
RUSSELL—William C. Edwards.

ST. HYACINTHE—Hon. Michel E. Bernier.
ST. JOHN (N.B.), City—Hon. Andrew George Blair.
ST. JOHN (N.B.), City & Co.—Joseph John Tucker.
ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE—L. Philippe Demers.
SASKATCHEWAN—Thomas Osborne Davis.
SELKIRK—William F. McCreary.
SHEFFORD—Charles H. Parmelee.
SHELBURNE AND QUEEN'S, N.S.—Hon. William Stevens Fielding.
SHERBROOKE—John McIntosh.
SIMCOE, E. RIDING—William Henry Bennett.
SIMCOE, N. RIDING—Leighton Goldie McCarthy.
SIMCOE, S. RIDING—Haughton Lennox.
SOULANGES—Augustin Bourbonnais.
STA[illegible]STEAD—Henry Lovell.
SUNBURY and QUEEN'S (N. B)—Robert D. Wilmot.

TEMISCOUATA—Charles Auguste Gauvreau.
TERREBONNE—Raymond Préfontaine.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Jacques Bureau.
TORONTO, CENTRE—William Rees Brock.
TORONTO, EAST—Albert E. Kemp.
TORONTO, WEST { Edward Frederick Clarke. / Edmond Boyd Osler.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur C. Ethier.

VANCOUVER—Ralph Smith.
VAUDREUIL—Henry S. Harwood.
VICTORIA (B.C.) { Thomas Earle. / Hon. Edward G. Prior.

VICTORIA (N.B.)—Hon. John Costigan.
VICTORIA (N.S.)—Hon. William Ross.
VICTORIA (O.), N. RIDING—Samuel Hughes.
VICTORIA (O.), S. RIDING—Adam E. Vrooman.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—Joseph E. Seagram.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—George A. Clare.
WELLAND—William Manly German.
WELLINGTON, C. RIDING—John McGowan.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—Edwin Tolton.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Hugh Guthrie.
WENTWORTH AND BRANT, N. RIDING—Hon. William Paterson.
WENTWORTH, S. RIDING—Ernest D. Smith.
WESTMORELAND—Henry R. Emmerson.
WINNIPEG—Arthur W. Pnttee.
WRIGHT—Louis N. Champagne.

YALE and CARIBOO—William Alfred Galliher.
YAMASKA—Roch Moïse S. Mignault.
YARMOUTH—Thomas Barnard Flint.
YORK (N.B.)—Alexander Gibson, jr.
YORK (O.), E. RIDING—William F. Maclean.
YORK (O.), N. RIDING—Hon. William Mulock.
YORK (O.), W. RIDING—N. Clarke Wallace.

ERRATA—VOL. I.

Col. 185, third paragraph from bottom of page should read thus :

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The amount asked for is the same as last year. There are increases for three officers in the first-class. One is promoted from the second-class to the first-class. Outside of the two increases caused by the promotion of two third-class officers into the second-class there is only $50 increase in that class. It is proposed to have seven first-class officers instead of six, ten second-class instead of eleven, and three junior second-class clerks instead of two. The number of messengers remains the same, with increases of $30 each.

Col. 1930, line 32 from top to read thus :

shipped, Great Britain took 668,000. In 1893, out of 1,187,000 barrels, Great Britain took 946,000.

	Bbls.		Bbls.
In 1894....	184,856	out of	278,238
1895....	756,232	"	853,268
1896....	504,680	"	567,182
1897..	1,579,272	"	1,668,470
1898..	414,181	"	439,418
1899....	972,125	"	1,075,068
1900....	896,935	"	956,458

These figures in each case represent the crop of the preceding year. I would like to ask what would be the effect on this industry, if Great Britain were to impose a tariff against those apples similar to the tariff we now exact on her goods ?

Col. 1935, at top delete lines 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 up to the word 'or,' inclusive.

Col. 2319, 5th line of last paragraph should read thus : Mr. Levecque—who was speaking on behalf of my opponent—has appealed.

Col. 2554—Supply, Heading, for Pictou Public Building, $7,000, read :

Picton, Ont., Public Building, $8,000.

Col. 2574, 5th line from bottom for 'unpaid' read 'paid.'

Col. 2575, 2nd last line to read thus :

meeting the wayfarer at every road corner in its vicinity.

Col. 2590, line 23 from top for 'joined' read 'declared himself.'

Col. 2592, line 5 from top for 'of Montreal' read 'of the minister.'

House of Commons Debates

FIRST SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 6, 1901.

To-day being the first day of the meeting of the First Session of the Ninth Parliament for the despatch of business,—Sir John George Bourinot, K.C.M.G., LL.D., D.C.L., Clerk of the House of Commons, and Lieut.-Col. Henry Robert Smith, Serjeant-at-Arms, Commissioners appointed by *Dedimus Potestatem* for administering the Oath to Members of the House of Commons, all attending according to their duty, Henri G. LaMothe, Esquire, Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, delivered to the said Sir John George Bourinot, a Roll containing a list of the names of such members as had been returned to serve in this parliament.

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

A message was delivered by René Edouard Kimber, Esquire, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod :

GENTLEMEN,

The Honourable Mr. Justice Gwynne, in his capacity as Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of this Honourable House in the Senate Chamber.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

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

And the House being returned,

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Sir John Bourinot, it is probably in the minds of all the members now assembled on the floor of this House that the unfortunate circumstance of the recent demise of the great and noble lady who was for more than sixty years our Sovereign, should call from us, as our first duty, the adoption of an address to His Majesty the King, conveying to himself and the Royal Family the expression of our deep condolence for the great loss they have sustained—a loss which is not theirs alone, but which I am sure is the loss of all British subjects the whole world over. But I would remind hon. members at the same time that this House has no voice and can take no action except through the Speaker of the House, and that practically it has no existence for business until a Speaker has been elected. So, from the very necessity of the case, our first duty must be to elect a Speaker. I would also remind the House that our next duty, according to parliamentary usage, is to hear from His Excellency the Governor General the reasons why he has thought fit to summon us together. When this double duty has been performed, I am sure it will be very appropriate—and in this I express the views of all the members of this House—that we should pass such an address as I have just alluded to. Therefore, I here and now invite the House to proceed at once to the election of a Speaker, and I suggest as a fit and proper person for the occupancy of that high office—the highest in the gift of the House of Commons—Louis Philippe Brodeur, member for the electoral district of Rouville. The cheers which have just met the name of Mr. Brodeur are an evidence that his acceptance of this high office will be acceptable at all events to this side of the House, and I venture to hope that it will be equally acceptable to the other side. We have endeavoured in this country to follow as closely as possible the parliamentary system of Great Britain, where the accumulated experience of many centuries has brought that system well nigh to perfection. In one particular, however, and a very important one, we have departed from that system. In England, when once a Speaker is elected, he is elected practically for life. He is continued in office from parliament to parliament, and occupies the Chair so long as he has a seat in the House. We have adopted another system. With us it has become almost an article of the unwritten law of parliament that with a new parliament there should be a new Speaker. Of course, a good deal might be

said as to the respective merits of these two practices ; there is no occasion, however, to enter upon such a discussion to-day. The hon. gentleman who was our Speaker in the last parliament, Sir James Edgar, unfortunately did not complete his term, having been removed by death. The hon. gentleman who succeeded him, Mr. Bain, did not seek re-election. Therefore we have not with us to-day the Speaker of the late parliament ; but in that parliament the office of Deputy Speaker was occupied by the hon. gentleman whom I have just named, Mr. Brodeur ; and I venture to assert that he performed the duties of that office with great acceptance to all, displaying both fairness of mind and an accurate knowledge of parliamentary practice ; and in the high position to which I venture to hope he will now be called by the unanimous assent of the House, I am sure he will display the same qualities in a still higher degree, and will be a true representative Speaker, holding even the scales of justice between all parties, and maintaining the principles and dignities of that great office. I therefore beg to move, seconded by Sir Richard Cartwright, that Louis Philippe Brodeur, member representing the electoral district of Rouville, do take the Chair of this House as Speaker.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Sir John Bourinot, speaking for the moment for His Majesty's loyal opposition in this House, I may say that we do not intend to question in any way the selection of the hon. gentleman whose name has been mentioned for the high office of Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada ; and I merely rise to add that we fervently hope on this side of the House that the hon. gentleman, an old colleague of many of us on both sides of the House, will be so able to observe the great traditions of that high office, both in this House and in the House of Commons of the mother country, that he may confidently rely upon the equal support of the gentlemen who sit either to the right or the left of the Chair.

The motion being put to the House,

The Clerk of the House (Sir John Bourinot) declared the motion carried in the affirmative *neminè contradicente*; and Louis Philippe Brodeur, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Rouville, duly elected to the Chair of the House.

Mr. Brodeur was conducted from his seat in the House to the Speaker's Chair by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Richard Cartwright.

Mr. SPEAKER ELECT. I beg to tender to this House my most sincere thanks for the great honour they have been pleased to confer upon me, by electing me to be their Speaker. It will always be my earnest desire to deserve the confidence reposed in me and to discharge my duties with the greatest impartiality. I am somewhat diffident as to my ability to meet the requirements of this important function; but I do venture to rely upon the indulgence of the House, and I am sure that members, on both sides, will always assist me in preserving the freedom and dignity of debate, and in vindicating our rights and privileges according to our rules and established usages.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

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

On motion of the Prime Minister the House adjourned at 3.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 7, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

A Message was delivered by Réné Edouard Kimber, Esq., Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod :

Mr. SPEAKER :

His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this Honourable House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

Then the Hon. Louis Philippe Brodeur Speaker elect, said :

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY :

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

The Hon. The Speaker of the Senate then said :

Mr. SPEAKER :

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

I am commanded also to assure you that the Commons shall have access to His Excellency

upon all seasonable occasions, and that their proceedings, as well as your words and actions, will constantly receive from him the most favourable construction.

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

And the House being returned,

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

FIRST READING.

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

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform this House that when the House attended His Excellency the Governor General this day in the Senate Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament, and, to prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of the Speech, which is as follows :—

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

Since our last meeting the Empire has been called on to lament the demise of Her late Majesty Queen Victoria. The universal regret and sympathy with which the tidings of her decease have been received throughout the entire civilized world, afford the best testimony to the manner in which she has, at all times, discharged her duties, both as a woman and a sovereign, throughout her unprecedentedly long and glorious reign, and I will venture to add that in no portion of her vast territories were those sentiments more profoundly felt than in the Dominion of Canada.

You will, I am sure, take early action to express your sympathy with the Royal Family in their bereavement and your loyalty to the new Sovereign.

The Canadian contingents to South Africa have nearly all returned, and it affords me a very great gratification to be able to assure you that the valour and good conduct of our Canadian soldiers have called forth the highest encomiums from the several commanders under whom they have served during the arduous contest.

The union of the several provinces of Australia into one confederation, upon lines closely resembling those on which our own Dominion has been established, marks another important step towards the consolidation of the outlaying portions of the Empire, and, I am well assured, will call forth your most sincere congratulations to the new commonwealth.

Acting on the advice of my ministers, I had, previously to the great grief which has fallen upon the nation, tendered an invitation on your behalf to His Excellency the Duke of Cornwall and York to conclude his intended visit to Australasia by one to the Dominion of Canada, and I am glad to be able to inform you that His Royal Highness has been pleased to signify his acceptance of the same. I still hope that that visit may not be considered impossible. I have no doubt of the warmth of the welcome with which he will be received.

My government has learned with great satisfaction of the progress being made with the Pacific cable scheme, and I trust that nothing may occur to delay its early completion.

Last summer I made a tour through Canada as far as Dawson City, and was everywhere received with unqualified proofs of devotion and loyalty. During my journey, I was, from personal observation, much impressed with the great activity displayed in the development of the mining and agricultural industries of the country, and with the substantial increase in its population. The thrift, energy and law-abiding character of the immigrants are a subject of much congratulation, and afford ample proof of their usefulness as citizens of the Dominion.

It gives me great pleasure to note the excellent display made by Canada at the Universal Exposition in Paris. The fine quality and varied character of Canadian natural and industrial products is evidenced by the number of awards won in nearly every class of the competition. It is a remarkable testimony to the effectiveness of our cold storage transportation facilities, that fresh fruit grown in Canada secured a large number of the highest awards. It is extremely gratifying to observe that, as a result of the display of Canadian resources, considerable foreign capital has found its way to Canada for investment and large orders from foreign countries have been received for Canadian goods.

The improvement of the St. Lawrence route continues to engage the very careful attention of my government. During the past year ship channels have been widened and deepened, additional lights and buoys have been provided and, in a short time, there will be telegraph and cable communication with Belle Isle. These additional securities will tend to make safer and more efficient than ever our great waterway between the lakes and the Atlantic.

I am glad to observe that the revenue and the general volume of trade continue undiminished, and even show a moderate increase over the very large figures attained during the past year.

Measures will be submitted to you for the better supervision of the export trade in food products, and also in connection with the Post Office, the Pacific cable and various other subjects.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

The accounts for the past year will be laid before you.

The Estimates for the succeeding year will likewise be placed upon the Table at an early date.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I commend to your earnest consideration the measures to be submitted to you, invoking the Divine blessings upon the important labours on which you are again entering.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—NEW LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier.) Before I move the adjournment of the House, I desire to give notice that to-morrow, if it be convenient to my hon. friends on the other side, I propose to move an address to His Majesty the King, of which I intimated the nature yesterday. I will avail myself of this opportunity to tender my congratulations, as well as the congratulations of this side of the House, to my hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) on his advancement to the high office of leader of His Majesty's loyal opposition. Of course, it would not be fitting for me to offer any suggestion whatever, or any observations, as to what should be the internal policy of the Conservative party ; but speaking as a citizen of Canada, I am quite sure that the elevation of my hon. friend to the position that he now occupies must be very gratifying to himself. Speaking personally, and as leader of the House, it affords me much pleasure to think in advance that the relations between my hon. friend and myself will be always pleasant and cordial. I am well aware that it will be my painful duty on many occasions to dissent from the views of my hon. friend because, as it is his misfortune to be in the wrong on the main question, I do not anticipate that he can be in the right on the minor ones. But we will agree to disagree as we have done in the past, and I am quite sure that my hon. friend will believe in my absolute sincerity when I tell him that I hope, with all my heart, he may continue to exercise for a long, long period, the functions of leader of the opposition. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I thank the right hon. gentleman for the kindness and courtesy which he has so well expressed in the remarks he has just seen fit to make with regard to myself. He will permit me, however, to say, in passing, that if I should remain leader of the opposition for as long a period as that joke is old, it will be wholly beyond my own expectations, and beyond the expectations of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. It will be our painful duty, I expect, on some occasions, to differ with the right hon. gentleman and those who support him, as to what will be the best interests of the country, but I can only say that I shall add my efforts to his in the direction that our differences shall be adjusted, so far as they can be adjusted in this House, in a kindly and courteous manner. In saying that, I am sure that I voice the sentiments of every hon. gentleman on this side of the House. It is needless for me to say that I have accepted the trust which has been reposed in me by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House with a great deal of diffidence and hesitation. That diffidence and that hesitation have not been inspired by any fear of the loyalty or fidelity of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, in which I have the most perfect confidence. They have rather been inspired by my own comparative inexperience in public life, and by the fact that I doubted my own capacity to follow in the footsteps of those great men, who, in times past, have filled the position of leader, on one side or other, in the House, of the party which I now have the honour to lead in this House. I remember also that the traditions of this House have been sustained by great men who are now on the other side of the House, but who for many years fought the battles of their party with more or less varying fortune from the side of the House which is now occupied by my hon. friends and myself. It will be quite convenient for us to dispose of the motion to which the right hon. gentleman has referred to-morrow, and I am sure that the motion which has been suggested will receive the most cordial support from hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

REPORT.

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

On motion of the Prime Minister the House adjourned at 3.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 8, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—INTERNAL ECONOMY.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message, as follows :—

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons an approved Minute of Council, appointing the Honourable Sir Richard Cartwright, G.C.M.G., Minister of Trade and Commerce; the Honourable Sir Louis Henry Davies, K. C. M. G., Minister of Marine and Fisheries ; the Honourable William Stevens Fielding, Minister of Finance, and the Honourable Joseph Israel Tarte, Minister of Public Works, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons, as Commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the 13th Chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled : 'An Act respecting the House of Commons.'

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, February 7, 1901.

DEATH OF QUEEN VICTORIA.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the resolution of which I gave notice yesterday, which seems to be eminently called for by the fatal occurrence under which we have met. We have met under the shadow of a death which has caused more universal mourning than has ever been recorded in the pages of history. In these words there is no exaggeration ; they are the literal truth. There is mourning in the United Kingdom, in the colonies, and in the many islands and continents which form the great empire over which extend the sovereignty of Queen Victoria. There is mourning deep, sincere, heartfelt in the mansions of the great, and of the rich, and in the cottages of the poor and lowly ; for to all her subjects, whether high or low, whether rich or poor, the Queen, in her long reign had become an object of almost sacred veneration.

There is sincere and unaffected regret in all of the nations of Europe, for all the nations of Europe had learned to appreciate, to admire, and to envy the many qualities of Queen Victoria, those many public and domestic virtues which were the pride of her subjects.

There is genuine grief in the neighbouring nation of seventy-five million inhabitants, the kinsmen of her own people, by whom, at all times, and under all circumstances, her name was held in high reverence, and where, in the darkest days of the civil war, when the relations of the two countries were strained, almost to the point of snapping, the poet Whittier well expressed the feeling of his countrymen when he exclaimed :

> We bowed the heart, if not the knee,
> To England's Queen, God bless her.

There is wailing and lamentation amongst the savage and barbarian peoples of her vast empire, in the wigwams of our own Indian tribes, in the huts of the coloured races of Africa and of India, to whom she was at all times the great mother, the living impersonation of majesty and benevolence. Aye, and there is mourning also, genuine and unaffected, in the farm houses of South Africa, which have been lately, and still are devastated by war, for it is a fact that above the clang of arms, above the many angers engendered by the war, the name of Queen Victoria was always held in high respect, even by those who are fighting her troops, as a symbol of justice, and perhaps her kind hand was much relied upon when the supreme hour of reconciliation should come.

Undoubtedly we may find in history instances where death has caused perhaps more passionate outbursts of grief, but it is impossible to find instances where death has caused so universal, so sincere, so heartfelt an expression of sorrow. In the presence of these many evidences of grief which come not only from her own dominions, but from all parts of the globe ; in the presence of so many tokens of admiration, where it is not possible to find a single discordant note ; in the presence of the immeasurable void caused by the death of Queen Victoria, it is not too much to say that the grave has just closed upon one of the great characters of history.

What is greatness ? We are accustomed to call great, those exceptional beings upon whom heaven has bestowed some of its choicest gifts, which astonish and dazzle the world by the splendour of faculties, phenomenally developed, even when these faculties are much marred by defects and weaknesses which make them nugatory of good. But this is not, in my estimation, at least, the highest conception of greatness. The equipoise of a well-balanced mind, the equilibrium of faculties well and evenly ordered, the luminous insight of a calm judgment, are gifts which are as rarely found in one human being, as the possession of the more dazzling though less solid qualities. And when these high qualities are found in a ruler of men, combined with purity of soul, kindness of heart, generosity of disposition, elevation of purpose, and devotion to duty, this is what seems to me to be the highest conception of greatness, greatness which will be abundantly productive of happiness

and glory to the people under such a sovereign. If I mistake not, such was the character of Queen Victoria, and such were the results of her rule. It has been our privilege to live under her reign, and it must be admitted that her reign was of the grandest in history, rivalling in length, and more than rivalling in glory the long reign of Louis XIV., and more than the reign of Louis XIV., likely to project its lustre into future ages.

If we cast our glance back over the sixty-four years into which was encompassed the reign of Queen Victoria, we stand astonished, however familiar we may be with the facts, at the development of civilization which has taken place during that period. We stand astonished at the advance of culture, of wealth, of legislation, of education, of literature, of the arts and sciences, of locomotion by land and by sea, and of almost every department of human activity. The age of Queen Victoria must be held to be on a par with the most famous within the memory of man. Of course, of many facts and occurrences which have contributed to make the reign of Queen Victoria what it was, to give it the splendour which has created such an impression upon her own country, and which has shed such a luminous trail all over the world, many took place apart and away from her influence. Many events took place in relation to which the most partial panegyrists would, no doubt, have to say, that they were simply the happy circumstance of the time in which she lived. Science, for instance, might have obtained the same degree of development under another monarch.

It is also possible that literature might have flourished under another monarch, but I believe that the contention can be advanced, and advanced truly, that the literature of the Victoria age to a large extent reflected the influence of the Queen. To the eternal glory of the literature of the reign of Queen Victoria be it said, that it was pure and absolutely free from the grossness which disgraced it in former ages, and which still unhappily is the shame of the literature of other countries. Happy indeed is the country whose literature is of such a character that it can be the intellectual food of the family circle ; that it can be placed by the mother in the hands of her daughter with abundant assurance that while the mind is improved the heart is not polluted. Such is the literature of the Victorian age. For this blessing, in my judgment, no small credit is due to the example and influence of our departed Queen. It is a fact well known in history, that in England as in other countries, the influence of the sovereign was always reflected upon the literature of the reign. In former ages, when the court was impure, the literature of the nation was impure, but in the age of Queen Victoria, where the life of the court was pure, the literature of the age was pure also. If it be true that there is a real connection between the high moral standard of the court of the sovereign and the literature of the age, then I can say without hesitation that Queen Victoria has conferred, not only upon her own people, but upon mankind at large, a gift for which we can never have sufficient appreciation.

But there are features of the reign of Queen Victoria which are directly traceable to her influence, and if I were to give my own appreciation of events as they have made their impression upon my judgment, I would say that in three particulars has the reign of Queen Victoria been most beneficient.

It has been stated more than once that she was a model constitutional sovereign. She was more than that. She was not only a model constitutional sovereign, but she was undoubtedly the first constitutional sovereign the world ever saw—she was the first absolutely constitutional sovereign which England ever had, and England we know has been in advance of the world in constitutioal parliamentary government. It may be said without exaggeration, that up to the time of the accession of Queen Victoria to the Throne, the history of England was a record of a continuous contest between the sovereign and the parliament for supremacy. That contest was of many centuries duration, and it was not terminated by the revolution of 1688, for although after that revolution the contest never took a violent form, still it continued for many reigns in court intrigues and plots ; the struggle on the part of the sovereign being to rule according to his own views ; the struggle on the part of parliament being to rule according to the views of the people.

Queen Victoria was the first of all sovereigns who was absolutely impersonal—impersonal politically I mean. Whether the question at issue was the Abolition of the Corn Laws, or the war in the Crimea, or the extension of the Suffrage, or the Disestablishment of the Irish Church, or Home Rule in Ireland, the Queen never gave any information of what her views were upon any of these great political issues. Her subjects never knew what were her personal views, though views she had, because she was a woman of strong intellect, and we know that she followed public events with great eagerness. We can presume, indeed we know, that whenever a new policy was presented to her by her Prime Minister she discussed that policy with him, and sometimes approved or sometimes, perhaps, dissented. But whether she approved or disapproved no one ever knew what her views were, and she left the praise or the blame to those who were responsible to the people. That wise policy upon the part of our late sovereign early bore fruit, and in ever-increasing abundance. The reward to the Queen was not only in the gratitude and affection of

her people, but in the security of her throne, and dynasty. When the terrible year of 1848 came ; when all the nations of Europe were convulsed by revolution ; when thrones were battered by the infuriated billows of popular passions ; England, England alone, was absolutely calm and peaceful. Thrones crumbled to pieces like steeples in an earthquake, but the throne of the Sovereign Queen of England was never disturbed ; it was firm in the affection of her subjects. As the reign advanced, it became the pride of her subjects that there was more freedom in monarchic England than under any democratic or republican form of government in existence. That being true, the Queen rendered her people a very great service indeed. She saved them from socialistic agitation, and so the great prosperity of England to-day is due not only to wise and economic laws, but due also to the personality of the Queen, and to her prudent conduct all through the sixty years of her reign.

But that is not all. The most remarkable event in the reign of Queen Victoria—an event which took place in silence and unobserved—the most remarkable event in the reign of the late Queen was the marvellous progress in colonial development, development which, based upon local autonomy, ended in colonial expansion.

Let us remember that in the first year of the Queen's reign, there was rebellion in this very country. There was rebellion in the then foremost colony of Great Britain ; rebellion in Lower Canada, rebellion in Upper Canada ; rebellion—let me say it at once, because it is only the truth to say it —rebellion, not against the authority of the young Queen, but rebellion against the pernicious system of government which then prevailed. This rebellion was put down by force, and if the question had then been put : 'What shall be the condition of these colonies at the end of Victoria's reign,' the universal answer would have been : 'Let the end of the reign be near or let it be remote, when that end comes these rebellious colonies shall have wrenched their independence, or they shall be, sullen and discontented, kept down by force.' If, on the contrary, some one had there said : 'You are all mistaken ; when the reign comes to an end, these colonies shall not be rebellious; they shall not have claimed their independence; they shall have grown into a nation, covering one-half of this continent ; they shall have become to all intents and purposes one independent nation under the flag of England, and that flag shall not be maintained by force, but shall be maintained by the affection and gratitude of the people.' If such a prophecy had been made, it would have been considered as the hallucination of a visionary dreamer—but, Sir, to-day that dream is a reality, that prophecy has come true. To-day the rebellious colonies of 1837 are the nation of Canada—I use the word 'nation' advisedly—to-day the rebellious colonies of 1837 are the nation of Canada, acknowledging the supremacy of the Crown of England, maintaining that supremacy, not by force of arms, but simply by their own affection, with only one garrison in Canada at this present moment, and that garrison manned by Canadian volunteers.

What has been the cause of that marvellous change? The cause is primarily the personality of Queen Victoria. Of course the visible and chief cause of all is the bold policy inaugurated many years ago of introducing parliamentary constitutional government, and allowing the colonies to govern themselves. But, Sir, it is manifest that self-government could never have been truly effective in Canada had it not been that there was a wise sovereign reigning in England, who had herself given the fullest measure of constitutional government to her own people. If the people of England had not been ruled by a wise Queen; if they had not themselves possessed parliamentary government in the truest sense of the term; if the British parliament had been as it had been under former kings in open contention with the sovereign, then it is quite manifest that Canada could not have enjoyed the development of constitutional government which she enjoys to-day. It is quite manifest that if the people of England had not possessed constitutional government in the fullest degree at home, they could not have given it to the colonies ; and thus the action of the Queen in giving constitutional government to England has strengthened the Throne, not only in England, but in the colonies as well.

There is another feature of the Queen's reign which is but little taken notice of today, but which, in my judgment, has an importance which we have not yet fully realized, and perhaps the term of which we have not yet seen. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, all the colonies of England in America, with the single exception of the French colony of Quebec, claimed their independence, and obtained it by the force of arms. The contest was a long and arduous one. It left in the breast of the new nation which was then born a feeling of—shall I say the word?—yes, a feeling of hatred, which continued from generation to generation, and which extended into our own time. Happily we can say at this moment that this feeling of hatred has largely abated. I would not say that it has altogether disappeared. Perhaps we can still find traces of it here and there ; but that feeling has so largely abated, that there is to-day between England and the United States of America an ever-growing friendship. What are the factors which have made this possible ? Of all the factors which have made reconciliation possible, the personality of the Queen is doubtless the foremost. It is a matter of history

that from the day of her accession to the Throne, the Queen exhibited, under all available circumstances, an abounding and lasting friendship towards that country which but for the fault of a vicious government would still have formed part of her dominions—a friendship which could not fail to touch the minds and hearts of a sensitive people. This was manifest in times of peace, but still more in time of war, and especially in the supreme hour of trial of the United States during the civil war. In the early months of the civil war, as perhaps few now remember, an event took place which almost led to hostilities between Great Britain and the United States. An American man-of-war stopped a British merchant ship on the high sea, and forcibly abducted from it two envoys of the confederate government on their way to Europe. That act was a violation of the territory of England, because England has always held the decks of her ships to be part of her territory. It not only caused excitement in England, but it caused excitement of a different kind in the United States. The action of the commander of the war vessel in making the abduction aroused a great deal of enthusiasm among the people of the United States, which was reflected even on the floor of Congress, and evoked many meetings and resolutions of commendation. Lord Palmerston was at that time the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and he was not the man to brook such an affront. He had a despatch prepared by the Foreign Minister, who, if I remember rightly, was at that time Lord Russell, peremptorily demanding the return of the prisoners and an apology. The despatch which had been prepared was submitted to the Queen; and then was revealed the good sense and the kind heart of the wise and good woman at the head of the British nation. She sent back the despatch remarking that it was couched in too harsh terms, and that it ought to be modified to make possible the surrender of the prisoners without any surrender of dignity on the part of the United States. This wise counsel was followed ; the despatch was modified accordingly ; the prisoners were released, and the danger of war was averted. That act on the part of the Queen made a most favourable impression on the minds of the people of the United States. But that was not all. Three years, or a little more afterwards, at the close of the civil war, when the union of the United States had been confirmed, when slavery had been abolished, when rebellion had been put down, the civilized world was shocked to hear of the foul assassination of the wise and good man who had carried his country through that ordeal. Then the good heart and sound judgment of the Queen were again manifested. She sent a letter to the widow of the martyred president—not as the Queen of Great Britain to the widow of the president of the United States ; but she sent a letter of sympathy from a widow to a widow, herself being then in the first years of her own bereavement. That action on her part made a very deep impression upon the minds of the American people ; it touched not only the heart of the widowed wife, but the heart of the widowed nation ; it stirred the souls of strong men; it caused tears to course down the cheeks of veterans who had courted death during the previous four years on a thousand battlefields. I do not say that it brought about reconciliation, but it made reconciliation possible. It was the first rift in the clouds; and to-day, in the time of England's mourning, the American people flock to their churches, pouring their blessings upon the memory of Britain's Queen. I do not hope, I do not believe it possible, that the two countries which were severed in the eighteenth century, can ever be again united politically ; but perhaps it is not too much to hope that the friendship thus inaugurated by the hand of the Queen may continue to grow until the two nations are united again, not by legal bonds, but by ties of affection as strong, perhaps, as if sanctioned by all the majesty of the laws of the two countries; and if such an event were ever to take place, the credit of it would be due to the wise and noble woman who thus would have proved herself to be one of the greatest of statesmen, simply by following the instincts of her heart.

Sir, in a life in which there is so much to be admired, perhaps the one thing most to be admired is that naturalness, that simplicity in the character of the Queen which showed itself in such actions as I have just described. From the first day of her reign to the last, she conquered and kept the affections of her people, simply because under all circumstances, and on all occasions, whether important or trivial, she did the one thing that ought to be done, and did it in the way most natural and simple. Thus, on the day of her accession to the Throne, when she had to hold her first Council of State, when she had to meet veterans of the army and dignitaries of the church and the state, she performed all her duties in such a way as at once to win the hearts of all present. The Duke of Wellington expressed his gratification in the blunt language of an old soldier by remarking that if she had been his own daughter, he could not have expected her to have done better. So it was on the first day, so it was every day, so it was on the last day of her reign.

She was a Queen, she was also a wife and a mother. She had her full share of the joys and sorrows of life. She loved, she suffered. Perhaps, though a Queen, she had a larger share of the sorrows than of the joys of life, for as Chateaubriand somewhere says, we have come to know how much there is of tears

in the eyes of queens. Her married life was one of the noblest that could be conceived. It can be summed up in one word: it was happy. But death prematurely placed her cold hand upon her happiness by the removal of the noble companion of her life at an early age. From that moment she never was exactly the same. To the end of her life she mourned like Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be consoled. After the lapse of forty years, time may have assuaged, but it did not remove her grief; we can apply to her the beautiful language of the French poet:

Dans sa première larme elle noya son cœur.
('In her first tear she drowned her heart.')

She is now no more—no more? Nay, I boldly say she lives—lives in the hearts of her subjects; lives in the pages of history. And as the ages revolve, as her pure profile stands more marked against the horizon of time, the verdict of posterity will ratify the judgment of those who were her subjects. She ennobled mankind; she exalted royalty—the world is better for her life.

Sir, the Queen is no more, let us with one heart say: Long live the King!

I propose to the House that we should unite in a resolution to His Majesty the King, to convey to him the expression of our sorrow at the loss he has suffered—a loss which, we may say with every respect, is ours also.

I propose that we should unite in conveying to the King the expression of the loyalty of his Canadian subjects.

Only a few days ago His Majesty sent a message to his broad dominions across the sea, in which he said it would be his aim in life to follow in the footsteps of his great and noble mother. Sir, we did not want that assurance on the part of His Majesty, to know that the wise policy and the wise conduct of the great Queen whom he has succeeded on the Throne would be his guide. We have believed from the first that he who was a wise prince would be a wise King, that the policy which has made the British Empire so great under his predecessor would also be his policy, and that the reign of King Edward the Seventh would be simply a continuation of the reign of Queen Victoria.

On our part let us offer to His Majesty the King the expression of our loyalty—a loyalty which does not spring from any sycophancy or fetichism—but from grateful hearts, who duly appreciate the blessing of living under British institutions. Let us wish him Godspeed, and let us hope that his reign may be as fruitful of good as was that of his wise predecessor. I now beg to move:—

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty:

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN:

We, Your Majesty's dutitful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, humbly beg leave to approach Your Majesty with the expression of our deep and heartfelt sorrow at the demise of our late Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria.

In common with our fellow subjects in all parts of the empire, we deplore the loss of a great ruler whose manifold and exalted virtues have for three generations commanded the respect and admiration of the world.

As representatives of the Canadian people, we mourn for the beloved Sovereign under whom our Dominion first rose into being, and to whose wise and beneficent sway are due in no small measure its growth and prosperity.

May we venture to add that above and beyond these sentiments which the sad occasion naturally calls forth, there has come to each one of us a sense of personal bereavement which, we say it with all possible respect and duty, makes Your Majesty's sorrow our own.

We pray that the God of consolation may comfort Your Majesty and the members of the Royal Family in the affliction.

It is with feelings not less deep and sincere than those to which we have just given utterance that we hail Your Majesty's accession to the Throne of your ancestors. We beg to assure Your Majesty of our devoted attachment to Your Majesty's person and government, and to express our unclouded confidence that the glory and the greatness of the British Empire abroad, and the happiness and well-being of Your Majesty's people at home, will suffer no diminution under Your Majesty's gracious rule.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I have little to add, Mr. Speaker, to the very eloquent and appropriate words in which my right hon. friend, the Prime Minister, has moved his resolution, beyond saying that it will meet, I am sure, with the cordial approval and support of every member of this House.

The right hon. gentleman has well referred to the condition of this country at the time when Her Gracious Majesty ascended the Throne, and its condition at the present time. Then there were five or six disconnected provinces, having little means of inter-communication, with hostile tariffs between them, with our North-west a wilderness, and with British Columbia an unknown country. Now we find this great country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, governed by one parliament, subject to the same general laws; and instead of rebellion, we see our volunteer soldiers returning home from fighting the battles of the empire across the seas. It is truly a great change, and a change which has been, to no small extent, brought about by the influence of Her late Majesty.

I may be permitted to add a word with respect to the interest which Her Majesty always took in her colonies on this side of the Atlantic. We well remember how anxious she was that the measure should pass which resulted in the confederation of these provinces. I may recall the words which Sir John Macdonald addressed to Her Majesty on the occasion of his interview at that time. 'We have desired,' he said, 'in this measure to declare, in the most solemn and emphatic manner, our resolve

to be under the sovereignty of your Majesty and your family for ever.' These words are particularly appropriate for all of us to remember at this time. And this we know, that subsequently, when the great work of binding together the provinces of Canada by a great railway was completed, Her Majesty expressed to Sir John Macdonald, in a letter, her pleasure at its accomplishment, stating that she had watched its progress with much interest, and that she hoped for the future success of a work of such value and importance to the empire.

Then, Sir, we may well recall the kindly words which Her Majesty addressed to Lady Macdonald on the death of Sir John Macdonald, and not less may we recall the kindness which she exhibited towards the family of the late Sir John Thompson on the occasion of his death in England. We remember that on that occasion she placed on his coffin a wreath of lilies and laurels as a token of her sincere respect for him, and the country of which, at the time of his death, he was Prime Minister.

I entirely concur in all that my right hon. friend has so well said with respect to the influence of Her Majesty, both in public and in private life, and I feel that perhaps one more word may be added in that connection, namely, the great toleration which she exhibited for all opinions, the great sympathy which went out from her to all races and creeds in the vast dominions over which she ruled. Victoria was great enough to recognize the greatness of truth, to know that it had many sides, and I believe that her influence in that respect will survive long in the memory which will be handed down of the achievements accomplished during her reign.

I think we might well quote, as a nation, with respect to her, the touching words which James Russell Lowell addressed to his wife :

> Blessing is she; God made her so.

Throughout the empire—not only throughout Canada, but throughout the empire—we may well say of her who is now gone :

> Blessing was she ; God made her so.

I believe that nowhere in the empire more than in Canada, will her memory be honoured and revered ; and may we not add that in our sorrow for her death, though in the fullness of her years, there is mingled a note of triumph for the character and the example she has left behind her.

With respect to the accession of His Most Gracious Majesty, it might be well to recall that when visiting Canada, and while he was yet a young man, he laid the corner-stone of this very building in which we now assemble. The corner-stone which he then laid might well have been thought a symbol of the great dominion which has since grown up. As the right hon. gentleman has said, there have been great developments during the reign of Her late Majesty. The foundations of our great Dominion were laid deep and broad and true during that time. Let us hope, as we all believe, that the structure which will be erected upon these foundations in the reign of King Edward VII. will be a fair and stately one, a structure of which all the empire, and not Canada alone, may well be proud.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That a Message be sent to the Senate, informing their Honours that this House has passed an Address to His Majesty the King expressing the deep and heartfelt sorrow of this House at the demise of our late Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria, and requesting their Honours to unite with this House in the said Address.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of the Prime Minister the House adjourned at 4 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 11, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That the Order for the consideration of the motion for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session, have precedence over all other business except introduction of Bills, until disposed of.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 2) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Explain.

Mr. INGRAM. I may say that it is in respect to perfecting the ballot.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

AN ACT RESPECTING MONEY-LENDERS.

Mr. J. A. C. MADORE (Hochelaga) (translation) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 3) respecting money-lenders.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Explain.

Mr. MADORE. (Translation.) As the Bill is not yet printed, I would ask to be allowed to postpone my explanations until the Bill comes up for its second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and in rising to perform this important duty, permit me to say, at the outset, that I am deeply sensible of the high honour which has been conferred upon me in my selection for the important task. I am also well aware of the difficulties which beset my path, and I would ask, Sir, with great respect, that the House would view my shortcomings with that lenience which in times past it has bestowed upon hon. members under similar circumstances. My inexperience will, perhaps, appear the greater, and I trust, on that account, your indulgence will be the less restricted, when I inform you that the past two or three days have furnished the only opportunity which I have ever had, even as a mere spectator, of witnessing the deliberations of this House ; so that my request is by no means a formal one, but by all means a most sincere one, when I ask you to bear with me for a short time whie I endeavour humbly to discharge the honourable duty which has been cast upon me. Hon. members will agree at the outset, when I remark that parliament has met upon the present occasion under circumstances, which, while they are both solemn and momentous, are likewise without parallel in the history and experience of the House. We have now embarked upon the first session of a new parliament, in the first year of a new century, and in the first year of the reign of a new sovereign. While these are conditions which render the present session more or less unique, there are other conditions which render it more than ordinarily impressive. During the brief period which intervened between the autumn dissolution and the meeting of the present House, an event of world-wide magnitude and importance has transpired in the British Empire in the death of our late Sovereign Lady the Queen, and the consequent demise of the Crown upon her illustrious son and successor His Majesty King Edward VII. It would be utterly impossible for me to add anything to the eloquent and finished tributes which have already been paid in this House to the memory of our late Queen, tributes which so fully and so appropriately express not only the sentiments of the House, but likewise the sentiments of the whole country. Permit me only to remark in this respect, that the long and glorious reign which has just been brought to a close will for many years to come form a particularly bright spot in British history to which Canadians will look with the greatest veneration and gratitude. It was the reign that gave Canada national birth ; the reign which raised her from a position of comparative colonial obscurity to the high position she occupies to-day in British history. It was the reign which not only gave us a constitution, but which moulded and construed our constitution and rendered it the almost perfect system of government it is to-day. It is gratifying to our pride to know that our Canadian constitution has been very largely adopted as a model for the federation into one great British territory at the other side of the globe. To the people of the Australian Commonwealth the people of Canada extend most hearty greeting and most cordial congratulation.

Her late Majesty acceded to the Throne through a long line of noble ancestors, a line to which her own reign has added untold dignity and splendour. And, while we mourn her loss, yet we can rejoice that she has left us a strong line of her own royal blood and descent who, by God's grace we pay, may long be spared to reign over us.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE. It will be gratifying intelligence to the people of this country to learn that Canada has at this most opportune time extended to His Royal Highness the Duke of Cornwall and York an invitation to visit this country on his return from his contemplated visit to the Australian Commonwealth. His Royal Highness has been graciously pleased to accept that invitation, and all Canadians, without distinction, will prepare to give a loyal and a fitting welcome to that noble prince not only on account of his exalted station as heir-apparent to the British Throne ; not only on his own account, but because he is the son of our reigning sovereign and the grandson of our late Queen whose death all Canada yet so bitterly mourns.

However, Sir, we must turn from the past with its glorious and vast achievements, with its triumphs and its mournings —our duty lies before us. Full well we know that this busy world throbs on careless of the coming and going of sovereigns. We must prepare to wrestle with the problems of the present and provide for the future. From a material point of view the speech from the Throne furnishes many substantial grounds for congratulation upon the excellent position which Canada occupies at the present time. It is very pleasing to know the vast strides which in recent

years have been made towards colonization and towards the fuller development of our varied resources. It is most satisfactory also to know that almost every branch of industry in this country is to-day flourishing. I have before me recently compiled figures relative to the trade of this Dominion which would furnish a most interesting theme did time permit me to discuss them, but I shall refrain from doing so as hon. members will be able to see these figures in the departmental returns. However, Sir, common every-day experience in the business world will establish far more clearly than statistics or returns would ever prove, that the golden era of prosperity in this country, which dawned shortly after this administration attained power——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Every day experience in the business world proves that the golden era of prosperity shows up to the present time no apparent sign of diminution, but on the contrary, Canadians may look forward to even vaster and more profitable commercial operations in the future than they have enjoyed in the past. I am well aware, Sir, that it is a vexed question as to what precise degree of credit the administration of the day is entitled to for the very happy surroundings which we now see on all sides. I do not know that any useful purpose can be served by an examination of the facts with the view of ascertaining just what the legitimate claims of the government are in that respect. I assume, Sir, that the government itself rests content with the knowledge, not only that its fiscal policy has received the approval of the great bulk of the community, but likewise with the knowledge that it must have received a considerable degree of approval even in the estimation of those who seemingly opposed it. It was approved at least to this extent: that its opponents did not see fit to offer any well defined alternative policy of their own but rather contented themselves with a desultory and indefinite sort of criticism of the general and detailed policy of the administration. I am well aware that I would enter upon highly contentious ground if I were to attempt a discussion of these much-debated subjects. However, I believe I may be permitted to remark in passing, that no matter how marked may be the division of opinion upon the government's rightful dues in these respects, upon another phase of the question, there is a singular unanimity of opinion in Canada, and that is, that if the course of those who are opposed to the policy of the government has in any degree whatever contributed to the general prosperity, it is in a degree so minute as to be quite imperceptible.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is a well recognized fact that there is a certain peculiar spirit of generosity which frequently pervades the mind of the victor in the hour of his victory, and I think the hon. members on this side of the House will be generous enough and candid enough to acknowledge the many grave difficulties which involved their opponents and against which their opponents were compelled to contend, not only in the recent general election, but likewise in the general election of 1896. We will remember that in 1896 our opponents were a government battling against adversity and in 1900 they were an opposition battling against prosperity. While there was a marked similarity in the difficulties of the two situations, there was a marked dissimilarity in the conditions under which they were forced to contend. I am satisfied that neither of these difficult positions—neither that of 1896 nor that of 1900—was the result of deliberate choice, these were rather the result of what I might term the admixture of fault and of misfortune. It was largely fault in 1896, and it was largely misfortune in 1900 which compelled hon. gentlemen opposite to labour under those unfavourable conditions. At this distance of time we have probably grown more candid than we were immediately after the event and I think it will now be readily assented to on all hands, that if the prevailing commercial distress in Canada for two or three years prior to 1896 was not wholly the result, it was very largely the result of the misdirected efforts of the Conservative administration of that day. And though we may not as readily admit it to-day, I believe that in two or three years, when we have grown more candid, we will admit that the very marked prosperity in Canada to-day, if not entirely, is very largely the result of the well-directed efforts of the administration of this day. Of hon. members opposite one might be permitted to say that their difficulty as a government in 1896 was to excuse adversity, while their difficulty as an opposition in 1900 was to explain away prosperity; and in order to achieve this end with as little injury as possible to the credit of the government of 1896 and to allow as little credit as possible to the government of 1900, they boldly proclaimed to the people that these very wide-apart conditions of commerce in this country were not the result of the acts or omission of any government, but were entirely the result of the prevailing trade conditions throughout the world. Their argument in a reduced form was simply this, that depression throughout the world renders Canadian success impossible, and commercial prosperity throughout the world renders depression in this country impossible. Now, Sir, while that argument might be applied to some countries, it is, in my humble opinion in the case of Canada, a thoroughly fallacious and

perhaps pernicious one, and one not likely to inspire any very great confidence in the future of the country.

I do not offer these remarks, Sir, in any spirit of unkind criticism, nor with the idea of exciting discussion upon them; but I offer them more as a prelude to a statement which I would now venture to make. Whether it has arisen from the course of hon. gentlemen opposite, whether, perhaps, in some degree it may have arisen from the course of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House during their somewhat prolonged training as an opposition, or whether it arises entirely from other causes, there is in Canada an opinion of some prevalence which I think should be discouraged; that is, that trade conditions in this country are almost entirely dominated or controlled by trade conditions throughout the world—that the world's prosperity is necessary to ensure Canadian success, and that world-wide trade depression will involve this country in calamity as surely as night follows day. Now, Sir, I for one most emphatically dissent from a proposition involving such a wholesale admission that the trade conditions of this country are so entirely dependent upon foreign conditions. While it would be unreasonable to argue that we can pursue the even tenor of our way in peace and plenty, absolutely indifferent to or independent of external conditions, what I do maintain is this, that Canada should be far less dependent upon external conditions than almost any other nation in the world. Be the world's distress as marked as it may be, that is no conclusive reason why with reasonably progressive and able government, Canada should not at all times and under all circumstances enjoy a very fair measure of prosperity, and no period of prolonged or marked distress at all. I do not believe we shall ever go seriously behind the proud record which has been established in the last few years. Certain it is that without the very grossest mismanagement and incapacity, Canada will never be relegated to that humiliating, that melancholy condition through which Canadians made so gallant a struggle for two or three years prior to 1896.

I do not make these remarks in any spirit of idle boasting. I believe the position is well backed up by the facts. I feel that we occupy a position of superior advantage to that of other commercial nations, and superior advantage to that of our chief trade competitor, the United States. Hon. members know far better than I do the facts and reasons that go to prove the truth of this assertion. I can only mention a few of them, and discuss them most superficially.

In the first place, we are a very new and young country. National youth may involve some disabilities; but it has compensating advantages, and Canada's youth is by no means the least of her advantages. We have an intelligent and educated population, and a population capable of great adaptability ; and that is a great thing in a country offering such a diversity of opportunity as Canada offers.

Then, Sir, a more important reason is that we have untold natural wealth. The natural wealth of this country is its reserve capital, a capital which has hardly yet been drawn upon at all—resources, not piled in impossible situations, not stored under impossible conditions, but for the most part ready for the hand of man. Take not only the fact that we have these resources, but consider the nature of the resources. Look at the natural products of the country, look at all the products of the country, if you will, and what will strike one who examines the trade reports is the very great proportion of our total trade which is made up of that class of commerce which the world deems necessaries, and the relatively small proportion of our trade which is made up of that class of commerce which the world calls luxuries. Older countries claiming greater refinement and larger riches, go into the production of luxuries to a far greater extent than a new country does; and in a moment of world-wide depression that country which produces luxuries is the country first to suffer, while the country which produces the prime necessaries of life, as Canada does in abundance, will be the last country in the world to feel the depression. There will never be a time, Sir, when the people do not want bread, meat, and the other food products which this country offers. There will never be a time when the commercial requirements of the age will not demand iron, steel, timber, fuel and the like articles of prime necessity which Canada can supply in abundance.

Then, Sir, as another reason why we occupy so essentially good a position, consider the natural advantages of the country. Take the great waterways extending from the very heart of the country to the seaboard; improved, it is true, by artificial means involving great expenditure, but now forming a reasonably complete system from the centre of the country to the Atlantic ocean. If there is one thing which the government of the day, and perhaps parliament, may take credit for, it is the manner in which they have viewed the question of transportation in recent years. I do not think anything has been done in recent years that has been more appreciated by the people of Canada than the wise expenditure which has taken place in bettering the transportation facilities of this country. The man who ten years ago would predict that raw fruit grown in Canada would be exhibited in Europe and carry off many of the leading prizes there, would have been looked upon as an idle dreamer; yet, Sir, in this first year of the new century, that is an accomplished fact; and that fact alone

opens up boundless possibilities for the future trade of this country.

These are some of the reasons why I claim that Canada occupies a position of pre-eminent advantage. I know that it may be said that all I have advanced may be advanced equally on behalf of our great trade competitor, the United States. It may be said that they have an intelligent people, great resources and great waterways, that they produce an abundance of the necessaries of life, and still that country does suffer from periods of marked depression—why not Canada ? Well, Sir, while a few years ago that might be an argument, almost a conclusive argument, against us, the relative position has since become changed and no longer can it be seriously advanced. There was, a few years ago, some degree of parallel, but we have reached a point when there is no longer any parallel between the two situations. We have now, I maintain, a position of far greater advantage than that enjoyed by the United States. It took us a long time to recognize that we had such a position and to appreciate it, but now that we have given due recognition to the fact, each succeeding year will magnify that advantage. Just so long as Great Britain continues to be the great commercial centre of the world, just so long as she continues the dominant factor in the money markets of the world, just so long as we find in her one of the great consuming powers —the great publishing and distributing power in the world's commerce—and just so long as we maintain our present trade relations with the mother land, Canada is bound to enjoy a pre-eminent advantage over her chief trade competitor.

We have always been a part of the British Empire, relatively speaking, for a century and a half at least, we have been a part of that system, but the bond between the mother land and the colony has been, for the greater part, one of sentiment. It was one which afforded us sentimental gratification, it is true. We were delighted that we were British subjects, living under British rule, enjoying British institutions, but beyond that sentimental gratification, the bond was a very vague and visionary affair. Well, Mr. Speaker, we still enjoy that sentimental gratification and have increased it a hundredfold, but we have to-day besides a still stronger bond—the material bond of commercial advantage.

Now, if you will permit me I will for a moment go back a little to advert briefly to what many of us, myself included, looked upon as a sort of crisis in the affairs of this country. I refer to that period of time when the United States adopted towards Canada what many looked upon as a distinctly hostile tariff. I think it was in 1891 that the McKinley tariff was first put in force, and while I have no doubt that there is a uniform opinion in Canada to-day that the ideal trade condition both for Canada and the United States would be a very large measure of reciprocal trade, there seems to be just as uniform an opinion, on the other side of the line, that the proper policy for that country is a high protective system. When the McKinley tariff was first put in force, there were many Canadians who considered that something like a staggering blow had been dealt to a large part of the commerce of this country. But, I do not think that, at this period of time, any one would say that the adoption of that high tariff was an evil unmixed with a large element of blessing. If it did nothing else, it made us more independent and put us on our resources and our mettle. Nevertheless, the fact remains that when that tariff did come into operation it seriously disorganized and disarranged a large portion of the trade of this country by cutting it off from the market where it had been profitably disposed of for many years. But our people, during that crisis in our history, showed their adaptability to circumstances and their readiness to meet new conditions. They said : If we cannot send our horses and barley and hay and other products to the United States, where we have been sending them for years, we will find new markets for them. There was then a Conservative government in power. In my humble opinion and belief, if ever an opportunity was offered in the history of this country for the display of some of those qualities of statesmanship, the possession of which that government was never tired of boasting and proclaiming to the country, that opportunity came to them shortly after the McKinley tariff went into operation in 1891. The whole cry of our people then was for new markets. The cry was a loud and prolonged one. But, whether due to the fact that the administration of that day turned an absolutely deaf ear to the appeal, or that they did not realize the necessities of the situation, or whether long years of power had rendered them careless and had imbued them with the idea that they had themselves become one of the fixed institutions of the country—whatever was the cause, certain it is they calmly rested on their oars, and year after year pursued the Micawber policy of ' waiting for something to turn up.' During all that time did the cry continue. Divine providence had done its part in giving us uniformly abundant harvests, but still the cry went up for new markets. In 1896 the elections came on, and that cry had its effect, and the government of that day was relieved from further duty and a new order of things established.

It was a bold stroke—and if we may judge by results it was a wise stroke taken by the incoming administration in the first few months of its tenure of office, when it adopted what has now become the settled trade policy of this country so far as the mother land is concerned. The administration seemed to cut away from all the old

moorings, and gave a preference to the mother country upon the principle of giving a little in order to gain a little, and the principle has worked well. I am free to say that I was one of those whose ignorance and inexperience did not enable them to see just what the effect of that movement was going to be. There were many others in the country like me, but I think I may claim credit to myself, that I have risen superior to many of those who thought with me, because now I do realize what some of them do not yet admit, how advantageously that policy has operated in our behalf. I submit that if any impartial man will take up the Trade and Navigation Reports of Canada and see how the trade of this country with the mother land has increased in the last two or three years, he cannot fail to come to the conclusion that the preference to the mother land has been a direct moving power in the increase of our export trade. I know it is said that the increase is largely in food products, and that there is no increase to any great extent in the ordinary manufacturing output of the country. But, we must not forget that the latter trade is as yet only in its infancy; and if we can compete with the United States in food products in the mother land, there is no reason why we cannot, with equal success, compete with them in other products, because we can meet them both in price and quality.

I know also that not very long ago it was held by some of the leading men of this country that the ideal position for Canada to occupy was that of a sort of vast emporium for the supply of raw material to the world. There were men who considered that that position would be infinitely more beneficial to us than any other. But that is an exploded idea to-day. All modern efforts, all modern energy, point in the opposite direction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I am glad to see hon. members opposite have at last come to agree with this side of the House. The opinion is now generally held that it is better for this country to export flour than wheat, lumber than logs, manufactured paper than pulp.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE. And with the advantages which the present administration has given for the sale and distribution of these articles in the mother land, our position of vantage will be more fully maintained in this country in the future than ever it was or could have been in the past. I trust that very soon it will be demonstrated in Canada that it is more profitable to export dressed beef than live animals. I believe that I may claim the honour of representing a portion of the great stock centre in the Dominion, the county of Wellington. The stock industry is not a local industry in any sense of the term. There is no industry in the country, I believe, which is more general in its effects than stock-raising. I think the time has come when parliament might fairly be asked to take some action to put that trade upon a basis of a dead-meat trade rather than upon a basis of a live-animal trade, which it is as now pursued. It has been demonstrated conclusively in the United States that there is more money in the dressed-meat trade, notwithstanding the trifling difference in price between the two qualities in the British market. Under the system of slaughtering these animals here there are compensating advantages which more than make up for the little loss in price on the other side of the water. Canadians will get the employment and the wage; and besides, all those portions of the animal which, up to this time, have been looked upon in this country as merely refuse and offal, material of no value, when treated by modern processes, can be transformed into profitable commercial commodities. Besides, there is a vast saving in freight, whether you estimate it by cubic space or by actual weight. To demonstrate the point clearly, let me take the case of the hide. The hide now goes to the old country on the live animal. It is stripped by British labour. Many of these hides come back to our tanneries and are manufactured into leather ; and of these, a great proportion go back to the British market. They make three distinct trips across the Atlantic ocean, whereas one trip would suffice if the animals were slaughtered here. It is gratifying to know that the government of the province of Ontario is taking steps in this direction. And, as the matter is so general in its application, I think parliament might well be asked to do something to establish that trade in this country on a substantial basis.

Now, I have occupied fully the time I intended to occupy. But there is one subject touched upon in the Speech which I crave leave to refer to in a few sentences. Otherwise, I should be guilty of a most glaring omission. If there is one thing from which we in Canada do not suffer, it is lack of pride. Canadians are a proud people—proud of their country and proud of their countrymen. We believe that the men who are bred in the northern half of the North American continent are second to no race of men in the world. We know that in the native Canadian you will find a stout heart in a strong body, surmounted by an intelligent head. We have known this for a long time ; but it has now been demonstrated to the whole world by the magnificent manner in which the Canadian soldiers acquitted themselves during the terrible conflict in South Africa. Their powers of endurance under most difficult circumstances, their valour and steadiness on the field of battle, their willingness and their intelligence have all been attested by officers high in the Imperial service. To say that Canada is proud of

these South African soldiers is to put it in a very mild way. Day after day, this whole country watched their career with critical eye ; and day after day we became prouder and more proud of these soldiers. When they embarked for South Africa, they took with them the honour of the country. It was pure and unspotted when committed to their charge. Through all their difficulties, through all their trials and privations, they have maintained it unsullied and inviolate ; and on their return to this country, they have brought it back with them if possible more pure—certainly more beloved, more highly prized than ever it was before.

Mr. Speaker, this is the opening year of the new century. The census will be taken this year. It will not only be a numbering of the people, but it will likewise be a measure of our national wealth and progress. Canadians look forward with the utmost confidence to the story the census will have to tell. We know that this country has grown in the last few years. We know that it has grown to the north and to the east and to the west ; and we are proud and thankful to know that the growth to the south of our international boundary line, which found so much favour a few years ago, has been stopped—we trust once and for ever. As between Canada and the United States, the movement of population is entirely satisfactory to this country. Surely, Sir, in this first year of the twentieth century, with all present conditions so satisfactory, without a cloud on the horizon of the future, Canadians may feel that they are within measurable distance of the realization of their dearest hope in seeing this country among the most splendid, most prosperous, most enlightened nations of the world.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to second the motion, moved in such felicitous language by my hon. colleague and friend, the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). Sensible as I am of the honour that has been conferred upon me, still I regret that some other member, more qualified than I am to perform this duty properly, was not selected. No doubt, the choice thus made was prompted by friendship, and I here offer the right hon. gentleman my heartfelt thanks. Had I consulted but my own wishes, I would have declined the great honour thus conferred upon me. But the electors of the constituency to whom I am indebted for the honour of sitting in this House have a right to expect from me the sacrifice of my own preferences to their interests. And it is in the name of the constituency which sent me here to represent them ; it is as the mouthpiece of my constituents, that I wish to address the House.

I am happy, Sir, to avail myself of this opportunity to tender you my warmest congratulations on the exalted position which you occupy as Speaker of this House, as also for the honour which has been conferred upon you when called to preside over our proceedings. That honour, which you fully deserved, reflects on the constituency of Rouville, which you so creditably represent here ; it reflects also on the province of Quebec, and on the whole French Canadian race.

It is not my intention to go at any length into all the matters dwelt upon with such marked ability and in such choice language by my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie). But I shall content myself with playing a more modest part, by merely referring to the salient features of the speech from the Throne.

We have met, Sir, under exceptional circumstances. We have met here in the first days of a new century, at the beginning of a new reign and at the opening of a new parliament. We stand on the threshold of the reign of Edward VII., who succeeds the most illustrious woman the world ever produced. We, the members from the province of Quebec, cannot forget that it was under the rule of the illustrious Queen upon whom the grave has just closed that Great Britain put into execution the treaty which had been sealed by the blood of heroes upon the Plains of Abraham. We cannot forget that it was under her reign that constitutional government and the full exercise of our political rights were secured to us. We are grateful and proud that one of our fellow-countrymen should now occupy the position filled by the French governors of old. We are also grateful for being allowed the use of our mother-tongue, on the floor of this House and in the administration of justice in this country, under the ægis of the British Crown. We are equally proud to see a man of our race and nationality occupying in the old Quebec basilica the pew occupied by the French governors under the old regime. And in return for those liberties, our fellow-countrymen have invariably showed their devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and they feel that they owe her a debt of eternal gratitude for the rank which Canada now occupies among the nations of the world. My hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) has referred to the second paragraph of the speech from the Throne, in which allusion is made to the return of our soldiers from South Africa. A remarkable coincidence which deserves to be mentioned in this connection is that one of the last public acts of Her Majesty the Queen was an audience granted to a group of our fellow-countrymen, who were returning from South Africa with the laurels of victory. That matter of the contingents sent to South Africa has been exhaustively debated, and I think it is now a settled question. But I thank heaven that we, French Canadians, should have had at Paardeberg and upon other battlefields, representatives of our

nationality. I am proud that on that memorable occasion, as upon several other occasions, our fellow-countrymen gave such a good account of themselves and furnished a fresh proof of their loyalty to the British Crown. Some people, who are unacquainted with the province of Quebec, and are unaware that gratitude is one of the moral characteristics of our race, are still inquiring whether the French Canadians are really loyal to the British Crown. That is now a question of the past. French Canadians are as loyal to the British Crown as their fathers were in 1776 and 1812, when, in a supreme effort, they spared the Union Jack the fate meted out to the flag adorned with fleurs-de-lis, which had to cross the sea again. Our fellow-countrymen have upheld the British flag in this country. And as to us, the young generation of to-day, we mean also to uphold the same flag. Still, were I allowed to offer a suggestion, en passant, I would ask to simplify the Dominion flag. As it is now, it bears the arms of seven provinces. It is too complicated and too hard to popularize. I would suggest that the Canadian flag, instead of having the Canadian coat-of-arms on the red field, should bear simply a maple leaf, as a type and symbol of a united Canada.

We are given to understand in the address that Canada may be favoured, next summer, with the visit of the Duke of Cornwall and York. It is within the recollection of several members of this House with what enthusiasm the Prince of Wales in 1860 was received at Halifax, Quebec, Montreal and elsewhere. Canada will feel proud and happy, and, in a particular manner, the people of the province of Quebec, I have no doubt, will be delighted to tender the royal visitor just as enthusiastic and as loyal a reception as that accorded his illustrious father.

And in this connection, Sir, there is a point to which, for my own part, I wish to draw attention. And I think I am voicing the general opinion of the House, when I say that we should be glad that His Royal Highness, on his return trip from Australia, should be accompanied to Canada by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who is expected to go and attend the celebration of the opening of the great Australian Commonwealth. Should the right hon. premier consent to visit that country, I need not say that he will just as creditably represent Canada upon that occasion and reflect as much honour on our country, as he has already done, when upon former occasions representing us in Great Britain, in France, and in the United States.

I shall not dwell at any length upon the visit of His Excellency the Governor General to Dawson City, as a review of all the facts connected with it would involve too lengthy developments.

Let it suffice to say that the country, in general, is satisfied with the organization of the Yukon territory and with its administration by the government. Canadians, who but a few years ago, fancied that the Yukon was the limit of civilization, have fortunately been undeceived, as we are now told that a French Canadian, no longer satisfied with going to the Yukon, is about to undertake the task of hoisting the Union Jack on the North Pole. Such an achievement would certainly redound to the credit of Canada, provided it were undertaken with the energy, patience and necessary resources to make it a success.

Now, I come to another clause in the address, that which makes mention of the Universal Exposition in Paris, and of the prominent place occupied by Canada. There is ample matter for congratulation in the excellent display made by Canada, and in the number of awards won by our country; and we have reason to believe that our natural resources will be better appreciated as they come to be better known. It was undoubtedly no small matter of wonderment to France to see such a display of natural products and such evidences of marked progress, coming from a country referred to by Voltaire in the last century, as 'a few acres of snow.' For the triumph which has been achieved in Paris we are indebted to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) and the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), who have spared no efforts to make our exhibit a success. It is gratifying to know that one of the results of that great industrial competition will be the removal of such obstacles as now bar the way to the full development of our trade with France. We hope in the near future to see that commercial intercourse increase by leaps and bounds.

The next subject touched upon in the address is the improvement of the St. Lawrence route, that great thoroughfare of our country. If Canada wishes to successfully compete with the United States, on the peaceful ground of trade, there is no other way open to us but in improving more and more the St. Lawrence route, and making it the great thoroughfare Providence intended it to be. It is gratifying for the country to know that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) is devoting all his energies to the achievement of that task. Much has already been done, but much remains to be done. The St. Lawrence route is at present threatened so far as the insurance rates are concerned, and attempts are being made to deprive it of the natural advantages bestowed upon it by Providence. I am confident that the government will spare no efforts to secure to that route the control and supremacy it has a natural right to.

In a short paragraph of the speech, reference is made in a very modest way to the increase in the general volume of trade and revenue. True, there was no necessity for the government to expatiate on the position of the country. For, no man can plead

ignorance of the present state of prosperity of Canada, and no one is ignorant of it but the man who wilfully closes his eyes to the light. That prosperity is so manifest from the Atlantic to the Pacific that no man in his sober senses would dare deny it.

We are promised new legislation on various matters, and among other measures which will be brought down is one for the better supervision of the export trade in food products. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has shown with his wonted eloquence that there was room for improvement in that direction.

The speech from the Throne further alludes to the post office, and here I may say that in the county which I represent, the mail service has undergone substantial improvements, as it has, no doubt, in all other parts of the country.

No man, I am sure, will begrudge the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) the praise he is entitled to for the creditable way in which he has administered his department these four years past.

The present position of Canada is excellent. Since the right hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues have been called to the head of affairs, truly astonishing results have been achieved. In the first place among those achievements let me mention religious peace and harmony restored to the country. We have undertaken the task of harmonizing the different classes and nationalities in this country, and of fostering those common sentiments and aspirations which go to the building of a great nation, and we have succeeded therein. Within the last five years, our trade has increased by leaps and bounds; and the growth of affairs has been simply phenomenal, and to-day Canada stands in the eyes of the world, in the front rank. If we only go on progressing at the same rate for the next twenty-five years, those among us who will then be spared will witness a wonderful growth of the country. We are on the high road of prosperity and let us hope that nothing will impede our course.

I now wish to conclude my remarks in the language of the majority of this House. As I have the honour of representing here a constituency one-third of whose electors are English-speaking, I think it proper to wind-up my speech in English, so as to be understood by the majority of this House.

Mr. Speaker, representing as I do the county of Bonaventure, one-third of whose population is English-speaking, I think it fit and proper to conclude my remarks in the language of the majority of the hon. members of this House. I was desirous to say a few words in the English language, but I was also anxious to keep up the tradition that has prevailed in this House, and therefore, I began my remarks in the French language. We have met, Sir, under exceptional circumstances. The death of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, the accession of her son, and the beginning of a new reign with the beginning of a new century, synchronising with the opening of a new parliament—all these things, Sir, are of a nature to break the routine of ordinary openings of parliament. I am glad to be able to declare on the floor of this House that in no part of this Dominion was there more heartfelt sorrow, more genuine grief, felt at the death of Her late Majesty Queen Victoria, than among the French-speaking people of the province of Quebec. And, Sir, the reason is plain. The French Canadians of the province of Quebec and their fathers saw realized under the reign of Her Majesty and put into execution the treaty which had been sealed by the blood of heroes upon the Plains of Abraham. It was under the reign of Her Majesty the Queen that constitutional government was secured to Canada ; it was under her reign that constitutional government was developed, that confederation was brought about, and that justice was extended to all classes and to all nationalities. French Canadians are among the first to honour her memory, and to be grateful to her for having been to some extent instrumental in bringing about the happy condition of things which now exists in this country.

Sir, I represent a county where, I believe, the race problem has been solved. This may seem somewhat extraordinary to some of the hon. members of this House. The county of Bonaventure adjoins the province of New Brunswick ; it is peopled by Acadians, by descendants of the United Empire Loyalists, by Irishmen, Scotchmen and Frenchmen. The majority of the people speak both languages. I have gone through three election campaigns in that county, and I never heard the race cry raised in any shape or form. One of my predecessors in the representation of that county, and one who will be remembered by some of the older members of this House, was the late lamented Mr. Fauvel, a French Huguenot, who represented the county of Bonaventure by the almost unanimous will of the people of all classes and of all nationalities. They have elected me, a French Canadian, to the House of Commons, and they have sent an English-speaking citizen to the legislature in Quebec. Those, Sir, are conditions which I should like to see prevail throughout this Dominion. We are now upon the threshold of a new century. If I were to venture to address a word of counsel to the present generation of Canadians who have taken no part in the strife and discord of former times, and who, I know, have no other desire but to see this country happy and prosperous, I would ask them, Mr. Speaker, to pledge themselves now, at the beginning of this parliament, to do their utmost to bring about good-will and a better feeling among all classes of our people. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to appeal to every friend of Bri-

tain in this House, and to every friend of Canada, to imitate the example of our departed sovereign, who was to a large degree instrumental in cementing together the various parts of the empire. I would appeal to those friends of Britain and to those friends of Canada to lay aside past dissensions, and to join hand in hand in building up on this continent a great and prosperous nation. Many of our dissensions in Canada have had their origin in Europe, dissensions which have existed for centuries between France and England; and I think I may say that we ourselves have done not a little during the reign of Queen Victoria to bring about a better understanding between France and England. After France and England had been fighting under Bonaparte for nearly twenty years in various parts of Europe, she through her ministers, secured an alliance between England and France, and for the first time we saw the cross of St. George and the tri-colour of France floating side by side in the battlefields of the Crimea. Sir, this is a lesson in itself which should be an example to us in this House, which should be an example to every true lover of Canada.

There has been some talk of difficulty between France and England, and there will probably be more; but let us hope that the dissensions of Europe will be confined to Europe so far as we are concerned. We French Canadians are descendants of France, it is true, but France to us is no more than a remembrance. We are children of the soil of Canada; we have never known any other country than this; this is the country to which we are attached, this is the country in which our fathers lie sleeping, and this is the country in which we ourselves shall sleep.

Mr. Speaker, Her Majesty the Queen, but a little more than a year before her death, performed an act which had a deep meaning, and at a moment which rendered it all the more significant. On a stormy night the British ship, the *Drummond Castle*, was shipwrecked upon the rocks in the British channel, off the coast of Brittany. A gun was fired, the only gun, I hope, that will ever be fired between France and England. The alarm was given, the French peasants rushed forward to the rescue of the British people who were being shipwrecked in that dark night, saving those who could be saved, and burying those on the morrow who had to be buried. The Queen covered the breasts of those poor peasants with medals which are worn to-day in Brittany in remembrance of her name and of her active mercy. Sir, let us all be imbued with that spirit in Canada, and for my part I ask for no greater honour than this, that later on, if I live long enough, I may be able to tell my children that I first sat in the parliament of Canada which became historical as the parliament of peacemakers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I have to congratulate most heartily both the mover (Mr. Guthrie) and the seconder (Mr. Marcil) on the very excellent manner in which they have addressed the House on this occasion. I was not able to follow as well as I could have desired the portion of the address of the seconder, which was given in his own beautiful language; but if I may judge of that by what he spoke in my own language, I am sure I cannot compliment him too highly on the sentiments which he expressed and the manner in which he expressed them. So far as the race problem, to which he has referred, is concerned, I may say to him, that in the province from which I come, that race problem has been a matter of the past for years. We never even think of it to mention it, and I trust with him that it will become so much a thing of the past in Canada that it will not be necessary even for any hon. gentleman, rising in this House, to suggest that there is such a thing in Canada as a race problem, if there be one to-day. With respect to what has been very eloquently said by the hon. mover of this address, I desire also to congratulate him particularly, because he is, as I understand, a member of the profession to which I have the honour to belong. His speech to-day showed a great grasp of public matters, and I am sure that he, as well as the seconder of the address, will be a very great addition to the debating power of this House. I cannot altogether agree with some of the things which the mover said, and he did not make some of his points altogether clear to me, but possibly I may learn his views more fully at some future stage of this session. He referred to the fact that prosperity dawned upon this country shortly after the present administration came into power. It was a striking tribute to this administration, that not only did prosperity dawn, but that it should have dawned so shortly after this administration came into power, and it is a still more striking tribute to this administration, although the hon. gentleman did not dwell upon it, that the advent of this administration into power brought prosperity to all the world. Of course, I do not know that all hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are in accord with the views which were expressed by the hon. gentleman in respect to that. There is a gentleman sitting in this House, a gentleman who has held an honoured position in this House for a great many years, and who has been recognized as a very high authority in trade matters. Possibly it may be that there is no hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who is better qualified to speak as to the causes of that prosperity than the hon. gentleman to whom I refer, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). That hon. gentleman, in an address which he lately placed before this country, did

not seem to take exactly the view which the hon. member for South Wellington took in the remarks which he so forcibly placed before the House. The view of the hon. member for North Norfolk was this, and possibly there may be some small modicum of truth as well as of common sense in the view which he expressed :

> The government was fortunate in assuming office just at the beginning of a period of prosperity, which not only applies to us, but to all commercial nations, and which it is well to realize has been due to the blessings of Providence, and to causes beyond the control of the Canadian government.

I do not know that I have anything to suggest in answer to what the hon. gentleman has said, beyond the words which have fallen so aptly from the hon. member for North Norfolk in regard to that matter. The hon. gentleman also referred to some opportunity which had fallen to the lot of the Conservative party when in power, and of which that party had not seen fit to avail itself. I understood him to rejoice that the present administration had taken some step which has corrected the mistake of the late administration, and has resulted in a marked increase of our trade with the mother country. I did not clearly gather from the hon. gentleman just what step of the present administration he referred to. Possibly when the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) comes to deal with this matter he may be able to supply that omission. As a matter of fact, we know very well what the policy of this government has been with respect to that, and we know what result, if it can be called a result, that policy has produced. If it be possible for this administration to so control trade matters as the hon. gentleman would have us think, how does it happen that this administration has been so remiss in its duty as to permit the imports of this country from Great Britain to rise from $33,000,000 to no more than $37,000,000 in the three years they have been in power, while during the same period the imports from the United States rose from $59,000,000 to $93,000,000 ? If these are matters which can be effectively dealt with by measures placed before the House, by Acts of the parliament of Canada, and if it be true that these are altogether independent of trade conditions throughout the world, it strikes me that the administration of this country is highly remiss in not having corrected that most unfortunate condition of affairs during the past few years.

Now, my hon. friend spoke also of the misfortune of the Liberal-Conservative party in struggling against prosperity in 1900. My hon. friend will permit me to say that the Liberal-Conservative party has no record of struggling against prosperity in this country. The Liberal-Conservative party, from 1896 down to the present time, has been prepared to concede, and all those who have been qualified to speak for it have always conceded, the prosperity of this country and have been thankful for it. It is true that the Conservative party has taken the ground that the prosperity is not due to any change of administration. It is true that the Conservative party has taken the ground, as it still takes the ground, that the prosperity may in no small measure be due to the policy which was advocated through good report and through evil report, and was maintained by the Liberal-Conservative party for eighteen years. I would remark, in passing, with respect to the depression in trade matters, which was referred to by my hon. friend, that with what he said in regard to the resources of Canada, and the possibility of Canada facing a depression more successfully than other portions of the world, I am inclined to agree, in some measure at least, but I desire to remind him and the House of what, I think, he has forgotten, that during the administration of the great party which I have the honour to lead in this House, a depression which prevailed throughout all the world was felt by Canada much less than by any other portion of the world, and much less certainly than by the great country to the south of us, although that country may claim to have resources as great, and possibly more varied, than even the great and varied resources of Canada.

Now, with respect to the other remarks which were so eloquently made by my hon. friend, I do not know that I need refer to them, at any length at least. It has been claimed by the right hon. gentleman, I think, who leads the government, that this is a business administration. I shall endeavour to claim for the opposition in this House that we shall be a business opposition, and, therefore, I do not propose to discuss, except so far as necessary, matters which have been referred to in the speech. With respect to one matter, I desire to say a word or two, and that is a matter which has been referred to so eloquently by the hon. member for South Wellington. I mean the part which has been taken by our Canadian citizen soldiers in fighting the battles of the empire beyond the seas. I believe, Sir, that Canada has every right to be proud of the way in which its men have acquitted themselves. We knew when they left us that they would be brave and true, and we hoped that they would be fortunate. They have fulfilled all these conditions. The opportunity came to them more than once in South Africa, and the opportunity never came to them when they were found wanting. They received the commendation of their superior officers on every occasion on which they were called upon to play a prominent part, and it is well not only for Canada, but for the world to know what Canada and the outlying nations of the empire are capable of doing in that respect.

I would especially like to refer in this connection to the welcome which the Canadian contingents received upon their arrival in my native city of Halifax. It was a day which will long be remembered by those who were in Halifax on that occasion, and I listened with great pleasure to Lt.-Col Pelletier, a compatriot to the hon. seconder of the Address (Mr. Marcil), who as chief in command of the first contingent returned thanks for the reception which was tendered to his regiment. Let me say further, Sir, that Canada is bound to see that those who fought for her and for the empire, and who because of wounds or disease are unable to earn a livelihood, are not left forgotten and unprotected. I regret that some mention was not made of this matter in the Speech from the Throne, and I trust that this omission was rather by inadvertence than by intent. I do not believe that the government of Canada intend to neglect to deal with this matter, especially in view of the fact that the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) used these words in the House last session :

I beg to tell that hon. gentleman that when Canada sends her sons to the front, Canada becomes responsible, and will know how to redeem that responsibility to the widows and the orphans of the brave men who may fall in that struggle.

We do not propose to shift that duty on to the shoulders of any insurance company, and I may remind the House that with the full concurrence of his Council, my right hon. friend ward and care of every honest-minded Canadian.

Further on the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) said :

Sir, I have no fear that the Canadian people will shrink from that duty. I say that the government have chosen the right way, and I say again that the brave men in the front may have no fear if it should please Providence that they should remain on the soil of South Africa, that their widows and little ones will not be the wards and the care of the state, and the ward and care of every honest-minded Canadian.

I have quoted this language because it expresses in more suitable terms than I could do, the views I entertain in regard to this subject, and I trust that the right hon. gentleman may be able to assure the House that the government will deal with this question before the session is over. As to the volunteers who have returned and who are able in some measure to perform the duties of life but who are handicapped in the struggle of life by reason of wounds or disease, provision should be made for them also. Again, the families of those who have fallen have in many cases been deprived of their bread winners, and while it is true that in some cases a provision has been made through the insurance which Sir Charles Tupper announced to the House last year, yet that does not cover all the necessity and it is most desirable that the government should make some further provision.

I regret also that no mention was made in the Speech from the Throne of the present position of negotiations—if any negotiations are pending—with respect to the fast Atlantic service. Upon that question both parties in parliament are united. The government undertook to deal with it in 1897 and we had reports from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, from the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Dobell, and from the right hon. gentleman during the session of 1897 and 1898, but since 1898 we have heard very little about the fast Atlantic service. The government have practically confessed that up to the present time their efforts have been an utter failure, but that is no reason why negotiations should terminate altogether, and so I trust that the Prime Minister will be able to assure us that the matter is still engaging the attention of the government.

Another subject which is not referred to in the Speech from the Throne is the present position of the negotiations which were entered into with the great republic to the south. About two years ago the Joint High Commission met and after several adjournments it finally, some eighteen months ago, ceased further negotiations and the House and the country are entirely in the dark now as to whether that commission proposes to resume, or whether it has absolutely abandoned its functions. It is the right of the House and the country to know from the right hon. gentleman to-day whether or not these negotiations are likely to be resumed at an early date. If they are not to be resumed we should like to know in what position is the Alaskan boundary question. It was intimated that that question stood in the way of adjustment, and if the question is to be dealt with (as was suggested on one occasion) apart from the Joint High Commission altogether, we would like to know what the policy of the government is with regard to that question so far as they are able to control it.

As to the proposed visit of the Duke of Cornwall and York to Canada, I may say, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House shall hail it with loyalty and devotion. The Duke of Cornwall and York is no stranger in my own province, for when he was serving as midshipman in the Royal Navy he spent several months in the city of Halifax and many pleasant recollections of him remain in that city. There is no part of Canada where he will be hailed more warmly and loyally than in that city by the sea. I shall not, Mr. Speaker, trespass on the time of the House further than to express the hope that the right hon. the Prime Minister will give us such information on the matters which I have referred

to, as he thinks it is proper for the House to receive.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, it is to me more than the usual pleasure——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the right hon. gentleman will permit me, I understood that the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) desires to say one word.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to a matter which I would be considered derelict in my duty if I failed to refer to in the discussion on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. Without saying anything with regard to the general treatment which the Canadian government may extend to the volunteers who went from Canada to serve in South Africa, and to the families of the men who lost their lives there, I wish to refer particularly to the case of Trooper Mulloy, the blind trooper. I may say that he is a native of my county, that he grew up there, that his friends reside there, and I deem it my duty to urge his case upon the consideration of the government. I think we have precedents following the rebellion of 1885, when grants were made to individuals whose circumstances were peculiar; and I believe the country will endorse my suggestion that something ought to be done for this young man. There is no doubt that the personal efforts and sacrifices made by the young man who went to South Africa have reflected glory on every Canadian citizen, and I believe the Canadian government and the Canadian people will willingly extend to those young men the treatment they deserve. There are circumstances connected with this young man's case which will justify the government in doing something for him on a basis altogether different from that on which others may be treated; and I only wish to bring his case to the attention of the right hon. leader of the government so that it may not be overlooked.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, it is to me more than the usual pleasure of such an occasion to extend my hearty congratulations to the hon. gentlemen who have placed in your hands the motion now before us. My hon. friend from the south riding of Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), has once more exemplified on the floor of this House to-day the truth of the saying that blood will tell. The older members of this House perhaps remember that once upon a time, some twenty-four years ago, the reply to the speech from the Throne was moved in this House by a gentleman of the name of Guthrie, who also represented the south riding of Wellington, and who, in the course of a too short parliamentary career, left on this House a deep impression for ability and character—an impression which, after the lapse of twenty years, is renewed in this House by a son of his, who shows that he is indeed a true chip of the old block.

With regard to my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), those who have had the pleasure of his acquaintance in his native province were aware that he was an eminent member of an eminent profession. He has been a journalist all his life. But they were aware also that he was perhaps still more gifted as an orator than as a writer; and the address which he has delivered to us to-day is a revelation to those who did not know him, while to those who had the pleasure of his acquaintance it is a fulfilment of everything they anticipated from him.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has paid to those two hon. gentlemen a due meed of praise, and in this, I beg to say, that I agree entirely with everything he said.

Let me say in passing that whilst my hon. friend was paying to the mover and seconder of the address the very just praise they deserve, he also paid a well-deserved compliment to the province which he has the honour to represent in this House, the province of Nova Scotia, when he stated that the racial problem no longer existed in that province. It is a pleasure to me to bear witness to the good feeling which prevails in the province of Nova Scotia; and if there is any spot in Canada where you never hear the inquiry what a man's creed or race may be, it is in that blessed province. In that respect Nova Scotia is a worthy example to all the other provinces of the Dominion.

I certainly have no fault to find with the manner in which my hon. friend has addressed the House on this occasion. That he was not altogether pleased with the remarks of my hon. friend the mover of the address is not perhaps a matter of surprise. My hon. friend, however, failed to understand the reference and the points which were made by the mover of the address. If my hon. friend was so unfortunate, I am sure he did not do himself justice. He did not exercise his well known legal acumen, for the meaning of those references was not far to seek. For instance, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition did not know what my hon. friend the mover of the address meant when he said that in 1891 nothing had been done by the late government to remedy the condition of things which then existed, and that afterwards, when the new administration came into office, it was prompt to take advantage of the situation and apply a remedy. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition said that he did not understand what had been done by the administration. Well, Sir, the answer is very obvious. Whereas in 1891 the late administration did nothing at all, when our trade was taken away from us by the legislation of the United States Congress in the McKinley Bill, in 1897 the present administration were not slow, when they found that the American market was closed to us, to open a new

market in Great Britain. That is the answer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The PRIME MINISTER. I see that my hon. friends on the other side do not yet appreciate the answer. Well, Sir, I would like to hear hon. gentlemen opposite say whether they are in favour of, or against the preferential tariff. That is the question I would like them to answer at this moment. We have recently gone through a very severe campaign in which, so far as I know, everything was discussed by hon. gentlemen opposite; but when they came to discuss the question of the preferential tariff, they were neither for nor against it.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am against a one-sided one.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is one man on that side of the House who is against it. I understand that my hon. friend had some aspirations for the leadership, and perhaps that is the reason why he is not in favour of the preferential tariff. Perhaps his views were not acceptable to his followers. He has given his explanation why he is sitting in the particular seat he now occupies.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition also referred to some opinions which had been expressed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), as to the causes of the prosperity of this country. My hon. friend from North Norfolk is able at all times to take care of himself, and it would not do for me to offer any explanation of his words. I rely upon him to do so at the proper time. But while my hon. friend was able to quote the opinion expressed by my hon. friend from North Norfolk, he did not favour the House with any opinion of his own on this question; and I may say that we would be more interested to know the opinion of my hon. friend than the opinion of my hon. friend from North Norfolk since he has expressed it. However, we are at the opening of the session, and perhaps at some other time my hon. friend will take the House into his confidence, and will tell us, as frankly as my hon. friend from East York has done, what he thinks of the preferential tariff. My hon. friend from East York, a stalwart of the stalwarts, says : 'I am against the preferential tariff.'

Mr. MACLEAN. No, no—a one-sided preferential tariff.

The PRIME MINISTER. There are some things which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition might have discussed which he did not discuss. My hon. friend never referred, for instance, to the late elections; and in this respect his speech of this afternoon is in marked contrast to the speeches which we heard during the last session and the previous session. Why, during last session, everybody who was in this House will remember that there never was a day when we were not challenged to bring on the elections. We were dared to dissolve parliament, we were told that we had lost the confidence of the country and that as soon as we would dissolve the House and appeal to the country we would be swept out of existence. Well we took these gentlemen at their word, parliament was dissolved, the day of the battle came, but the result was far different from what these hon. gentlemen expected. I shall not speak on that point at any length, but I may be permitted to quote the language which the late Mr. Disraeli used on a somewhat similar occasion. He was speaking of the position of the government of Lord Derby, not after a general election, but after a vote of parliament, and this is how he characterized it :

> It was like a convulsion of nature rather than any ordinary transaction of human life. I can only liken it to one of those earthquakes which take place in Calabria or Peru. There was a rumbling murmur, a groan, a shriek, a sound of distant thunder. No one knew whether it came from the top or the bottom of the House. There was a rent, a fissure in the ground, and then a village disappeared; then a tall tower toppled down; and the whole opposition benches became one great dissolving view of anarchy.

This is a true picture of the last election, but as my hon. friend did not allude to it, I will not discuss it any further.

My hon. friend wanted to have information on some three or four different matters. First of all he wanted to know the intention of the government with regard to pensions to the wounded soldiers who were disabled in South Africa, and afterwards my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) wanted to know what would be done for one of those heroes in particular. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition seemed to think that the omission to refer to this matter in the speech from the Throne was due to inadvertence. No, Sir, it was an intended omission, and this is the reason. We do not know exactly in what position we stand at present with regard to the imperial authorities in this matter. My hon. friend knows that in the despatch sent last October, and on which we acted, the British authorities announced that they themselves would deal with this subject, and I would again call the attention of my hon. friend to that despatch in which he will find his answer. It went on to say :

> The condition of pay, pensions, transport, &c.: Whilst noting the generous offer of the government of New Zealand to furnish pay in addition to transport, Lord Lansdowne is of opinion that the same conditions should be applied in the case of each colony, namely, every colonial force should be landed at the port of debarkation in South Africa fully equipped at the cost of the colonial government or other body furnishing the force; the Imperial government to provide from that date pay at Imperial rates, supplies and ammunition, and to defray the cost of trans-

port back to the colony when the services of the force are no longer required. Wound pensions and compassionate allowances to be paid by the Imperial government at Imperial rates.

Now, it is perhaps doubtful if the pensions which will be paid by the Imperial government will be adequate to meet the views entertained by the Canadian government, but it is meet and proper that we should know exactly where we stand with regard to the action to be taken by the Imperial authorities; and then if in our opinion—and I may say that I doubt, taking the measure of pensions on the other side, if the pensions to be granted by the Imperial authorities will be adequate, in our view, to what should be done to those who have risked their lives in South Africa—if in our view the pensions to be granted by the Imperial authorities are not sufficient, according to what I might call the Canadian standard, I have no doubt that this parliament will be well disposed to supplement them by an extra grant. That is the reason why no mention was made of this in the speech from the Throne.

My hon. friend wanted information upon the fast Atlantic service. I am sorry to say that upon that subject I have none to give. The conditions are not yet so favourable in England that we can undertake to have that service at an early day. But in all probability, as the war is now drawing to a close, normal conditions of trade will be resumed, and then the time will be appropriate to take up that question of a fast Atlantic service, to which both parties in this country are committed.

With regard to the Joint High Commission, the condition is just the same to-day as when we last separated. That commission has not been dissolved, it is still in existence, and we intend at the earliest possible moment to resume negotiations. But my hon. friend is aware that the conditions were not favourable to the resumption of negotiations when we separated. First of all, we had the general election on hand ourselves, and there was also one on the other side of the line, and pending the result, it was impossible to resume negotiations. But when this session has closed and the American Congress has terminated its sittings, I have no reason to doubt that we shall be able to resume negotiations and bring them, I hope, to a satisfactory conclusion.

I shall not touch upon all the topics which have been discussed, for instance, the Alaskan boundary, concerning which I am sorry to say I have no hope of arriving at a settlement further than I had on the former occasion. The Americans have taken such an attitude and such a course, and we have also taken such an attitude, that it seems almost impossible to reconcile the two opposite views. If I were not a member of the commission myself, I would feel more inclined to speak freely, but without venturing to criticise the position taken by the American commissioners, I may say that we can hope that if we cannot reach an honourable settlement of the question between ourselves, we may at least effect an honourable compromise. Between two such countries as the United States on the one hand and Canada and Great Britain on the other, I am sure there is no difficulty that cannot be settled by an honourable compromise or arbitration. If we cannot ourselves arrive at an agreement, certainly we can agree to call in a third party, a friendly power, to arbitrate. In the meantime, we have taken a step which was important to take in a matter of great moment. At any moment, there might be discoveries of gold in that district, and we know from the character of the men who risked their lives in the search for gold, that unless we knew exactly where the gold might be found, whether in the territory of Canada or the United States, great complications might result unless there was a settled boundary. Consequently we have agreed on a provisional boundary, which will serve as a boundary so long as the question remains unsettled, and that provisional boundary has been settled by the geographers of the two countries. In a short time I will be able to lay on the table the report on the commission. But for the present we have a provisional boundary, by which the two countries have agreed to abide, and according to which the rights of the two countries are to be settled in the meantime.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the temporary boundary in the nature of a compromise between the two boundaries which are respectfully contended for, or is it nearer the one than the other?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is in the nature of a compromise between the respective positions taken by the two parties. But, I may say, this was not the idea which inspired us when we agreed to lay out the boundary on the ground. Perhaps the main idea which we had in our mind and which guided us was to fix the boundary at a place where it would be more convenient for the trade on the Dalton trail and also on the Lynn canal, which is the part most frequented. I think I have answered all the questions put to me by my hon. friends. Following the example of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), I shall not enter into any contentious matter now. I may say that I shall be glad, when the hon. gentleman exposes the policy of his party, to consider it more critically. At the present time I have only to say to hon. gentlemen opposite in conclusion, that our policy will be the same as for the last four years—a policy which received such ample endorsation by the people of Canada on the 7th of November.

Motion (Mr. Guthrie) agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That Peter Macdonald, Esquire, member representing the electoral district of East Huron, be appointed Chairman of Committees of the Whole House.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—AUDITOR GENERAL'S AND OTHER REPORTS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. Mr. Fielding) moved :

That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into a committee to consider of a Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) when he expects to bring the estimates down ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very shortly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And may I ask when we are to expect the Auditor General's Report ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I shall have to make further inquiry on that point. We are pressing it forward by all possible means, but at my last inquiry the document was not complete. I shall be able to tell my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) at the next sitting.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With the indulgence of the House, I would like to ask whether the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) suggests that we should go into supply before the Auditor General's Report is down. I think it would be very inconvenient to do so—I can hardly see, at present, how it will be possible to do so. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be able to give us to-morrow the date when we may expect the Auditor General's Report.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will do my best to give the hon. gentleman a statement to-morrow. Meantime, the formal steps with respect to supply, taken at the first of the session, are being taken ; and, within a day or two, we will let the hon. gentleman know what further steps will be taken.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I would like to ask the Prime Minister (the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in what state the departmental reports are. The lateness of these reports last year delayed the business of the House for months. It is inconvenient, in fact it is impossible, to properly discuss the estimates and to reach conclusions with regard to the matters that come before us, until we have these reports. If these reports come before the House at an early day, it will be a gratification to us on this side to assist the government to put through the business of the House as promptly as possible.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) will find no cause of complaint on that score.

Motion (Hon. Mr. Fielding) agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. Mr. Fielding) moved:

That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising a Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—THE ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. Mr. Fielding) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending June 30, 1902, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, February 11, 1901.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved :

That the Message of His Excellency and the estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS.

The public accounts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900.—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

The report of the Post Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1900.—Hon. Mr. Mulock.

The report of the Department of the Interior for the year ending June 30, 1900.—Hon. Mr. Sifton.

The report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ending June 30, 1900, —Hon. Mr. Sifton.

The report of the Department of Agriculture for the year ending October 31, 1900.—Hon. Mr. Fisher.

The report of the Department of Public Works for the year ending June 30, 1900.—Hon. Mr. Tarte.

The report of the Department of Inland Revenue for the year ending June 30, 1900.—Hon. Mr. Bernier.

Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year ending June 30, 1900.—Hon. Mr. Fielding, for Sir Louis Davies.

Statement of all bonds or securities entered in the Department of the Secretary of State of Canada since last return, February 6, 1900.—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. J. CLANCY (Bothwell). After this little theatrical display perhaps we may receive some information as to when the Auditor General's Report will be down. The most important returns are still left to be brought down, the Auditor General's Report and the Trade and Navigation Returns. Perhaps the Prime Minister will give us some information about that ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I should certainly endeavour to gratify the rather fastidious curiosity of my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy). I should suppose he would have enough reading for one night at least. To-morrow, perhaps, I may be able, after conference with the Auditor General, to tell him when this report may be expected. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before we adjourn, I merely desire to say to the right hon. gentleman that we on this side of the House are delighted at the effect of the admonitions we had to give to the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues last year, when we had to wait for these reports for weeks, and even months, in some cases. The promptitude with which most of them have been brought down this year is very gratifying.

Mr. WALLACE. With these exceptions, that the reports of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), which are so necessary for the discussion of the commercial affairs of the country, are not brought down, and we have no information as to when they will be down. As to the Auditor General's Report, the law of the land compels it to be brought down within fourteen days of the opening of parliament. That law was flagrantly violated by the government at all the previous sessions. I hope the government will realize the fact that they are amenable to the law as well as other citizens of this country, and that they are required to obey the law with respect to the Auditor General's Report.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman is just as well aware as I am that the report of the Auditor General is not at all under the control of the government. The government is not at all answerable for the delay of the Auditor General's Report. With regard to the report of the Minister of Customs, the House I am sure will learn with regret that the Minister of Customs has been called away from Ottawa by sickness in his family. But he will be here to-morrow, I hope.

On motion of the Prime Minister, the House adjourned at 5.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 12, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That a special committee of five members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed, a list of members to compose the select standing committees ordered by this House, and that the said committee be composed of : Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. Borden (Halifax), Sir Richard Cartwright, Hon. Mr. Sutherland and Hon. Mr. Haggart.

Motion agreed to.

THE RAILWAY QUESTION.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the attention of the House to a matter which I consider of supreme importance to this country, and to put myself in order I shall conclude with a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. gentleman will conclude with a motion to adjourn the House ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I will move the adjournment of the House, and to that motion I propose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member may be absolutely in order in moving the adjournment of the House, but at the same time I would call his attention to the fact that he will doubtless have ample opportunity to discuss the question which he has in view under our ordinary procedure. Unless the question is of really urgent importance, it is harldy regular to bring it up in this form. At the very outset, I wish to direct the attention of hon. members to the fact that it would be much more convenient if questions of ordinary importance were placed upon the Order paper. It would greatly facilitate the business of the House if this course were adopted.

From the year 1867 up to the year 1896, during a period of nearly thirty years, there were about twenty-five motions to adjourn the House made for the purpose of bringing a special subject before the House. However, during the last session of parliament there were no fewer than thirty-four motions of that character. It is only necessary to mention this to the House to show the change that has taken place, and I might be permitted to express the opinion that it would be more regular if these motions to adjourn the House were only made in connection with questions of the most urgent importance.

Mr. MACLEAN. Even under your suggestion, Mr. Speaker, I can still raise the question, because it is a question of the most urgent importance to the people of Canada. I desire to bring before this House, and before the country, the great fact transpiring in the United States to-day as to the control of railways. The railway mileage of that country is now passing into the hands of a most powerful syndicate. This syndicate controls most of the railways of the United States, and there is a dread that within two or three weeks there will not be one line of railway in the neighbouring republic which will not be controlled by Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Vanderbilt, Mr. Harriman, Mr. Hill—whose name we hear a great deal of in Canada—and some others. These men have under their power now over $2,000,000,000 of railway capital, and not only that, but these same men control the banking institutions, they control the coal fields, they control the Standard Oil Company, and only last week they got control of the entire iron production of the United States. Last night there was a statement—and here is where the question comes home to Canada—in the Montreal *Star*——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh. Where ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Perhaps the statement is reported as coming from a friend of hon. gentleman opposite. That statement is this :

> It would not be very difficult for the powerful financial interests which Mr. Hill represents to secure a majority of the common stock of the great Canadian Pacific Railway.

Now, the point that I want to bring before the people of Canada and this House is this, that these men, who have obtained control of the railways of the United States, are in a position to-day to capture the control of both the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. I can go further : I believe that tracers are out to-day after the stock of these two railways, in order that Messrs. Morgan, Rockefeller, and the men associated with them may, if they think it necessary, get the control of these two Canadian roads ; and I call the attention of the people of this country to this fact, that less than $50,000,000 put on the stock market to-day will secure the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Did this country put all the money which it has put into the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway in order to build railroads which might pass any day from the control of this country to the control of the United States ? What do we see happening at this moment ? These Canadian railroads, in connection with which the people of this country have spent so much money under reputed Canadian or English management, are to-day a menace to Canada. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway have announced that they intend to shape their policies to build up American cities, if necessary, at the expense of Canadian cities. There is the great question before the people of this country. We were discussing platitudes yesterday in this House, but here is a definite question. The Grand Trunk to-day is antagonizing the city of Montreal, and I believe the Canadian Pacific is antagonizing the city of St. John. These two railroads tell the people of Canada, openly and above board, that they have no consideration for Canadian interests, but will, if it is in their own interests, direct their traffic to the United States. If that is the case to-day, how much worse will it be when Messrs. Morgan and Rockefeller and their associates go on the stock market and secure control of the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway ? I am not dealing in a generality, but am speaking of something that might happen to-morrow. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) occupies a seat on the board of directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he and Mr. Shaughnessy might attend a board meeting to-morrow and have an intimation made to them that the Canadian Pacific Railway had passed from the control of Canadians to the control of these gentlemen in New York.

Mr. DAVIS. How are you going to stop it ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I will tell you how to stop it, and I am going to appeal to history. The most significant thing that has happened in my time was the thing which Benjamin Disraeli accomplished not so many years ago in connection with the Suez canal. He made an arrangement with the bankers of the British government by which he had the necessary money placed at his disposal, and before anybody knew anything about it, the world woke up and learned that England owned the controlling shares of the Suez canal. That was a first-class investment, and one of the things resulting therefrom is that Egypt is to-day one of the most important and growing sections of the British Empire. I say that if we are alive to the danger which seems to overhang our country, this parliament, irrespective of party, will take the bull by the horns, and place Canada in a position, if necessary, to go on the stock

market and buy the control of these two great Canadian railroads. Here is the point: the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk, as owned and controlled to-day, actually antagonize our own country, our own ports, our own canals, our own river routes, our own fast Atlantic service—antagonize Canadian interests in every way. But if the state had control of these railways, they would be the complement of our canals, of the Intercolonial Railway, of our rivers and harbours, and they would be, what they are not now, national railways helping to build up this country.

Some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are disposed to make sport of this; but I read only yesterday in an Ottawa paper that the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) proposes to extend the Intercolonial Railway across this continent so as to give the people of Canada some relief from the exorbitant rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I believe in that, if we cannot nationalize the Canadian Pacific; but it will cost more to extend the Intercolonial across the continent to the other seaboard than it would to acquire to-day the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is the present and immediate way of settling the transportation problem of this country; there is the way to get a fast Atlantic service—to use the railways of Canada to build up our Atlantic ports; and it can be done for less than $50,000,000. The country would not have to bear any more expense in connection with the bonds and the various investments of the railway than it bears to-day. It is the traffic that pays all these expenses. In fact, I believe, the capital could be converted to a 2½ or 3 per cent basis instead of having to bear the rather high rates that prevail to-day. The country would benefit in that way and in a thousand other ways from such an action on our part. We should not for a single day longer allow the control of our railways, and it may be the control of our coal areas, to stand in danger of passing over to the capitalists of the United States. And there is something coming in the United States. I believe a revolution is imminent there. What is likely to happen was depicted the other day in a cartoon in a New York paper in which Uncle Sam was watching some boys—Morgan, Rockefeller and others—putting the railways into a bag, and he said to the boys. 'When you get them all into one bag, I intend to take them over.' That is the position of matters in the United States. There are great constitutional difficulties in the United States in the way of the government taking over the railways; but in Canada all that is required is a resolution to be passed by this House, and the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) ought to be able in twenty-four hours afterwards to make arrangements by cable in England to have the necessary money to buy the control of the railways. It is an easy thing for us to do. We have extended the Intercolonial Railway, and it is the best asset Canada has to-day. I am told the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) is in favour of extending the national railway. If he is, he is on good lines. The Intercolonial Railway must not end where it is to-day. The people have substantial grievances, which must be remedied, and the way to remedy them is to stop chartering railways and giving away to railway corporations the lands of the country.

Somebody is going to tell me that there will be corruption and maladministration attending this project. I would be prepared to pay a man like Mr. Hays, who is admitted to-day to be the first railway man in America, $100,000 a year, if necessary, to administer our railways absolutely for the benefit of the people and irrespective of party or political considerations; and we can get such a man. Perhaps we could get three men to do the work for a great deal less money. But what I am talking about is a serious present problem before the people of Canada, which may be forced upon their attention any day—a problem which must be solved, and to which immediate public attention should be directed; and we should have some statement from the government as to what they would do if they should wake up some morning and find that our two great Canadian railways had passed into the hands of that enormous syndicate in the United States which to-day controls nearly every mile of railway in that country, which controls every acre of coal lands, which controls the Standard Oil Company, which controls the iron output of the country, which controls the banks. (Mr. Morgan is besides the greatest banker in the world to-day), and directing its energies against Canada and controlling our railways with the capital behind it, could wipe the name of Canada from off the face of the earth, and that is the only thing that could do it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Mr. Mulock). Oh no.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am glad to hear the hon. the Postmaster General say that even they could not do it. I know of some who tried to do it a few years ago and did not quite succeed. I wish, in all seriousness, to call the attention of this House and the entire country to the situation as it exists to-day and ask, under these circumstances, some information from the government of what they are likely to do under the circumstances.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would not like to be offensive to my hon. friend, but I would suggest to him that if he were serious at all in the policy which he has adopted, he has

not chosen the best method of bringing the policy he advocates to the attention of parliament. The suggestion made by him that the government should buy the Canadian Pacific Railway is surely worthy of some notice beforehand so that we should have time to consider such a large question. But he has chosen instead to bring up this question, without a moment's notice, to the attention of the House. I would suggest, at the opening of this session, that we ought, as much as possible, to adhere to the old rule that no question be brought to the attention of the House on a motion to adjourn except one of great urgency.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not see the urgency in this case. This matter can stand until to-morrow. I do not think it is of such a character that twenty-four hours' notice would be too much to give, before proceeding to its discussion. If he is anxious to have the question brought up without a moment's loss of time, he could do so, within the rules, by calling attention to it in a few moments when we move that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply. And even if the House be not ready to go into supply——

Mr. MACLEAN. If.

The PRIME MINISTER. The motion could be moved in order to give my hon friend the opportunity he desires, which I, for my part, would be glad to give him. I therefore have no other course to ask the House to take than to vote his motion down.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I think, Mr. Speaker, that this House is entitled to a little more information from the government than has been given us. The matter brought before our attention by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) is one of momentous importance to the people of Canada. The right hon. the First Minister has either not been seized with its importance, or, for some other reason, is not prepared to make any statement about it.

But take the facts, as we know them, connected with this railroad question. We have had the information give us within the past few days that the Grand Trunk Railway has made the city of Portland its ocean seaport, not only for the winter months, but the whole year round. This magnanimous, generous and beneficent government built a bridge for this company in order to enable it to take its business away from Montreal to Portland, and the Grand Trunk Railway boasts that that bridge has been built without a dollar of cost to that company. I have always said in parliament, and this side of the House always protested that the bargain made with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Drummond County deal, was a most improvident one. But leaving the Drummond County Railway aside for the moment and dealing simply with the Grand Trunk Railway, this government gave them sufficient money to enlarge the Victoria Bridge across the St. Lawrence and to carry that product, which we all desire should be shipped from the Canadian ports of Montreal or Quebec in the summer, and Halifax or St. John in the winter, to a foreign port. Now we have the important information from Mr. Reeves that the whole of that business in winter and summer is to be transported to Portland. The Grand Trunk Railway say that they have made enormous investments in Portland and ask: Are we to leave those investments idle? And they have been aided by the generosity—or rather I should say by the extravagance, the unjustifiable extravagance, of this government—to make Portland the winter and summer terminus of their road. Here is a most disastrous position of affairs. We have our Canadian cities down by the sea, Halifax and St. John, of which we are proud, and whose growth and increase we should do our best to develop. Then we have the city of Quebec, which is beginning to show—and we are glad to know it—signs of increased prosperity, and the great city of Montreal, the ocean port of Canada. Yet we are told to-day that the business of this country, so far as the Grand Trunk can do it, is to be carried past our doors into a foreign and hostile country. I protest that the government should have something to say about these matters rather than make the poor plea that it is inconvenient to bring them up, that we should adhere to the old rule and let the motion stand until to-morrow, when the House goes into Committee of Supply. In my opinion that is a most absurd proposition. You cannot move an amendment to the motion to go into supply because the government will then say: This is a want of confidence motion, and will call on all its supporters to vote it down without discussion. My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) has taken the proper course in bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Then there is another question, which arises in a distant locality, but is closely connected with the one now before the House. We read from day to day that James J. Hill, of the Northern Pacific Railway, is acquiring possession of Canada's great coal fields, the Crow's Nest coal fields, and that he will apply to parliament for a charter to build a road into that district. It is true that the speech from the Throne gives us no enlightenment or information about this important matter, but we would like to know something about it. We would like to know whether the Crow's Nest coal fields, the greatest perhaps in the world to-day, are to be handed over to this rival corporation beyond the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada or the government, which three or four years ago manipulated them in the interest of its friends.

There is another matter connected with this. We all remember when the right hon. the First Minister, at a banquet in the city of Toronto, was hailed as a great deliverer because he had got a telegram from Mr. Fielding, his Finance Minister, in England, stating that the Fast Atlantic steamship service was an accomplished fact—the business was concluded. Perhaps, I am mistaken in saying that the telegram was from the hon. Minister of Finance; it may have been from the hon. member for Quebec West (Hon. Mr. Dobell). At any rate, it was from some minister in England—but there are so many ministers in England at different times that we cannot keep track of them. To-day, as I have said, we have a confession that there is to be no fast Atlantic line. And we have it further said that we do not need a fast Atlantic line. Why, of course not. If Portland, New York and Boston are to be the ocean ports for the Dominion of Canada, what do we want with fast steamers from Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, or St. John? All these things seem to be going together; and we have a government in power to-day that, so far as we can see, do not realize their duty in relation to these matters. We wish to rouse the government and to make them realize that these are important questions and that we expect them to do their duty to the country with regard to them.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), possibly, has pursued a line not relevant to the question raised by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), when he attacks the government for its policy in aiding railways in the past. I imagine that the question raised by the hon. member for East York is one that we can discuss with better results if we abstain from partisan attacks upon the government for policy or action not directly bearing upon that question. It is possible that a better course could have been pursued by my hon. friend from East York in presenting this question to the House than that which he has pursued. But the question is before us now for discussion; and it might be well to devote just a little time to it to call the attention not only of the House, but of the country to this important matter. I must confess that the position taken by my hon. friend from East York with regard to the imminence of a great crisis in this country in relation to monopolies and to transportation affairs is a position, perhaps, well taken. The absorption by a few individuals in the United States of the entire railway system of that country is a portentous fact; and the development and present condition of affairs in that country are of a character to challenge our attention. Results are being wrought out there which should be to us a warning as to the course which we shall pursue. Everything in the United States seems to tend to pass the leading business interests into the hands of trusts and rings and monopolies. A few days ago a steel trust was formed with a billion dollars capital.

Some hon. MEMBERS. A thousand millions.

Mr. CHARLTON. A thousand millions are a billion, I understand. The organization of the railway trust follows fast on the steel trust. All the great railway interests of the United States are being absorbed by a few capitalists, and the position of the plutocracy threatens the best interests of the country. Half of the property in the United States is held by about twenty thousand individuals, and every conceivable kind of business seems to be legitimate prey for the trusts. The operation of these trusts must be inimical to the interests of the people at large. Transportation charges in the United States are often enormously beyond what they should be, if based upon the actual cost of operating the transportation lines. The same is true of telegraph charges. A few years ago, I looked up affairs in connection with the Western Union Telegraph Company, and I found that upon the enormous capital of $86,000,000, they were paying dividends at the rate of eight per cent. That capital covered only $16,000,000 of actual cost. That stock represented sixteen millions of money and the balance of water; but upon the whole of it the people of the United States were paying dividends of eight per cent. As to transportation, take the case of the New York Central, for instance. The stock has been watered from time to time, until that road, which is paying six per cent upon its nominal capital, is paying nearly forty per cent upon its actual cost. Things go on in this way, and the people are plundered by the monoplies and by the operations of these trusts and corporations. And now that this question is under discussion in this House, now that the discussion has been precipitated, it is our duty to consider whether we ought not to strive in some way to avert the calamities that are now falling upon the United States—whether we should not take some action in this country that will prevent the establishment of a great plutocracy, that, like a giant octopus will seize everything within its reach.

I rise merely to say as a member on this side of the House, that I think this is a question that deserves the greatest and fullest consideration on the part of the public men of Canada. Whether it is well that the government should absorb the railways, whether it is well to build an independent line and regulate rates by means of roads across the continent, as the government of the state of New York regulated rates by means of the Erie canal from tide-water to the lakes—these are questions deserving consideration; they are questions of a practical character to which we should devote

our best energies in order to find a solution that will be in the best interests of the country. I sometimes have had a fear that the government ownership of railways would lead to political corruption and to a condition of things not at all desirable. I do not know that that is necessarily the case. I believe the government might own the telegraphs of the country; and I would be in favour of the assumption by the government of that system at once. I am not sure, but that the government might go further in the interests of the people, and take charge of the transportation of the country as well. I do not give these as my views, but I do say that, with all the developments we see going on around us, with all the evils we see growing up, the time has come for the House to take these matters into serious consideration and to decide whether Canada cannot place herself in a position that shall avert the evils that have shown themselves among our neighbours to the south of us.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the resolution is put, I would like to ask of the Prime Minister (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), if any steps have been taken by the government to ascertain the truth of the reports that have been ventilated in the papers for some time as to the removal of the Grand Trunk Atlantic port from Montreal to Portland. The Dominion line which was largely subsidized by the government, as I understood, carries the mails; and the Grand Trunk is also greatly indebted to the government. As this matter has been before the public for some time I would like to ask the government whether they have taken any steps to ascertain what is being done by these two companies.

The PRIME MINISTER. I wish my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) would put a notice of his question on the Order paper.

Motion (Mr. Maclean) to adjourn, negatived.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. Mr. Fielding). My purpose, if the House be willing, is to proceed with the order of Supply to-day. But, I would refer to the observation made by the leader of the opposition yesterday, with respect to the Auditor General's Report. Of course, if that hon. gentleman takes the position that it is not expedient to go on with Supply until we have that report, I cannot take exception to his position. But, I ought to explain that the Auditor General, in the performance of what he believes to be his duty, brings his report down to a very late date and endeavours to include in it correspondence almost down to the very day of the meeting of parliament—certainly to a very recent date. The consequence is that his report is completed late and must be hurriedly pushed ahead. We are now informed that the best that can be done is to have the report ready by Friday next. Therefore, if objection be taken, I will not press my motion, because I realize that hon. gentlemen opposite might desire to have the Auditor General's Report before them. We hope to have it here by Friday.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose we might make a little progress by taking up some items as to which the Auditor General's Report would not be so necessary as with reference to some others, letting it be understood beforehand that it should not be considered a precedent. I think that course has been pursued on some other occasions. As the formal items with regard to which there will be no discussion would really take a very short time to pass, perhaps it would be as well under the circumstances to await the arrival of the Auditor General's Report, and then proceed as expeditiously as we can. If I thought there would be any great saving of time, I would be glad to fall in with the suggestion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding); but I do not think we would save more than an hour or two, and consequently we might as well wait.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I quite concur in the view of the hon. gentleman, and I will not press the motion.

REPORT ON TRADE AND NAVIGATION.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). Yesterday I asked a question concerning the report on trade and navigation, and the First Minister said that the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) was not here. I see he is in his place to-day, and I would like to ask him when we may expect the report of his department to be down. I might say that last year——

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. member has the right to enter upon a discussion. He may put the question, why the report has not been brought down, but he can not discuss it.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not going to discuss it; but I would just say in one sentence that last session a new era was inaugurated in the Department of Customs by which the statistical branch was transferred from the outside ports of the Dominion to the city of Ottawa for the purpose of having this report down at the earliest possible moment, earlier than formerly. Now we are in the eighth month after the conclusion of the fiscal year, and the report that I thought would be down probably in three or four months, is yet to come. Now, that is a matter which I think is a grievance, because the report on trade

and navigation, perhaps above all others, loses its value by being delayed. The business men of the country require——

Mr. SPEAKER. As I have said, the hon. member has a right to ask a question, but I do not think it would be proper, except upon a question of urgency, to enter upon a discussion. He will be quite right in asking the reason for delay in bringing down some report, as he is doing now. I would like to be fair with the House, and I suppose it would be proper that no question should be brought up unless upon notice being given, excepting of course such questions as the hon. gentleman is bringing up now. But he cannot enter upon an argument.

Mr. WALLACE. It has been the universal custom in the House to ask the question and to make a reasonable statement in order to explain it, but not to raise an argument. I am sure that I have not raised any argument on this occasion, because the minister himself will coincide with every word that I have said. I simply ask him now when we may expect the report of his department to be down ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Mr. Paterson). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would say that the printing of the report is being expedited as much as possible, and I hope to be able to present it to the House on Monday next. I do not promise to do that, nor to say positively when it will be ready. I will not follow the hon. gentleman in the argument he made use of ; but if he will reflect for a moment he will acknowledge, from his acquaintance with the workings of the department, that the advantage sought to be obtained in the change which was made, will only become manifest next year. He will see that we had to begin a new system of getting up monthly reports last July, and we have had to do the work of compiling the tables of the trade and navigation while this is going on, and therefore, it would be impossible the first year to reap the full benefit of the change. But I expect that under this new system we will be able to present the Trade and Navigation returns much more promptly than we have been doing.

QUESTIONS.

SAW-LOGS ON INDIAN RESERVES.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

What quantity of saw-logs was cut on Indian reserves in the province of Ontario in the season 1899-1900?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The quantity of saw-logs cut on Indian reserves in the province of Ontario in the season of 1899-1900 was twenty-four millions three hundred and sixty-five thousand, five hundred and eighty-five feet, board measure.

Mr. WALLACE.

SAW-LOGS EXPORTED.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

What quantity of saw-logs were exported from the province of Ontario to the United States during the season of navigation of 1900?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). The quantity and value of logs exported from the province of Ontario to the United States from April 1 to December 31, 1900, as shown by export returns, are as follows :—

	Quantity.		Value.
Cedar	15	cords	$ 105
Elm	10,857,000	ft. B.M.	86,070
Hemlock	2,638,000	"	12,915
Oak	142,000	"	3,401
Pine	30,672,000	"	270,360
All other	4,835,000	"	27,019

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—GRAVES OF CANADIAN SOLDIERS.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to bring back the remains of all those Canadian soldiers who lost their lives in South Africa?

2. Is it true that the graves of all those who have fallen are located and properly recorded in order that relatives and friends may know where to find them?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). The Canadian soldiers who lost their lives in South Africa were for the time being British soldiers, they received the burial of British soldiers, and it is not proposed to interfere with the traditions and customs of the British army in this respect. I may add that Her late Majesty the Queen expressed a desire, when her grandson died in South Africa, that he should be buried there ; the same is true of the only son of Lord Roberts, who lost his life there while in the British army. In reference to the second part of the question, I am not able to give a full answer. I may say that this matter is under the control of the British army authorities. I believe, however, that in many of the cases the places and graves of the Canadian soldiers who have fallen in South Africa have been properly marked and designated.

REPAIRS TO WABASH ENGINES.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. Upon how many engines have the Wabash Railway Company paid duty on repairs during the year 1900?

2. What were the numbers on each engine repaired, what were the repairs and the amount of duty paid the government on each engine so numbered during the year 1900?

3. What was the total amount of duty paid the government by the said company for the year 1900 on engines repaired?

4. Did the government employ an expert mechanic to value the repairs and new parts supplied to said engines, in order to arrive at the proper amount of duty to be paid? If not, what method was adopted?

5. Did the government, or any member of the government, receive any complaint from any quarter regarding the Wabash Railway Company being allowed to repair their Canadian engines in the United States? If so, what was the nature of said complaints?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). In answer to questions 1, 2, 3 and 4, I would remark that it has not been usual to disclose to the public the details of invoices or of customs duties paid by importers in individual instances, such transactions at the custom house being usually treated as confidential in their nature. Special returns from various ports would in any event be necessary to furnish the information asked for. The Customs Department is advised, however, that the Wabash Railway Company has paid duty on repairs to several engines during 1900. 5. I am informed that no complaint has been received at the Customs Department regarding the Wabash Railway Company being allowed to repair their Canadian engines in the United States, unless the following inquiries, contained in a letter from the hon. member for East Elgin can be so regarded, viz. : Whether the Department of Customs have any agreement with the Wabash Railway Company which would give them the right to take their engines or other rolling stock of their company over to their own shops in the United States for the purpose of repairs, and, if so, how does the Department of Customs arrive at the amount of duty (if any is paid) the company should pay on such repairs ?'

CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR EAST ELGIN.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. Who is appointed Census Commissioner for the electoral district of East Elgin?
2. How many applicants applied for the position, and what are their names?
3. How many applied for the position of enumerator? What are their names, and how many have been selected up to date?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. gentleman's question, I would say that Mr. A. D. McGugan will be the census commissioner for the electoral district of East Elgin. In reply to questions 2 and 3, I would say that there have been no applicants.

Mr. INGRAM. Did the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fisher) say Mr. McGugan for East Elgin or West Elgin ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A. D. McGugan for East Elgin.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A CANADIAN MINT.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

Is it the intention of the government to establish a Canadian mint? If so, where and when?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram), I would say that a measure respecting the establishing of a mint in Canada will be introduced during the present session.

DEFACED OR MUTILATED COINS.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

Is it the intention of the government to call in all defaced or mutilated coin?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). There has never been any provision in the Currency Act of Canada for the calling in of defaced or mutilated coins, and the government has no authority at present to take such action. Persons who clip or deface current coins, or who utter such clipped or defaced coins, are liable to prosecution and punishment under the provisions of the Criminal Code. Defaced coins, under the Currency Act, cease to be legal tender, and should be refused by everybody. Whether it is expedient to amend the law in respect to mutilated or defaced coins is a question for future consideration.

GRAIN RECEIVED AT INLAND CANADIAN PORTS.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

How many bushels of grain were received at the following ports during the season of navigation of 1900, and the port of shipment from where same was received: Midland, Owen Sound, Parry Sound, Collingwood, Goderich and Sarnia?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett), I would state that as soon as the notice of the question appeared on the paper, the Department of Customs wired to the different ports mentioned in the question for the information. It has not been received yet from all the ports, but the moment it is received, I will communicate the answer to the House.

REVISION OF DOMINION STATUTES.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

Will a revision of the Dominion Statutes take place at an early date?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. LaRivière), I would say that a revision of the Dominion statutes will take place at an early date.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

Is it the intention of the government to amend the Dominion Lands Act reducing the rate of interest on the unpaid portion of the price of public lands sold on terms ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Yes. The Act referred to having fixed the standard rate of interest at 5 per cent, it is proposed to ask parlia-

ment to adopt that rate in respect of sales of Dominion lands.

LOAN TO MENNONITES IN MANITOBA.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

1. What was the amount of the loan to or for the Mennonites who settled in Manitoba, and at what rate of interest?
2. What reduction was made subsequently to the rate of interest, and what amount did that reduction represent?
3. Has the whole amount of the loan been paid back, as well as the interest? If not, what amount is still unpaid?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). 1. There were $96,400 loaned to the Mennonites who settled in Manitoba. Interest at the rate of 6 per cent, to be funded four years after date, was charged; repayments afterwards to be annually made in sums calculated at the rate of 6 per cent compound interest. 2. A reduction was made from 6 per cent compound interest to 4 per cent simple interest. The actual amount of the reduction it is impossible to calculate. 3. The whole amount has been paid back, together with interest at 4 per cent. Amount loaned, $96,400; amount paid, $130,381.43; interest, $33,981.43.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

Is it the intention of the government to introduce this session legislation respecting the appellate jurisdiction of the Minister of the Interior in connection with mining claims?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). In reply to the question of the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that the jurisdiction referred to is conferred by order in council, and legislation is not required to modify it. The question of altering the method of dealing with appeals is now under consideration.

YUKON—TELEGRAPH CONSTRUCTION.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

Referring to Yukon telegraph construction and to pages 7310 and 7311 *Hansard*, 1900, where the right hon. the Prime Minister promised to 'find in the department (of Public Works) all the information we could get, intending to bring it down without a motion,' and to page 7514 *Hansard*, 1900, where the hon. Postmaster General quotes the Prime Minister's request of the Public Works Department as follows :—'That every means be taken to furnish the hon. gentleman at the earliest moment with every bit of information in the possession of the department.'

(a) When will this information be furnished?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte). Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is good enough to make a motion, all the information that he desires will be brought down as speedily as possible.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand that these papers will not be brought down unless they are formally moved for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. It will not take any time.

HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS AT SKINNER'S POND, P.E.I.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

What amount of money was expended at Skinner's Pond, Prince County, P.E.I., for harbour improvements at that place during the year 1900?

Was a special appropriation made for this work, and if not, out of what vote was the money taken ?

What engineer recommended the work, and the date of his report?

On what date was the work commenced, and when stopped? The name of foreman, with number of days employed and wages paid him per diem?

Names of men employed, with number of days and wages paid each?

Names of men with teams, giving number of days employed and wages paid?

Has the department settled with and paid Mr. John Doyle, owner of the land taken for this work?

Is it the intention of the department to continue the work this season?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte). 1. $1,462.09. 2. No special appropriation, money taken from general vote, Harbours, P.E.I. 3. Mr. J. B. Hegan, report dated September 30, 1898. 4. Work commenced October 1 and ended December 22, 1900. 5. Name of foreman, Edmond Gallant, employed 72 days at $2.50 a day. 6 and 7. Thirty-five men employed in October, 32 in November, and 20 in December, at $1.35 per day. 8. Nothing has been paid Mr. John Doyle for land. 9. The matter is under consideration.

RURAL POSTAL DELIVERY.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

Is it the intention of the government to institute a system of rural postal delivery?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). The subject of a system of rural postal delivery is now receiving the consideration of the department.

CANADIAN REPRESENTATION AT OPENING OF AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT.

Mr. BROCK asked :

1. Has any communication been received by the government of Canada inviting the Dominion to be officially represented at the opening of the parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia in May next?
2. If so, has any gentleman been chosen as the representative of Canada ? If not, why not?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There has been an invitation sent by Mr. Edmund Barton, the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia. It is to the Prime Minister of Canada personally :—

The people of Australia will be overjoyed if you can visit them at the time of the opening of the first parliament of Commonwealth by His Royal Highness the Duke of York.

This is the only invitation that has been received so far, and the acceptance of it will depend on the length of the session.

ALLOTMENT OF ROOMS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin) by Mr. Puttee asked :

1. How many rooms are there in the House of Commons for the use of members during the session?

2. What disposition has been made of each one for the present session and to what members have they been allotted ?

3. Has any provision been made for the accommodation of Independent members of the House this session as was made last session ?

4. If not, why not, and will the government make such provision?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte). There are twenty rooms for the use of ministers and members of the House. The disposal that has been made this year of these rooms is the same that was made up to 1896.

Mr. WALLACE. No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Exactly the same as was made in 1896. The rooms have been disposed of as follows: No. 26, Nova Scotia; 27, French Whip's room; 16, Ministerial room. No. 16 is the Ministerial room. No. 6 is very well known as the Opposition room. No. 7 is the room of the Minister of Public Works. No. 7½ is the room of the Postmaster General. No. 33, which was last year occupied by the Hon. Mr. Foster, has been given to the Hon. Mr. Costigan, who belongs to the same province.

Mr. BENNETT. Quite a change though.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, for the better. Room 34 has been given to the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Solicitor General. Room 33A has been given to the Printing Committee, as last year. No. 89 is the Prime Minister's room. No. 90 is the room of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. No. 91 is the room of the Minister of the Interior. No. 92 is the room of the Minister of Railways and Canals. No. 94 is the room of the English Ministerial Whips. No. 93 is the room of the Minister of Customs. No. 95 is the room of the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Militia. No. 96 is the room of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. No. 42 is the room of the exministers. No. 4 is the room of the leader of the Opposition. I repeat that the rooms this year are used the same as since 1896.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

VENTILATION ON OCEAN STEAMSHIPS.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth) asked:

1. Has the government taken any steps to induce the ocean steamship companies to ventilate the holds in which apples are carried ? If so, what steps, and with what success ?

2. What steamers, if any, have been induced to ventilate the holds in which apples are carried, and what means do they use to effect the ventilation?

3. Has the government taken any steps, and if so, what steps, to ascertain if the steamers have actually carried out their promises, if any were made, in regard to ventilation of holds for apples?

4. Has the government taken any steps to ascertain the results of the ventilation of holds of vessels for apples in regard to their condition on arrival in Great Britain? If so, what is the result?

5. Does the government intend again to test the value of British markets for Canadian grapes?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher):

1. The Department of Agriculture requested and urged the owners and agents of various steamship lines from Canadian ports to provide ventilation for the holds or other places in which apples were carried, by the use of fans or otherwise. A communication to that effect was sent to them under date September 29, 1897. The matter has been followed up every year since that date; and the various owners and agents were urged to provide ventilated accommodation for cheese also.

2. In July, 1900, the Department of Agriculture offered a bonus of $100 towards the initial expense of fitting up each approved steamship, to be paid after the ventilating equipment had been in use for at least three voyages. Twenty-three steamers were fitted with exhaust fans to ventilate the holds wherein fruit and other perishable cargo was stowed. These were steamers of the Allan, Thomson and Donaldson lines. The steamers of the Dominion Line, the Elder-Dempster Lines and the Manchester Liners (Limited) are reported as being provided with only the ordinary ventilators.

3. Agents of the department were stationed in Montreal and at the ports of London, Bristol, Liverpool, Manchester and Glasgow, to observe and report on the loading and discharge of Canadian cargoes. The report indicates that the cargoes were delivered in better condition from the holds ventilated by exhaust fans than from other holds. The government intends to continue trial shipments of grapes.

SCHOOL LANDS, MANITOBA—SALES BY AUCTION.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher) moved for:

List of school lands sold at public auction in Manitoba during last year, place of sale and name of auctioneer and other officials in charge of the sale. The name of the purchaser, with the description and acreage of the respective lots purchased, price of sale per acre and amount paid on account. A list of the lots adjudicated but which were subsequently resold, name of first purchaser, price bid and at which adjudication was made; also, price at which sale of same lot was subsequently made, with name of purchaser.

He said: It is a well-known fact, Mr. Speaker, that the school lands held for the province of Manitoba are managed by the Deparment of the Interior of the Federal government, and from time to time sales of portions of these lands are held. Many such sales have taken place in former years. During the past year several sales have taken place at different points, and it appears that speculators attended, and made bids on these lands although they did not intend to carry out their bargain, but rather expected to get the lands at a lower price when they were offered for sale again, and in some instances they actually did succeed in their expectations. I do not for one moment intend to blame the government for what has occurred, but at the same time there is something further to be done in those cases. An inquiry is now being proceeded with into the matter, and from the evidence adduced before the presiding judge it has been found that the system I have referred to has been carried out so extensively that the province of Manitoba will be at the loss of several thousand dollars. There is another phase of this case which constitutes a serious grievance. Bona fide settlers who intended to purchase these lands either to enlarge their own domain, or as farms for their children, have been ousted out of the opportunity of so purchasing by these speculators over-bidding them, and then after the bona fide intending purchaser had left the place the lands were again put up for sale and sold at a lower price than in the first instance. Evidence is daily being adduced before the presiding judge giving further instances of this kind of thing. I will not undertake to read that evidence, as it is rather long, and indeed as the inquiry has not yet been concluded, it would perhaps be premature to bring the matter before the House. I trust that as soon as this inquiry is completed and as soon as the government is convinced that there have been frauds perpetrated, that all these corrupt and fraudulent sales will be cancelled and that a chance will be given to bona fide settlers to purchase these lands. I am glad to know that an investigation has been ordered, because there undoubtedly has been something wrong going on. When this investigation is completed it will be the further duty of the government to rectify the wrong that has been perpetrated to the detriment of the bona fide settlers who intended to purchase those lands.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). There is no objection whatever on the part of the government to bringing down the information which the hon. gentleman asks for. I can readily understand his desire that full and detailed information should be in his possession and in the possession of the House in regard to this matter, which in the province of Manitoba is a matter of great importance. So soon as my attention was called to the fact that there were charges of irregularities in connection with the sale, steps were taken to order an investigation, and the investigation has been going on for some time past under the direction of His Honour Judge Prendergast, one of the county judges of the province of Manitoba. We have asked Judge Prendergast to complete his report as rapidly as possible, so that it may be laid before parliament. So soon as the report is in my hands, I will have it laid before parliament without any unnecessary delay. I can assure the hon. gentleman that everything that can be done by the department to protect the interests of bona fide buyers will be done. Of course, it would be altogether improper for me to express any opinion until the result of the investigation is known; but I might say that the investigation so far indicates that the first reports regarding the irregularities were very much exaggerated. That may or may not be the case. When the judge's report is here, we shall be able to decide.

Motion agreed to.

YUKON—IMPORTATION OF LIQUORS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for:

Return showing an itemized statement of the number of gallons of spirituous and malt liquors taken into the Yukon district since the period covered by return (1900), the number of permits issued therefor, names and post office addresses of those persons or companies to whom permits were granted, and the amount paid therefor, and all correspondence connected therewith.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I might remind the hon. Minister of the Interior that the language of the motion is exactly the language of the motion moved last session, which was complied with in the form there suggested. I have followed the same form for the purpose of comparison of the particulars brought down in the return of last session with those which I would like to have continued in this.

Motion agreed to.

YUKON—MR. OGILVIE'S REPORTS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for :

Copies of all reports from Mr. Ogilvie, Commissioner of the Yukon district, not already brought down, together with such information as is available respecting the report referred to on page 5025 *Hansard*, May 10, 1900, and the delay in sending it forward.

He said : The acting Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) of last session will recollect that the session expired without his having been able to obtain from Mr. Ogilvie the report for which he asked by wire on several occasions ; and the object of this motion is to have that report brought down, if it reached the department, or, if it did not reach the department, to have brought down the explanation, or such papers or correspondence as may exist in regard to those inquiries of which we were advised from time to time. Before the motion is disposed of, I might take this opportunity of asking the hon. the Minister of the Interior whether there is any truth in the report that Mr. Ogilvie has resigned. The reason I bring this rumour to the attention of the House, is that, after it had circulated some days in the press, it was followed by the report that a gentleman—a Mr. Ross, I think —would probably be his successor, and I think this an opportune time to ask the hon. gentleman if there is anything in that report.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that Mr. Ogilvie has not resigned, nor have I received any intimation from him that he intends to resign.

Motion agreed to.

LENGTH OF SPEECHES IN THE HOUSE.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk) moved :

1. That the practice of delivering speeches of great length in the Canadian House of Commons has introduced a discursive and irrelevant style of discussion, is destructive of pertinent debate upon public questions, leads to waste of valuable time, unreasonably increases the length of the sessions of parliament, is in marked contrast to the practice with regard to debate that prevails in the British House of Commons, and tends to repel the people of Canada from a careful and intelligent consideration of the proceedings of parliament.

2. That it is desirable that rules and modes of procedure be adopted limiting, under certain conditions, the length of speeches, and regulating the general conduct of debate in that regard.

3. That a special committee be formed to consider the question of parliamentary debate, length of speeches, general conduct of debate, and proper methods of securing greater promptitude in the despatch of the business of the Canadian House of Commons, so far as they be consistent with parliamentary rights and the general interest of the public; and report its recommendations to this House.

4. That such special committee shall be composed of the following members : Messieurs Britton, Cowan, Haggart, Clarke, Parmalee, Monk, Madore, Fortin, Russell, Costigan, Tupper, LaRivière, Oliver, Prior and the mover.

He said : The motion which I am about to make, Mr. Speaker, was brought under the consideration of the House two sessions ago, and upon that occasion received unfavourable action. It was upon the Order paper last session, but owing to the delays, which this motion aims at, instituting proceedings to prevent, it was never reached. I am glad to have this opportunity, at this early stage of the session, of bringing the matter to the attention of the House again. The feeling, I think, in the House itself, is a pretty general one that some modification of our rules might possibly be made in order to facilitate the despatch of business, and correct some of the evils that have been gradually growing up in the procedure of parliament. The tendency to lengthy speeches has been a growing one, for several sessions past, and the length of the speeches has tended to the prolongation of debates often extending over days and weeks, consuming an enormous amount of time, and with practical results of very little consequence indeed.

The country, so far as my observation goes, looks upon the mode of conducting business in the House of Commons with a good deal of disfavour and dissatisfaction, and the methods which we have drifted into are of a character to repel the country from a proper consideration of the proceedings of parliament. We are gradually reaching a position when the proceedings of the House attract very little public attention, compared to their importance, owing to the prolongation of debates by speeches marked by their irrelevance and want of logical application to the case.

This resolution proposes no specific rules. It merely recites the facts with regard to the operations of this House and the methods we are falling into in the conduct of business. It proposes no line of conduct for the remedying of this evil except the indirect one, which, I trust, will bear direct and positive fruit, namely, the appointing of a committee to examine fully into the case, to take into careful consideration all the facts connected with our procedure, and the results which have flown from the application of these rules, and to consider whether it may not be practical, to some extent, to adopt a modification of these rules which will lead to a more rapid despatch of business and lessening the length of parliament and improve the conduct of business in such a way as will commend the approval of the government and the House,

and bring about a more practical method of transacting the affairs of the country.

The United States House of Representatives many years ago were driven, by long discursive speeches and waste of time, to the adoption of rules for the purpose of saving time. Some of these rules we shall have before us if a committee is given for our guidance, as well as the rules and regulations of the English House of Commons. In the United States House of Representatives, for instance, speeches are limited to one hour, a time is fixed for the closing of debate, and after a certain stage of debate speeches are limited to five minutes. Several speakers may, of course, give up their time to one, but all the time that each speaker is entitled to is five minutes. Any amendment made to an original motion, which, in our case, opens the whole field of discussion again, can only be presented in a speech of fifteen minutes, and must be replied to in a speech of ten minutes, and the debate upon it is then closed. It was found imperatively necessary to adopt rules of this character in order to get the business of the country through within a reasonable time. We are reaching the same position which existed in the United States when these rules were adopted. We had a session of six months last year, during which we had thirty-three motions to adjourn, which led to a practical waste of thirty-three days, and an expenditure of that time on questions which did not appear on the Order paper. In the meantime hon. members had to wait from day to day, and from week to week, and from month to month, to reach motions they had on the Order paper. That was the case with myself, and even then I did not reach the motion I had on the paper for final action at all. Without enlarging further on the question, I may say that we are all aware that much valuable time is thus wasted, and that it is desirable to adopt rules for the securing of greater pertinence and brevity in the character of the speeches, and greater speed in the despatch of business.

The committee, if granted, will have this question under its consideration, and will make what suggestions or recommendations to this House it may think fit. These can be dealt with by the House, and the House is not committed, by the granting of this motion, to anything the committee may recommend. Unless this House adopts any recommendation of the committee, of course, there will be no change, but I think, considering the circumstances, considering the methods we have fallen into in the discharge of our duties, it would be wise to adopt a committee to consider what should be done, and then leave the matter in the hands of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN, (Halifax). I would suggest to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) that there hardly seems any occasion for presenting this motion at the present time. It is true that the methods of debate in any deliberative assembly must always demand attention. It is possible that, sometimes, time is wasted in this House. I suppose that the same can be said of any deliberative body. Until we become perfect, it is absolutely impossible to conduct the business without wasting more or less time. But the move which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) proposes is one of a great deal of importance, and I expected to have heard a word from the right hon. gentleman who leads the House in regard to it. It is a matter that does not affect solely this parliament, or this session; it is a matter that will be of very serious moment to future parliaments. There are two things that must be borne in mind in dealing with it—in the first place, to secure the transaction of public business without waste of time, and in the second place, to secure to every man in the House of Commons as great liberty in discussion and criticism as is consistent with the transaction of public business in a legitimate way.

Mr. CHARLTON. The resolution proposes that that shall be secured.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the question is, whether or not, in the House of Commons of Canada at the present time, there is need of any change. If there is to be a change, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) has not given us any light as to the particular methods which will be suggested to the committee which he moved. I think that this is a matter in which we shall do well to 'hasten slowly.' We should not take it upon ourselves within a few days of the opening of this first session of a new parliament, to deal with a matter of this kind, which, possibly, in the opinion of a great many members of the House is not a matter that very urgently requires to be dealt with at all.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) has reminded the House that this is not the first time he has introduced a motion similar to this. In fact, if I remember aright, this is the third time that my hon. friend has brought this identical motion to the attention of the House. On previous occasions I did not for my part favour the passing of such a motion; and I see no reason to modify the views I formerly entertained. I agree with my hon. friend that in the last parliament the speeches we listened to, were, perhaps, of a somewhat inordinate length. At that time, I said that I would rely upon the good sense of the House to remedy that evil without taking any formal step to do so. I have reason to believe that this parliament will see, in these matters, a very marked improvement. I suppose that this year, parliament will come back to the old practice of delivering speeches of moderate length, and that there

will be no necessity to apply the American system to our procedure. My hon. friend says, very truly, that the practice lately introduced in this House, is in marked contrast to the practice of debate that prevails in the British House of Commons. But the adoption of the rule which my hon. friend suggests, the American rule, would not——

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not suggest that.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps my hon. friend did not suggest that in so many words in his motion, but, as I understood his remarks, he had it in mind to adopt somewhat the American system of limiting speeches——

Mr. CHARLTON. Not at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then I am the better pleased. Still, I cannot see that there is any reason, at this early period of the session, for trying to correct what was, no doubt, an evil. I think we can try this parliament and see how far the evil, which was so marked in last parliament, will prevail in this one. But, I may say to my hon. friend, that it is not out of place for parliament to revise its rules generally. For my part, I am prepared, and, indeed, I intend to see if the rules of the House cannot be modified somewhat. I am a strong believer in the British system of procedure, and I would only suggest that we should see how far we can adopt the rules which prevail in England. If I say, that, at an early date, I intend to call the attention of the House to this subject, perhaps my hon. friend will agree in the meantime, to withdraw his motion.

Motion withdrawn.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Return of a certain report made in June, 1900, respecting Toronto Harbour by Engineers W. F. Jennings and Joseph R. Roy.—Mr. Kemp.

Return showing,—1. When J. R. Thompson was appointed an official of the Department of Interior, outside service.

2. His duties and salary.

3. Whether he ever acted in any other capacity than a homestead inspector, and if so, in what capacity or capacities, and for what length of time.

4. When he was dismissd. Date of notice of dismissal. At what date he would, if on duty as homestead inspector, probably have received it.

5. The date to which he was paid. If engaged by month, whether he was entitled to his pay up to the end of January, 1901? And if not, why not?

6. Whether it is not customary, in dismissing officials of several years' standing, to pay them a gratuity in proportion to their length of service? Whether it has been done in similar cases? If so, why not in his?

7. The cause of his dismissal.

8. What charges were made against him, and whether he was given an opportunity to reply to them?

9. Copy of notices issued by Mr. Burley.

10. Copy of Mr. Burley's instructions.

11. The name of the person at whose instance Mr. Burley issued such notices, and if on his own responsibility, whether Mr. Burley's action was approved or censured.

12. Whether it is customary for the Department of Interior to advertise for parties to come forward and make complaints against the officials of that department? If not, why was that course followed in this case?

13. The result of said investigation. Whether the investigation was adjourned to enable the complainant to secure evidence, and how long the investigation lasted?

14. Whether Thompson was ever notified of the finding of the investigation?

15. A copy of this notification.

16. The date of Mr. Burley's investigation and the date of his report.

17. Whether the files of the department in the case under investigation furnished the complainants.

17a. Whether it is customary in such cases to hand over the files of the department to the complainants?

18. Whether Mr. Thompson requested the department to furnish him certain papers on the files furnished the complainants as having any bearing on the complaint?

19. Whether he made this request more than once; if so, how many times did he do so? What reply was given him in each case?

20. The name of the party or parties appointed in his place?

21. The qualification of his successor or successors for the position?

22. His or their experience to qualify him or them for the said position, and of what has such experience consisted? At what date were such appointments made and on what recommendations?

23. At time of Thompson dismissal the amount of work on hand requiring attention by him or some one acting in the same capacity.

24. A comparative statement of the last two years of the duties performed by him and all the other homestead inspectors and forest rangers where the duties of both offices are performed by the one official.

25. The number of instructors made during the twelve months ending November 30 in years 1896-7-8-9 by all parties acting as homestead inspectors, and the number of days in each year they were employed making inspections. The number of days in each year they receive pay, and during the time they were under pay, what other duties as homestead inspectors were they engaged at? Also the number of applications for patents received by each during the same period, and the fees the department received for such applications?

26. The date when the charges were made against Thompson which were investigated by Mr. Burley?

27. The date of Mr. Burley's report.

28. Whether any further charges have been made?

29. If so, by whom, and their nature?

30. When Thompson was apprised of them and asked to disprove or reply to them?

31. Whether it is not the custom of the department to give all officials an opportunity to reply to any charges of insinuations against their conduct?

32. The duties of Mr. Burley prior to the investigation of charges against Mr. Thompson?

33. How long Mr. Burley has been in the employment of the Department of the Interior;

his calling or business prior to appointment to investigate such charges, and what was his salary?

34. Whether, at the date of such investigation, Mr. Burley was considered Mr. Thompson's superior officer ?

35. Who recommended Mr. Burley's appointment as investigator or commissioner into the charges against Mr. Thompson ?

36. Was there any protest, verbal or written, against the appointment of Mr. Burley by any official of the department or any other person ?

37. How long the investigation lasted ?

38. What it cost the department ?

39. What the department paid the witnesses brought by the complainant ?

40. Did the department pay any of the legal expenses of the complainant?

41. Did the department pay the legal expenses of said Thompson in the case?

42. Was the department asked to do so, and to what amount ?

43. If so, what reason was given for declining to or refusing such request ?—Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.

Return showing :—1. The number of immigration agents employed by the government of Canada in the United States of America for each of the calendar years 1894-5-6-7-8-9 and 1900, together with the names of each of such agents, date of appointment of each, the location of each during each of said years, the salary of each during each of said years, number of days spent by each in his office, each year, amount of rent paid by each agent for offices during each of said years, number of days spent by each agent in travelling and amount of travelling expenses of each during each of said years and amount allowed during each of said years, to each or any of the said agents for board or lodging, or for both, the amount of help employed by each agent during each of said years together with the amounts paid by each agent each year for such help, giving the names of persons employed, number of days employed each year and amounts paid each year to each person employed and showing all other expenses in connection with these agents and their work. Date of leaving or dismissal from the service of the Dominion government. If still in the employment of the government, where, and the salary for the present year, and the number of emigrants reported by each agent during each of the said years as having emigrated to Canada from the district in which he was working.

2. The number of agents employed by the government of Canada in the United States of America for each of the calendar years 1894-5-6-7-8-9 and 1900, who were paid by commission, the manner of determining the commission to be paid each agent, the amount paid to each during each of said years, the amount of all other expenditure incurred by the government of Canada during each of said years on account of immigration agents employed in the United States of America on commission, and the work done by each of such agents during each of said years.

3. The names of all other immigration agents employed during the calendar years, 1894-5-6-7-8-9 and 1900 by the government of Canada, the date of appointment of each, the location of each during each of said years, the salary of each during each of said years, the number of days spent by each in travelling and the travelling expenses of each during each of the said years, the number of days spent by each in his office during each of said years and amounts paid by each for office rent and hired help, in detail, during each of said years, amount allowed to each for board and lodging during each of said years, and amount of all other expenses during each of said years of each such agents in connection with his office and charged to the government of Canada.

4. Date of appointment of W. T. R. Preston, his salary, his duties, his travelling expenses, amount he charged the government of Canada for board and lodging and other expenses in connection with his office, during each year since his appointment.—Mr. Wilson.

Return of the report of the engineer who surveyed Napanee river in 1890, and for a return showing the names of the persons employed, length of employment and sums paid to each person, and giving details of all other sums paid, with names of persons to whom payments were made on account of the said survey.—Mr. Wilson.

Copies of all papers, instructions, tenders, contracts, correspondence, reports in any way relating to the construction of a dwelling for the officers of the government or staff in Dawson City.

Also, all instructions, papers, tenders, contracts, correspondence, in any way relating to the construction of public buildings under contract awarded to William Rourke.

Also, all instructions, papers, tenders, contracts, specifications, reports in any way relating to the construction of a bridge leading from the barracks and other public buildings to the main part of the town in Dawson.—Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.

Copies of the address presented by the citizens of Dawson to His Excellency the Governor General on the occasion of His Excellency's visit to that city in 1900, all orders in council, correspondence and papers in any way connected with the said address and the requests and representations contained therein.—Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.

REPORT.

Report of the Minister of Justice—Penitentiaries.—Hon. Mr. Fielding, for Mr. Fitzpatrick.

On motion of the Prime Minister, the House adjourned at 4.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 13, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE DEATH OF QUEEN VICTORIA.

Mr. SPEAKER read the following messages from the Senate :

Resolved, That one of the Masters in Chancery do go down to the House of Commons and acquaint that House that the Senate doth agree to the Address to His Most Excellent Majesty the King, expressing their deep and heartfelt sorrow at the demise of our late Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria, by filling up the blank with the words ' Senate and.'

Resolved, That one of the Masters in Chancery do go down to the House of Commons and acquaint that House that the Senate have passed an Address to His Excellency the Governor General respectfully requesting His Excellency to be pleased to transmit the joint Address of the Senate and House of Commons to His Most Excellent Majesty the King, expressing their deep and heartfelt sorrow at the demise of our late Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria, and request the House of Commons to unite with the Senate in the said Address.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I beg to move, seconded by Sir Richard Cartwright :

That the Address to His Excellency the Governor General be concurred in by filling up the blank with the words 'and Commons,' and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

DEBATES COMMITTEE.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That a Select Committee be appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of this House during the present session, with power to report from time to time ; to be composed of Messrs. Ball, Champagne, Charlton, Clarke, Earle, Fortin, Holmes, LaRivière, Macdonald, Monet, Roche (Marquette), Russell, Scott, Sutherland (Essex) and Taylor.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—PAY OF MEN.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. Has a deduction been made from the pay of any of the men of 'C' Battery, which served in South Africa?
2. If so, why was such deduction made?
3. Does it affect all the members of the Battery, and if not, why not?
4. What was the total amount of the deduction, if any, and how many members of the Battery did it affect?
5. Upon what basis was the deduction made?

THE MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). No deduction has been made, but I would suggest to the hon. gentleman, in order to bring all the facts in reference to this matter properly before the House, that he make a motion.

Mr. CLARKE. Make a motion about what, if there has been no deduction ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. For the papers.

TRANSPORTATION OF GRAIN.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

How many bushels of grain were received at the following ports during the season of navigation of 1900, and the port of shipment from where same was received :—Midland, Owen Sound, Parry Sound, Collingwood, Goderich and Sarnia?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). Collectors of customs report the grain received by water at the ports referred to during 1900 as follows :

	Bushels.
At Midland—	
From Chicago.....	4,742,147
" Duluth	2,229,048
" Milwaukee	1,460,606
" Fort William.....	1,783,040
Total	10,214,841
At Owen Sound—	
From Chicago	78,179
" Duluth	97,000
" Fort William.....	1,014,637
Total	1,189,816
At Parry Sound—	
From Chicago.....	11,010,643
" Duluth	2,305,371
" Fort William.....	76,313
Total	13,392,327
At Collingwood—	
From Duluth	153,108
" Fort William.....	297,674
Total	450,782
At Goderich—	
From Chicago.....	604,025
" Duluth	151,106
" Fort William.....	911,199
Total	1,666,330
At Sarnia—	
From Chicago.....	2,536,680
" Duluth	997,204
" Fort William.....	423,195
Total	3,957,079

SURVEY OF SOUTH-EASTERN MANITOBA.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

Is it the intention of the government to have all the unsurveyed public land in the south-eastern portion of the province of Manitoba subdivided during the coming season?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) : No. It is not the intention to have all the land referred to surveyed during the coming season. It is all that the department can accomplish to survey the land that is required for settlement. Every effort will be made to have the land in the district referred to, which is required for settlement, surveyed so fast as it is required.

INDIANS ON ROSSEAU RESERVE.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

Will the few Indians remaining on the Rosseau River Reserve, in Manitoba, be soon removed to some more convenient and profitable place for them, and will the land now mostly all unoccupied by them be opened for settlement?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) : The Indians re-

ferred to cannot be removed, nor can the land be opened for settlement without their consent, the land having been reserved for the use of the Indians by treaty.

SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR SURVEY.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

Was a survey made by a competent engineer of Summerside Harbour during the years 1899 or 1900? If so, what was the engineer's name, and has he reported? What depth of water in the channel does the report show? Did the engineer recommend the deepening of the channel by dredging, or otherwise ? If so, what steps have been taken by the government to carry out his recommendations? What is the depth of the water in the channel by latest surveys and reports?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte) : There has been no survey by the department since 1897.

SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

Were tenders invited during the years 1899 or 1900 for the building of a breakwater at Summerside Harbour, Prince County, P.E.I.? If so, how many tenders were received, what were the names of the parties tendering, and amounts of their respective tenders? To whom was the contract awarded, and amount of contract? Was any date fixed for the commencement and completion of the contract, and if so, what were the dates? Has the contractor commenced operations, and to what extent?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte) :

1. Yes.
2. Five.

McDonald & Moffat.....	$55,900
Reid & Archibald.....	74,490
R. B. Holman	75,000
R. C. McLeod	84,000
Wm. Bermingham	104,000

3. Contract awarded to McDonald & Moffat, for $55,900.
4. Work to commence immediately after signing contract, May 25, 1900; to be completed in eighteen months, or November 25, 1901.
5. Nothing has been done yet.

WEST PRINCE ELECTION—THEFT OF BALLOT-BOX.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

Is the government aware that a ballot-box, containing the ballots cast at Greenmount, Poll No. 5, on November 7, 1900, was stolen from the government railway train between Alberton and Summerside, on or about the 10th day of November last, when said ballots were ordered by Judge McLeod to be produced before him for recount in the West Prince election? What action, if any, has been taken by the government to discover the thief and have him brought to justice ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The government has received no information on that subject.

TOBACCO DUTIES.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. What was the total amount of duty collected on tobacco for the year ended June 30, 1900 ?
2. How much of this amount was due to the additional duty imposed in the session of 1897?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier) :

1. Total duty collected on tobacco, including license fees, $3,281,639.48.
2. Of this amount $971,977.60 is owing to duty placed on raw leaf in April, 1897.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) :—

1. The total amount of customs duty collected on tobacco for the year ending June 30, 1900, was $140,946.47.
2. The amount due to additional duty imposed in the session of 1897 was $20,017.58.

INDIAN CORN IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. How many bushels of Indian corn were imported into Canada from the United States in the years ending June 30, 1899 and 1900, respectively; also, the total value thereof for said years, respectively?
2. How many bushels of Indian corn, not the produce of Canada, were exported from Canada in the years ending June 30, 1899 and 1900, respectively; also, the total value thereof for said years, respectively?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) :

Statement of Indian corn imported from the United States, for years ending June 30, 1899 and 1900 :—

1899.

	Bushels.	$
Indian corn for distillation..	810,096	278,113
Indian corn, N.E.S. (free)...	23,342,814	8,996,890
Exports same period	16,009,847	6,362,683

1900.

	Bushels.	$
Indian corn for distillation..	607,544	201,515
Indian corn, N.E.S (free)...	17,502,639	6,961,970
Exports same period	11,758,882	4,757,595

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—PAYMENT OF 'C' BATTERY CONTINGENT.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to pay all the men of 'C' Battery, which served in South Africa, the full amount promised them, out of the Canadian treasury?
2. If so, when will such payment be made to the men who did not assign their pay to relatives on leaving the country?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). I am advised by the officers of my department that the men and officers of 'C' Battery have already been paid all they are entitled to under the Act of last session, by which the money was voted to the contingents serving in South Africa.

SENDING OF MILITIA TO VALLEYFIELD.

Mr. PUTTEE asked :

1. Who was responsible for the sending of militia from Montreal to Valleyfield, Que., on October 25 last, the arrival of which precipitated a strike by the employees of the cotton mills?
2. Was the Militia Department consulted, or did it give consent to the despatch of further troops two days later?
3. In the riot that followed consequent upon the arrival of these troops, were any of the men seriously injured?
4. At whose expense were these military operations carried out, and have the accounts been settled?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden) :

1. The mayor of the town of Valleyfield, who made requisition upon the officer commanding military district No. 5.
2. The Militia Department was not consulted, nor was it necessary to consult the Militia Department before calling out the troops. (Militia Act, cap. 41, clause 34 (2).
3. Not so far as known at headquarters, Ottawa.
4. At the expense of the town council. It is not known whether the accounts have been settled or not.

TUBERCULIN TEST AT GROSSE ISLE.

Mr. McGOWAN (by Mr. Sproule) asked :

Is the government aware that complaints have been made of the unreliable and injurious effects to cattle imported into Canada for breeding purposes by the use of the tuberculin test at the quarantine station at Grosse Isle?
2. What steps does the government intend to take to remove the evil complained of?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). Some representations have been made to me regarding the matter. I may say that the use of the test is not at the Grosse Isle quarantine station, which is only intended for people, but at the cattle quarantine stations, none of which are at Grosse Isle. As regards the second part of the question, the matter is under the consideration of the department.

GERMAN DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CANADA.

Mr. KEMP asked :

Has there been any correspondence between the government or any member thereof and the Imperial government or any member thereof regarding the discrimination against Canadian products by Germany, and if so, has the government any objection to bringing down the correspondence?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have to inform my hon. friend that there is no correspondence to be brought down at this moment on this subject.

IMMIGRANTS SETTLED IN CANADA.

Mr. WILSON asked :

How many immigrants have settled in the Dominion of Canada from January 1, 1900, to December 31, 1900, and from what countries have they come respectively?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

The total immigrant arrivals for the calendar year 1900 were 44,697, from the following countries :—

United States	15,500
English and Welsh	8,184
Scotch	1,411
Irish	765
Galicians	6,533
Germans	705
Scandinavians	2,330
French and Belgians	483
Miscellaneous nationalities	8,676

TORONTO JUNCTION PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. WALLACE asked :

1. Whether the government has yet examined any sites for the proposed public building in Toronto Junction ?
2. If so, what officer has made the examination ?
3. Has any site been yet selected ?
4. If so, where, and of what area, and at what cost ?
5. If no site has yet been selected, what does the government intend doing ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte). No site has yet been examined, and consequently no officer has made an examination. In reply to the fifth paragraph of the question, that is under consideration.

IN THE MATTER OF THE POST OFFICE OF KINNEAR'S MILLS.

Mr. GEORGES TURCOT (Megantic). (Translation.) I move that an address be voted for copies of the evidence, exhibits and report of the inquiry held at Inverness, in the county of Megantic, on August 21, 1900, by Hon. Mr. Justice White, of Sherbrooke, in the matter of the post office of Kinnear's Mills.

I deem it my duty, in my capacity of member for Megantic, to move for those papers, and the reason why I make that motion is to show the interested parties how anxious the government have shown themselves to do justice to whomsoever justice was due. Here are the facts of the case :—

On December 6, 1899, a letter was mailed at the post office of Kinnear's Mills, being supposed to contain $200. As the money had disappeared, the interested parties made a complaint, and an inquiry was held by the post office inspector, Mr. Bolduc, of Quebec. Mr. Bolduc reported that the letter contained no money.

As the interested party was dissatisfied with that report, a second inquiry was held

by the post office inspector for the district of Ottawa, Mr. Hawkins. That gentleman made a report exactly similar to the first. As there prevailed a great deal of excitation in the locality, and as the interested parties were not yet satisfied, I obtained from the hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) a public inquiry, which was held by Hon. Mr. Justice White, of Sherbrooke. The latter reported in the same sense as the former reports just referred to.

As the interested parties were not yet satisfied, the more so as those reports did not confirm them in their claims, and as they pretend that the evidence given is favourable to them, I move for the production of the evidence, exhibits and report of the inquiry, in order to show that the government is willing to render full justice.—Carried.

RAILWAY BONUSES.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox) moved for a return showing :

1. The amount of the bonuses or subsidies voted by parliament each year to railways during the years 1896-7-8-9 and 1900, inclusive.

2. The names of all railways to which bonuses or subsidies were voted by parliament during each of the said years, and the amount voted to each railway.

3. The amount of such bonuses or subsidies paid to each of the said railways during each of the said years, and the conditions of such payments.

4. On what part or parts of the said bonuses or subsidies voted during the said years was interest payable, and how much of each of the said bonuses or subsidies on which interest is payable has been paid, giving details with reference to each railway.

5. The amount of interest paid during each of the said years by each of the said railways on the bonuses or subsidies they have received.

6. What railways to which bonuses or subsidies have been voted by parliament during each of the said years, and paid wholly or in part with the condition that interest should be payable, have paid interest on the bonuses or subsidies received by them, and how much interest has each railway receiving such bonuses or subsidies paid each year.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the motion is carried, I desire to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) if he would agree to the addition, in the third paragraph of the following words, after the word 'years.' 'Or to each and every company or individual who may have become vested with such bonuses or subsidies, by a transfer, or otherwise.' If my hon. friend has no objection, I will move that his motion be amended in that way. The words will not in any way change the effect of the motion, except to enlarge it.

Mr. WILSON. I have no objection.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Mr. TURCOT.

MANITOBA SCHOOL LANDS.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher) moved for :

Copy of all memorials, petitions, resolutions and correspondence in reference to the transfer to the government of the province of Manitoba of school lands and funds already accumulated from sales thereof.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is no objection whatever to bringing down the correspondence which took place before the present year. But, my hon. friend (Mr. LaRivière) may be aware that, during the present year, we have received a new petition on this subject, the correspondence upon which is still pending. We could not well bring down that correspondence. If my hon. friend will restrict his motion to correspondence previous to the year 1901, there will be no objection to it. And, later on, when the correspondence is concluded, there will be no objection, if the hon. gentleman will renew his motion, to bringing down that correspondence also.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I would rather withdraw the motion in the meantime.

Motion withdrawn.

CHARTERED CORPORATIONS.

On the motion for :

List of all corporations now doing business in Canada under charter of the Dominion government. The number receiving subsidies by cash or land grants and the amount of such subsidy attached to each.—Mr. Smith (Vancouver).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I would like to ascertain from the hon. gentleman whether his motion contemplates the inclusion of any other than railway corporations, whether he desires to get information with respect to any other corporate body than such as may be operating a railway.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Vancouver). I desire to include every corporation that has a charter from the government, that has a privilege of any kind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to point out to my hon. friend that he is imposing a very arduous task upon that department of the government which has charge of the records of these corporations. I do not know that it can be ascertained and stated to this House now what corporations are actually doing business in Canada that have actually been chartered under Dominion legislation, and I am quite sure that there are none such which have been receiving bonuses and subsidies, unless it may be some companies that have been perhaps bonused as manufacturing concerns producing steel,

or iron, or some such material product. The hon. gentleman must have some definite object in his mind, and I would suggest that he could best attain that object by so framing his resolution as to include it definitely, instead of requiring the return of an immense mass of matter that would simply be useless to him, and that would involve a large amount of labour in its preparation. If he would amend the present resolution by putting the word 'railway' before the word 'corporations,' and say 'now incorporated or being operated in Canada,' he could later introduce another resolution covering the additional ground that he has in his mind.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Possibly the motion as framed does not strictly cover what the hon. gentleman wishes to get at. The words 'charter of the Dominion government' might be restricted to companies formed under the Joint Stock Companies Act, and might not include corporations created by special Act of this parliament.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would include both, would it not ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A charter of the Dominion government would hardly include a company chartered by special Act of this parliament. I mention this, because I thought it possible that the hon. gentleman might desire to include such corporations.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). I will make the necessary amendments to the resolution.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let it stand.

Motion allowed to stand.

MOTION AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Return showing :—

1. The dates of the erection of the Dominion grain elevators at St. John, N.B., and at Halifax, and the cost of each.
2. The amount of grain handled during each year since said elevators were built, giving the amount of each kind of grain handled by each elevator each year, and how much of each kind of grain was received at each elevator each year for export and exported.
3. The number of officials employed at each elevator each year and their salaries.
4. All other expenses paid each year on account of each of the said elevators.
5. The gross cash receipts at each of the said elevators during each year since they have been built.—(Mr. Wilson.)

ADJOURNMENT—HARBOUR AT MIDLAND.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Before the House adjourns, I would like to ask the First Minister to allow me to make an explanation in reference to an item that appeared in the Montreal *Gazette* this morning. Under the heading 'The Harbour at Midland' there is a statement made that a deputation waited yesterday upon the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and the writer uses these words :

> The representation is that by increasing the present depth of water twenty feet, the grain shipments can be doubled. . . . Many heavy steamships now unloading at Buffalo could and would come to Midland, were there sufficient depth of water.

I wish to take the earliest opportunity of correcting that statement. If such a statement were made to the minister it is entirely incorrect, because there is already at that port considerably over twenty feet of water, and vessels carrying over a quarter of a million bushels of grain are to be seen there at all times. I can only assume that the gentleman who sent the despatch was wrongly informed. I hope the information that was given to the Minister of Public Works as to the requirements of that harbour was more correct than the information given the gentleman who sent this despatch.

THE BUDGET SPEECH.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the motion to adjourn passes, I wish to say to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), that we would like to have as much notice as possible of the day on which he will deliver his budget speech. I do not suggest that the date be fixed now, I merely mention that we would like to have as much notice as possible.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The usual course is to give several days' notice, and I will endeavour to follow that.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 4.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 14, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

STRATFORD P. O. CARETAKER.

Mr. MacLAREN (Perth) asked :

1. Are the government aware that the caretaker of the Stratford post office has been recently dismissed?
2. What was the cause of his dismissal?
3. Has an investigation been held?
4. Has his successor been appointed?

5. If so, what is his name, and what is his salary?
6. At whose instigation was the dismissal made?
7. If an investigation has not been made, will the government cause it to be held?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte) :

1. Yes, on January 26, 1901.
2. Such employment is of a temporary nature and such services can be dispensed with at any time.
3. No.
4. Yes.
5. J. P. Murray, $50 a month, the same as his predecessor.
6. Minister assumes responsibility.
7. No.

LIGHTHOUSE, VICTORIA BEACH, ANNAPOLIS, N.S.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked :

1. Has the government or the Department of Marine and Fisheries received tenders for the construction of a lighthouse at Victoria Beach, in the county of Annapolis, N.S.?
2. From what persons have such tenders been received, and what is the amount of each tender?
3. Has the government or Department of Marine and Fisheries accepted any, and if so, what tender?
4. Has the lowest tender been accepted? If not, what is the difference between the amount of the lowest tender and the amount of that which has been accepted?
5. Whose tender has been accepted?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In the absence of my hon. colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I beg to reply :

1. Yes.
2. John Roney, $497 ; R. W. Hardwick, $497 ; Ralph M. Oliver, $645; John W. Snow, $698.11 ; Lemuel Moonson, $850 ; John S. Hayden, $1,000 ; Pickels & Mills, $1,100.
3. Yes, the tender of John Roney.
4. Two persons tendered at the lowest sum, and the tender of one of these was accepted.
5. The tender of John Roney.

DISMISSAL OF JOHN CRAIG.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. Has Mr. John Craig, for many years postmaster at Strathclair, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reason?
3. Were charges made against him, what was their nature, if any, and was an investigation held?
4. Has a petition been received to retain Mr. Craig in his position? If so, how many names are attached?
5. Has his successor been appointed? If so, who, and upon whose recommendation?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

The answer to the first question is, yes.

To the second, active political partisanship.

To the third question, yes, active political partisanship, which, having been shown, no further investigation was deemed necessary.

To the fourth question, yes, ninety-five.

To the fifth question, yes, William H. Reed, on the recommendation of the Hon. Mr. Sifton.

PRINTING DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. Were all the departmental reports presented to the House on Monday last printed in the government printing office in this city?
2. Are the departmental reports yet to be presented to the House being printed, or to be printed, in the government printing office in this city?
3. If any of the departmental reports have been printed, or are being printed, in outside offices, what are the names of such offices, where are they located, on what terms is the work being done, were tenders called for the work, and why was the work not done in the government office?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. Yes, with one exception, the Department of Public Works Report.
2. Yes, with one exception, the Trade and Navigation Report.

3a. The report of the Department of Public Works has been printed at the office of *La Patrie*, in Montreal ; the Trade and Navigation Report is being printed at the *Herald* office in Montreal.

3b. At current commercial rates.

3c. No.

3d. Pressure of urgent work.

THE G. T. R. SHIPPING PORT.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the government taken any steps to ascertain exactly whether the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Dominion Steamship Company intend making the city of Portland, in the United States of America, the shipping port of both these companies, to the exclusion of Montreal?
2. What steps has the government taken in regard to said change contemplated by these companies?
3. What information has the government of Canada obtained in reference to said proposed change?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). As soon as the announcement was made in the newspaper press with reference to the transfer of the Dominion Steamship Line to Portland, and of the Grand Trunk Railway business to that port, inquiries were made by correspondence.

That correspondence is still pending, it is unclosed at present, and it would be premature to make any announcement as to what conclusions may be drawn from the correspondence passed between the parties.

LAND SCRIP TO SOUTH AFRICAN CONTINGENTS.

Mr. McCORMACK asked :

Is it the intention of the government to issue scrip for land to each officer, non-commissioned officer and man from Canada who served the empire in South Africa?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have to inform the hon. gentleman that such is not the intention of the government.

MR. OGILVIE, YUKON COMMISSIONER.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. Has Mr. Ogilvie, Commissioner of the Yukon district, been recalled or dismissed?
2. Has any communication been sent to him respecting in any way his continuance in office or his retirement from office?
3. Has any communication been received from him on this subject?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). In the absence of my hon. colleague the Minister of the Interior, I beg to reply :

1. No.

2 and 3. No official communications have been sent or received.

RAMA TOWNSHIP INDIANS.

Mr. McLEOD asked :

1. Do the Indians of Rama Township, Ontario, pay any taxes to the municipality for roads and bridges, or do any road work?
2. What acreage of land is held by the Indians in that township?
3. Is it the intention of this government to assist the white settlers of Rama Township in the maintenance of roads and bridges, in proportion to the acreage and value of lands held by the Indians?
4. What amount of money stands to the credit of the Indians of Rama Reserve in the department here?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). In the absence of my colleague the Minister of the Interior, I beg to reply :

1. These Indians, like all other Indians in the Dominion, are exempt from paying municipal taxes on lands within a reserve, but they perform statute labour on the roads abutting, as well as those running through the reserve, as required by the provisions of the Indian Act.
2. 2,380 acres.
3. The question of granting assistance to the municipality to maintain the roads in the township of Rama, is under consideration.
4. $52,485.45.

CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR CHARLOTTE, N. B.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. Has a census commissioner been appointed for the electoral district of Charlotte, N.B.?
2. How many applications were made for the position, and what were the names of applicants?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). 1. No census commissioner has been appointed for the electoral division of Charlotte. 2. The applications are private.

WATER LEVEL OF THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. Is the government aware that in the Senate of the United States, at the first session of the 56th Congress, in January, 1900, the following resolution was passed, viz.:—

'That the President of the United States invite the government of Great Britain to join in the formation of an international commission, whose duty it shall be from time to time to report upon the conditions and uses of the waters adjacent to the boundary line between the United States and Canada, including all the waters of the lakes and rivers whose waters flow by the River St. Lawrence to the Atlantic Ocean, and also upon the effect upon the shores of these waters and the structures thereon and upon the interests of navigation by reason of their diversion from their natural flow, and further to report upon the necessary measures to regulate such diversions.'

2. Have any representations been made to this government by (1) the government of the United States, or (2) by the Imperial government in reference to the above?
2. If so, will the government state how the matter referred to now stands?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The government has not been informed of the matter referred to in the question, either by the Imperial authorities, or by the United States government.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. ANDREW B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I beg leave to move the second reading of Bill (No. 2) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900. I may say that this deals with the form of ballot that was used in the last general election. Hon. gentlemen will remember that, in counting up their votes, they found a number of ballots that were blank—had no mark on them at all.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will ask my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) to allow this to stand. We have not received the Bill yet.

Order allowed to stand.

CHARTERED CORPORATIONS.

On the motion :

Mr. Smith (Vancouver)—List of all corporations now doing business in Canada under charter of the Dominion government. The number receiving subsidies by cash or land grants, and the amount of such subsidy attached to each.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Vancouver). In presenting the resolution, that which stands in my name on the Order paper, I would move

that it be amended by inserting the word 'railway' before the word 'corporations.' I do this at the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Smith, Vancouver), to have the notice of his motion put on the paper, so that the motion may come before us in the regular way on Monday.

Motion dropped.

OTTAWA AND THE C.P.R. STREET CROSSINGS.

Mr. THOS. BIRKETT (Ottawa) moved for :

Copies of all applications, documents, papers and correspondence by or between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the government, or the Minister of Railways and Canals, whereby the Canadian Pacific Railway Company applied for and obtained permission to cross, or continue to cross, certain streets in the western part of the city of Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). There is no objection to the motion passing. But I am not aware that there has been any correspondence on this subject. Applications, I apprehend, would come in the regular course. But any papers there are in the department will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MACLEAN. Before we adjourn, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), whether it is his intention to move the House into Committee of Supply to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Some hon. members requested, and I thought it reasonable, that we should not proceed with supply until the Auditor General's Report was placed on the table. On the assumption that that report would be presented on Friday, I said that on that day we would proceed with supply. I still anticipate that we shall have the report to-morrow. And if it is likely that some matter is to be brought up for discussion on going into supply, we might proceed. If the report be laid on the table after the House opens, perhaps hon. members would not be willing to proceed with business in Committee of Supply. But, as it seems that any discussion might be proceeded with, I would say 'yes' to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Maclean's) question.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding), does not propose to make any progress in supply ? Otherwise, I would ask, what particular portion of the estimates he intends to deal with ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would be pleased to make progress, but possibly objection might be taken to proceeding in supply at the same moment that the Auditor General's Report is laid on the table. Otherwise we might go on with supply, beginning with civil government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then the report will not be laid on the table till after we meet to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps not.

Mr. MONK. If we are to meet to-morrow only to adjourn, I am sure there are a number of members who would prefer to be absent. The report of the Auditor General should be in our hand for a little while before we go into supply. Under the statute, it ought to be before the House the first week of the session——

Mr. FRASER. Fourteen days.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No ; the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is right.

Mr. MONK. I have verified it but recently. If we receive the report of the Auditor General late in the sitting to-morrow, what progress shall we make ? We shall merely meet and adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER. The government is in no way responsible for the fact that the Auditor General's Report has not yet been placed before parliament. I think it would be a bad example, if we wish to have a short session, to commence adjourning. We must adjourn over next Wednesday in any case, as that is Ash Wednesday, and a legal holiday.

Mr. SPROULE. It does seem to me that the contention of the First Minister can hardly be sustained, when he says that the government is in no way responsible for this report. Though the Auditor General may not be an officer under the government, still, he is under the supervision of the government, and this is a departmental report which parliament needs before it can intelligently do its work. It is the duty of the government to see that the House is in possession of these reports before the business to which they relate is gone on with.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. It seems to me that we might as well not sit to-morrow, thus allowing many members, even those who live at a considerable distance, to return home. I am willing to sit to-morrow if there is business to be done. But as we see by the

Order paper that there is no work that we can go on with, we might as well adjourn until Monday. There is no use in meeting merely to adjourn. I hope the Prime Minister will reconsider the matter.

Mr. WALLACE. Speaking for myself, I am not much in sympathy with the proposal to adjourn over to-morrow. We have met to do business, and we should be ready to do it. But, when the First Minister tells us that the government are not responsible for the Auditor General's Report not being down, I cannot agree with him—and for two reasons. In the first place, the Auditor General's Report will be prepared promptly if the ministers present their documents to the Auditor General in good time to give him the opportunity of going over and revising them. And when the Auditor General's Report is prepared, it is a matter for the printer ; and the printers are under the direct control of the government. If the Auditor General has no control over the printing of the documents that he presents, the ministers have. There must be control somewhere, and where is it ? The Printing Department is in the control of the ministers themselves. We hear today that the government are sending part of their printing down to the city of Montreal ; and I am told by printers who know what it means, that the printing of the Trade and Navigation Returns is most profitable, because it is printed in both languages, and the same figures are retained for both the French and English edition, so that it is a doubly profitable transaction for the printers. That was sent down to the favoured newspapers, giving them enormous profits, though the ministers state at regular rates. Well, the regular rate is double the rate for column work, and it is double rate again for printing in English and French, though as a matter of fact it is printed in the one language only, the figures being the same for both languages. And still we are waiting for the Trade and Navigation Returns that should have been in the hands of the public many months ago.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As regards the Auditor General's Report, of which alone I care to speak, the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in assuming that it is under the control of the government. The Auditor General is not an officer of the government ; he has been purposely made an officer of this House.

Mr. WALLACE. Nobody said he was an officer of the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, the hon. gentleman says that we are responsible, but if he is not our officer, we cannot be responsible.

Mr. WALLACE. I said the ministers are responsible for the printing, I did not say they are responsible for the work of the Auditor General's Report.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This happens to be a question of the work of the Auditor General, because, as I said a day or two ago, the Auditor General, in the discharge of what he deems to be his duty, includes in his report correspondence which occurs down to the very eve of the meeting of the House. I am not sure that is the wisest possible plan, if we are to get the document promptly. But he desires, and it is a convenience no doubt to the members when the book comes out, that the correspondence should be placed in that part of the book where the particular matter referred to is found, and that keeps a large quantity of printing matter open and undetermined up to the very last day, on the eve of the session.

Mr. WALLACE. When was the copy handed over ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The copy goes down by stages, it is not matter that goes down all at once, that vast volume cannot be all tumbled into the hands of the Auditor General at once, he prepares his report from time to time. I am not prepared to say, I have not heard any complaint from him as to the time when he receives the copy, but I think the difficulty arises from the fact that the Auditor General, in his desire to do his work well and faithfully, tries to include documents covering a period down to the very eve of the meeting of the House. That is my own opinion of it, and while it is convenient for the members to get the document in that shape ultimately, it inevitably leads to some delay.

Mr. WALLACE. But the Auditor General's Report does not come down to any recent date at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman will find, when the report comes down, that it contains correspondence down to within the last few days.

Mr. WALLACE. It may contain the correspondence, but that is not what we most want.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The correspondence is a part of the one and the same book, the document we are talking about ; and if the Auditor General, in his desire to make these very interesting notes and comments, wishes to bring the book down to a very late date, I am sure he only does so for the convenience and information of parliament. But the plan has its disadvantages.

Mr. MONK. Is it in conformity with the law that the Auditor General puts this correspondence in this report ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course the hon. gentleman is aware that the Auditor General's Report includes a large mass of documents. When we speak of the Auditor General's Report we speak of the whole printed book. Merely bringing down any special part of his report without all the details would not be a compliance with the statute.

Mr. BENNETT. I desire to call the attention of the premier to this fact, that many members who live west and north of Toronto, owing to the fact that there are no Sunday trains on a great many of the branch lines, are compelled to wait till Monday before they can start for Ottawa. So if there is nothing to be done to-morrow, and we have an opportunity of getting home to-night, we will have a couple of days at home without losing an extra day.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend will look at the Votes and Proceedings to-day he will find that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has given notice that when the government moves the House into Committee of Supply, he will move a motion of a very important character. We can discuss it to-morrow.

Mr. HAGGART. With reference to the Auditor General's Report, if I remember rightly, there is an order of this House that the report shall be published before the 31st of October. Why is not that done? There is also a provision for its distribution before parliament meets.

The PRIME MINISTER. It may be proper when the Public Accounts Committee is organized to have this subject discussed. With regard to bringing down the Auditor General's Report at the present time, the hon. gentleman knows that we are quite powerless in the matter.

Mr. MACLEAN. If the House will pardon me, after what the First Minister has said I wish to repeat that I am willing to let the discussion on my motion go over until next week if that will suit the convenience of members. My hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Holmes) has just come to me and says that he and others of his friends would like it to go over until Monday.

Mr. HOLMES. I agree with what the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has said with reference to the adjournment. There are quite a number of members from the west who would like to return home, and who will necessarily lose Monday from the cause he stated. If some arrangement could be made whereby we would not lose Monday, it would be an advantage for the members from the west.

Mr. FIELDING.

COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. HACKETT. I desire to call the attention of the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) to the fact that we have had no mails from Prince Edward Island for the last eight days. What steps has he taken to overcome this difficulty ? I know the government has two steamships blocked in the ice, and while these ships are not available, I want to ask the Postmaster General if he is going to have the mails conveyed by ice boat from Cape Traverse to Cape Tormentine, as formerly.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). When my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) succeeds in getting across from the island to the mainland and reaches Ottawa, I will consult him, and be then in a much better position to answer the hon. gentleman's question. At present I understand that all communications between the mainland and the island is interrupted by reason of the condition of the ice.

Mr. HACKETT. I want to say in answer to the minister——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, the hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to know what the passage of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries from the island to the capital has got to do with the transmission of the mails. What action has been taken with regard to the transmission of the mails from Prince Edward Island to the mainland ? There are a number of people here who are interested in what is going on down in the island.

Mr. WALLACE. Before that motion is carried——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, the hon. gentleman has already spoken.

THE PARLIAMENTARY MAILS.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I have not yet spoken. I want to ask the Postmaster General if he could not get better service at the post office here. The evening papers from Montreal only reach us on the following morning. They get here at nine o'clock by the mail service and they never come up from the city office until the following day. This is my experience since the opening of the session. It is not the fault of the office in the Commons, but it appears that the distribution office in the city is not carried on as it should be. The same thing takes place in regard to our western mail. The mail from the west arrives at two o'clock in the afternoon, and we do not get our mail in the House until eight or nine o'clock the same evening. I think it is quite too long

for us to wait—three or four hours—for the transfer of our mail from the city office to the office in the House of Commons.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). Mr. Speaker, I will inquire into this matter that the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) has brought to my attention, but, I will say, that there has been no change since I took office four years ago.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Last session the mails were sent up more regularly.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There has been no change made to my knowledge since we took office.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of the government to what appears to me to be an extraordinary fact. The only reason given for this House meeting to-morrow is to consider some business that is to be brought forward by hon. gentlemen occupying seats on the opposition benches, and, although we were told in the speech from the Throne that measures would be submitted to us :

—for the better supervision of the export trade in food products, and also in connection with the post office, the Pacific cable and various other subjects

—we have been meeting and adjourning here day after day for want of a single measure introduced on the part of the government. This is the only part of the programme suggested to us in what was expected at the opening to be a business session.

Mr. FRASER. So it is.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We have, on this side of the House, given every assurance that we were ready to go on, but everything has come to a full stop because, as the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) says, one department of the government has for the moment broken down and it is not able to discharge its proper duties. Consequently, not being in a position to ask for supplies, having none of their measures ready for the consideration of the House, they propose that we should take up only such business as the opposition shall bring forward. I think this is a very unfortunate position for the government, and since the business of the government is in our hands they might very well listen to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman who has his business ready and rest over to-morrow before we tackle that.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 15, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE (Wright) (Translation.) moved :

That the first report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of the House be now concurred in.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). (Translation.) What does the report contain?

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. (Translation.) The report the adoption of which I move recommends that the quorum of the committee be reduced from eight to five members.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That the report of the special committee appointed to report the lists of members to compose the select standing committees of this House be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That a select committee composed of Messrs. Borden (Halifax), Bourassa, Brock, Casgrain, Clancy, Clarke, Davies (Sir Louis), Flint, Fraser, Heyd, Hyman, Johnston (Lambton), Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Monk, Roche (Marquette), Scott and Wade, be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the Library.

Motion agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That a Message be ordered to be sent to the Senate informing their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a joint committee of both Houses on the subject of the printing of parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, viz. :—Messrs. Bennett, Casgrain, Clarke, Davis, Holmes, Hughes (Victoria), Hyman, Johnston (Cape Breton), Johnston (Lambton), LaRivière, Lavergne, Loy, Maclean, McColl, Marcil (Bonaventure), Oliver, Parmelee, Préfontaine, Richardson (Grey), Scott, Sutherland (Oxford), Taylor, Thompson and Tisdale, will act as members on the part of this House on said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I beg to lay on the table the report of the Auditor General for the year ending June 30, 1900.

Mr. WALLACE. What date ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For the year ending June 30, 1900 ; with various notes and comments of a later date.

Mr. WALLACE. I thought it would be up to the 14th of February.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The correspondence is up to a very recent date.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. EDWARD A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara), moved the first reading of Bill (No. 4) to amend 'The Railway Act.' He said : This Bill relates to the liability of the railway company, in case cattle guards are not kept at highway crossings. At present, the law is that if an animal is at liberty, not controlled by a human being, and gets upon the railway from the highway, even though there is no cattle guard, the company is not liable. The object of the Bill is to make the company liable to keep up cattle guards, on the theory that these guards are needed for the purpose of preventing animals from being killed or injured when they are not in charge of a human being. If the animal is under the control of a human being, cattle guards are not necessary, because the human being will see to it that the animal is kept out of danger.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY—DISTRIBUTION OF AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before we proceed to the Orders of the Day, I would like, for one moment, to call the attention of the House to certain facts connected with the distribution of the Auditor General's Report which was laid on the table a moment ago. Technically, the report cannot be considered before parliament until it is laid on the table. But from the morning papers it is quite clear that the press must have received a copy of this report yesterday ; and to-day, having seen a reference to the Auditor General's Report in a morning paper, I sent, both to the distribution office of this House and to the post office, to obtain a copy. I was informed through a page that the reports were ready and in the possession of the post office of the House, but they could not be distributed to the members, nor could I obtain a copy until the report was laid upon the table of the House. Now, while that may be technically right, there seems to me to be no reason why that rule should not be broken in favour of a member of parliament as well as of a member of the press. I do not in the slightest begrudge the press who have received a copy, but it is as straight a violation of any rule as would be handing it to a member, on application, in the House. I certainly think that the members of the House should receive this public document at least as soon as the members of the press.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). My hon. friend's point seems to me well taken. But I really cannot give him any explanation of how that document was given to the press. I can only say that yesterday afternoon, very soon after the adjournment of the House, the Auditor General sent the report to my office. It had been his purpose to lay it on the table during the afternoon if the House had continued in session, but owing to the early adjournment he was not able to do so. I was as much surprised as my hon. friend when I saw some statement attributed to the Auditor General's Report appearing in a morning paper. I am afraid I will have to look elsewhere for information as to how it was obtained, for I have no knowledge of it. I think the hon. gentleman's point is well taken.

Mr. MACLEAN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say that if the House is moved into supply, I will not go on with the motion of which I have given notice, for the reason that there is a large number of members who wish to take part in that discussion, and they are away from the House to-day. But I let my notice of motion stand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that is no reason why government business should be delayed, although of course we would be glad to discuss the hon. gentleman's motion. I move that the House do now resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought the understanding was that we should not proceed with supply to-day for the reason that the Auditor General's Report is not in possession of the members of the House, even at the present time. I have not received a copy of it, nor have the hon. gentlemen around me.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course I understood in our conversation on the subject yesterday that a portion of the afternoon would have been occupied by the motion of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), who has now laid it aside for another day. I supposed, moreover, that the Auditor General's Report would be on the table, if not in the hands of the members, for some time before the motion of supply was made. But if my hon.

friend, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), thinks it would not be convenient to go on with supply, under these circumstances, and as I think there is a fair room for his criticism, I will not press the motion.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 3.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 18, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Annual Report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900.—Hon. A. G. Blair.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 5) to restrict the importation and employment of Aliens.—Mr. Clare.

QUESTIONS.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Were tenders invited during the year 1900 for building an extension to Tignish breakwater, Prince County, P.E.I.?
2. In what newspapers were the notices calling for tenders inserted, with dates of publication and length of time between insertion of notice and date when tenders were received and opened by department?
3. How many tenders were received, with names and addresses of parties tendering and amounts of their respective tenders ?
4. Name and address of person to whom contract was awarded, and amount of same ?
5. When is the work to be completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte) :

1. Yes.
2. Charlottetown Patriot, Charlottetown Guardian, Charlottetown Prince Edward Islander, Summerside Pioneer, Ottawa Free Press, Ottawa Le Temps, Bryson Ottawa Valley Advocate. Tenders called on June 29, to be opened on July 20, 1900.
3. One, J. H. Myrick & Co., of Tignish.
4. J. H. Myrick & Co. for $4,255.75.
5. To be completed on or before October 31, 1901.

WINNIPEG LETTER CARRIERS.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

1. Has the following petition been received by the Hon. the Postmaster General :

Winnipeg, Manitoba.

To the Hon. Wm. Mulock,
H.M. Postmaster General.

We, the letter carriers of the city of Winnipeg, respectfully beg leave to request that the present scale of salaries now paid us be considered and revised.

That owing to the continued prosperity of the Dominion during the past six years, the cost of living has been very much increased and wages in all other branches of labour have advanced accordingly.

Also, the reduction in postage rates, together with the expanding trade of the country, has increased the work of our branch of the postal service.

We submit from experience that the increased cost of rents, clothing and provisions generally have absorbed all our earnings, thereby adding largely to the difficulty of maintaining ourselves and families with any degree of respectability.

We respectfully call your attention to the wide difference between the pay of letter carriers and that of other public employees of this city, while the duties performed by us are much more onerous and exacting, and make much greater demands upon our intelligence, honesty and physical endurance than that of civic employees generally.

We also submit that we are the only class of public servants debarred from participating in the growing time, and we therefore ask that 20 per cent be added to present salaries so as to enable us to live with some degree of domestic comfort.

Therefore, your petitioners pray that you may be pleased to take early steps towards the granting of this our reasonable request.

2. Is it the intention of the government to accede to the legitimate request of the petitioners?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Yes, and is receiving the consideration of the department.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—OPINION OF THE CANADIAN GOVERNMENT.

Mr. BOURASSA asked :

1. Was the Canadian government or any of its members consulted by the British government on the South African question since the 1st of June last?
2. Did the Canadian government or any of its members offer any opinion or make any suggestion to the British government on the matter?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Canadian government was not consulted, nor was any of its members, by the British government on the South African question since June 1 last. No member of the Canadian government offered any opinion on the matter.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—THE BADEN-POWELL POLICE FORCE.

Mr. BOURASSA asked :

1. Is it true that some Canadian officers are engaged, or are going to be engaged, at recruiting men for the Baden-Powell police force?
2. Who are they?
3. Are they paid for that work by the Canadian government?
4. What is their pay or salary?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden) :

1. Yes.

2. Officers of the headquarters staff, certain district officers commanding, certain officers of the North-west Mounted Police, and probably the services of other officers will be required. The only officers not in permanent employment so far detailed are Capt. F. W. L. Moore, 4th Regt. Canadian Artillery, and 2nd Lieut. G. S. Beer, Nelson Rifle Company.

3. No.

4. No pay or salary has been arranged for. An officer is entitled to the pay of his rank while employed.

OPERATION OF TICKET-OF-LEAVE ACT.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

1. How many convicts have been conditionally liberated from each of the various penitentiaries, jails and prisons in Canada under 'The Ticket-of-Leave Act' ?

2. How many have since been re-arrested and re-convicted for the same or other offences?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) :

1. Kingston, 55 ; St. Vincent de Paul, 54 ; Dorchester, 35 ; New Westminster, 9 ; Stony Mountain, 6 ; Central prison, Toronto, 28 ; Montreal jail, 9 ; Aylmer jail, 1 ; Sorel jail, 1 ; Halifax County jail, 1 ; New Westminster jail, 1 ; Regina jail, 1 ; Nelson jail, 1 ; Quebec jail, 1 ; Penetanguishene reformatory, 1 ; Dawson jail, 1 ; Andrew reformatory, 1 ; Ottawa jail, 1 ; over 208.

2. So far as the Department of Justice is aware, seven have since been re-arrested and re-convicted for a similar or other offences.

ADVANCES MADE TO SETTLERS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

Is it the intention of the government to reduce the rate of interest on the unpaid balance of the loans and advances made to the settlers in Manitoba in about the year 1876, as was done in the case of the Mennonites?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I beg to say that the subject to which the hon. gentleman refers is under consideration at the present time. No definite decision has been arrived at. I hope to be able to say more upon the subject before the session is over.

MANUFACTURE OF BINDER TWINE BY THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

To whom was the binder twine, manufactured by the government, sold in 1900? At what price was the binder twine, manufactured by the government, sold in 1900? What was the cost of raw material and manufacture of binder twine in 1900?

Mr. BOURASSA.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). As I presume this question refers to the operation of the twine industry during the fiscal year ending June 30 last, my hon. friend will find the answer to the information he asks for at pages M—46, 47 and 48 of the Auditor General's Report. As to the last branch of the question, it has not been the custom nor the policy of the government, since the inception of the binder twine industry, to give the cost of the raw material until such time as the product has been marketed for the season.

PAYMENTS TO GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What was the total amount contributed by the present government to the reconstruction of the Victoria bridge at Montreal?

2. What is the amount paid annually by the government for the use of the Victoria bridge by the Government railway?

3. What is the amount paid annually by the government for the use of the Grand Trunk Railway from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, for the government railway?

4. What is the amount paid annually by the government for the use made by the Intercolonial Railway of the Grand Trunk Railway terminal facilities at Montreal?

5. Is there anything in the conditions of the grants or arrangements above referred to between the government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada which restricts the latter from making its shipping port at Portland, to the exclusion of Montreal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The total amount contributed by the present government towards the reconstruction of the Victoria bridge at Montreal was $500,000.

2. The amount paid annually by the government for the use of the Victoria bridge by the government railway is $40,000.

3. The amount paid annually by the government for the use of the Grand Trunk Railway from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert for the government railway is $37,000.

4. The amount paid annually by the government for the use of the Grand Trunk Railway terminal facilities at Montreal is $62,500.

5. There is nothing in the conditions of the grants or arrangements above referred to between the government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada which restricts the latter from making a shipping port of Portland.

HYDRAULIC MINING LEASES.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

Referring to the list of hydraulic mining leases on p. 55, Annual Report of the Department of the Interior, 1900—

(*a*) What is the date of each lease?

(*b*) What conditions or terms, if any, of these leases respectively have been complied with?

(c) What conditions or terms, if any, of these leases respectively have not been complied with?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Mr. Speaker, I will have to ask the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to move for a return for the information he is asking for. I cannot satisfactorily or intelligently give it in answer to a question.

ST. CATHARINES, ONT., WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. Was the Premier, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, correctly reported in the Evening Journal newspaper of the city of St. Catharines of Tuesday, the 6th day of November last, in reporting his speech delivered at the said city on the day previous in regard to the application of the said city for a supply of water from the old Welland Canal, in the following words :—

'A matter of great interest to you in regard to a water supply was brought to my personal notice some eight or ten days ago, and so busy have we been that the government has not had time or the opportunity to settle the matter, but, my friends, after the election, I will take the matter in hand, and I promise that you shall have justice done to you.'

2. What has been done since the said elections in regard to the matter therein referred to?

3. Does the government intend to grant the said application, and if so, when?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I cannot inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) if the report distributed of my speech on that occasion is accurate or not. I presume, however, it is substantially correct. The question to which it refers is now undergoing the consideration of the government.

LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RAILWAY SUBSIDY.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin) asked :

1. Did the government either give or promise to give the sum of $3,200 per mile to the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway extension, and if so, why?

2. Is the government aware of the fact that the said Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway extension runs parallel with and very near to the Michigan Central Railway for about three-fourths of its length?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Yes ; the government not only promised to give the subsidy, but has entered into a contract with the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company for the payment of a subsidy to them on completion of the line in accordance therewith.

2. Yes ; the government is aware of the fact that, for a limited number of miles, the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway extension does run parallel, or very nearly. to the Michigan Central Railway. This fact was made the subject of discussion in parliament at the time the subsidy proposal was being passed upon. The government, in the Bill providing for this subsidy, reserved the question of the grant for determination, after inquiry, by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, as to whether adequate and efficient running powers should be arranged for by the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway over the Michigan Central line. An objection was taken in parliament by gentlemen in opposition to such qualifying clause being introduced, and it was insisted that the grant should be made without any qualification whatever. This view was pressed strongly, and a motion in amendment was made to strike out the qualifying clause ; it was lost on a division. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council subsequently heard evidence upon the whole question, examined into it carefully, and came to the conclusion that satisfactory arrangements could not be made over the Michigan Central Railway for the running of the Lake Erie and Detroit River trains.

HON. CHARLES BURPEE.

Mr. WILMOT (by Mr. Fowler) asked :

1. What is the date of Hon. Charles Burpee's appointment to the Senate?

2. Is he now a member of that body? If not, why, and when did he resign?

3. In the event of his resignation, was he given a position of emolument under government? If so, what were the duties of the office and the amount of remuneration?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). Hon. Charles Burpee was appointed senator on February 1, 1900. He resigned on July 19, 1900. He was appointed one of the Paris exhibition commissioners on August 9, 1900. He did not go to Paris. His salary was the same as that of the other commissioners, being at the rate of $2,500 per year, with an allowance of $3.50 a day while in Canada and absent from his residence, and actual transportation expenses.

POSTMASTER AT BRANDON, MAN.

Mr. BOYD asked :

1. Is Mr. James Kavanagh now postmaster at Brandon, Man.? If not, did he resign or was he dismissed?

2. How many years did Mr. Kavanagh act as postmaster at Brandon?

3. Was an investigation held by the post office authorities prior to his removal?

4. Who is now postmaster at Brandon, and what is the date of his appointment?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). In the absence of the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock). I beg to say :

1. Mr. J. C. Kavanagh is not now postmaster of Brandon, Manitoba. He has

been removed from the postmastership of that office.

2. Mr. Kavanagh had been postmaster of Brandon since August, 1881.

3. In view of the representations made in the matter, a post office investigation was not considered necessary.

4. Mr. Kenneth Campbell is now postmaster of Brandon. He was appointed on December 24 last.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

At what date was the first instalment of 'MS.' of the Auditor General's Report for last fiscal year sent to the government printing office?

Has all the 'MS.' of the report been sent in to the government printing office?

At what date was the last instalment of copy sent to the government printing office?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. September 11, 1900.
2. Yes ; the report is presented.
3. February 6, 1901.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. LIONEL DANSEREAU TO HOUSE OF COMMONS STAFF.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. Clarke) asked :

1. Has a Mr. Dansereau been appointed to a position on the staff of the House of Commons?
2. If so, what are the duties of the office?
3. What is the salary attached?
4. Is Mr. Dansereau a son of the editor of La Presse newspaper ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. Mr. Lionel Dansereau has been appointed assistant clerk of French journals, to fill the vacancy caused by the demise of the late Mr. G. I. Barthe.

2. His duties are to assist the clerk of French journals in the translation of the journals and the appendices.

3. Salary to be fixed by Mr. Speaker and the Board of Internal Economy.

4. Mr. Lionel Dansereau is a son of Mr. A. Dansereau, of Montreal.

CONTRACT WITH KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. Is the correspondence between Hon. James Sutherland and Hon. William Harty set out in the following poster (used in the recent general election in Kingston, Ont.), authentic?

2. If yes, what is the date of the order in council referred to in the telegram from Hon. James Sutherland to Hon. William Harty of November 5, 1900 ?

3. What the terms of the order in council (briefly stated)?

4. Was any formal contract, based on the said correspondence, entered into? If so, when?

5. What are the terms of such contract (briefly stated)?

Mr. SIFTON.

Locomotive Works Bought—Hon. Wm. Harty is Kingston's Friend—Has Orders for Thirty-two Locomotives—Twenty for the Government and Twelve for Mackenzie & Mann—Where was the Conservative Help for the City on this Occasion—Read the Government's Contract Below and Thank Liberals for Redeeming a Big Industry.

The correspondence closing the order: Kingston, November 3, 1900.—Hon. James Sutherland, acting Minister of Railways and Canals, Woodstock : Dear Sir,—I expect to be possessor of the locomotive works in this city on Monday next. I now beg to offer you as follows : I will build (20) twenty locomotive engines for the Intercolonial Railway upon any specification the officials of that railway may furnish me, and will guarantee the engines as being as good in every respect as you can buy from any other builder. In order to settle the question of price and to ensure the work being done by Canadian workmen, I will guarantee to make the price per engine $500 less than you can import the same from any foreign locomotive engine builder. Kindly let me have your order by wire. Yours sincerely, (Sgd.) Wm. Harty.

Montreal, November 5, 1900.—Hon. James Sutherland, Woodstock, Ont.—Arrived here this morning, Windsor Hotel, will be here all day. Please answer my letter of Saturday by wire if possible. (Sgd.), William Harty.

Hon. Wm. Harty, Windsor Hotel, Montreal.—Have received no letter from you. (Sgd.), James Sutherland.

Hon. James Sutherland, Woodstock, Ont.—I mailed you a letter from Kingston Saturday night. You will likely receive it this afternoon. Wire answer to it if possible. (Sgd.), Wm. Harty.

Hon. William Harty, Windsor Hotel, Montreal.—Your offer to build twenty locomotive engines for the Intercolonial Railway accepted. Order in council already passed to this effect. (Sgd.), James Sutherland, acting Minister of Railways and Canals.

Montreal, November 5, 1900.—Hon. James Sutherland, Woodstock, Ont.—Thanks for order. (Sgd.), William Harty.

Montreal, November 6, 1900.—Edward J. B. Pense, Kingston, Ont.—Have just completed, at 4 p.m., purchase of locomotive works from liquidators. Have secured contract from government for twenty engines for Intercolonial Railway, and am promised twelve by Mackenzie & Mann. In endeavouring to help myself I rejoice in indirectly being able to do something for my old employees of the locomotive works. Home to-morrow noon. (Sgd.), William Harty.

The Option to Mr. King Ended Monday—Mr. Harty Bought Tuesday—No Delay About That.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Mr. Speaker, I can make no statement as to the publication of the poster referred to in the question, but the correspondence as set forth is substantially correct. The government was attacked by its opponents for placing orders for locomotives in the United States of America, although there was no manufacturing establishment then in operation in Canada capable of executing the orders, and when a company of Canadian capitalists was prepared to revive, enlarge and sufficiently capitalize the Kingston works,

which had closed down, the government felt it to be its duty to afford the company all proper assistance and encouragement in its power. In accordance with this policy, an order in council was thereupon passed on October 16, authorizing a contract to be entered into, and later, on December 22 last, the contract was executed between the government and the Canadian company.

I.C.R.—ERECTION OF STATION AT PASSEKEAG, N.B.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. Have tenders been received for the erection of a station at Passekeag, N.B.?
2. If so, from whom have such tenders been received, and what is the amount of each tender?
3. Has the government, or the Department of Railways and Canals, accepted any, and if so, what tender?
4. Has the contract been let; if so, to whom, and if not, why not?
5. Has the erection been begun; if not, why not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Yes, tenders have been received for the construction of a station of Passekeag, N.B.
2. Tenders were received from Mr. Peter Campbell, and Messrs. Hiram M. and Harvey Copp. The amount of Mr. Campbell's tender was $500, and Messrs. Copp's, $700.
3. The tender of Mr. Peter Campbell was accepted.
4. This contract has been let to Peter Campbell.
5. The erection has not been commenced, as the exact location has not yet been decided upon.

POSTMASTER AT LOWER MILLSTREAM, N.B.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. Has Mr. John E. McAuley, for many years postmaster at Lower Millstream, King's County, N.B., been dismissed?
2. If so, why, and at whose instance?
3. What charges, if any, were made against him, and was an investigation held?
4. Has a petition been received to retain Mr. McAuley in his position? If so, how many names were attached?
5. Has his successor been appointed? If so, did he apply for the position, or was he recommended, and by whom?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. Yes.
2. Mr. McAuley was removed from office for being an active political partisan, on the representations of Lieut.-Col. James Domville, ex-M.P.
3. See answer to No. 2. In view of the representations made, an investigation was not considered necessary.
4. Yes—54. Lieut.-Col. Domville states that the large majority of the signers do not reside in the district served by the Lower Millstream post office.
5. Mr. Henry A. McPhee has been appointed postmaster of Lower Millstream. He did not apply for the appointment. He was recommended for the office by Lieut.-Col. Domville.

THE PARIS EXPOSITION.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. Clarke) asked :

What has been the total amount paid in connection with the Paris Exposition up to February 1, 1901?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). The total amount expended for the Paris Exhibition to the 31st January, 1901, was $286,165.71 ; less overcharge for space (refunded), $10,641.43; total, $275,524.28.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. What sums have been paid by the government, since June 30 last, for printing done in offices other than the Government Printing Bureau in this city?
2. What are the offices in which such printing was done?
3. What is the total amount paid to each office for such printing?
4. What is the nature and class of work, if any, given to such outside establishments ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. The Herald, Montreal, $16,140.55, printing immigration pamphlets ; Stovel Co., Winnipeg, $3.75, printing certificates ; Advertiser Printing Co., London, $6.50, printing lists of letter boxes ; J. Hope & Sons, Ottawa, $54.50, requisition books special ; J. Coombs, Charlottetown, $25.50, forms of tenders and posters.

2, 3, 4. Besides above, there was paid for printing voters' lists, as follows :—Herald, Montreal, $1,040.06 ; Witness, Montreal, $838.47 ; Ontario Reformer, Oshawa, $41.36; Hunter, Rose & Co., Toronto, $824 ; Monetary Times, Toronto, $736.49 ; Warwick Bros., & Rutter, Toronto, $1,397.10 ; Murray Printing Co., Toronto, $2,826.29 ; Wm. Briggs, Toronto, $2,477.48 ; La Patrie, Montreal, $275.53.

YUKON—MINING REGULATIONS.

Mr. MORIN asked :

Have the regulations respecting the size of mining locations been changed since the year 1897?

If so, in what respect have such changes been made, and the date or dates thereof?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). 1. By an order in council, dated the 18th of January, 1898, provision was made that placer mining claims in the Yukon territory be increased

to 250 feet in length, the side boundaries to be lines along bed rock three feet above the edge of the creek or lowest general level of the gulch.

2. By an order in council, dated the 21st of March, 1898, quartz mining claims on Dominion lands were increased to 1,500 feet in length by 1,500 feet in breadth.

3. By an order in council, dated the 12th of September, 1898, provision was made for granting entry for copper mining locations in the Yukon territory, having an area of 160 acres in a square block.

4. By an order in council, dated the 20th February, 1899, provision was made that one discoverer of a new mine should receive a claim 1,000 feet long, and a party of two discoverers two claims amounting altogether to 1,500 feet, also that creek or gulch claims should extend 1,000 feet on each side of the creek or gulch, and that river and hill claims should be 1,000 feet in depth.

THE DUTY ON LUMBER.

On the motion :

That in the opinion of this House, duties should be levied upon lumber imported into Canada corresponding with those now existing upon lumber entering the United States.—Mr. Bennett.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Stand.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have no objection that this motion should stand, but I would remind the House that this is the fourth time the order has been called, and if we are to have a short session, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) will agree with me that the government will have to ask for another day very shortly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) is not in the House now, and that is the reason the motion cannot be proceeded with to-day.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well, it stands.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN GENERAL HUTTON AND LT.-COL. SAM. HUGHES.

On the order being called for return of correspondence, &c., between General Hutton and Lt.-Col. Sam. Hughes.—Mr. Hughes.

Mr. S. HUGHES (North Victoria). I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that this matter should be allowed to stand for some time yet, as there are two letters which I have not now in my possession, and for which I have written to the other side of the water. If the right hon. gentleman allows the motion to stand for a few days more, I shall be prepared to take it up.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It stands for to-day.

TELEGRAPH LINE BETWEEN BENNETT AND DAWSON.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for :

Return of all reports made by Mr. Charleson respecting telegraph construction work formerly or now under his charge ; showing also the names of men employed under him between Bennett and Dawson and the nationality of each so far as possible; the wages and allowances for each man so employed; particulars as to any strikes on the part of the men for higher wages; the names of parties who supplied the poles for the telegraph wire; and copies of all contracts and correspondence respecting the same; whether standing trees en route have been used for stringing wires, and if so, for what distance approximately, in comparison with the distance where poles were used; how many poles were paid for, how many of those paid for were not used for the telegraph line; whether the linemen employed at Dawson, Ogilvie, Selwyn, Selkirk, Five Fingers, Lower LeBarge and Tagish are British subjects, and if not, the nationality of each; the names of sub-contractors for the supply of poles, and the residence of each subcontractor, and all contracts respecting the same; the terms of charter of ss. W. S. Stratton, the charterer's name and all papers respecting the same; the name of her master and acting master and his nationality; the terms of the charter party ; the use made of this steamer, whether she was used for supplies or otherwise, and what boats other than scows were so used; how many scows were used and on what terms; the amount charged or paid for transportation by water outside of the ss. Stratton, the length of time during construction Mr. Charleson was actually present with the construction party ; the particulars as to purchase of ss. Lullie C., the purchase, disposal or sale or transfer of the boat and the terms thereof respectively; copies of all reports and correspondence respecting the same; the arrangement for supplies made and with whom; the arrangement at Bennett respecting pay for men's time returning from Dawson; the amount already paid for the line under Mr. Charleson's charge; copies of accounts rendered and of accounts paid in connection with this telegraph work, the rate of pay first and now allowed A. Boyer, assistant to Mr. Charleson; also a statement showing where Mr. Charleson places his orders in Vancouver in this connection and on what terms, and what commissions, if any, are paid on these supplies, and to whom; the name of Mr. Charleson's agent at Vancouver in this connection; the quantity of supplies obtained by Mr. Charleson from the United States; whether Mr. Charleson's son was paid $350 or other amount or amounts for expenses of a trip to Ottawa or otherwise, and whether he is or was then an employee of the government; whether Mr. Charleson awards contracts to his foreman, and whether the foreman's expenses were paid into the locality of operations at government expense, and whether tenders are asked for in this connection; and all contracts, reports, and papers respecting contracts let by Mr. Charleson or under his supervision in connection with the telegraph line from Bennett to Dawson.

He said : In moving for the papers in connection with this matter, one or two words are due by way of explanation, and I think an explanation is also due from the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr.

Tarte), or from some member of the government in regard to the very curious circumstances connected with the attempt to obtain from the government some details of the expenditure of about half a million dollars of public moneys in connection with the two telegraph routes in the northern portion of British Columbia and the Yukon. In the discharge of my duties as a member of parliament last year, I made an effort to obtain information upon some facts, which if they are correct suggest that there has been a scandalous waste of public money, and that there had not been proper supervision over the expenditure. I was immediately met in a spirit far different from that which I would have expected from a self-respecting government. There appears to be a most extraordinary effort, not merely to keep from parliament the information to which it is entitled on this subject, but immediately that a member of this House endeavours to obtain full information on matters coming to his notice touching the expenditure of this money, it would seem that he must be prepared to be the object of attack and slander. Last session Mr. Bergeron, then a member of the House, failed to obtain the information, and I succeeded in getting from the Prime Minister a pledge that the information would be given ; but instead of the information being given to the House, a telegram was read in my absence by the present member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) —read contrary to the rules of this House, and contrary to the practice that should obtain in connection with the discharge of the responsible duties of members of parliament—and in that telegram I was accused of having uttered a false slander, or, with having repeated a falsehood on the floor of the House, although I had taken pains to say that while the information that had reached me was serious, I would take no responsibility whatever in connection with the facts mentioned. The Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) asked me if I was speaking from my own knowledge, and as 'Hansard' shows, I took care to say that Mr. Charleson (whose name is involved) should not be unfairly attacked in the House, that such was not at all my intention ; that this information had been brought to my notice. He occupied a position as a public servant who was given very large powers and a very large discretion in connection with an exceedingly large sum of public money ; and I pressed, both in his interest and in the interest of the public, for the immediate communication of the facts by the government to the House. Not that I wished to pin Mr. Charleson in an unenviable position ; not that I anticipated that his character would not be completely established when the return was brought down ; but for every reason I urged that the return should be brought down. Promises were made from time to time, and those promises were not complied with. Although this subject was brought to the attention of parliament as long ago as February of last session by Mr. Bergeron, what happened ? First of all, he asked a question in detail, which involved reflections on Mr. Charleson and on the Department of Public Works, as many of these questions, if they are not answered or explained satisfactorily, do involve reflections on the responsible head of the department. These questions, instead of being answered, were met by a request on the part of the Minister of Public Works to move for a return, as is often done ; and Mr. Bergeron turned his question into the form of a notice of motion. Time and again in my presence Mr. Bergeron attempted to move that motion, and at the request of the government the motion stood. It stood until so many private members' days were made government days that it became a certainty that the motion could never be put ; and consequently, the motion was dropped in order to comply with another rule of the House, so that when the House was in Committee of Supply or on going into Supply, there could be a discussion on the subject of that notice of motion. Finding, however, that that would be unfair to all, I, in the absence of Mr. Bergeron, asked the Prime Minister in this House if he would permit me to move for these papers summarily, without having to wait till motions were called. As I understood, the government did not object to that, and I said I would allow that to stand as a notice ; but, later on, when I was about to make the motion, the Prime Minister took objection to my making a motion without its going on the Order paper, which, as all those familiar with parliamentary practice will understand, meant that during that session motions could not be moved ; but, although the Prime Minister took the objection, he agreed across the House that he would see that these papers were gathered together and brought down, in order that before we reached the Public Works estimates, in charge of which was the Hon. Postmaster General, the House would have full information on these matters. The papers not coming down, an appeal was again made by myself to the Treasury benches ; and the Postmaster General stated, and in so far exculpated the Prime Minister, that the Prime Minister had, in accordance with his agreement across the floor of the House, sent word to the Department of Public Works to press on the preparation of those papers, and have them laid before the House on the earliest possible day ; and the Postmaster General said he had repeated those directions to the department. Time went on ; the papers were not brought down ; they have not reached the House of Commons yet ; so that on the day that this House met, I put a question to the Minister

of Public Works referring to the pledge of the Prime Minister and the pledge of the Postmaster General when acting Minister of Public Works, promising those papers at the earliest possible day, the last promise being in June, 1900 ; and I was more than astounded when the Minister of Public Works began again the tactics of last session, and told me to put my notice on the paper, which I have done. And so it will take time, we do not know how long, if the practice of last session is followed, in order to get these papers brought down. I would not have referred at such length to this matter were it not for the invidious position in which it was attempted, unfairly, to place me. What is to be the rule in this House ? Are hon. gentlemen on either side of you, Sir, to be encouraged or discouraged in bringing to the only place where such matters can be satisfactorily settled, and the facts cleared up, matters involving often the character of public servants, matters whispered at the corners of the streets or published in the newspapers, and which, if true, show that there is something rotten in the state of Denmark ? Or, is every hon. gentleman supposed, before he ventures to inquire how the public money is expended, to be bound to hold a court of investigation off his own bat, to summon before him gentlemen supposed to have knowledge of the matters, and obtain from them solemn declarations ? Though I have been in parliament for some years, I have never yet heard of such a suggestion; and if the House listened to the telegrams which were read here, contrary to the rules of the House, as I have said, it would appear that my idea of the position and the rights and responsibilities of a member of parliament is entirely wrong ; because, while these papers were withheld by the government, their supporters were permitted to read these insulting and improper communications to the House, criticising and reflecting on the position taken by me, whereas, in fact, as I have endeavoured to explain, I made no charge, and I have made no charge now ; but I did bring forward as a formal motion for information in the possession of the government, the facts or the statements which had come to my knowledge, and in regard to which I assumed it to be not merely my duty, but primarily the duty of the government, to give the most immediate and perfect investigation possible under the circumstances ; and I do not think it was just to the officers whose names are covered by my motion, Mr. Charleson, for example, or any of the others connected with the expenditure of that public money under him, that these matters should have been permitted by the government to have stood so long without the House being given the official information which is in the hands of the government. For instance, take this statement in regard to the second branch of Mr. Charleson's work. I referred immediately last year—though my motion now covers both matters—to the telegraph line from Bennett to Dawson, in regard to which statements, which were in everybody's mouth, were made to me, as I stated then, by men in Mr. Charleson's employ ; that is to say, statements touching the contracts for telegraph poles, that while those contracts were let by Mr. Charleson, and the poles were strewn along the route, the trees were used, and very properly used, for stringing the line over a large portion of the route. Nevertheless, the country paid for the poles, which will never be used, but which will rot before they are needed for the line. Things like that suggest not only incompetency, but a great deal more. I do not, however, undertake to vouch for any of those statements, and I ask that immediate light be let into this matter from government sources, to which this gentleman was bound to report. Then, there were matters connected with the charters of one or two tugs or small boats. All of these things were suggested in detail, the fullest exposure of the information in my possession was made, and the Order paper contains those statements without any explanation having been given at the hands of the government during a whole session, from February until July.

Now comes this statement, that with regard to the other contract, involving a large sum of money, for the line from Quesnel in British Columbia to Telegraph Creek at Atlin, so scandalous had been the transaction, and so great the incompetence, an incompetence amounting to wrong-doing, that the line has gone seventy miles beginning at the two termini of the line, and they cross each other with seventy miles of country between them. That may be a myth, but if it be true, the money of the public is being wasted, and we should have the assistance of the government in coming to a conclusion.

It is not sufficient to say that newspapers very often make misstatements. It has been the Imperial practice to bring to the attention of the government rumours in the press that seem to be well sustained, when they affect the expenditure of the people's money, and that such rumours should be promptly and fully investigated and satisfactorily answered by the responsible members of the government.

We have in the Auditor General's Report of this year the items of vouchers for a very large expenditure of this money. These papers ought to be ready now if the ministers have any authority whatever, for we have had the hon. the Postmaster General stating that in June last, in compliance with the Prime Minister's request, he gave directions to have them immediately pre-

pared ; and if they are ready, I would like to have them brought down to the House at the earliest possible moment.

I understand that Mr. Charleson is here. At any rate he was here a few days ago. Last session he was here and disappeared, and no doubt his duties called him away, but it would be a great convenience, in connection with the proper auditing of these items in the Auditor General's Report, touching an expenditure of $300,000 or $400,000, under the direction of Mr. Charleson, that he should be here. He was given —probably necessarily so—the widest possible powers, and he ought to be present, in view of the fact that many of the matters covered by my motion affect him personally. Therefore, in his interest, as well as that of the public, every expedition should be used so that an audit may be made in the most effective manner.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). All the papers that have been asked for will be brought down without any delay, and then my hon. friend will be found to have again made statements to the House for which there is no foundation. If he will permit me to use the word without any offence, I think it is unfair to use such big words as 'scandalous' before the papers are brought down. If anything is wrong, the time will come when that wrong will be shown, but before anything is proved—and nothing will be proved—I say again it is unfair to make statements of the kind the hon. gentleman has indulged in.

Mr. Charleson has directed those two important works very efficiently. He has constructed the line between Bennett and Dawson, a length of 650 miles, and has been complimented all over the country on the diligence he has shown. During last season he had constructed no less than 1,350 miles of telegraph lines under very great difficulties indeed. Every precaution was taken by the department. An accountant of the Department of Public Works was with him all the time, the Auditor General sent one of his officers with him to look over the accounts, and I am quite sure that when the papers are brought down, all the accusations made—because these are accusations—will be found to have no foundation whatever. I do not see that it will serve any good purpose to discuss the question at greater length, but I must say that it is no encouragement to public officers to find that they are treated in the way my hon. friend treats officers who have after all accomplished great things. The construction of these lines is considered a deed of great ability. There is to-day only a small gap of about fifty miles not completed. That gap will be completed as soon as the season permits, and I expect that by the first of July next we will have telegraphic communication from Ottawa to Dawson City.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. the Minister of Public Works will not be permitted to throw across the floor of the House such insulting observations with regard to myself without, at any rate, my resenting his conduct in that regard. By what authority does he state that I will again be found to have made assertions not based on fact.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I challenge the hon. gentleman to point out a single matter concerning which I have made false assertions in this House. If he were familiar with the English language he would have understood—perhaps he did understand me—but if he did he would certainly not have said that I made one charge against Mr. Charleson. If the English language is capable of expressing what I sought to say, all I did say was that if the allegations covered by my motion were true, they involved scandalous reflection, not so much on Mr. Charleson, as on the government for having withheld the information required. I said that it was unfair to Mr. Charleson or to any officer in the employ of any department that these matters should be allowed to stand over their heads. I did not say that Mr. Charleson was on his defence, but simply suggested that it was the duty of the government to bring down the fullest information in their possession, even though that information should involve some reflection on the officers of the government or their political head, and it is the political head who is in a most unenviable position. He it is who is responsible for having withheld this information. If there be any justification for the suggestion that there has been an intentional withholding of the information—and the facts seem to warrant it—then the reflection is entirely, so far as this House is concerned, upon the head of the Public Works Department.

My use of the word 'scandalous,' which seems to have excited the hon. Minister of Public Works, though, I supposed, he should have become accustomed by this time to that word—when I used that word, I did not say that the acts of any man under him were scandalous. I said that in the acts of those under him, if the statements made in the reports were correct, there was a very great scandal. And I want to say this before I sit down, and say it in connection with these acts, as in connection with others that come under review of the House or of the Public Accounts Committee—I shall be delighted to find that there is not the slightest foundation for any of the suggestions in that motion. I have never met Mr. Charleson and never heard of him in connection with anything else than this public business. His character may have been, and may

be now, all that his friends claim it to be. But, as I say, under the circumstances, even if his character is white as snow, when he has to do with the expenditure of a large sum of public money, and when the matter comes before a member of the House, it is his bounden duty to press, as I do, for the fullest information, and to inquire into the matter to the very bottom.

Motion agreed to.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—PAY OF THE MEN OF 'C' BATTERY.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto) moved for :

Copies of all papers, telegrams, &c., respecting the pay of the men of 'C' Battery, Canadian Artillery, which served in South Africa ; or respecting the deduction of any portion of the pay of the men or any of them.

He said : I make the motion at the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Mr. Borden). I had hoped that it would be possible to get the information by a series of questions which I placed upon the Paper a few days ago ; but it was the hon. minister's wish that the information should be obtained by presenting this motion. I may say, as justification for doing so, that grave dissatisfaction exists among a great number of the members of the battery who allege that they were not treated as generously as they ought to have been treated. They claim that when they volunteered their services to assist Her Majesty's forces in South Africa, they did not haggle over the terms of their engagement, and, consequently, they had a right to expect that the government of Canada would live up to the spirit as well as the letter of the Act of Parliament under which their pay was ordered. The provision for paying them may be found in the schedule of the Act passed last session, making provision for the expenses of the volunteers who were serving with Her Majesty's forces in South Africa. From what I can gather from those who have interviewed me, and who complain of the treatment they have received, a unique condition of affairs exists. It is claimed that a large percentage of the men of the battery assigned their pay, before leaving Canada, to their relatives or friends, and that these have received the full pay to which they were entitled ; while the men who did not make an assignment have received practically nothing from the hands of the government of Canada since they arrived at Cape Town on their way to the front. 'C' Battery was engaged with Col. Plumer's column, and spent a considerable portion of its time in operating in the territory of the colony of Rhodesia. I understand that the climatic conditions existing there are of the worst character, that it is the worst place in Africa for malaria and fever; and that it was difficult for the men, in passing through that territory, to obtain any provisions or any little comforts, more difficult than if they had been on service in any other part of the territory in which the campaign was carried on. The Rhodesian government, from what I have been informed, first proposed to give each man who took part with Col. Plumer's column a grant of land. They afterwards changed their proposition and voted a lump sum to be given to those who operated in Rhodesian territory in that column. No portion of this money was paid to the men of the battery until two or three days before they reached Halifax on their way home. It was then paid to them by the officer whose duty it was to make the disbursement. The sum paid to each gunner or private, I believe, was between $130 and $140. When the men of the battery arrived at Halifax, they were informed that checks for the Canadian pay due them were deposited in their envelopes, together with their discharge, but these checks were removed from the envelopes and the men were requested to give their names and addresses and were told that the money coming to them would be forwarded to them in due course. It was evidently the intention of the government of Canada to pay these men the sum that had accumulated and was standing at their credit, at the time they arrived back from South Africa ; and the men are rather at a loss to understand what was the cause of the change in the determination of the government. I do not desire to take up the time of the House, but these are the facts as I understand them. If I have stated them correctly, the government has been guilty of an ungenerous act—may I use the word, of an picayune act ?—in depriving the men of this sum on the plea that Canada is to pay only the difference between the rate named in the schedule of the Act and that which they received from the British government during their service in South Africa. I hope the government will decide to reverse their order and send the men checks for the amounts coming to them. The men state that, while the volunteers from Australia and New Zealand who formed part of the Plumer column were equally beneficiaries of the Rhodesian government, the governments of Australia and New Zealand made no deduction of their pay when they returned to their own country. If the men have stated the facts correctly, they have made out a strong case ; and I hope the minister will announce the intention of the government, notwithstanding the fact that the Rhodesian government has given the money I have stated, not to withhold from the men a sum equivalent to the difference between Imperial pay and the pay guaranteed to them by the Canadian government.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). I think it is hardly fair of my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) to apply the word 'ungenerous' to the treatment of the South African volunteers by the government, or to speak of the government 'depriving' certain members of the contingent of their proper pay. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the statute of last session prescribed the amount the men who went to South Africa in our various contingents were to be paid, and the manner of that payment. The matter was fully discussed in this House; and in the statute under which $2,000,000 was voted, an order in council was incorporated prescribing a maximum of pay to be given to these men and providing that should the imperial pay fall short of that prescribed amount it should be made up out of the amount voted by parliament. The statute was very clear on the point, it seems to me. Explaining the word expenditure' in this statute it says it includes:

(b) The pay and allowances of each such volunteer (both before and after the date of his debarkation in South Africa) at the rates named in the order in council dated the thirteenth day of March, one thousand nine hundred, set forth in the schedule of this Act, the provisions of which order in council are hereby approved and confirmed.

Now, so far as 'C' Battery, which is immediately under discussion, is concerned, the pay of the men of that battery was limited by clause B of section 1 of the order in council, which is a part of the Act, to 75 cents for each private, and the difference between the Imperial pay and 75 cents was to be paid by this government, either directly to the men after their return, after their service was over, or if they assigned their claim to any of their dependents in this country, it was to be paid as the service progressed. Now it turns out that 'C' Battery served in Rhodesia under Imperial pay. That, I think, is a vital question to this whole argument, whether the pay was, in the sense contemplated by the statute, Imperial pay under the Imperial warrant. I have asked that question of the officials in my department, and they inform me that there is no question but that the pay received by 'C' Battery for their services in South Africa, which was five shillings a day per man, was Imperial pay in the sense mentioned in this section. Now, the fact is that the men of 'C' Battery received five shillings a day; the fact is that the Department of Militia is limited by the statute from which I have just read to 75 cents per day per man. How then is it possible for the government, under the statute, to pay these men additional when they have already received a very large amount in excess of the total amount that they are authorized to receive in Imperial pay and additional pay from Canada, when, in fact, they have already received far more than the amount that we are authorized to give? That is the question which I had to face, and I am advised by the officers of my department, that under this statute we had no authority whatever to pay those men anything additional.

The hon. gentleman has said that a large percentage of the men of 'C' Battery have received more than the others. It is true that about one-third of the men, on going away, as in the case of all the contingents, assigned their additional pay, that is, the pay they were to receive over and above the Imperial pay, to their dependents in this country; and the Militia Department paid them in ignorance of the fact—which should, I think, have been reported to this department by the officers of 'C' Battery—but, at any rate, in ignorance of the fact that the men were already in receipt of more money than we were authorized to pay. The fact is that, in my judgment, and in the judgment of my officers, instead of the government of Canada being under an obligation to pay more money to the two-thirds, the one-third who have received it ought properly to return to the treasury that money which they have improperly received. That is the situation as viewed by my department, and which I endorse. The hon. gentleman says that cheques were made out, and taken down to Halifax to be handed to these men. That is quite true. It was not until these men landed in Halifax that the officers of the department were aware that they had already received more pay than was authorized by statute. Then, of course, the cheques were withheld, and were destroyed. More than that, I may say that the officer in command of the battery, as I am informed by the accountant of my department, who was present at the time, the moment the battery landed at Halifax, told the officers of the Militia Department that the battery had already received more pay than was authorized by statute, that they were perfectly satisfied, that the additional pay was not expected and should not be handed to them. Now, I make that statement here as having been reported to me, I have it from the accountant of my department. So, I think, in view of what I have said, that the government is not fairly chargeable with haggling or with ungenerous treatment, or with having deprived these men of anything which properly belonged to them.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). May I ask the minister if I understand him to say that the men received pay from the Imperial government at the amount of five shillings per day in addition to the Rhodesian bounty?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, there was no Rhodesian bounty, it was daily pay at five shillings, and that pay was, strictly speaking, according to the letter of the law, as I am in-

formed, and was paid within the meaning of the term 'Imperial pay' under the Imperial warrant.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). A few days ago I was induced to place on the Notice paper a question respecting the matter which is referred to in the motion of the member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). I was induced to do so on account of a communication which I had received from a member of 'C' Battery who resided in the county I have the honour to represent. I then discovered that these cases were quite numerous, and I was anxious to ascertain the facts with reference to these men, because I, like others, thought it a hardship to the men who enlisted with an understanding that the very best pay was to be given to those who went to South Africa and suffered all the hardships that they did, and I thought, at the time the Minister of Militia and Defence answered my question, that his answer rather evaded the whole question. However, I have learned to-day more of the drift of the matter, and the grounds which the hon. gentleman takes. Now, I must confess that I cannot for a moment think that the Rhodesian government intended that the five shillings a day they gave these men, under special and peculiar circumstances, was ever intended to be a part of their pay, or that it was in any sense whatever intended to release either the British government or the Canadian government from paying these men what it was originally intended to give them. What object could that governemnt have in doing so? Were they so flush with money, had they such an abundance of gold in that country, or did they think that the British Empire was too poor and that the Dominion of Canada was too poor to pay these men, and therefore they had to come to their rescue and pay them the deficiency? I cannot look at the matter in that way at all. I can only think that the Rhodesian government, in consideration of the services these men rendered for the protection of property in that country, did not give the five shillings a day as any portion of their pay, but as a bounty—we may call it what we like. It was a gift, it was a present, and ought to be treated as such by the government of this country, who, I think, will yet see their way clear to change the decision they have arrived at, and give these men the full sum that was voted by this parliament a year ago. I trust that they will do so, because there will be fairness in doing so. Certainly, if it transpired that sixty men have been paid in full and some one hundred and twenty men are to receive a very much less sum, there would be a very great deal of dissatisfaction. In behalf of my constituents, and of others, I appeal to the hon. Minister of Militia to reverse his decision, and have no breaking of faith with the men who went to South Africa to fight the battles of the empire.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia whether the British government gave any pay to 'C' Battery?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, nothing outside of the 5 shillings.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). Mr. Speaker, there are two points involved; one is whether the amount paid by the Rhodesian government is Imperial pay within the meaning of our statute. The second point is that, assuming it is Imperial pay within the meaning of our statute, whether, under the circumstances, it would not be better for our government to pay the difference treating it as bounty, rather than have the dissatisfaction existing which now exists. I know that it will involve a considerable sum.

Mr. CLARKE. How much?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. About $17,000.

Mr. BRITTON. Of course, I do not know the exact figure. It is somewhat of a surprise that the matter has been practically decided by the government, as I infer it has been from the answer which the hon. minister makes. I suppose it is under consideration practically and that the matter will be dealt with in a way that will be considered fair to all parties. The other point to which I call attention is that, in some way or other, it has been possible that some men in connection with 'C' Battery have got more pay than others. This is an unfortunate state of matters, because, although it has been paid to those dependent upon them by reason of their pay being assigned, the payment to all intents and purposes, was to themselves. They have got the benefit of it. If these men have received pay to a larger extent, treating it as if this Rhodesian pay were not a matter of bounty, or gift, something different from the Imperial pay, and others did not get the same treatment, there is going to be a felt hardship and wrong done to some of these men. Therefore, I sincerely hope that there will be some remedy found so that all many feel that they are treated fairly and generously in this matter. It is better to lose a few thousand dollars to enable these other men to get their pay according to what was really the intention than that there should be any cause of dissatisfaction on the part of any one.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. Minister of Militia (Hon. Mr. Borden) that he must be controlled by the terms of the statute, and if, as a matter of fact, the pay which has been received, is pay provided by Her

Majesty's government, it would be necessary that we should have a further vote before the Department of Militia could make the payment to these men which has been advocated by the gentlemen who have spoken. But, one thing that the hon. gentleman did not make clear to me was how it is that the pay provided by the government of Rhodesia is pay provided by Her Majesty's government. It is true that the hon. gentleman tells us that the officers of his department instruct him that such is the case, but, the question whether such is the case depends, in the first place, upon the facts, which I do not think we have had very clearly before the House, and in the second place, upon the construction of this statute as to which officers of his department are possibly no more capable of advising him than some hon. gentlemen in this House. If the government of Rhodesia provided the pay for these men, I do not exactly understand for what reason you can say it was pay provided by Her Majesty's government. The words 'Her Majesty's government' are used in this order in council and in the statute in contradistinction to 'The government of the Dominion of Canada.' It was evidently intended by the words 'Her Majesty's government' to refer to the Imperial government. If this pay was not provided by the Imperial government, it seems to me that the case is an open one for the Minister of Militia, and is one as to which he can deal in the way suggested, because it is a case which has not been definitely dealt with by the statute. I must confess that I think the hon. Minister of Militia might enlighten the House a little more fully at some future date as to what the precise facts are in respect to the pay provided by the Rhodesian government, and then the House will perhaps be in a better position to come to a conclusion as to whether these men should not receive their pay. I agree with what has been said as to the unfortunate condition of affairs in having some of these men paid more than others, and I think it would be extremely desirable on the part of the government to have them all paid alike, even if we went a little beyond the statute of last year. I still think that the hon. Minister of Militia might give us, at some future date, information in regard to the exact facts concerning this pay. What I mean by that is this: suppose that the colony of Natal, or the government of Cape Colony, or any municipality——

Mr. CLARKE. Or individual.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Or individual, as my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) suggests, should in consideration of distinguished services rendered to a colony, or city, or municipality, vote a sum of money to any particular battalion of the contingent that we sent to South Africa, it is certainly perfectly clear that that should not be allowed to reduce the pay which that battalion should receive from this government. The question is whether or not the money which these men received from the Rhodesian government is of that character or whether it is within the terms of this statute pay provided by the Imperial government. If it is the latter I think the hon. Minister of Militia is perfectly right, but if the former, I think he should reconsider his decision.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If I might be allowed to say one word here by way of explanation it will be this ; in the first place it is evidently the spirit of our law that all the men who went to South Africa with the second contingent should receive 75 cents a day. It does not seem to me material where they received it from. The idea was that they should receive 75 cents a day and no more.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, no.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, assuming that the Imperial pay would be below that. There was no other pay to these men ; that is the pay which they received, 5 shillings a day, and the information is that this was Imperial pay at Rhodesian rates. All the men received Imperial pay from the Imperial exchequer at Rhodesian rates, 5 shillings a day.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, it seems to me pre-eminently the case that this motion should prevail, because hon. gentlemen seem to be wandering from the point before the House. It is a motion for certain papers. The remarks made by the hon. Minister of Militia (Hon. Mr. Borden) show clearly that if any decision in reference to it is to be arrived at it is desirable that the papers should come down, so that, with the papers before it, this House can come to a conclusion in regard to it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We will bring the papers down.

Mr. NORTHRUP. So far nothing has been said by the hon. minister to indicate that he will bring the papers down. The moment the motion is adopted the papers will come down, and I venture to say that there is nothing to discuss until they are brought down. I venture to suggest that the hon. minister instead of conferring with his subordinate officers should place the matter before the hon. Minister of Justice, because it is pre-eminently a legal question. Perhaps, when the papers are brought down and the matter comes up it may be settled in the House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, if the government really desire to settle the question and to treat all these men alike, if there is any doubt about the statute, they can bring in a supplementary

Bill this session, or the matter may be dealt with by a clause in the Supply Bill. In that way the men can be fairly treated, as the House desires to see them treated.

Mr. S. HUGHES (North Victoria). Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia (Hon. Mr. Borden) to this aspect of the case. When did this Rhodesian pay begin; did it begin the day they left Cape Town, and when did it end? How far south did these men come before that pay ceased, and when did they get it? Who is the paymaster, and was it all on the one paysheet? These are questions which may very well engage the attention of the minister. I would draw attention to the fact that it would be inadvisable if some of 'C' Battery were to get extra pay and others not. I would also point out that a great many men in the other two batteries feel that they did just as good work, and travelled through just as inhospitable a country and unhealthy a climate as did those men, and yet they were limited to the ordinary pay.

Motion agreed to.

THE YUKON MINING REGULATIONS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for:

Return in tabular form showing the names of all cases in which an appeal has been taken to the hon. the Minister of the Interior (past and present) under the mining regulations, the date when each appeal was perfected, heard and decided.

He said: The other day the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) stated that the question of sending these appeals to the judicial tribunals was under consideration, and I trust that later on the result of that consideration will be announced. I think the time has come when the question should be discussed, and in view of such discussion it would be most convenient to have this information. I have asked for it in the form that would seem to be most useful, and its preparation will not involve a great deal of labour. Up to the time of the development of the Yukon the appeals, I assume, were few and far between, and consequently the table would be most useful if it began from the period of the first appeal. The Department of the Interior under ordinary circumstances taxes the entire time of any capable and industrious minister apart from these appeals. It has always been the testimony of ministers in charge of that department, that the ordinary business fully occupied the time of the minister and the officials, altogether outside of these judicial functions, and as time goes on it will not, I believe, be in the public interest that the Minister of the Interior should be charged with such matters. The order in council which made the minister the final tribunal in these matters no doubt contemplated originally that these appeals would not be very frequent, and it was passed with a view to the expediency, and the cheapness of the disposal of these matters from the unsettled regions of Canada, but the original intent has no application to the Yukon district of to-day, with its judicial tribunals and the opportunities afforded the residents there to bring these legal questions before the courts. It might very well happen, for there is nothing to prevent it, that a gentleman without any legal training might be head of that department, and it would be rather difficult for him to decide on questions of law. The subject is one of exceeding interest and the object of my motion is to have the information before the House when the question is dealt with.

Motion agreed to.

YUKON—DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for:

Copies of all reports, letters or communications, not already brought down, from Mr. Ogilvie, commissioner for Yukon district, received by the government of Canada or any member thereof, or by any deputy minister or other officer, in any way respecting the administration of public affairs in the Yukon district.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I would suggest to my hon. friend that he amend his motion so as to have it apply to the papers not already brought down. A very large number of papers comprised in this motion have already been laid on the table, and unless the hon. gentleman wants them recopied there is no necessity for including them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I shall have very great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in agreeing to the amendment which I understand the hon. minister to move, namely, to add the words 'not already brought down.'

Amendment agreed to, and motion as amended agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copies of all correspondence, telegrams, letters, notes and memoranda exchanged between the Canadian Commissioner at the Paris Exhibition, or any member of the Canadian Commission, and Lord Strathcona, or the Royal Commission, or the Colonial Secretary, in relation to the representation of Canada at the exhibition.—Mr. Bourassa.

List of all railway corporations now doing business in Canada under charter of the Dominion parliament which have received subsidies by cash or land grants or are entitled thereto, and the amount of such subsidy attached to each.—Mr. Smith (Vancouver).

Return showing the amount of the rebate paid on agricultural implements exported from Canada for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1900, specifying amount paid to each firm in each of those years.—Mr. Roche (Marquette).

Copies of all reports, official memoranda and papers dealing with irregularities, mistakes by order in council or otherwise in the administration of the provisions of Dominion Lands Act in the Yukon district.—Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.

ADJOURNMENT—TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I suppose the House is not disposed to go on with Government Orders to-day, as members have not been notified in advance, and, therefore, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, there is a matter contained in a New York paper to which I wish to direct the attention of the House just for two or three minutes ; and, as we have no other business before us, I think this is the best opportunity to raise this question. It is said that it is rather bad parliamentary form to bring up a question of this kind when the Orders of the Day are called. I do not believe that ; but still, to please my hon. friends on the other side of the House, I bring it up on the motion to adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER. Well, I may tell the hon. member that on the motion for the adjournment of the House, the only question to be discussed is whether the House shall adjourn now or not. When the Orders of the Day are called, if a formal motion for adjournment is made, not by a member of the cabinet, but by some other hon. member, in order to bring up a question for discussion, he has a right to discuss that special question ; but on the motion for the adjournment of the House, which is the one made now, I do not think there can be any debate except on the question whether the House shall adjourn now or not.

Mr. MACLEAN. Well, Mr. Speaker, what I wish to say is that the House should not adjourn until they discuss the question which I propose to bring before them ; and time after time members of this House have exercised the right of calling the attention of the government and the country to important matters on the motion to adjourn. I will only take up the time of the House for two or three minutes. In the New York *Tribune* of yesterday, there is the following despatch :—

St. Petersburg, Feb. 15.—M. De Witte, Minister of Finance, has issued a decree regarding the application of an increased tariff to certain imports from the United States. The decree is based upon the first paragraph of Article 628 of the customs statute.

M. De Witte has proved his ability to hit quick and hard. He was evidently prepared for reprisals before Secretary Gage took final action. M. De Witte sent to the Senate on Wednesday for publication an ordinance levying 30 per cent increased duty on the most important American imports into Russia. The ordinance was published to-day in the 'Official Messenger,' and becomes effective on March 1. This action is greatly regretted in American circles, who anticipate much harm therefrom.

In a despatch from Washington dealing with this question, in the same paper, the following admissions are made :—

The decree is issued in retaliation for Secretary Gage's order imposing a countervailing duty of 32 cents on each pood (about thirty-six pounds), of Russian bounty-paid sugar imported into the United States, and it is believed that a grave crisis has been reached in trade relations between the United States and Russia.

The immediate effect of the Russian decree, when it becomes operative on March 1, will be to increase by 50 per cent the duties on American steel and iron goods. These goods already enjoy two separate reductions, 30 per cent and 20 per cent from the conventional duties. The articles referred to in the Russian decree are machinery and tools of every kind, manufactures and products of cast iron and steel. The addition of 50 per cent to the duty will, it is thought, prove practically prohibitory.

Mr. TALBOT. What has all that to do with Canada ?

Mr. MACLEAN. What it has to do with Canada is this. To-day we have grave issues with the United States, and if we follow the example of the Russian government and Mr. De Witte, and give the Americans tariff for tariff, reciprocity of tariffs, we will bring them to time. You will never get the Alaskan boundary question settled satisfactorily unless you do this. The way the Americans will settle the Alaskan boundary question will be the way the United States Senate attempted to settle the question of the Nicaragua canal the other day, unless hon. gentlemen opposite have stiffer backs ; it will be by an Act of the Senate of the United States instead of by negotiation. The point I wish to make is that we must have a little De Witteism in our government. We must have a tariff with a sliding scale, which will be friendly to a friendly government, but will be protective as against an unfriendly government. I do not say that we should go to work and revise our tariff immediately.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MACLEAN. I mean that I cannot bring forward a revised tariff ; that is for the government. But I wish to say that if the government expect to settle the questions that are unsettled to-day between Canada and the United States, there is only one way to do it, and that is by means of the tariff. There is no way in which you can touch the Americans so quickly as

through their pocket. If they find their goods barred out of Canada, they will quickly come to time. Why, what would that mean to them ? In 1896 we imported $57,000,000 worth of goods from the United States. That sum has grown to-day to $96,000,000 or more, and it is growing steadily. Canada is the best outside market the United States have. But as long as we are fools enough to let their goods come into this country under the present low tariff, while they put up a high tariff to bar out our goods, we shall never get fair treatment from them. The most important question which can be brought up in this House to-day is the question of some sort of tariff reform which will put us in the same position towards the Americans as the so-called out-of-date government of Russia enjoys. That government has a whip in its hand, and it is using it with great effect. The industrial community of the United States is in such a state of alarm that there will soon be all sorts of representations made to Washington, and the American government will be going down on their knees to Russia. I see my hon. frend the First Minister laughing in a jocular way, and the knight from Oxford is looking rather sad over it. But this is a question worthy of their attention, and they have before them a very good example of the way to settle the Alaskan boundary question and to compel the Americans to respect our fishery rights—by treating them in all respects as they treat us.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTINGENTS.

Mr. WALLACE. Before the House adjourns, I would like to call the attention of the right hon. First Minister to the following paragraph in the Montreal Gazette of last Saturday :

Loyal Australia.

Fifth Victorian Contingent of 1,500 Men Sails.

Melbourne, Feb. 15.—The fifth Victorian contingent, 1,250 men all told, sailed for South Africa to-day.

Is it the intention of the government to send another contingent from Canada to South Africa ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is a rule of parliament not to bring up more than one subject on a motion to adjourn. I would also remind the hon. gentleman on another feature, that if he wants to put a question to the government, there is another rule requiring him to give notice.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 4.45 p.m.

Mr. MACLEAN.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 19, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Secretary of State for Canada for the year ending June 30, 1900.—Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

EAST QUEEN'S, P.E.I., ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Hon. Mr. Justice Hodgson and the Hon. Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, a certificate relating to the electoral district of East Queen's, in the province of Prince Edward Island, by which the said election is declared to be void.

I have further to inform the House that the trial judges having reported :—

(*c*) That there is reason to believe that corrupt practices, namely, treating, extensively prevailed at the election to which the petitions relate.

(*d*) We are of opinion that the inquiry into the circumstances of the said election has been rendered incomplete by the action of the parties to the said petitions, and that further inquiry as to the extent such corrupt practices prevailed is desirable.

I have, in conformity with section 48, chap. 9 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, withheld the issue of my warrant for a new election pending any action to be taken by the House in the matter.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending June 30, 1901, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, February 19, 1901.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved :

That the Message of His Excellency, together with the supplementary estimates for the current year, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—ASH WEDNESDAY.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That when the House adjourns this day, it stand adjourned until Thursday next.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—THE RAILWAY QUESTION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, before we enter into the consideration of that motion, I desire to bring an amendment before the attention of the House, dealing with the question of the government ownership of railways in this country. I have framed an amendment on the narrowest lines possible in order to elicit the fullest discussion, and in order to present the matter before the House and the public in a wide and clear manner. When, the other day, I brought this question to the attention of the House by moving the adjournment of the House, I was criticised because it was said that I was out of order, and that I was springing the question upon the House and the country. I am here to justify what I did then, because what I did then secured for me a very prompt expression of opinion from one end of the country to the other, and if I am moving to-day in a more regular way, it is because, to-day, I have at my disposal an expression of opinion that comes from one end of Canada to the other, and which proves the gravity and indicates the importance of this question, and which justifies me in bringing it up now on a motion to go into Supply. In the short week which has elapsed since I first made the motion, I have had expressions of opinion from all over the country ; from the press and from the public men of Canada endorsing my course ; and, in the discussion to-day these expressions of opinion will throw a great deal of light upon the subject. What is the question to which I direct the attention of the House and of the country ? It is the gravity of the fact that the great railroads of Canada are liable at any moment to pass into the control of that great monopolistic syndicate which has recently acquired control of the great railways of the United States. The future of Canada is involved in that question, and therefore if I take up a little time of the House in trying to make my position good, I trust hon. gentlemen will pardon me. Let me first give a sketch of these men in the United States who control the railways, and I shall do so by way of illustration. At the head of that combination is Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, of New York, who to-day is the collossus of banking in the world. There is not a proposition that he will not undertake; he frequently puts schemes through which involve from fifty million dollars to a thousand million dollars. He commands almost the entire banking support of the United States, and he has associated with him men of great experience and capacity ; men like the head of the Vanderbilt family, owning thousands of miles of railroads in the United States; men like Mr. George Gould, who controls thousands of miles of railway, as well as the telegraph system of the United States largely ; men like Mr. Rockefeller, the head of the Standard Oil Company, who also controls thousands of miles of railway ; men like Mr. Harriman, also a great railway owner, and these men, along with others, form to-day, the most powerful combination that ever existed in the United States. Within the past few weeks they have consolidated the Vanderbilt lines, the Gould lines, all the Pacific lines, including the Northern Pacific, the Union Pacific, the Great Northern, and the Southern Pacific. These men not only control the railroads of the United States, but they control also other great corporations. Within a week they have secured control of the iron and steel production of the United States, capitalized at $950,000,000. They control the oil production of the United States, through the Standard Oil Company; they control the copper production of the United States ; they control all the coal fields in the Eastern States and the Southern States, and the coal fields of Ohio, and they are preparing to control the ship-building of the United States. There is not a single proposition of the first magnitude that these same men do not seek to control.

What is still more significant to the people of this country to-day is the fact that they also control the service of Mr. C. M. Hays, who was the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, and who is to-day to be the manager of the consolidated system—a man whom all the world admits is the greatest administrator of railway in America and who, having been in the service of the Grand Trunk, and knowing the transportation problems of Canada, as no other man in America knows them, is in a position by reason of his connection with this great syndicate and his knowledge of our railway, to lay out a scheme whereby in the twinkling of an eye the two great Canadian railways could pass into the hands of this syndicate. And even if they do not pass into the hands of this syndicate, they could be greatly injured by him.

They also control steamship and river lines of steamers, on the Pacific, on the Atlantic and on many of the inland waters of the United States.

Now, Sir, if they can control the railways of the United States, I am here to-day to argue that they can control the railways of Canada in a very easy manner, and since I raised this question last week, we have had the opinion of Mr. Shaughnessy, the head of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to show how

easy it would be for this powerful United States syndicate to control our Canadian railroads. In an authentic interview given out by Mr. Shaughnessy, he makes this statement :

Mr. T. G. Shaughnessy, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, was asked by a *Herald* representative to-day as to what he thought of the possibility of the Canadian Pacific Railway being acquired by a powerful syndicate of United States capitalists, as was stated in the course of the debate on government ownership of railways in the House of Commons yesterday afternoon.

'Oh, it is quite possible,' continued Mr. Shaughnessy; 'there is nothing whatever to prevent American capitalists, if they have got the money, from buying the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is for sale in London and Montreal, and on Berlin and other continental bourses. Having acquired the stock, there is nothing to prevent these gentlemen from controlling the policy of the company, and exercising their control for the advancement of United States interests.'

Now, not only can these men control these railways at a comparatively small cost—as Mr. Shaughnessy has said, of $30,000,000—but they can control these railways by the simple act of leasing them, for which they will only have to pay a very small consideration. We therefore see that these men can any day acquire control of both of our great Canadian roads for a mere nominal sum. And not only that they could ruin the Canadian manufacturer and the Canadian citizen by the local rates which they could impose on our local traffic and by the preferences which they could give to American products and manufactures coming into this country. They could if they liked, in this strong position hold us in the hollow of their hand. We would all be their serfs and their servitors.

And if they once started to gobble up our railways, they could gobble up our great lines of production, just as they have got control of the iron and steel and copper and petroleum production in the United States.

We have been discussing the status of these roads from another point of view, and recently it has been pointed out that their management at the present day is a menace to our country. It has been charged against them, the Grand Trunk Railway particularly, that they were discriminating against Canadian ports, and rendering almost useless the great sums of money we have spent on our canal system, on our harbour improvements, and on the deepening of the St. Lawrence route. If these railroads can do that to-day, how much more injurious would it be to this country were they to pass into the hands of a United States syndicate. To-day the fight is between the American shipping ports as against the St. Lawrence route, and do you think that if these men who have all their interests bound up in the ports of New York, Boston, Baltimore and Philadelphia, could get control of the Canadian railways, that they would not use that power to the detriment of Canada. This question is therefore, to us, one of supreme national importance, and that is why I have thus early availed of the opportunity to bring it before the parliament of Canada. Why, this syndicate could render nugatory the effects of all the money we have spent in building up our canals and in trying to create great shipping ports in Montreal, in Quebec, in St. John, and in Halifax. These men could do all that by spending fifty million dollars in buying the control of our railways, or easier still for them, by leasing the roads. And, Sir, they would have no hesitation in doing it.

My argument in favour of government control of railways is, in the first place, because I wish to stop the unpatriotic management of these roads towards Canada, and in the second place, I wish to try and prevent our railways falling into the hands of United States monopolists. I have two arguments in my favour. First, that these roads on which Canada has spent so much money in the way of subsidies are to-day inimical to the interests of Canada ; and second, that they are liable to fall into the hands of these men in the United States. These, I submit, Sir, are two good reasons in favour of my contention. In order that I may bring the mind of the House clearly to this matter, I propose to read some expressions of public opinion which have been given within the past week on this question. I shall first quote the Hamilton *Herald*, which says :

Few speeches delivered in the Dominion are more worthy of serious attention than the one which was made yesterday by the member for East York (Mr. Maclean). It was a very bold and radical speech, and a very important one. Mr. Maclean advocated the acquirement by the government of the whole interest in the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway as a means of averting the great danger. The proposition is made not so much as a matter of general national policy as because the nationalization of the railways is the only adequate means of defence against the national danger arising out of new and unexpected conditions. Even more significant and important than Mr. Maclean's advocacy of this policy is Mr. Charlton's tacit endorsation of it. The member for East York has for some years been an advocate of national railways; but Mr. Charlton has never given any hint of favouring such a radical innovation. The member for North Norfolk is a prudent, cautious politician, inclining to conservatism; and the fact that he favours the serious consideration of Mr. Maclean's proposal will go far to save that proposal from ridicule as one of Billy Maclean's fads.

La Patrie on the same day says :

The situation is far from being a desperate one; it is neither dark nor compromising as depicted by fantastic rumours. But the present agitation will open the eyes of those who had refused to see, and will cause those with serious thoughts to give careful attention and efficacious protection to our great natural interests.

Here is an extract from another paper which I think will appeal to the House, namely, the Montreal *Witness* :

There are few persons who have been observing how the interests that are developing Canada have been falling into few hands, and many of these foreign, who have not wondered what might be the effect of it all on self-government and on Canadian nationality. Whether or not there be anything in the fear expressed by Mr. Maclean of the Canadian Pacific Railway falling into the tentacles of the all-absorbing railway octopus now developing in the United States, the bare mention of such a possibility must awaken serious reflections in the minds of all who remember the nature and extent of the sacrifices made by the country to secure the construction of that great transcontinental railway. If such an extraordinary anti-climax to an undertaking, originally designed to knit the scattered provinces together and make this country independent of the United States in matters of transportation, could have entered the minds of the statesmen who projected the railway, we may be sure they would have provided securely against it in the charter and Act of incorporation. The magnitude of the new power which has come into existence on this continent, however, with its unconcealed intention of controlling transportation between the two oceans, gives colour to the apprehensions expressed in parliament, extravagant though they may appear. The Canadian Pacific Railway is of the nature of an Impreial highway, as it is certainly an alternative route between Britain and the east. Such being the fact, its control by foreign and possibly hostile capitalists is a contingency not to be contemplated. Like the Suez canal, as Mr. Maclean says, it is an Imperial necessity. It has long been boasted as Canada's contribution to the empire's defences. It must remain a national enterprise. Mr. Maclean's proposal that this should be accomplished as Lord Beaconsfield secured the key of the east, is one which, should it be the right one, will not perhaps be facilitated by the public proposal of it. In taking the readiest way to answer the Sphinx's riddle and to unlock the Asian mystery, that Oriental magician did not propose at the same time to solve the great economic problem of the west, nor do we know that the way proposed is the right one. We only know that the question is a live one, full of electricity.

I am not going to read all the press opinions which I have, but I wish to read some extracts from an article in the Toronto *Globe* of only Friday last. The *Globe* says :

Mr. Shaughnessy says that there is nothing whatever to prevent American capitalists from buying the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is for sale in London, Montreal, and on the Berlin and other European exchanges. Having acquired the stock, there is nothing to prevent them from controlling the policy of the company and exercising their control for the advancement of United States interests. He might have added that there was nothing to prevent them exercising their power to the positive detriment of Canadian interests without overstating the case. The danger is even more immediate, for there is nothing to prevent the present owners of the road, whether they be Canadians, Americans or Germans, from operating the road in such a way as to favour foreign at the expense of domestic enterprises. In fact, the present management have been convicted of such lines of policy on many occasions, not adopted for the purpose of favouring Americans or hurting Canadians, but that they might augment net receipts regardless of consequences. Such restrictions as have been placed on the transfer of stock in the Canadian Pacific Railway agreement seem rather for the protection of the company than to preserve the national character of the road. But even if there was a specific provision against the sale of stock to foreigners, it would be of no avail, for the exactions of a Canadian company would be quite as onerous as any pressure that could be applied by foreigners. The danger lies in the absence of any defence against discrimination injurious to Canada. This defect has been mentioned by Mr. Shaughnessy, and it should be remedied, as far as possible, by the creation of machinery for controlling services and regulating rates.

Here is what the *Globe* says on government ownership :

With regard to the agitation for government purchase and operation, Mr. Shaughnessy expressed the view that it would be a far better policy to buy out roads like the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk than to subsidize and construct useless lines. He says emphatically that we have had too much wasting of public money in the past for the building of railways which are not only in themselves useless but are positively injurious, inasmuch as they cripple the lines already built. This, he says, is very pernicious, and it would be far preferable that the government should take over the existing lines than that they should build new ones to compete with them. All who have studied the history of competitive railway building in Canada and the United States will see the wisdom of this position. In every case where two roads have been constructed to do the work of one the result has been the maintenance of rates by agreement and the imposition of a double burden on the community. The people have been required to maintain two equipments instead of one, and the greater cost of management has militated against any reduction of rates. If anything has been established and settled by the experience of the past it is that railway competition is not often an effective means of regulating railway charges. Only an unreasoning and destructive obduracy that no business man would be likely to indulge in would justify the government in paralleling existing railways. We may get an exaggerated idea of the waste of parallel roads through the contemplation of railway maps. Unnecessary duplication of roads by the government would be a great waste of capital, and while it would not cost the government any more than the purchase of existing roads, it would mean the destruction of a great amount of capital already invested in the railways.

That is the opinion of the Toronto *Globe* of Friday last. Here is an extract from a St. John paper, the *Gazette*—this is directly the opposite of the wind-up of the *Globe* article :

Perhaps the best way to meet the combination is by the construction of a government line of railway from Montreal to Parry Sound and another from Montreal to the Detroit river. This would prevent railroad combination from charging excessive rates of freight in the most populous sections of Canada and would furnish

means of transportation independent of company railroads to the great west. The *Gazette* is strongly in favour of fast transcontinental railroad owned and operated by the government of Canada. It has been shown time and again that less than one-half of the proceeds of the sale of stocks and bonds of railroads constructed in Canada has gone into the road-bed or equipment of these lines. . . . . The time is not far distant when Canadians will be compelled to grapple with the question of transportation rates, because if we only paid rates proportionate to the cost of moving the freight and allowing a fair interest on the actual cost of the road-bed and equipment, freight rates in Canada would be cut in two. The question is one which requires great consideration and careful legislation. It is a question which the Minister of Railways has already given great consideration, and he will probably be able at an early date to present legislation which will prevent any further inroad on public rights by railroad corporations or combinations.

Here is a brief extract from the London *Advertiser*, a prominent Liberal paper :

The question thus raised is a very large one, but not less large and formidable would be the proper handling if any remedy could be proposed. But these are the sort of questions which, before the twentieth century is very old, may compel men to sit up and think.

The London *News* says :

Mr. Maclean has stated that the government, that is the people of Canada, could secure control of the Canadian Pacific by the expenditure of $50,000,000. That looks like a large sum, and it is a large sum, but the question, to the *News*' mind, is simply whether that money shall be spent now, and the people of Canada be given a chance to transport their goods and do business on a fair basis, or whether we shall wait until the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the other big Canadian roads pass under the control of the United States railroad trust, and then have to be bought out at an enhanced figure.

There are many problems connected with government ownership of railways, and business methods would have to be strictly adhered to in the event of the government securing control of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but these problems will be no easier of solution in the future than now, and meanwhile the plundering of the country by exorbitant rates will have been going steadily on.

The situation has apparently got to be faced. Why not do as Mr. Maclean suggests and face it now?

The next authority I want to quote is the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), who addressed a letter the other day to the Montreal Board of Trade, in which he made the following remarks :

The American railways are equipping themselves in a most energetic and modern manner in order that they may be able to carry cheaper and cheaper every day the western trade to the ports of the United States. I greatly fear that unless we make an earnest effort on behalf of Canada, we will lose much of the benefits and advantages of the improvements that we have made to the St. Lawrence route.

In my humble opinion, we must not lose one moment. The St. Lawrence route must be overhauled, made deeper and wider, and as safe as possible from one end to the other, in order to provide cheap and quick transportation from the west to the European markets.

The more I study the map of Canada the more I feel convinced that the ports on the Georgian Bay are destined to become splendid reservoirs and recipients of trade. All that trade can be secured to the St. Lawrence route if we make the necessary effort.

The consequence, I believe, of what the hon. minister here says cannot be anything else than government ownership.

Let me read just two more newspaper extracts. The Winnipeg *Free Press* says :

It behooves the people of Canada to take some notice of symptoms that have lately developed among railway companies controlling the chief railways in Canada, of an effort to coerce this country by threatening to injure Canadian ports by transferring their trade and terminals to United States ports. . . . This practically amounts to an attempt to establish a system of terrorism and to frighten the Canadian people from taking steps which they consider proper. It is, therefore, a reasonable thing that the public should look to the government to exercise all possible control over these roads, and by legislation, if possible, prevent them from injuring what they were subsidized to build up and improve.

The St. Thomas *Times* says :

If the government has no other means of stopping this anti-Canadian policy on the part of the Canadian railways, it should have no hesitation in putting Mr. McNaught's suggestion into practice.

That suggestion is that a preferential tariff should only be allowed on goods that come in by Canadian ports.

The St. John *Telegraph* of February 15, says :

But the interests of the country, and particularly of these maritime provinces, demand some such radical cure for the present trouble.

The writer in the above quotation refers to Mr. McNaught's remedy for the discrimination by Canadian railways against Canadian ports.

The St. John *Telegraph* of February 14, says :

The latter idea [the extension of the Intercolonial to the Georgian Bay] was outlined by the Minister of Railways in his speeches in St. John prior to the general elections. Such a movement will check for ever any possibility of American railway magnates monopolizing the constantly increasing transportation of Canadian products to the eastern seaboard.

I can hardly agree in the opinion that the extension of the Intercolonial Railway by the government will settle the question. That would only aggravate the situation, although I have supported in the past and may, under certain circumstances to-day, defend that proposition.

I have one more letter to read, out of many similar ones which I have received :

Dear Sir,—I am much pleased to read of the stand you have taken with reference to the government ownership of railways. The stand you have taken is well chosen, and it is difficult to imagine any other way to escape from the railways of Canada being absorbed by the gigantic

combine that evidently has for one of its objects to get hold of and control our railways. Could they accomplish their design, then the independence of the Canadian people will exist in name only. For it is a self-evident fact that if any corporation can control the means of transportation in Canada, they can then dictate their terms in other directions. So far as I can learn, the system of government ownership in some European countries seems to give general satisfaction to the travelling and commercial public. One of the advantages is, that it for ever shuts out all gambling in stocks, and special rates to favoured localities or individuals. As I am a stranger to you, I will refer you to our member, A. E. Vrooman, or Hon. George McHugh; also will add that I am a lifelong Reformer. But your step is in the right direction, and of my own knowledge, know that a large percentage of the people were looking in the direction of government ownership before this movement was inaugurated. So you can easily see how much more interest will be taken in this matter now. You are at liberty, if you see fit, to use this letter for any purpose that will suit your convenience.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the name ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Minthorne, of Oakwood.

I think, Sir, I have proved to the House that a serious problem is before us. I think I have proved, by quoting the leading newspapers of the country and by a reference to the language used by two members of the government, that we have to grapple with a very serious problem; and having made that point, I think it is incumbent on me to make some practical suggestion. That practical suggestion is that there can be no radical cure of these evils except government ownership. You will says perhaps that government ownership involves a very large financial proposition. I said the other day that it would take $50,000,000 to acquire the Canadian Pacific Railway. I spoke wide of the mark intentionally, and have since found out that less than $30,000,000 invested on the stock exchanges to-day would secure control of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and also that for less than $20,000,000 you can secure control of the shares of the Grand Trunk Railway. But, there is a much more simple proposition, which perhaps will surprise the House and the public. I say in all seriousness that the government of Canada, which is controlling the Intercolonial Railway, the national system of railways, can obtain a lease of the Grand Trunk Railway for $1 a year, and the Canadian Pacific Railway for $1 a year, and that is in substance all the financial obligation involved. The government can lease these two great roads for $1 per year each and get a lease for 999 years, if it so desires. Such transactions are going on every day. But the government would have this to do, and I am not concealing that from the House and the country : it would have to assume the liabilities of these roads. But, who is assuming the liabilities to-day ? It is the people of Canada, for it is the traffic that sustains these roads. The bondholders, the shareholders have not assumed them, but the people who use the roads are meeting these liabilities, and there is only one portion of these liabilities concerning which one of these companies is in default, and that is the first shares of the Grand Trunk Railway. So far as the Canadian Pacific Railway is concerned, however, every dollar of liability in connection with it is being paid, and paid promptly, and yet the shareholders of that road would be willing today to lease that great enterprise, which has about $300,000,000 invested in it, to the people of Canada for $1 per year. That is a very simple proposition.

Mr. BRITTON. Are you authorized to make that offer ?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, but if the hon. the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) will authorize my hon. friend to make inquiries, I believe he will find that such an offer would be accepted. That is the way I meet the question. How will you raise the fifty million dollars? I ask the Minister of Finance : Have you two dollars a year to spare? If you have, you can control both the great railway enterprises of this country. I rather prefer the method of purchase to the acquirement of the lines by lease. But, they can be purchased—both of these great lines—for less than $50,000,000 ; and that is no great difficult burden for Canada to assume at this day ; we have faced larger undertakings, and have carried them out successfully. So far as financial questions are concerned, there is very little to prevent the country acquiring both roads. If we acquire the shares of these roads and assume all the responsibilities, the time will soon come when the liabilities can be converted so as to be a much smaller burden upon the people. Five per cent obligations can be converted into three per cent obligations—not all at once, of course, for some of the outstanding bonds have years to run ; and the sub-leases of the smaller sections also will not be renewable for years to come—but, as the bonds and leases mature, they can be converted at much smaller figures, and thus, without confusion the liability can be made to bear a much smaller percentage of interest and the traffic will be relieved of a very considerable burden.

Mr. HEYD. How much liability should we have to assume ?

Mr. MACLEAN. The total liability of the Canadian Pacific, so far as I can make out is $300,000,000. But that rests upon us to-day, and the people are paying the interest upon it in the traffic rates. But, though we bear this burden, we have nothing to say about the management of the road. When we pay the piper we should have the privilege of controlling the road.

Mr. COCHRANE. We have had experience in running railways.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is the point I was coming to, and that is the point of my amendment. And, on this point I expect the support of the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair), and the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), because we have been informed in an official way, that they are prepared to extend the national system that we have to-day. I am prepared to extend that system if necessary, for our national railway is the best asset we have; and I hope the country will extend it and expand it. My amendment is, in substance, that, as we have a national road, the first thing we ought to do is to depoliticalize its administration. We do not want politics in the Intercolonial Railway; we do not want members of this House making appointments in connection with that road, or taking part in fixing its rates. I do not say that these things take place to-day, but I have heard that they do. The first step towards nationalizing the railways is to depoliticalize the railway we have. I do not mean to say that the Minister of Railways shall not sit in the House and be responsible to this House for that road. But what I do say, is that he should turn the administration of the railway over to first-class railway men who will allow no politics in the management. Is that possible? I believe it is; and I am going to quote the opinion of a very prominent railway man on this point. I do not wish to give his name, but nearly all who hear me can guess who he is. He is said to be the biggest railway man we have in Canada. Happening to meet him, I said to him, 'What do you think of nationalizing the Canadian Pacific Railway and also including the Grand Trunk Railway, if necessary?' He said: 'It might be the best way out of it; but you cannot do that if you drag it into politics.' I then asked him, 'Is it possible to administer the railway without dragging it into politics?' His answer was, 'It is.' He is a man of great force and rapidity of thought; and he named over fifteen men, going from the maritime province, across the continent picking them out here and there. They were all first-class men. And he said, 'Take these fifteen men; give them $1,000 a month as pay for going to a meeting once a week; let them appoint a general manager, the best man they can get, and pay him $50,000 a year if necessary; and I believe you might run the Canadian railways with more economy and with better service to the country than by any other possible system.'

Mr. TALBOT. Give us his name.

Mr. MACLEAN. You will have to take my word for it. I am giving you merely a conversation, and would not care to take more liberties with it than to say the gentleman I refer to is a very prominent railway man of this country.

Mr. MACLEAN.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think we know who it is as well as if he had been named.

Mr. MACLEAN. I suppose so. It was our friend Sir William Van Horne. In conversation the other night he said that if the road could be taken out of politics and administered by a board of the kind he had suggested, it would be possible to administer it successfully and with the greatest benefit to the people of Canada.

Now, as I pointed out the other day, we in Canada can carry out the proposition I have made, and do it very easily. We do not need any more legislation; we can do it under the legislation we have. We do not even need more money; we can do it with the money we have. In the United States, where there is a great movement in favour of the nationalization of railways, there are serious constitutional difficulties in the way. I have already said that I do not see how the American people could nationalize their railways without a revolution. But we have already started, and have only to continue in our present course, and, in a very short time all the roads can be taken over by the Dominion.

The proposition has been made, and the name of the Minister of Railways and Canals has been connected with it, of curing the railway grievances in this country by extending the Canadian national system—that is by nationalizing the Booth line from Montreal to the Upper Lakes, and making some arrangement for a new government line clear across the continent. I shall feel obliged to support that if my own proposition is not realized. In the meantime I would say it is the most extravagant thing we could do, and, in one respect, only aggravates the situation. If you build another transcontinental line as a means of regulating the Canadian Pacific, you increase the burden that the traffic has to bear. Sooner than see this done, I would make every effort to take over the Canadian Pacific. How much would it cost to build a competing line across the continent? I believe it would cost a hundred millions, and perhaps more; and, when this is done, the country will have two lines to maintain, and, instead of getting lower rates may get higher. The true solution of the difficulty is to nationalize the Canadian Pacific—make it part of the Canadian government system. That can be done at small cost, and without aggravating the situation, while securing immediate relief to the people of this country.

Another thing that the government is committed to, and one that I must endorse if I cannot get government ownership of railways, is to attempt the removal of existing grievances by establishing a railway commission. If better is not done, I hope that commission will be established. But you must face the fact that a commission

will be constantly at war with the railways, and that war will be carried on at great expense. If you nationalize the railways, the whole energy of the commission can be given to managing the roads and securing the interests of the people. If you wish to avoid this constant warfare which the establishment of a railway commission would involve, you must have national ownership. In that respect, I wish to read other portions of this interview with Mr. Shaughnessy which bears directly on the point. Now, this is the most serious statement of all, and it is well worth the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals :

> 'So much for the possibility of the control of American capitalists. What do you think, Mr. Shaughnessy, of the suggestion that in order to prevent this the government should itself acquire possession of the Canadian Pacific and other railways material to the prosperity of Canada, which are now owned by companies?'
>
> 'Well,' observed Mr. Shaughnessy, 'speaking quite frankly, I think it would be infinitely better, if the government intends to take up seriously the business of railroading, that the public money of this country should be invested in the acquisition of such railways as the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk than that it should be wasted in the subsidizing and construction of useless lines. We have had too much wasting of public money in the past for the building of railways which are not only in themselves useless, but are positively injurious, inasmuch as they cripple the lines which are already built. This is very pernicious, and, as I have said, it would be far preferable that the government should take over the existing lines than that they should build new ones to compete with them. You are at perfect liberty to quote me as having said this; I really do not think there is anything more I can say on the subject.'

Now, what are we up to ? We are up to this, that we have got to establish another government line, and maintain a railway commission, and have two great continental roads in the service of the country, or we have got to nationalize the one we have. There is no other way out of it. There is great expenditure ahead of you, and the Minister of Railways and Canals is almost committed by his newspaper friends to another transcontinental line, and to a railway commission in constant warfare with the roads ; either that or you have got to nationalize the road you have. That is what we are up against, and that is another point to which I desire to direct the attention of the country.

Now, can we nationalize railways ? Is it a foolish idea ? What are the facts in regard to that ? Our fellow colonists, as we call them, in the southern hemisphere, in Australia, in New Zealand, have nationalized their railways, and they would not change their policy to-morrow under any circumstances. This is a great fact that comes home to us. In some European countries the railways have nearly all been nationalized. In Germany there are two kinds of railways, state-owned and private-owned ; but the tendency is to take over every private-owned railway there. In Austria and Hungary they have the best transportation for passengers in the world, and the cheapest, and it is because the government controls the railways. It is the same in almost every other European country. They have state-owned railways, and the people do not for a moment think of abandoning the system and going back to private corporations. Public opinion is growing in favour of state-owned railways ; and in England to-day one of the few ways in which the British manufacturer will be able to meet foreign competition is by having lower freight rates, and the way they wish to attain that object is by the state taking over the roads.

Now, Sir, this railway question will never be smaller than it is. Delay only aggravates the situation. Let us never forget that it is the traffic that pays for and maintains the railway, not the shareholders, or the bondholders, or the administration of the road. In other words, the people who use the roads support them ; why should they not control them ? Canada can buy the controlling shares of the Canadian Pacific Railway for less than thirty million dollars, and she can buy the controlling shares of the Grand Trunk Railway for less than twenty million dollars. Canada can own and control both roads, subject to the mortgages on them, for less than fifty million dollars paid for their controlling shares. Canada can lease and secure control of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway for $1 each a year, on undertaking to guarantee the shareholders who now have the control, less than 4 per cent on the face value of the shares. The stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway guaranteed by government at 3 per cent would be above par, and that is what the shareholders desire.

The proposition of public ownership in its simplest form lies in assuming the liabilities, guaranteeing the interest and dividends, and leasing each road at a nominal rental of $1 a year. Surely the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has two $1 bills at his disposal. As a matter of fact, the traffic of the roads is now doing all these things, with the single exception of some shares of the Grand Trunk Railway. But, with government ownership the extravagant competition for traffic would cease, the working expenses incident to rivalry would be reduced, the existing obligations in the way of rents on leases of road would be absorbed, interest on bonds and preferred stock could be gradually reduced, and that very materially, and in a thousand ways savings could be effected in works unnecessary to a co-operative railway and a co-operative rail and water system. Better wages could and would be paid to the smaller number of men, but the wages bill

of a consolidated system would be much smaller.

And these railways once consolidated would be the complement of all our other public works, our canals, our harbour improvements, our river improvements. To-day the railways have antagonized the national railway system of this country. I also speak within the truth when I say that the railways of Canada for years did their best to delay the deepening of the canals of this country, and they succeeded in it; and I believe they are trying to interfere to-day in every way possible with the utilization of these canals. But if once the government owned the railways, the canals and the railways would then be complementary of each other, and would work harmoniously for the benefit of the Canadian people.

I have heard it said that if we start out to nationalize the railways by purchase, the shareholders would run up the price. Now, that is not a fact, the converse would actually happen. As soon as it became known that Canada proposed to nationalize the railways, there would be a competition between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway as to who would sell or lease first; and if the majority of the stock of either roads was to be acquired, there would be a rush and a competition between the shareholders to sell to the government. Neither road, nor any of the shareholders of that road, would wish to be left out; and instead of the price of stocks going up they would naturally come down by reason of this competition. No doubt that may seem a peculiar statement, but it is one I am prepared to stand by.

In the supreme struggle which is now going on between the United States and Canada, between New York, Boston and Portland on the one side, and the St. Lawrence route and Canadian ports on the other, can we for one moment allow our great railway system to fall under the control of the great United States combine, which has its centre in the American ports of New York, Boston and Baltimore? Can we afford that as a Canadian people? Can we afford to allow great interests in American ports to control our own railway system on which we have spent so much money? Some gentlemen think they see a great many lions in the way of government ownership. I admit there are difficulties, but I think they can be met and overcome. We have to retrace our steps, but in doing so we will be doing something that I believe the people of Canada desire us to do.

The greatest curse in politics to-day is the corruption wrought and exercised by corporations in the municipal, provincial and federal spheres. The corruption of corporations even threatens our courts. The political corruption of a political administration of a railway is a flea-bite compared to the corruption of the people and legislatures by corporations. A corporation never dies, because it is a past-master in corruption. That is not the case with individuals. People say they are opposed to government railways on account of the political corruption which would exist in their management. Sir, I am not afraid of that. The political corruption that I am afraid of in this country is that which has been exercised by great corporations. There is no comparison between the two. I grant you there will be some corruption and there will be some maladministration, but that is nothing to compare with the greater corruption that threatens this whole country by reason of the power of these great corporations.

An intelligent democracy like ours ought to be equal to cope with any problem that arises. A people who prides themselves on their ability for self-government ought to be equal to the further responsibilities of self-ownership of great franchises. Surely if we are competent to govern ourselves we ought to go forward and put in practice this proposition of assuming control of the great railroads of this country. We are not less able in the solution of our economic problem, not less competent to do what our fellows in Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, or what the nations of Europe have done. Here is the next proposition which I wish to submit; you cannot settle a twentieth century problem with nineteenth century ideas. This great problem is a twentieth century problem and the solution of it is in national ownership and not in the practices that have been observed in this House and in the Railway Committee of this House for the past thirty years. What is the problem before the railway manager as the roads are run to-day? The problem before Mr. Hays, or Mr. Shaughnessy is: How can we administer this railway so as to secure the best returns for the men who have invested their money in it? The problem before the manager of a national system of railways is: How can I run this railway in the best interests of the people who have to support it? These propositions are two entirely different ones; the man who is working for the government has much higher work in his hands. All he has to do is to see what he can do for the people, but with Mr. Hays and Mr. Shaughnessy nine-tenths of their time is taken up dealing with questions of competition and finding out how they can make a profit for the shareholders and bondholders of the road. Instead of public ownership of railways tending to demoralize the people, I believe it would compel every man to take a deeper interest in public affairs and to use his ballot more conscientiously. Instead of public ownership entrenching a party in power it would tend to effect more rapid changes in parties. Patronage and responsibility are a source of weakness not of strength to party. This is the way I understand the idea of self-government in this country. If every man

has an interest in the railways of the country he would take a greater interest in public questions, and instead of railway administration being a bar to good government I think it would help it. The difference between a private trust controlling all roads of a country and state ownership is this: The trust gets all the benefit of consolidation, economical management and the saving effected in not having to duplicate existing lines and takes the bulk of these benefits to itself. A state-owned system receives all these benefits and economies and gives them to the people. A trust antagonizes or may antagonize a nation ; a state-owned system is bound to be patriotic.

Science, genius, enterprise, public spirit, utilizing the thousand and one imprescriptible legacies of the past, are constantly striving to better the lot of mankind, and up to the present time the wealthy, the ambitious, the trusts, the combines, the corporations have tried to corner and to restrict, have succeeded in cornering, in restricting the use of these discoveries, of these gifts to man made by genius, intellect, enterprise and public spirit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken up a good deal of the time of the House, but I do trust that I have brought clearly before the House and the country this question of government ownership. I trust that the question as brought up by me will receive the attention of the House and the government and in doing what I have done I have only discharged my duty. I am one of those who believe in and have every confidence in the Canadian people. I believe they are equal to the task of owning and controlling the railways of this country. I am not one of those who cast a slur upon the honour of my fellow-countrymen in Canada. It is said up and down Canada by the great corporations owning the railways of this country that the Canadian people are unfit to own railways, that they are dishonest, unpatriotic and corruptible. I do not believe that ; I agree with what Senator Hoar of Massachusetts said who, discussing the question of trusts in the United States declared : I believe that the great bulk of the American people are honest, patriotic and incorruptible. I believe the same of the Canadian people, but the men who own these great trusts in Canada to-day have a paid propaganda, a propaganda that is filling the newspapers of this country with the idea that we are a corrupt lot of people, that the government is corrupt and that in no way could a railway be honestly administered by the people. I repudiate that slander on my fellow-countrymen, on the government and legislature of this country. I believe we can do these things. I believe this is the work before us now, and that is the reason why I have brought this question up here to-day. I have not brought it up to embarrass the government, or the House, nor have I brought it up to embarrass my own friends, as has been said, but I have brought it up so as to direct public attention to it and if possible to induce the government, before they go into a system to which they seem to be committed, namely, of extending the Intercolonial Railway, to first try to make a reasonable effort to nationalize all the railway lines of this country. If they do that they will be doing something patriotic ; they will meet with the support of the people of this country, but if they do not do it there will be a party arise in this country and arise in this House that will make the nationalization of the railways in Canada its main plank and if this party and these men do come forth I believe that when they make an appeal to the people of Canada they will receive an overwhelming mandate to nationalize these roads. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move :

That all the words after the word 'That' be left out, and the following added instead thereof: 'in order that the government railway system of Canada may be used to the best possible advantage of the people by being a substantial check on the freight charges of railways owned by private corporations, and in order that the government system may give the public the most efficient service, this House is of the opinion that the administration thereof should be freed of all political influence or interference.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I was in hopes that we would have heard a word or two from the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) in regard to the matter which has been brought before the House by my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) who has just taken his seat. I think, in the first place, that the thanks of this House and the country are due to the hon. gentleman for having brought this matter to the attention of the House and the country, because, while there may be some of us who would not go so far as the hon. gentleman has gone in his remarks in regard to this matter, there can be no doubt whatever that this is a subject which should invite the earnest attention of the government. We know that the government of this country is at the present time engaged in carrying on a business which is ordinarily carried on in this country by railway corporations, and we know that it is carrying on that business in competition, to a certain extent, at least, with private corporations. Now, my hon. friend's motion is perhaps not so wide as the remarks which he has addressed to the House in regard to it. His motion is that the administration of our railways should be freed from political influence or interference. If I rightly understand what the hon. gentleman intends by the language which he has used in this motion it seems to me that there could hardly be two opinions in the House in respect to the desirability of the principle which he has laid down. The Intercolonial Railway is run as a department of the government. It is, I

presume, and always has been, more or less, subject to the same party political influence which affects other departments of the government in this country. Now, I suppose, that none of us could doubt that if the administration of the Intercolonial Railway, or indeed of any department of the government, were freed from that political influence and interference which are sometimes not conducive to the public interest it would be a distinct gain to the country. The government railways of this country stand in a different position from other departments of government in that respect. For example the Post Office Department deals with the carriage of mails throughout the country, and it is provided by statute that any person undertaking to enter into competition with it shall be guilty of an offence. When you come to deal with railways there is a different condition of affairs. Look at the administration of the Intercolonial Railway. It is more or less subject to what is called political influence and political interference. I am using the language which my hon. friend used in his motion. Let us suppose that the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the Bank of Montreal, or any great manufacturing concern in this country were to undertake to carry on its business subject to political influence and interference of this kind. Does any one suppose for a moment that the business of such a corporation would not be greatly hindered under such conditions? Does any one suppose that equally good results could be arrived at by any great Canadian corporation if it were hampered in such a way ? Therefore, so far as the motion tends to prevent political influence and interference in connection with the administration of the Intercolonial Railway, we ought all be heartily in accord with and I presume that the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) would be the first person to join in the wish for such a desirable consummation as that.

When you come to go further and to deal with the means by which you shall attain such an end, and with the question of nationalizing the railways of Canada the House perhaps may not be prepared to express an opinion. Since my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) brought this matter to the attention of the House, I have endeavoured to examine in some slight way the mode in which other colonies have dealt with this matter, and I find that in the Australasian colonies and in New Zealand, the railways are for the most part dealt with by a commission, and in these colonies the freedom of the administration of the railways from political influence has been found to be productive of very beneficial results. I am not prepared to say that we should at once follow the example of these colonies. We have a very much larger problem to deal with in Canada than arises in the Australian colonies, because we have about 17,000 miles of railways (of which about 1,500 are government railways) and the paid up capital of the railway lines in Canada runs up to nearly $1,000,000,000. Therefore, when we speak about nationalizing the railways of Canada, or when we speak about dealing with the Intercolonial Railway by means of a commission, we have a pretty large problem to consider, and we possibly have difficulties which were not present in the experience of the colonies to which I have referred. I think, however, that the matter has very properly been brought to the attention of the House, and it is a matter upon which the government of this country should have a policy. There are many matters as to which the government has made investigations during the past five years, and on which the public money of this country has been expended, which are very much less worthy of the consideration of the government and of the country than the matter to which my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has drawn the attention of parliament. While it is a matter in which I agree we should not move hastily, a matter which we should take time to consider ; it is nevertheless a matter which the government should take into earnest and prompt consideration. I believe that the country demands that the government should do so. I am prepared to support the motion giving it the meaning which I have attached to it ; not dealing with it as necessarily involving the appointing of a commission, not dealing for the present with the question of the nationalization of our railways or the means by which that will be accomplished, if it is ever accomplished, but dealing with what I understand to be the main proposition laid down by my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean), namely : that the administration of government railways in Canada should be free from party political influence and interference.

Mr. HEYD. Is that all there is in the resolution ?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is what I understand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. Mr. Blair). I have no desire to cast any reflection upon the procedure of my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean), because I am quite convinced that his disposition is to treat the House in a bona fide spirit on this question. It is, I am sure, not his intention to ask us to vote upon a resolution to which he has not addressed the attention of the House, and in support of which he has made no argument. Indeed, if his remarks has even a remote relation to the subject-matter of the resolution, I am unable to see it, but perhaps that is my misfortune. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean)

puzzles me. He will, I think, confess that he himself is puzzled because if his argument proves anything it proves that the best policy for this country is that the railways should be absolutely and entirely controlled by the government of the day and become government property. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) is a sincere advocate of the nationalization of railways, but does it not occur to him that as he has presented the question to-day it is more an academic question than a practical one. We are met in this parliament as practical men for a practical purpose, but my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has not recognized that fact in the course which he has taken on this question. He has not offered us any suggestion as to the manner in which this policy is to be carried out, and when he tells us that it would cost five thousand millions and two dollars to acquire the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway systems, it would seem to be necessary that he should follow that up by at least giving us some hint as to how we should finance an undertaking of such magnitude.

Mr. MACLEAN. Two dollars will do it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) says that two dollars will do it, his statement is a convincing proof that he is not looking on this question from a practical point of view. Inasmuch as all of his argument has been of that character and as it did not touch the resolution at all, I apprehend that when the matter is duly discussed he will withdraw his motion rather than have the public suppose that we are voting on a motion which might lead those who read his speech to think was the real question before the House, when as a matter of fact it deals with an entirely different matter. The hon. gentleman's motion deals entirely with the government railway system, and on a careful study of its wording he will find that there is involved in it a distinct implication that a government system of railways is not a wise system, that it is attended with disadvantageous results, that there is a tendency that the rates on a government railway will be higher than on another railway, because the government railway is subject to political influence.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Mr. Mulock). That the rates will be lower.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, higher; because my hon. friend—his language, if it means anything, implies this—suggests that you ought to get this government system of railways freed from political influence or control in order that rates may not be maintained, but that the tariff of rates may be diminished. I am not, I think, misinterpreting the words of the hon. gentleman's motion, which is distinctly and explicitly pointed against the policy of government ownership and control of railways altogether. If it means anything, it means that. It means that you must not own or control railways, because they will be subject to political influence. Can you imagine a railway owned by a government which is not subject to political influence? Is there a possibility of such a thing existing? I cannot conceive of it, and I am sure my hon. friend cannot conceive of it. Why do I say that it is under political influence? Because, being a property of the people, the trusteeship of it must be in the government of the day supported by the representatives of the people. Its very basis and foundation is that it is under the control and supervision of the people, and that control and supervision can only be exercised in a political way. Will my hon. friend suggest to me how it is conceivable that a government railway system can be managed without the management largely partaking—and I am putting it in the mildest possible form—of a political character?

Now, I am not speaking entirely without having had some opportunity of gathering information as to the experience of others on this question. We can turn, as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has done, to the results of the experiment in the various Australasian colonies, and what do we find there? They started out building and owning all their railways. They had probably felt some dissatisfaction with the extent to which political influence was operating in connection with the maintenance and administration of those railways, and they concluded that it would be a wise policy to change the system, and they changed the system. Take the case of New Zealand, for instance, which was largely followed by the other provinces. Down to 1887, the province of New Zealand owned its railways as a government system, controlled and managed exclusively and directly through the administration. In 1887 they changed that system and adopted a commission. Their idea was that they would have all the advantages belonging to government ownership without any of the incidental disadvantages consequent upon political interference or control. After trying that system from 1891, down to 1894, they found that after all they had not overcome the disadvantages which they had hoped to be able to overcome. They found that political influence still existed. They had not found that it was so very harmful under the direct administrative system prior to 1887; but they found that it still prevailed; and in 1894 they made a change in the character of their commission, and tried that change down to 1897. The change did not seem to suit their purpose any better; and in 1897 the policy of the govern-

ment took a marked advance—or a retrograde step, as some might perhaps regard it. They went back practically to direct government ownership and control through a minister of the Crown; and they did that distinctly on the ground that they had not freed themselves from any of the disadvantages incident to government ownership and control, but had incurred a very great many disadvantages which were injurious to the country as a whole, under the system of a railway commission. One of the things they complained of especially in respect of the management of a railway commission was that the commission was not open to the pressure from the people and from parliament and from the government which it ought to be open to—that there was not the same broad and liberal policy maintained by the commission that would have been maintained if the railways had continued under the direct management and control of the government, and that the commission was not in close touch with the people and ready to yield to the people's wishes. They complained that the rates were maintained against the public interest to the disadvantage of business, prejudicial to the establishment of industries and against the spirit of enterprise which was abroad in the country. So they have practically gone back to direct control through a minister of the Crown.

The same results have attended the experiments of the other provinces in the same directions. In Tasmania up to 1891, the railways were being operated by companies. By an Act of 1891, all government railways were vested in a minister. The Governor in Council appoints the general manager, who acts under the direction of the minister. In Victoria, a system of three independent commissioners was introduced in 1883, but in 1891, there was practically a return to government control, the minister being made the head of the commission, and having a dual vote. By an Act of 1896, the form of the commission was changed from three to one, and a commissioner was obliged to act simply as an adviser to the head of the department. In New South Wales, by an Act of 1858, the commissioners of railways held office during pleasure; but in 1888 three independent commissioners were appointed, as in Queensland and Victoria. This condition of things has since been changed so that the commissioners are unable to take any steps or adopt any policy without the consent of the Governor in Council. In South Australia, by an Act of 1858, a commission was created and commissioners appointed to continue in office during pleasure. In 1887 a change was made, and three independent commissioners were appointed. In 1894 one commissioner was appointed in lieu of the three, and the Minister of Railways in the government was vested with power to decide all questions wherever any differences of opinion arose. So that you see that while all these experiments have been going on in these other provinces, whose conditions to some extent resemble ours, the changes which have been made within the last ten or fifteen years have been all in the direction of revesting in the government the direct control and management of these railways. In the discussions which have taken place upon these various proposals from time to time, I have seen no difference of opinion expressed upon this point, that no matter how the government railways might be managed—whether the control be invested in a commission or remain in a minister—it was impossible to divest the administration from political influences and control. These would make themselves felt under any circumstances. I am quite sure that my hon. friend, when he asks this House to subscribe to the proposition that we should free the administration of these railways from government control—

Mr. MACLEAN. Political.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Political control rather, he practically declares himself in favour of freeing the railways from government control entirely, and divesting the government of the control they now possess, both as owning and as operating the railway system. I think, therefore, as far as I can judge, that the motion of my hon. friend is not one which can commend itself to the House, and I trust he will not press it to a vote.

He must himself admit that it does not reflect the conclusion which one is entitled to draw from the argument he presented to the House. His argument was not in support of the proposal embodied in his motion, but on the contrary directly antagonistic to it.

While I am not prepared to say that the ideal condition, so far as the management of railways in Canada, and possibly in any country is concerned, might not be that these railways should be entirely under the control of the government—be owned and managed by the government or under direct government supervision—while that might well be said to be an ideal condition, we have not this question before us in any such practical shape, it has not been presented to us in any such form, as would justify us in passing upon so large and momentous a question as that at present.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). I listened, Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of interest to the remarks with which my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) introduced his resolution, and I thought he was doing bravely until he read the terms of the resolution itself. I am one of those who believe that the time has come when the people should get a certain portion back of

that which belongs to them, and that it is time we should call a halt in the rolling up of these immense fortunes by a few individuals. The number of people who believe that much of the wealth which should go into the hands of the people generally is being diverted by corporations, and particularly by large railway corporations, is increasing largely, and I listened with favour to the remarks of my hon. friend, and would support to the best of my ability any scheme calculated to lessen the burdens that rest upon the producers in this country, and give a larger share of the benefits to the great mass of wage-earners. But the resolution is entirely different from the language in which it was introduced. The question of state ownership does not present itself at all in the resolution, nor do we find in it any condemnation of monopolies. The only thing we find in the resolution is this, that the hon. gentleman took advantage of a sentiment that is strongly growing in this country in order to disseminate the idea that the present government is not successfully carrying on the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway, and that we could only hope for successful management by vesting one-half of it in the hands of Conservatives. That is all there is in the resolution. It does not call on us to approve of government ownership, but simply to condemn the present management of the Intercolonial Railway by the Hon. Mr. Blair, and to declare that everything would be bright and rosy if he would only associate with himself some good red hot Tory. I am not prepared to support that resolution, because there is not the remotest connection between it and the speech with which my hon. friend introduced it. I am with him when he declares himself in favour of bettering the condition of the mass of the people. I am with him when he expresses his desire to prevent millionaires from rolling up fortunes and going to distant lands and seeking honours in distant lands by becoming Sirs and Lords and Dukes ; but I am not prepared to condemn the present management of the Intercolonial Railway. I do not want, nor do the people want, hon. gentlemen opposite, for years to come, to have any share in its management.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I merely wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that while I subscribe entirely to this resolution, which I cannot conceive can be controverted by any one, I am not prepared to accept in their entirety the views expressed by my hon. friend in his very able address, concerning the great danger which by common consent threatens the railways of this country. I cannot understand how it can be possible, after the discussions we have heard in this House, for any man to uphold the principle that the administration of the Intercolonial Railway, or any railway controlled by the government, should not be free from political interference or influence. Why, that doctrine has been accepted on all hands. We have had experience in the province of Quebec of the danger and evils of political influence—not governmental control—but political influence in the management of railways and of how dangerous that influence may become. My hon. friend opposite, the right hon. leader of the government and hon. gentlemen who have followed political events in the province of Quebec, and the results of the ownership by the government of railways there, will surely not fail to subscribe to the proposition advocated by my hon. friend the member for East York (Mr. Maclean) that any such plan as he advocated to-day, under the name of nationalization of railways, must be preceded by the freeing of government railways from that political influence and interference, as he properly terms it, which by the consent of everybody has always been so detrimental.

My hon. friend took occasion to refer to the great danger which threatens us, the existence of which he ably showed by the quotations he made, namely, the danger of the absorption of our railways by foreign capitalists, few in number, who would use those railways, built up largely by us, for the benefit of their own country and for their own selfish ends. That danger is well known. We all know that we are threatened with it, and we had the right to expect some expression of opinion from the government benches upon so momentous a question. Have they not thought it over ? Are they not able, even if they cannot give us a remedy for that dreadful evil, to show us that they have thought it over, or that they intend to think it over ? Apparently they are not. If my hon. friend the leader of the opposition had not risen to express his own views, we would have had no expression at all from the government on this question. Why ? My hon. friend from East York has spoken to us of the project of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) to extend the Intercolonial Railway—which we all know he prolonged from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal at considerable sacrifice to the taxpayers of Canada. He has the project, my hon. friend informs me, of carrying that railway as far as the Pacific. We all know the great weight my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works—and I am pleased to recognize it—has in the councils of the government. We can well understand, if what we have heard in the province of Quebec is true, that the Minister of Railways, clever though he may be, after his experience in Paris last summer, when he went over——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was not in Paris last summer.

Mr. MONK. A strong delegation of the government went over to influence the Minister of Public Works ; but we all know how that hon. gentleman downed

them on that occasion. We can understand why they should now hesitate to express an opinion on any subject coming before them until they know what the Minister of Public Works thinks about it. The Minister of Railways and Canals tells us that there is no connection whatever, between the motion which appears upon the paper and the views discussed by my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean). He thinks that if we are going to nationalize the railways, it is useless to discuss the proposition, even as a primary proposition, that the government railways should be free—not from political control, he came down to that in closing his remarks, but from that political influence and interference which has always and admittedly been so detrimental to the management of railways. If we are to accept the astounding proposition of the Minister of Railways, that political influence and interference must always exist; there is no remedy. Surely, the hon. minister is a pessimist in that regard; surely, there is some hope that the people of Canada will see to it that, in time, and with patience, that evil is removed. But, No, says the minister, that political influence and interference must be associated with government control. As to that, we know that the railways in those countries in which they are under government control are free from that obnoxious influence and interference. We have only to open the books which treat of that subject to convince ourselves that there is no such thing under European control of railways as political influence and interference, with all the evils that those two words imply; and we have proof that in British dependencies, where railways are owned by the government, efforts have been made, and with success, to obviate this evil. Let me quote a word from Larrabee, a well-known authority on railway questions. On page 65, speaking of the railways in Victoria, he says:

> All lines are under control of a board so constituted as to be entirely removed from political influence. Several roads were originally owned by private companies, but all of them were acquired by the colonial government, the last one in 1878.

Hole, on the nationalization of railways, page 226, says:

> New South Wales has adopted the system of putting its railways under the control of three experienced railway commissioners, of which Mr. Eddy, an expert from England, was the head. The political element in New South Wales proved itself quite as objectionable as in Victoria.

Here, Sir, are two countries similarly situated to our own, where, more hopeful than the Minister of Railways and Canals, they did not start with the idea that political influence and interference in the management of railways, is the inevitable consequence of government ownership, and where they have succeeded. Therefore, I ask, is it not possible to adopt the principle at least, that political interference and influence is totally distinct from government control? That is what my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) is advocating—government control of railways. Even if political interference under government management cannot be done away with at once, at least we should work in that direction; and that is the opinion of the country. Now, I said that, though quite in favour of the proposition of my hon. friend from East York, I did not entirely agree with him as to the means of carrying it out. Of course, if, as the government says, no danger threatens us, if it be true, as the Minister of Railways and Canals tells us, that this is merely an academic question, we are losing our time. But that is not the opinion of the country. Have we no remedy other than the acquisition of these two vast lines? For my part, I am not prepared to suggest another remedy; but I think that the remedy proposed by my hon. friend, and so skilfully defended by him, is fraught with great danger at the present moment. The danger is one to our finances, and I think that the existence of that political influence and interference, which I, for my part, condemn, constitutes another danger, should we carry out the project of acquiring these railways. We are not in the same position as the Congress of the United States. Their powers of legislation, in a case analogous to this one—I imagine, without having gone fully into the question—would be extremely limited by the constitution. Our parliament on the other hand, is supreme. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has referred to the acquisition of Suez canal shares, one of the masterly strokes of Mr. Disraeli's policy. But, in carrying out that policy, the great English statesman was acquiring a property entirely beyond the control of the parliament of Great Britain. I am exposing merely a primary view of the subject before us, but would point out that we are dealing with two immense enterprises that we have built up, I might almost say with our own money, and which we maintain. We have built these railways for what purpose? We have built them in order to develop this immense inheritance with which Providence has blessed us. But now, if I am to accept all that has been stated by my hon. friend, who has so carefully studied the subject, we are in the presence of the danger involved in the possible acquisition of these two great roads by foreigners, by a syndicate composed of a few men who have no interest in Canada, and who desire to make these railways, which, I think, we can fairly consider the railways of the people of Canada, useful in carrying out their own private aims, and to benefit a country which is not our country. Under these circumstances, I ask myself if there is no remedy in legislation? I ask if parliament, being supreme, and having in view what has been done by the people of

Canada towards the construction of these lines, and being face to face with a danger which is recognized by all, except, perhaps, by the Minister of Railways and Canals, but realized, I think, by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works—being face to face, I say, with an imminent danger, is it possible that parliament, whose powers are so great, can provide no remedy ? I would be inclined to say that before this imminent evil falls upon us, before the evil of foreign ownership or foreign control of these lines is actually realized, there must be some remedy in legislation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is there not foreign ownership already ? Is not a large portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway stock owned by Germans ?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend seems to be just wakening up to the danger which threatens us. Everybody knows that the capital which built the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Grand Trunk Railway too, so far as I know, was largely furnished by people who live in Europe. But surely there is a difference between that and the ever increasing action, the devouring action, if I may use that expression, of these five, or six, or eight men whom the member for East York (Mr. Maclean) named here the other day, and who are known by all men who take any interest in that subject. We are face to face, I say, with the danger of a few wealthy Americans obtaining control of the great railway lines ; and that is a very different thing from a certain amount of European capital being invested in our railways with no other object than of earning a dividend on that capital. I am not going to take up the time of the House by indicating particularly any legislative remedy. In the first place, I do not know of any ; but I do submit to this House that this parliament is all-powerful. We are in the presence of a great danger, and surely we have the power in this parliament, without being obliged to buy over again these lines which we have built largely with our own money, to discover some legislative remedy which will enable us to ward off that impending danger, and to keep these great railway lines in our own control, for the purpose of developing our own country, instead of allowing them to be used for the development of the neighbouring republic.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). It is to be regretted that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has brought forward so big a subject, one of such vital concern to the people of Canada at large, on so small a motion. I agree with almost every word that has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) ; but I must say at once that I cannot vote for this motion as it stands, though I fully concur on the main principle that there might be government control without political interference. I cannot agree with the proposition of the Minister of Railways and Canals, that government control of railways and political interference with government control of railways are one and the same thing. They are two things in most civilized countries, and I hope the time is not distant when they will be two things in Canada. But the concrete proposition contained in this motion is not a practicable one at present. The reason is trivial, but it is true all the same. We know that one party who was in power for a great many years never attempted to cure that evil, and used the political advantages of government control of railways to their fullest extent. It is quite natural, therefore, that the other party now being in power would likewise be unwilling to take steps to cure that evil while they have a chance to take their revenge. But when an equilibrium has been established in the administration of the Intercolonial Railway, when the blue blood and the red blood have been mixed up in equal proportions, I think the proposition of the hon. member for East York will likely receive more favourable consideration from the members on this side of the House.

But, to my mind, that is a very small question compared with the greater one which has been so well dealt with by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. I am in total disagreement with the Minister of Railways and Canals when he calls this an academic question. I think it is the most practical and vital question that is before the people of Canada to-day, or is likely to come up for the next few years. It is no argument against the proposition of the hon. member for East York to say that the capital of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or of any other big railway in Canada, is in the hands of foreign shareholders. For my part, and I think I express the opinion of most Canadians. I have no objection to foreign capital coming into this country to build railways, or to establish any other great enterprises, provided such capital, the moment it is invested on Canadian soil and receives the protection of the Canadian government, becomes Canadian capital for the benefit of the Canadian people. I have no objection to as many foreigners as you like being shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway so long as that railway is controlled by the parliament of Canada ; but I have a great objection to Americans coming in here and obtaining the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway and making it a mere branch of an American railway system.

Now, as to what legislation we should adopt, I do not propose to indicate any at this time ; I did not rise to say to the Minister of Railways and Canals that he should do this or that he should do that. I have sufficient confidence in the business ability

of that hon. gentleman, as well as in the clear-sightedness of his colleagues, to believe that when they give their earnest attention to this question they will be able to discover a remedy ; I have no doubt that they will look upon it from a Canadian point of view. Sir, I have been for some months past branded as a disloyal citizen ; but as a Canadian, considering this question one of the greatest national problems which has ever been brought before this parliament, I say now to ministers of the Crown and members of parliament, that if they do not give it their serious consideration they will be committing a national crime. The moment the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway become a branch of an American railway system, controlled by an American syndicate whose primary interest will still be in the American republic, that moment will Canada be in danger. Even though this American syndicate had for its whole object a profit on their capital invested in Canadian railways. If they find out that they can increase their revenue and increase their dividends by wiping out the political line which exists at present between the United States and Canada, they will find means to do so. They will find capital enough not only to buy out our railways, but they will find sufficient capital to buy newspapers in Canada ; and, without insulting the members of this House, I may say they will probably find means to incline to their wishes and their schemes some of the representatives of the people of Canada whom they will be able to secure. We have seen other legislatures influenced by capitalists, we have seen other statesmen who have been influenced by foreign money.

Mr. BRITTON. Speak for yourself.

Mr. BOURASSA. The hon. gentleman is a little too sensitive ; I meant no personal allusion to him. I have enough respect for the hon. gentleman to tell him that he is wrong in considering my remark as personal. But I wish to say, Sir, that while this parliament is composed of good men, they are no better than the average statesmen of any other country ; and we know that in a legislature it sometimes takes but very few voices to change the balance of power. When strong attention is not given by the representatives of the people to questions of this kind, when they rely simply upon the leaders of their party to frame their policy and then go on blindly and vote as the whip of their party will tell them to vote; it might take no very big amount of money and very few men to put this country into the most dangerous position that it could be put into. Therefore, Sir, whilst I am certainly not going to vote for the proposition of the hon. member of East York (Mr. Maclean) because I think in its concrete form it is not opportune, I say that we have a duty to perform here ; and it is to give warning not only to the members of this government but to all the members of this House, whether Conservative or Liberal, whether friends or opponents of the Canadian Pacific Railway because, after all, these are small questions compared with the real issue. It is our duty as representatives of the Canadian people to look at this big question from the real national point of view, not to have any prejudice about it, not to make up our minds hastily that it will be solved either by government ownership of railways or by some other means but to realize that the question is so important that we should give our personal attention to it. We should think of the future of our country, and of the great sacrifices that have been made in the building of our railways. We would not be equal to our position, we would not fulfil our duties to the people if we did not give to this question the attention which it deserves and I know, or I hope I know, that the government of Canada will give proper attention to it, and that, on some future occasion, we will be able to hear from them an expression of opinion which will resolve itself into a practical result when the danger will really come upon us.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). Mr. Speaker the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) thinks that we should wait. He says that there is a great danger, that the danger is threatening but that we should wait until that danger has really come upon us and then he is confident that the government will do the right thing.

Mr. BOURASSA. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) will allow me : I do not say that we should wait. On the contrary, I say that we should prepare at once and be ready to meet the danger with a practical remedy when it comes.

Mr. WALLACE. I understood the hon. gentleman's last sentence was that we should wait until the danger comes. He also says that one of his objections to the motion made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) is that when the Conservative party were in power for many years they had the control of affairs, that they had the patronage and that we should wait until the Liberal party have been in power for a number of years more so that they may even up. I think it will be conceded by every one who has watched affairs that they have done remarkably well in that direction during the past five years and have evened up, that they have dismissed officials and appointed others with remarkable facility. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) has the same grievance. He acknowledges that a great evil is threatening this country, that dangers are around us. He says the wealth of the country is being converted into the hands of individuals and corporations and that we should be on the alert, that we should be prepared

to defend the interests of the people, yet, he says the same thing as the hon. member for Labelle. He says that some red hot Tory may obtain a position and therefore he will oppose the motion. That is his only argument against it. I suppose he thinks there are a great many red hot Grits hungry still that have not been given an opportunity of feeding at the government trough who will have to be satisfied before the interests of the country can be looked after.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) told us this afternoon that the motion of my hon. friend for East York means that the government must not own railways nor control them. I do not think it could be fairly given that interpretation. The government must always control the larger politics of the country and the policy of the government might be very much different from the policy that would be promulgated by a commission. A commission might be endeavouring to make the road a financial success, on the same lines as the railways that are owned by private corporations are doing. Their managers are attempting to build up business and to get the highest prices possible from the business point of view, to make their road a paying one and a popular one. That would be their object, but the effort of the government in controlling the railways would be higher than that. It might be said that a railway was required through a particular portion of the country. It might not be a financial success at all. The portion of the system going through that country might be a losing road so far as the financial side of it was concerned. It might not pay its way for many years to come but it might be valuable in developing and opening up the country, and therefore the government with political foresight and having regard to the higher politics of the country would control such a road. Now, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says that the Australian colonies and New Zealand started out to build railways. Our condition and our circumstances are very widely different because the great railways, the great arteries through the country, are already built. We have them here to-day, we have 16,700 miles of railway in operation in the Dominion of Canada. We have people thickly settled, there is a network of railways, there is every railway accommodation and facility that can fairly be demanded by the people. All we have to do now is not to plan how to build railways but to provide amongst other things against the great evil of unnecessarily duplicating lines of railway. There can be no more wasteful expenditure of public money than the building of parallel lines of railway. Last session there was up in the House the question of running a line of railway parallel to the Michigan Central Railway up in the counties of Essex and Kent and the government took power, then, if I remember correctly, to investigate the matter and give the subsidy if, in their judgment, after full investigation, they should so decide and we heard the other day, I think, from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that the subsidy had been given to a line running side by side with another railway. Now, I object to that use of the money of the people of Canada. The Rainy River Railway case is practically another example. They say that the commercial necessities of the country require that we shall have two lines of railway out of Manitoba and the North-west Territories to carry the freight. If that be the case let the second line be a commercial undertaking because the justification for the second line is that the business has so largely increased as to make its construction necessary. If that be the case, then that railway should be built, not by the enormous subsidies given by the Dominion and by the provinces of Ontario and Manitoba—which we are told would in themselves be nearly sufficient to construct the road—but it should be built as a strictly commercial undertaking. If we had government control of these roads the evils which are pointed out would not exist and the money of the Canadian people would not be diverted from useful enterprises to the wasteful extravagance of duplicating lines of railways. We all remember that a few years ago they had almost a revolution in Manitoba because the Dominion government had refused permission for this railway to enter that province. The pressure brought to bear upon the government of Canada was so great at that time, that the government was compelled to back down from the position they assumed and were forced to allow the Northern Pacific to enter Manitoba. The people of the province were promised that there would be competition and that competition would cheapen rates and prove of an inestimable value to the province. But what occurred ? Why, Sir, we have the fact admitted to-day that the scheme was an absolute failure and that no competition and no cheapening of rates resulted. This railway company took the money of the people of Manitoba and they turned around and made an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the same rates were charged as before. In the province of Ontario there is no competition between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway which tends to cheapen rates. Go to one of these railway companies and they will tell you that they cannot reduce passenger rates or freight rates because they have made an arrangement with the other company, and the stipulated rates must be lived up to by both. They will tell you that they cannot run an excursion even to a competing point without consulting the other railway company and insisting upon the terms mutually agreed upon. These are great evils which exist to-day, and we are threatened with the further great evil that

our Canadian railways may at any moment be handed over to individuals foreign and hostile to the interests of Canada ; to individuals who would make the Canadian lines subservient to the lines of the United States, a condition of things which would work ruin to our people. Do we not see to-day that the Grand Trunk Railway has not its summer terminus at Montreal or Quebec, nor its winter terminus at Halifax or St. John ? Do they not announce that their summer and winter services will be at Portland ? I say, Sir, that we should use the powers that the parliament of Canada undoubtedly possesses to look after the interests of our Canadian people, to see that the ports of Quebec and Montreal, of Halifax and St. John, and this new port of Sydney shall get the Canadian business so that the harbours we have built up at vast cost shall not be deserted. We all know that to the point to which the freight is carried, there will the shipping go to take it across the ocean. It is absurd to say that although the Grand Trunk Railway carries its freight to Portland, and the Canadian Pacific Railway may carry its freight to Boston, there will still be a great trade for the port of Montreal. Sir, if our Canadian railways carry the produce of Canada and the United States freight in transit through Canada, to American shipping points, then there will be no trade for our Canadian ports. It is the duty of this parliament to look after the interests of the Canadian people. The railways will not do it. It is true we have had an incompetence in the government ; we have had the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) splurging around doing great things for the port of Montreal in his mind, but actually accomplishing little or nothing for five years. We have had him making great pretensions of what he was going to do at Port Colborne to make it a transhipping point, but we would like to know what he has actually done. He cannot tell us, because he has accomplished but very little. However that may be, it is not the point. The point is that the Canadian people are capable of self government. We surely have the material to properly administer our affairs and to control our business. I have faith in the people of Canada that they will do so, and whether it is done by a commission, or whether it is done by a minister, or whether it is done by a combination of both a minister and a commission, it should be done by ourselves. The Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) told us that in New South Wales they had a commission (independent, I presume, of the minister) but they were not satisfied with it, and so they adopted the new plan of having three commissioners, one the Minister of Railways and the other two railway men of experience, and although the minister did not attend to the details yet if a difference arose he had the veto power. The minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) points to that as a conspicuous instance of the failure of a commission, but if it is the better way to give the minister for the time being a veto power, then let us adopt that system which has to commend it the experience of other colonies. Surely there are means which will remove the control of our railways from the political arena so far as the details are concerned, and still leave the supreme power over them to the parliament of Canada and to the government of Canada which represents parliament. Sir, public opinion is rapidly forming on this question, and as has been said by the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd), thousands of people outside of parliament are eagerly watching the event transpiring to-day, and are coming rapidly to the conclusion that it is the duty of the government to promulgate a policy in this regard. The government of this country is bound to have a policy on all great questions of public interest, and to express it to the people of Canada. Sir, the people of Canada are eagerly watching for the announcement of the policy of the government in this respect. But, Sir, as far as we learn, the government have very little opinion upon it ; and the only one who spoke, the Minister of Railways, has thrown cold water on the proposition for any further government ownership or control of railways. In that, Sir, I venture to say that he and the government for whom he is speaking, do not represent the views of the people of Canada.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). Mr. Speaker, as this question presents itself to my mind, there are three issues before us. One is the political control by the government of the Intercolonial Railway, a government railway; another is the non-political control of the Intercolonial Railway by a commission; and the other is the state ownership of all railways. Taking for granted that the motion of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean)—not his speech—refers to the non-political control of the Intercolonial Railway, I shall have pleasure in supporting it. My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) spoke for the motion and is going to vote against it. My hon. friend from East York made the motion and spoke against it. We hear a great deal of discussion about the danger that exists of foreign control of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. To-day, Sir, the stock of both of these railways is controlled by foreigners. The trade of Portland, Boston, and a large portion of the trade of New York is being built up by these railways. For years the freight charges on these railways have been as they are to-day as low to Boston and Portland, as to Montreal, and in some cases lower. This has been going on for many a day, and I presume that it will

continue for a considerable period longer. The danger is not coming on; it has been in existence for many a long year, and I am glad that the people are at last waking up to the need of building up Canadian seaport towns and cities, and putting a stop, so far as they can, to the building up of American cities by Canadian railways. The control of the Australian railways by commissions is reported to work very satisfactorily. The railways there are practically all government railways; but there is this peculiarity about them. They run to large cities, and do not intersect the country with branch lines to the same extent as is the case in Canada. In South Africa the railways are all owned by the government, but their control is non-political, and they are, I believe, working remarkably well. The only objection I have heard urged against the non-political control of government roads was that the commissioners do not keep pace with the times in regard to freight rates. That would be corrected, however, by the competition of other roads in this country. In New Zealand and the Australian colonies there is no competition; but in Canada there would be, and the commissioners would be kept up to the mark. I have pleasure in supporting the motion of the hon. member for East York on the understanding that it means the non-political control of the Intercolonial Railway, and not, as his speech indicated, the government ownership of railways.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee.

Charges of management $17,443 80

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). It will be noticed that there are several small increases in the contingent accounts of the different offices throughout the country. The largest item of increase is $5,000 on account of the printing of Dominion notes. That arises from the general expansion of business throughout the country. There is an increase of $650 in the item of expenses in connection with the issue and redemption of Dominion notes. That is made up of small increases of $30, which are contemplated to the young ladies engaged in that branch.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman say why he has increased these salaries?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not mention any particular salaries, but I said there were several votes taken in contemplation of increases. I can give the hon. gentleman the items. The increase of $150 in Winnipeg is explained by the fact that a young lad who has been doing minor clerical work is put on the permanent list at the not very extravagant salary of $350 per annum. At Charlottetown it is contemplated to take authority to give two increases of $100 each. I think these are the only salary increases which are provided for here.

Mr. MACLEAN. I thought the hon. gentleman spoke of general increases to a number of young ladies ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I say there are $30 increases to a number of young ladies engaged in the work of signing notes. These are persons who are poorly paid and they are given their $30 increase.

Mr. MACLEAN. Would the hon. gentleman tell us now whether he is prepared to recognize the claims of the letter carriers of this country in the same way ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When we come to the Post Office Department, that question will be settled.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman has raised the principle of a poorly paid portion of the public service getting an increase, and we are thus within our rights in asking whether he will apply that principle to the poorly paid letter carriers. I would be quite willing to vote for this increase if the hon. gentleman will tell me that when he comes to the Post Office Department he will recognize the claims of the letter carriers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend will show me any letter carrier who receives less money, I will be almost disposed to agree with him.

Mr. MACLEAN. The letter carriers have families to support, and these ladies have no one probably to keep but themselves ; and if one section of the service is to be recognized, the hon. minister ought to be able to tell us whether he proposes to recognize another poorly paid section.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have to hand my hon. friend over to the tender mercies of the Postmaster General in respect of the letter carriers, and I do not think he will be found ungenerous. The increases I ask for are very small and are given to the fair sex, and I appeal to my hon. friend's gallantry to allow them to pass.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am not objecting, but would like to see the men getting a fair proportion as well.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are the salaries of these employees ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. After these increases are given, the highest salary paid will only be $530, and the salaries of these ladies range down to $430 or thereabouts.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. That is a pretty good salary compared with that given the letter carriers.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask some information as to the details of the item for commissions on the payment of interest on public debt. What bank receives the commission?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Bank of Montreal and the agent of the government in London.

Mr. CLARKE. What commission does it receive ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The arrangement is an old one, made some years ago, and has not been altered. It is quite a small commission, but I could not give the exact fraction from memory.

Mr. BRITTON. The hon. gentleman will find the details on page G-12 of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. MONK. I see there is an increase of $5,000 over the sum of $55,000 paid last year for printing Dominion notes. Has the increase of printing been so great as to justify this large increase ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no increase in the rates, which are established by contract, but in the amount of business done on account of these growing times.

Mr. MONK. What is the amount of notes printed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The increase in the circulation is in proportion to the general increase in the volume of business. As the trade of the country expands, you have to provide more notes. Instead of providing too many, we are receiving criticism for not issuing new notes fast enough. The complaint is that many of the notes have been years in circulation, and are not as clean as they should be.

Mr. CLARKE. Are the plates on which these notes are printed still being engraved in the United States?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The system which has obtained for several years continues. All the work of engraving is done in Canada, but the dies on which the plates are made, are, under the terms of the agreement, permitted to be made in the United States.

Mr. MONK. I would like the hon. Minister of Finance to tell us what proportion of notes this increase of $5,000 represents. It is an increase of one-tenth.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is our own estimate of the probable requirements of the year beginning the first of July next, and necessarily it is only an estimate. It is impossible to do more in a general way than indicate the sum of money to be required. We have not figured out the precise number of each kind of notes, but inasmuch as the trade of the country is increasing from year to year, we ask some small increase in the appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. HENDERSON. I judge from the remarks of the hon. minister that this increase is intended to meet the requirements of the growing times. I presume he will also say that the same evidence will go to demonstrate the fact that a growing time heretofore did not exist because there was no increase of Dominion notes required. I am not sure that we have any greater reason for believing that there will be an increased demand for those smaller notes in the years to come than there was in the past, though I think it very well to make provision for the calling in of those notes which are soiled and torn, and the replacing of them by a new issue. I am quite sure that the country will hail with delight the promise that a great many of those small notes which have been handled so much are taken out of circulation, and some cleaner ones substituted in their place.

Mr. CLARKE. The last item on page 10 includes printing, advertising, and so on. Is it intended that this printing shall be done in the Government Printing Bureau here, or will it be given out ? I wish to enter an emphatic protest against the practice, which seems to be carried out to a greater extent than heretofore, of sending the government reports and other matter to be printed in various printing offices throughout the country. With all respect, I contend that the aim of the government should be to make the plant here as complete and perfect as possible. The work of printing can be done with a government plant more cheaply and expeditiously than if it is farmed out. Is any of the work covered by this item to be done outside of the Government Printing Bureau ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. None of the printing in my department has been sent out.

Mr. CLARKE. I congratulate the minister on that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The general question is worth discussing, and it can be taken up at another time. The printing of my department has all been done at the Bureau.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What was the expenditure under this head last year? In the report of the Auditor General, I see that the estimate was $12,000, but the expenditure was $21,000, an excess of nearly 100 per cent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Under the items in the Auditor General's Report, a number of the expenditures seem to be

grouped. I cannot give the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) the information he asks for, but will try to procure it. I would be willing to reserve the item, or, without that, to give the information at a later period.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not wish to have it reserved.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. minister explain the very rapid increase in the vote for printing Dominion notes ? The estimate for 1899-1900 was $40,000, and it is now increased to $60,000. There may be a good reason for it, but the increase is a large one.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is right in his figures. If he will turn to the statements I have made in the budget speeches, he will see that there has been a great increase in the circulation of Dominion notes. I have not a statement of the increase for the current year, but it is very considerable. There is no other explanation, for there has been no increase in the rate.

Mr. CLANCY. Does any of this increase arise through the issue of new denominations, to which we have seen some references in the public press ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE No ; there has been no change in that respect ; we are not issuing new denominations.

Mr. MONK. Can the hon. minister tell us what portion of this item is for printing, and what for advertising, and so on ? It would shorten the work of the committee if the factors making up such an item as this were given.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I find that the Auditor General has grouped some of these items, and I cannot at the moment answer the question, which was the same as was asked by my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), but, if it is desired, I shall be glad to procure the information later on.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not wish to delay the committee, but it seems to me that it is stretching this item somewhat to include in it this amount of $9,000 odd.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was a special transaction, due to handling a large amount of gold, which was exceptional, and was due to the stringency of the money market.

Civil Government—Governor General's Secretary's Office, including W. H. Walker at $1,700, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act $10,410

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In that item there is one increase from $1,550 to $1,700, one statutory of $50, and $60 for a messenger ; and there is one new junior second-class clerk at $700 ; making a total increase of $960.

Mr. MONK. What need has arisen for the new clerk ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Instead of having a man as a temporary whose pay is chargeable against the contingent account, one clerk has been given the rank of a junior second-class clerk, and so comes upon the permanent staff.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the contingent account reduced ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it is somewhat reduced.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On what account ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is decreased on that item, but increased on another one.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister does not seem to have seen his way clear to so amend the law as to make it unnecessary to have this provision so often in the estimates—' notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' I have brought that to the attention of the hon. gentleman on more than one occasion, and have reasons that seem to me to make it undesirable that items should appear in that form, and have suggested that it would be better to amend the law. I presume the hon. gentleman has not seen his way clear to take that course.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The difficulty of course is that the law deals with matters generally, and these items are necessarily of an exceptional character. It might be difficult to frame a law which would cover all these cases. The theory is that the general outline of the Civil Service Act may be considered right, but in exceptional circumstances, when it is desired to give a larger increase than is authorized by the Act, these words have to be inserted. It may be said they occur often, but in proportion to the total number of officials in the service it will be found that they occur very seldom.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the reason for the inclusion of the words in this particular item ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because the gentleman named in the Governor General's office would receive a larger salary and a larger increase than he would be permitted to receive by the ordinary operation of the Civil Service Act. He would only be entitled to get, by the ordinary method of statutory increase, $50. The proposal is to give him $150. The gentleman's name is Walker.

Mr. CLARKE. Has he received the usual statutory increase during the past two or three years ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, this is a special increase.

Mr. CLARKE. Notwithstanding the fact that he received the usual increases during the past two or three years ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. What particular service does he render to entitle him to a special increase of $150 while the other clerks are practically not getting any at all ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In all the departments there will be found some officials who are deemed specially worthy of an increase, and the officials who are connected with the Governor General's department have reported this gentleman as especially worthy, and we have accepted the responsibility of recommending the increase.

Mr. WALLACE. How long has he been in the service ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He has been there for quite a long time. He is an old official.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance where he expects this thing to end, of refusing those in the civil service their promotion, or rather the statutory increase to which they seem to be entitled. I am not going to argue the question upon the ground that has been discussed here on many occasions, whether they were legally entitled to it or not. The government have contended from time to time that they were not, while others have taken the opposite ground. But, I want to point out that we are constantly met with difficulties from that system being carried out. There is gross favouritism appearing upon the surface; I will not say that it is so in reality, but, I say the hon. gentlemen expose themselves to fair criticism when they do that kind of thing. Instead of laying down one rule which should be carried out in every instance, we find this exceptional treatment from year to year growing worse. We have estimates filled with that saving clause 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary.' I will venture to say in looking over the estimates that it will be found to occur oftener than last year, for the simple reason that hon. gentlemen have taken it into their own hands to set aside the law. The right hon. gentleman seems to be amused at it. It is not a matter of amusement. If he were in the position of these gentlemen who have to live at the beck and nod of their superiors, with their merits no longer an element entitling them to receive what the law allows, he would not be amused. I say it is not fair, it is dealing unfairly with the civil service and putting them in an unfair position. The end can only come when we have adopted a system that the civil service of this country should be entirely independent of any government. We are now entering upon a discussion of the estimates, and we are met with these unsavoury items, I say unsavoury, because they lead to such evils that they will never be rectified until the government go back to the old system.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. gentleman will find, as respects the general question of statutory increases, that we rather liberally interpret that declaration this year, and he will not have so much reason to complain as he supposes.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We were asking, in respect to item No. 2, as to what the special qualifications were which necessitated an increase to Mr. Walker.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). It is rather a difficult question to answer, other than that the officials to whom we look for advice in connection with the office reported him as specially worthy. I do not know that I could give my hon. friend any other than a general answer.

Mr. CLARKE. If my memory serves me, when the vote for the Secretary's office in connection with His Excellency the Governor General was up last session, this question of statutory increase occupied a good deal of the time of the committee. May I ask if the minister depends entirely on the recommendations made by the head official in that office as to whether increases shall be given or withheld ? What is the rule that has been adopted ? We find that in this and some other offices some officials are given statutory increases regularly, while in other cases such increases are withheld. Is merit the final and sole guide in giving or withholding these statutory increases ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I need not say that every office is under the control of ministers, and ministers are responsible for them, but there are some offices which come more directly under the personal observation of the minister, and he is able to rely on that. In respect to others, this is not the case, and he has to rely upon information given him. The Governor General's office is one of that kind. We are all responsible for it, and we join in the recommendation, but the officers do not come so closely in touch with us as some others do.

Mr. CLARKE. By whom are the recommendations made ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The recommendations are made by the officer in charge, and, of course, we accept them, and endorse them as we do by bringing them before the House.

Department of the Secretary of State, including A. Drouin at $1,500, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act $37,730

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The only thing which requires explanation is in regard to the salary of Mr. Drouin, and the explanation given that his salary is increased $100 this year is, that he has received no increase for several years. He is a very competent officer, and does all the engrossing for the Department of the Secretary of State. The minister recommends it.

Mr. CLARKE. This is one of those cases where the head of the department did not recognize the efficiency of the official. I understand the Prime Minister to say that this is a very efficient officer, and notwithstanding that fact he has been deprived of his statutory increase for two or three years. How is that ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) asks how it is that he has not received his statutory increase. It is more than I can say at the present time, because I did not confer with the hon. the Secretary of State upon this subject. I only answer for the increase this year. This year he is given, not $50, but $100.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How did he vote in November ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, if he voted according to his former proclivities, perhaps he voted wrong, but perhaps he has had more light.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the explanation of the decrease ?

Mr. CLARKE. It is inexplicable.

The PRIME MINISTER. One messenger less.

Department of Interior, including A. P. Collier at $1,100, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act $109,764

Mr. HENDERSON. This is a very large increase ; I think we should have some explanation of this item.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The increase in this vote amounts to $7,040. The increase is made up as follows : Statutory increases for thirty-nine clerks, at $50, $1,950 ; $25 for one clerk, which comes in because the period of proportion came in the middle of the year ; four statutory increments to messengers, at $30 apiece, making $120. In the amount stated there is an increase of the salary of the deputy minister of $800. This is a matter which the government does not ask to have finally passed upon by the committee at the present sitting. Then, there is an additional second-class clerk, Mr. A. P. Collier, at $1,100, and eight additional junior second-class clerks, at $600 each, making $4,800. The four statutory increases given to mesengers on July 1, 1900, was not provided for last year, the amendment of the Civil Service Act not having passed until after the estimates were framed, but as there was money available, they got the benefit of the Act, and there were three increases of $30 each and one of $10. The total increase is $8,825. There is a decrease against that, of the difference between the salary of $700 of J. Curley, retired, and Mr. B. Scott, appointed junior second-class clerk, at $600 ; the salary of one second-class clerk, whose services were dispensed with, $750, and two messengers promoted to be junior second-class clerks and their places not filled, $980. An increase of $150 for the accountant was placed in the estimates last year, but he was not entitled to it until January 1 of this year. The net increase is $7,040.

Mr. CLANCY. This item stands.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Only as respects one portion of it. The increase in the salary of the deputy will be reserved for further consideration.

Mr. WILSON. Would it not be as well to let the whole item stand ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We propose to reduce the item for the present, so as not to raise the question of the increase in the salary of the deputy minister. If that proposal is made it will be a matter for subsequent consideration.

Mr. HENDERSON. In the event of the government deciding that the salary of the Deputy Minister of the Interior shall be increased, will the government carry out that policy in regard to the other deputy ministers ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think the hon. gentleman understands what the Minister of Finance said. The minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) said that he would ask the committee to pass the item less $800, leaving the salary of the deputy at $3,200. If the government should ask the House to increase the salary it will have to be done by another resolution.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand what the Minister of Finance said, but the Minister of the Interior does not understand the question I asked. In the event of the government increasing the salary to $4,000, will it be the policy of the government to increase the salaries of the other deputy ministers to $4,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we proposed to increase the salary to $4,000, that question would be pertinent, and if later on we propose to increase it, the question will come up, but just now it has no bearing.

Mr. HENDERSON. We have the right to know why the government contemplated

this change at all, and we should also know the policy of the government on this matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As respects these estimates the policy of the government is not to make any change in the salary of the deputy.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why does the minister ask for this increase of $4,880 ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is for eight additional junior second-class clerks at $600 each. Legislation was passed last year to provide for junior second-class clerks which would in many ways be the same as the old third-class clerks. The increase of the staff has become necessary owing to the immense increase in the clerical work of the Department of the Interior. If my hon. friend Mr. Borden has time to look at the departmental report he will see that the actual clerical work of the department is more than double what it was three years ago, although the staff has practically remained the same. I might have asked the House to authorize an increase in the writer class who are paid out of contingencies at $400 a year, but it is desired, in some cases at least, to get the services of men rather than of ladies and it is difficult to get male clerks at $400 a year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who is the registration clerk mentioned here ? In the Auditor General's Report there is no such designation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. K. J. Henry.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When was he appointed under that designation ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think he was called by that title in the estimates previously. He was registrar of the official correspondence when I came into the department and there has been no change.

Mr. TAYLOR. You will remember, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Macdonald, Huron), that when you and your friends sat in opposition previous to 1896, the continual cry of the opposition of that day was that there were too many civil servants and too many ministers. This year, however, the Department of the Interior proposes to increase the number of its employees by six, and the number in the Department of Indian Affairs by three. Previous to 1896 these two departments were in one, so the proposal now is to appoint nine extra clerks for that department. In almost every department of government it is the same thing this year. Yet only a few years since these gentlemen opposite proclaimed that the work could be done by half the officials. That goes to prove that every statement they made in opposition was incorrect. The work has not increased in these departments, but the government is constantly increasing the number of officials.

Department of Indian Affairs $51,070

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to have an explanation of the increase of $3,390 in this department.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The increases altogether amount to $3,390, and the explanation of them is as follows : Thirty statutory increases at $50 each, $1,500 ; three statutory increases of messengers at $30 each, $90 ; three junior second-class clerks at $600 each, $1,800. I may explain that the three junior second-class clerks are not additions to the staff of the department. They are promotions of persons in the lower class of writers, and the amount of their salaries as paid at present will be taken out of the vote for contingencies. These clerks now receive $515, $430, and $460 respectively. They have all been in the department for some time.

Mr. MONK. How much are the messengers getting now ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. $480, $510, and one packer at $560.

Mr. CLARKE. Are the clerks now being appointed required to pass any civil service examination ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Oh, yes.

Office of the Auditor General $30,437 50

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the explanation of the increase ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The increases are entirely statutory—twenty at $50, and one which will cover only three-quarters of a year at $37.50, making a total of $1,037.50.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the Auditor General now satisfied with the assistance in the way of clerks which the government affords him ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have heard no complaint of late. All the recommendations he has made in the matter have been confirmed.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board $49,927 50

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is one special increase to Mr. Fraser, who has been twenty-five years in the service, and has very important duties to perform as inspector of savings banks and Assistant Receiver Generals' office and who is a particularly capable officer. There are six statutory increases of $50, and two of messengers at $30. These would make an increase of $560 but there are two messengers less in the list of permanent officials, owing to the fact that two old mes-

sengers have passed out of our department, and we shall have to provide for two messengers in the contingencies to supply their places. These are the only changes in the department.

Department of Customs $41,040

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is proposed to advance one officer who is at the maximum of a first-class clerk to a chief clerkship, and to fill his place by promoting a gentleman who is at the maximum of the second class, and whose place will be filled. It is also proposed to take a vote in order that perhaps another officer may be advanced to that class, making one extra clerk in that branch. It is proposed to put into the junior second class three clerks whose salaries have hitherto been paid out of the contingencies.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the minister any objection to give the names of the clerks who get the increase ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They will not, of course, be granted until the first of the year ; but the promotion proposed of a first-class clerk to a chief clerkship is that of Mr. Farrow, the accountant of the department, who has been there for twenty years. His salary is now $1,800, the maximum of the first class, and it is proposed to make him a chief clerk without increasing his salary. It is proposed that Mr. Bliss, who is at the maximum of the second class, and is the chief of one of the branches, should fill the place of Mr. Farraw, if his promotion takes place.

Department of Inland Revenue $38,200

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any change in this department ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The amount asked for is the same as last year. There are increases for three officers in the first class. One is promoted from the second class to the first class. There are nine $100 increases in the second class. It is proposed to have seven first-class officers instead of six, ten second class instead of eleven, and three junior second-class clerks instead of two. The number of messengers remains the same, with increases of $60 each.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the explanation of the fact that the Commissioner of Inland Revenue receives $3,200, and the Commissioner of Customs $2,800 ? Perhaps the Minister of Finance can tell us.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Both of these gentlemen occupy dual positions and receive payments from two sources. Just why one receives more than the other, I cannot tell. I believe the salaries are the same as before. The Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, I think, receives $800 as Commissioner of Standards. The Commissioner of Customs receives payments in the same way. They do not correspond exactly with those of the Inland Revenue.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The salaries really are the same.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With a slight difference.

Department of Agriculture $59,072 50

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would like to change this resolution by reducing the amount by $1,000 in the class of third-class clerks.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are you bringing these in too much just for the purpose of striking them out ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it was a mistake.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the explanation of the increase that still remains ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are the statutory increases given to the clerks who are entitled to them.

Department of Marine and Fisheries, including J. F. Fraser at $1,900, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act $62,440

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What does the head of the topographical service, Mr. Stewart, get. He had about $1,600 or $1,700. Although I have not had any communication, directly or indirectly, with Mr. Stewart since I left the department, I think that his case has not been considered by the government as it ought to have been. I remember his character in the department and his extreme modesty, and doubt very much if he has ventured to press his case on the attention of the government, and I hope that in bringing his name to the attention of the government, I am at least doing him no injury. It is not encouraging to men of exceptional ability, who graduate in our universities and enter the public service, that their ability should not receive fit acknowledgment. When I was in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, we had a very able and costly officer, so far as our exchequer was concerned, in Commander Boulton, who did very good work indeed, in organizing the Hydrographic service on the lakes. He was borrowed from the Admiralty and we had to give him his imperial pay and what was called a colonial allowance, fixed by the Imperial navy, or something like $5,000 a year. in all. He got the assistance of Mr. Stewart, who came on the staff without any political influence, but solely on his merits, and who was a graduate of the Kingston Royal Military College, especially recommended for his ability. After a year or two of service under Commander Boulton, Commander Boulton was asked what were his qualifications for the work. He came in at a small salary of some $600 or $700, and his salary had risen

to $1,000 or $1,100. Notwithstanding the fact that Commander Boulton well knew what would be the result, he gave a very strong certificate in favour of Mr. Stewart. Being not only an able man, but an English officer and gentleman, Captain Boulton gave Mr. Stewart the highest possible recommendation, and said he was quite satisfied that any charts made under Mr. Stewart's supervision, after survey made by him, would be acceptable by the Admiralty as Admiralty charts. Mr. Stewart took Commander Boulton's place. It was my intention to advance Mr. Stewart as rapidly as possible, as such men are very rare in all the colonies. The Admiralty has had to lend men like Commander Boulton, at very high salaries, to other colonies, and I question whether in any of the colonies there is any superior to Mr. Stewart in charge of that high class of work, and I do not believe there is an officer performing similar duties in the Imperial service to-day, under the Admiralty or any colonial government, with such small pay.

I am not personally interested in Mr. Stewart, but simply know his work and press his case on the government, not only in Mr. Stewart's own interest, but in that of the government, as it is certainly in the public interest that when men of that kind can be obtained at home, they should be given every encouragement, and a certain amount of generosity in our dealings with them will in the end be a great saving to the public service "pour encourager les autres."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I agree with the hon. gentleman that capable scientific men are not too common, and that we should show our appreciation of their services. I have no personal knowledge of Mr. Stewart, but find that he is now receiving a salary, including the small increase in these estimates, of $1,950.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is better than I thought.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is evident therefore that my hon. colleague, the Minister of Marine, has endeavoured to recognize Mr. Stewart, but I will draw his attention to the matter.

Department of Railways and Canals, including S. L. Shannon at $2,200, Gerard G. Ruel at $2,000 and J. W. Pugsley at $1,600, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act	$41,350

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no material increase in the amount. But it has been provided in the case of two or three of the officers who were considered exceptionally entitled that an additional allowance be made to them. We allow the accountant, who is a most excellent officer, an addition of $150. The law clerk, who also is a very efficient and capable man, is given an increase of $200. We allow the clerk of the Railway Committee an addition of $100. Then we promote Mr. Ross from the second to the first class, but without increase in pay.

Civil Government—Department of Public Works	$47,020

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any explanation of the increase here ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The fact that no special increase is mentioned shows that the increase is due simply to statutory increases.

Civil Government—Geological Survey	$55,200

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The increases in this vote amount to $1,300. There are the usual statutory increases of $50 of twenty-one technical officers, and $100 for two technical officers, Messrs. Faribault and J. M. Macoun. There is also $50 for the chief clerk and accountant. The reason for the special increases to Messrs. Faribault and Macoun is this : Last year I asked the House to increase the salaries to some of the officers who were in the same rank as Messrs. Faribault and Macoun. These gentlemen were left out then because they were going to Paris and were getting a little special allowance in connection with that service, which was considered, for that year, equivalent to the increase of $100. I am asking the committee to authorize the same increase of $100 to these gentlemen this year.

Civil Government—Post Office Department, including Miss M. A. Slater at $600, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act	$216,250

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). This vote is increased by $8,045, made up, as follows :

Ninety-nine increases of $50 each	$4,950
Twenty-seven increases of $30 each	810
One increase	20
Nine increases of $50 each, paid in 1900-1901, over and above the number estimated for	450
One additional first-class clerkship	1,600
Proposed transfer of R. P. Taylor, Ottawa Post Office, not carried out and salary not re-estimated	420
One additional packer, which through error in last year's estimates, money was not provided	300
Junior second-class clerk, Miss Slater	600
Provisional allowance, short estimate	5
Difference of salary of J. D. Campbell as a junior second-class clerk ($600) and the amount ($140) specially voted for him last year	460
To provide for the salaries of six third-class clerks, to be transferred from outside service as junior second-class clerks	4,000
	$13,615

Decreases.

Difference between the salaries of six second-class clerkships which became vacant ($7,800) and the salaries of six junior second-class clerks promoted to those vacancies ($6,600)	$1,200

Difference between the salaries of thirteen junior second-class clerkships which became vacant ($11,560) and the salaries of the eleven temporary writers appointed to fill those vacancies ($6,600) and the two vacancies in second class ($2,000)..	2,960
Proposed transfer of two letter carriers, Birtch ($510) and Jeffrey ($500) from Ottawa, not carried out	1,010
Difference between Mr. Harrington ($1,800), promoted from first class to chief clerkship, and that of Mr. Binks ($1,400), promoted to fill vacancy	400
	$5,570
	$13,615
	5,570
Increase	$ 8,045

With special reference to Miss Slater whom it is proposed to appoint as a junior second—she has been in the service in some minor capacity for many years, and has attained an age which makes her ineligible for appointment without special provision of this kind.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Has the hon. minister given the statutory allowance to every clerk in the post office, or has he picked out some whom he considers especially worthy ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Provision is made in these estimates for all who are eligible.

Office of the High Commissioner for Canada, including C. J. Taylor at $1,500 and Thos. Allin at $950, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.....$10,500

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a statutory increase of $50 and two special increases of $100, as set forth in the estimates.

Civil Government—Contingencies, rent and insurance, &c.—High Commissioner in England $11,200

Mr. CLARKE. Is it the intention of the government to make any change in the clerks in the high commissioner's office ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not in a position to make any definite statement on the subject at present. In regard to the item for contingencies, &c., the increase is made up of small contingencies, one item, I recollect, being an increase in the income tax, which has been increased in England owing to certain events.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board $6,700

Mr. CLANCY. What is the reason of this increase of $800 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend will, perhaps, observe that in the item of Civil Government I explained that two messengers, who were formerly a charge against Civil Government, would now pass to contingencies. There was a reduction in the item of Civil Government for these two messengers, and they had to be provided for in the contingent item instead of in the direct vote. It makes no alteration in the number of officials.

Mr. CLANCY. Does it makes any alteration in the status of the civil servants ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These messengers who went out were men who had been in the service for a long time. One of them was promoted to a clerkship, and the other one has passed to the staff of the House of Commons.

Department of Customs—Clerical and other assistance, including $1,750 to be paid, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $5,625; printing and stationery, $2,000; sundries, $2,730; total $10,355

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The decrease of $1,825 in clerical and other assistance is explained by what I said before, that three extra clerks, who have been paid out of contingencies hitherto, have been granted a vote in the civil service vote. Then, we took last year a vote of $15,000, preparatory to the new plan of compiling statistics. We do not need to ask for that this year, as the staff is under way and in operation. There is a saving of $15,000. When we come to the outside vote you will find I have to ask for this $15,000, and for several thousand more.

Mr. MONK. Then, in reality, there is an increase of about $2,000. You ask for $10,000 this year, and $12,000 last year.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is $1,825 taken out of contingencies and put in the civil service vote.

The Department of Inland Revenue—	
Clerical and other assistance	$2,000
Printing and stationery	2,800
Sundries	2,200
	$7,000

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. What is this increase ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There is an increase of $700 for printing and stationery, and $50 for sundries.

Mr. MONK. How does the hon. minister justify the increase in the item of printing ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have not the explanation, but if it is considered important I will bring the information later on.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps the hon. minister will give us that information upon the reservation which has been made of the item of printing generally.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What we would like the hon. gentleman to explain to us is the occasion for that increase in the cost of printing. Why is it that an increase in the printing is necessary ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I will bring the information.

Item allowed to stand.

Post Office Department—	
Clerical and other assistance, including $50 to pay W. Cooch, a packer and sorter for the technical work of inspecting letter carriers' boots, and $120 to pay S. J. Carter, of the dead letter office at Winnipeg, a provisional allowance for excessive cost of living in Manitoba, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act....	$32,355
Printing and stationery	21,000
Sundries	4,000
Balancing and summarizing depositors' accounts at close of year ending June 30,1901	3,425
	$60,780

Mr. CLANCY. I think we had something relating to this same matter last year, in regard to this party, who, I believe, was removed from the city of Ottawa. Perhaps we will have some explanation of this item.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are only two increases in this vote, one an increase of $50 to a man named Cooch. Cooch is a packer, and being on that service could not, without special reference in the vote, be allowed any increase other than the normal one, but he performs some special work, the work of examining the boots. Mr. Sidney Smith, the head of the stores branch, has recommended him, and thinks him very well entitled to be paid for that service. It is a valuable service, and we would either have to pay him or engage some person especially for it.

Mr. CLARKE. Are the boots procured by tender ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, I really do not remember how they are obtained, now, They have been buying them in the same way for many a year.

Mr. CLARKE. No change ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I have made no change in the system ; we change the boots occasionally, that is all. The $150 is what I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has particularly alluded to. His memory is excellent. We did have a reference to this gentleman before. Mr. Carter has been transferred from Ottawa to Winnipeg, although he is still in the inside service technically. The dead letter branch belongs to the inside service, but when we decentralized it and opened up two or three offices, this gentleman was sent up to look after the Winnipeg office. We propose to give him this special grant on account of the extra cost of living in Winnipeg.

Mr. CLANCY. It is not a new thing to have it stated to the House that gentlemen are employed on the ground of being able to do some technical work. This is going pretty far. I am not objecting at all to the party in question, but it never ocurred to me that it required much technical skill to examine boots. What is the nature of the examination that is made and the extent of it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are 1,816 pairs of letter carriers' boots examined per annum, and the estimated time occupied is three weeks.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Is it to see that the union label is on the boots ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose the real object is to see that the boots are of good quality.

Mr. CLARKE. Well heeled.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman tell the committee what was the occupation of Mr. Cooch before ? Is he a practical boot maker ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was a shoemaker by trade.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to inquire if Mr. Cooch is the packer referred to in item No. 21 for the Post Office Department. I see one packer is paid $300 a year. If this $50 is additional to that $300 a year, I will gladly support it, for I do not think the hon. Minister of Labour, who happens to be the Postmaster General, would want a man to work for a year as a packer for less than $1 a day. I hope this $50 given for this technical work of inspecting the boots is to the packer who is put down for the small sum of $300 a year.

Mr. ROCHE. Mr. Chairman, I take exception to the wording of this paragraph, which reads :

To pay S. J. Carter of the dead letter office at Winnipeg a provisional allowance for excessive cost of living in Manitoba.

I do not think this is fair to that province. We wish immigrants to come into that province and we do not want to leave the impression that the cost of living there is excessive. In future editions of the estimates that term should be left out ; indeed, it might be struck out now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The point is well taken, and perhaps a better word can be substituted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The words formerly used were 'provisional living allowance.'

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will find out the words which are used in the other votes and adhere to them.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Postmaster General did not tell me who this Mr. Cooch is.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Cooch was in receipt of $500, the maximum salary of his class, but last year parlia-

ment was good enough to increase the maximum to $600, and Mr. Cooch being an excellent officer, came in for an increase of $30.

Mr. CLARKE. How long has he been in the service ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was appointed on the 5th of August, 1872.

Mr. MONK. What portion of that $21,000 is for printing, and what portion for stationery.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is a bulk sum, and it has not been customary to apportion it to each item, so that the officer cannot give me the information.

Mr. MONK. Is that printing done outside the government printing office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is all done in Ottawa.

Mr. MONK. Is it done at the Government Printing Bureau ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is all done by the King's Printer.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I see $300 mentioned here as the salary of a packer. That seems an absurd amount.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no man drawing that salary for this office which is vacant.

Mr. CLARKE. It is likely to remain vacant at that salary.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If there were an appointment to be made we could not pay more, but we found that salary on the statute-books when we took office.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If a vacancy can receive a salary of $300 that is a strong argument in favour of the letter carriers.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it not be well to draw the attention of the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Mulock) to this, so that he can send his officer to make inquiries.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will mention it to the Minister of Labour.

Department of Trade and Commerce—Contingencies $6,500

Mr. CLANCY. Is it the intention in this case as in others that the sum which appears here as a decrease shall appear as an increase in some other vote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a transfer from one service to another, but that does not alter the number of officials.

Mr. CLARKE. Nor the amount to be paid each.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If they are employed as temporary writers, and are now made junior second-class clerks, they would of course get increased salaries.

Administration of justice $101,055

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is it necessary that this vote should stand in the absence of the Solicitor General ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not ask that the vote should stand, but when the Solicitor General is here I would like very much on some occasion, possibly when going into supply, to mention a matter in connection with this vote, and I give this as notice to the Solicitor General so that he may be prepared to discuss it. There seems to be a misunderstanding at the bar in Vancouver in regard to the arrangement for the sittings there of judges of the Supreme Court. Some time ago the question was raised as to whether there was a condition in the order in council, or in the commission, or in both, requiring the judge who was appointed at that time to reside in Vancouver. As a matter of fact no judge does reside in that city, although there is an impression that there was an arrangement made at the request of the bar of Vancouver to bring that about. One judge comes over generally on Monday and leaves on Friday or Saturday. That does not mean that there is always a judge from Tuesday to Friday, because for various reasons the judge who generally attends is not always able to keep these appointments. I wish the Solicitor General would refresh his memory on that matter, so that it may be known whether the government is in the position to have the wishes of the bar of Vancouver met, in order that we might have a resident judge in Vancouver.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will see that the matter is mentioned to the Solicitor General, and no doubt at a later stage he will deal with it.

Mr. CLARKE. This vote includes the item of $9,000 for the enforcement of the Alien Labour law. Is there any objection to letting the item stand ? We ought to have some explanations of it from the Solicitor General.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Might I ask for an explanation of the increase of $400 in the salaries of three judges in Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the salaries of these judges are regulated by statute. When the Solicitor General is present, I am sure he will give my hon. friend the explanation.

Item allowed to stand.

Legislation—House of Commons contingencies, including $300 for clerical assistance for the leader of the opposition $25,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the government would do well to take into consideration that item of $300. It is a very small amount for a first-class man.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am quite agreeable, and perhaps when we bring down the supplementary estimates we may have something more.

Publishing debates $40,000

Mr. CLARKE. What does that include ?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is for the publication of the Debates. We expect that this session will be a short one, and next session also, and that is the reason why we are simply asking for the sum of $40,000.

Mr. CLARKE. The question of more expedition being used in issuing 'Hansard' after the House closes has been already before the Debates Committee. It seems to me that an unnecessary delay takes place now, and also that it might be possible to have 'Hansard' supplied to the members of the House at a much earlier hour on the day following the debate. I do not know whether the matter had best be discussed here or in the Debates Committee ; but I would like to ask the minister if any application was made by the Department of Printing for an additional press for the purpose of expediting the printing of 'Hansard.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes—not particularly for the printing of 'Hansard,' but for the several work of the department, there has been a suggestion that we should increase the plant. We did provide some increased plant a little while ago, but it is the kind of department that will always require a little more money.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask if the vote of last year for this service, $60,000, was all expended ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, I understand that the vote of last year was fully expended, owing to the session being so long.

Mr. HENDERSON. There is perhaps not so much complaint with regard to the publication of the bound volume as there is with regard to the issuing of the revised copy. I understand the press throughout the country does not receive 'Hansard' until revised and printed, and there is usually a delay of ten or twelve days before that is done. It seems to me that that time should be shortened at least one-half. There is no reason why the revised 'Hansard' should not be issued say between five days after the unrevised edition is published. This would be a very great convenience to people in the country. We get extra copies of the revised edition to send out, and in the case of important speeches on special subjects, the subject is almost too cold by the time the public receive the debates. I hope those in charge will use every effort possible to have the revised edition published at a much earlier date.

Mr. SPEAKER. The printing of debates is entirely under the control of the Debates Committee, and the subject is one which should be discussed before that committee. I understand that last year this question was brought up several times and that some new scheme was devised in order to secure greater expedition in the distribution of 'Hansard.' I do not know what has been the result, but the Speaker of this House has nothing to do with the printing of the debates, and the members of the Debates Committee are doing their best to render justice in that regard, and I have no doubt will do their best to give the House satisfaction.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am much obliged to Mr. Speaker for his explanation. I have never had the honour of being a member of the Debates Committee and thought this the proper place to draw public attention to the matter. Perhaps the committee will think it proper to take this into their consideration again.

Estimate of Sergeant-at-Arms.. ..... $39,540

Mr. SPEAKER. There is a decrease of $85. A new assistant messenger has been appointed who received $200 less than the former messenger, and on the other hand we are providing for an increase to two messengers at $30 each, one doorkeeper $30, and night watchman at $25.

Mr. CLARKE. Are these all permanent officers.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. There is a reduction of $20,000 in the amount provided for the Debates, because it is expected that this session will not be long, but why is there not a reduction provided in the case of extra sessional clerks, &c.?

Mr. SPEAKER. We have voted the same amount for many years and have never provided for long sessions, but take a supplementary vote when necessary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Some hon. gentlemen are desirous of going home, as tomorrow is a holiday. We have made very substantial progress, and I think we might now adjourn.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I agree with my hon. friend Mr. Borden (Halifax), that we have made a very fair degree of progress.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the House adjourns I would like to mention the desirability of having the Committee on Public

Accounts organized. I understood that this committee was to have been called to-day. But that was not done, for some reason that I do not understand. Notices have been sent out to members of other committees announcing meetings for Thursday; but I, as a member of the Public Accounts Committee, have not received notice of the summoning of that committee for that day. I think it very desirable for the purpose of expediting the business of the session that this committee should be organized as early as possible. It is very natural to suppose that that committee will have business to transact, and business in which a great many members of the House are more or less interested. I would suggest to the right hon. Prime Minister that he or whoever is charged with that duty should see to it that this committee is summoned for Thursday.

The PRIME MINISTER. My instructions were that all committees should be summoned for Thursday. If that has not been done in the case of the Public Accounts Committee it must have been a mistake. I will see to it that the committee is summoned for the following day.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 9.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 21, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough) moved:

That the public accounts of Canada for the year ending the 30th of June, 1900, with the report of the Auditor General for the same year, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax) moved :

That the name of Mr. Lancaster be struck off the list of members of the Committee on Expiring Laws, and be replaced by that of Mr. Roddick.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) moved :

That the name of Mr. Roddick be struck off the list of members of the Committee on Railways and Canals, and be replaced by that of Mr. Lancaster.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) moved :

That the name of Mr. Rosamond be struck off the list of members of the Committee on Public Accounts, and be replaced by that of Mr. Birkett.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 6) respecting the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters, and to change its name to the Independent Order of Foresters.—Mr. Emmerson.

Bill (No. 7) relating to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Geoffrion by Mr. Fortin.

Bill (No. 8) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Geoffrion by Mr. Fortin.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 9) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Explain.

Mr. HENDERSON. The object of the Bill is, first, to remove entirely the white space at the top of the ballot, and also the white space below the black bar at the bottom of the ballot, to prevent voters making the mistake of marking outside, which frequently occurred in the last election. Another object of the Bill is to prevent the misuse of the oath marked 'T,' which permitted persons who were not voters to go and demand a ballot on taking a certain oath and giving reasons which are not provided for by the statute, but which are allowed by the returning officers, such as absence or neglect in the preparation of the list. I hope by these means to remove these difficulties. These are the chief clauses of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

UNIFORM FRUIT PACKAGES.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (South Wentworth) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 10) to amend the Weights and Measures Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. SMITH (South Wentworth). The object of the Bill is to provide for uniform fruit packages—berry boxes. At present there is no standard, and all sorts and sizes are used.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ALIEN LABOUR.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg)—for Mr. Ralph Smith (Vancouver)—moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 11) to amend the Act to restrict the importation and employment of aliens.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. PUTTEE. The Bill is to amend the existing Alien Labour Act in several respects, in order to make it more workable and of more use as an anti-contract labour law.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he makes provision in this Bill so that the enforcement of the Act shall be automatic, and shall be taken out of the hands of the government.

Mr. PUTTEE. That is to a great extent the object of some of the amendments in the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

APPOINTMENTS OF EX-MEMBERS AND CANDIDATES.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. How many members of the last parliament have been appointed to offices of emolument under the Crown by the government since the 15th day of March, 1900?

2. What are the names of such members, to what offices have they been appointed, and what are their salaries and emoluments in each case?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The following gentlemen have been appointed to offices of emolument under the Crown: Mr. Wm. Hutchison, Commissioner at the Buffalo Exhibition, at $250 a month and $10 a day for living expenses ; Mr. Firman McClure, Census Commissioner for the province of Nova Scotia, at $5 a day and $5 a day for living expenses ; Mr. M. T. Stenson, Collector of Customs at Sherbrooke, at $1,400 a year ; Mr. J. M. Hurley, Inspector of Fisheries, at $1,000 a year.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

How many candidates who unsuccessfully contested ridings for seats in the parliament of Canada have been appointed to offices of emolument under the Crown by the government since the 11th July, 1896? What are the names of such appointees, to what positions have they been appointed, and what is the emolument in each case?

The PRIME MINISTER. The following gentlemen who have been candidates since 1896 have been appointed to offices of emolument under the Crown : Mr. R. L. Drury, Census Commissioner for the province of British Columbia, at $5 a day and $5 a day for living expenses ; Mr. Firman McClure, Census Commissioner for the province of Nova Scotia, at $5 a day and $5 a day for living expenses ; Mr. W. B. Wallace, County Court Judge of Nova Scotia, at $3,000 a year ; Mr. J. M. Hurley, Inspector of Fisheries, at $1,000 a year.

THE ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. KENDALL asked :

1. Have any representations been made to the government on behalf of Canadian employees of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company to the effect that they are discriminated against in favour of alien labour brought into Canada under contract?

2. If not, will they consider it their duty, if in the future such representations are made, to investigate the matter with a view to removal of discrimination, and also with a view to ascertain to what extent it may be beneficial to Canadian labour to allow the provisions of the Alien Labour law to remain in operation and to what extent it may be beneficial to enforce the provisions of the Act?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

1. No.

2. Should any such representations be made, they will receive the careful consideration of the government with a view to such action as the public interest appears to demand.

LIGHTHOUSE, SECHELT ISLANDS, B.C.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Is it the intention of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to erect a lighthouse on Black Rocks, off the Sechelt Islands, on the coast of British Columbia, this coming summer?

2. If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) :

1. No application appears to have reached the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for a lighthouse on Black Rocks, and the locality is not known in the department. An application, however, for a day beacon on White Rock, off Sechelt Islands has been received, and is now obtaining the consideration of the department.

RAMA RESERVE MEDICAL OFFICER.

Mr. McLEOD asked :

1. Who is surgeon or medical officer appointed by the government to the Indians on the Rama Reserve?

2. When was he appointed?

3. What sums have been paid him each year since 1896?

4. Have any further sums been paid by the government for medical attendance, and to whom, and what amount in each year since 1896 ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. A. R. McDonnell, M.D.
2. 21st March, 1900.
3. At the rate of $150 per annum since the date of his appointment.
4. G. H. Corbett, M.D., was paid $150 per annum up to 1st February, 1900; E. L. Proctor, M.D., $6 3rd February, 1898; Toronto General Hospital, $9.20 13th December, 1898; John McLean, M.D., $94.25 for services from 1st February to 1st April, 1900.

OVERFLOW OF THE SEVERN.

Mr. McLEOD asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been called to the flooding of certain lands along the Severn river, immediately below the dam at Washago, erected by the government to facilitate the escape of spring floods?
2. Is it the intention of the government to place a sum in the estimates to remove certain obstructions below the dam to facilitate the escape of flood water?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte) :

1. Yes.
2. $2,500 appropriated for use, during present year, on Severn river, and $1,700 for widening outlet of Sparrow lake.

CENSUS COMMISSIONER, EAST SIMCOE.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

Has a census commissioner been appointed for the electoral district of East Simcoe? If an appointment has been made, upon whose recommendation was such appointment made?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), I beg to reply : No.

LARGEST GRAIN CARGO, MONTREAL.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

What was the largest cargo of grain received at the port of Montreal during the season of 1900 from the upper lakes, giving amount in bushels, from whence received, and kind of grain?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

Via Parry Sound and Canada Atlantic Railway. On September 4, 1900, a cargo of 51,000 bushels of wheat passed down to Montreal by water from Coteau Landing. This grain came from Depot Harbour over the Canada Atlantic Railway to Coteau Landing.

Via Welland Canal. On November 14, 1900, a cargo of 45,000 bushels of wheat passed down from Kingston by water to Montreal. This grain was shipped from Fort William.

CANADIAN IMMIGRATION.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. How many immigrants entered the Dominion of Canada during the year beginning on the 1st day of July, 1899, and ending 30th day of June, 1900?
2. How many of these have settled in Canada?
3. Referring to those who have settled in Canada, from what countries have they come respectively?
4. What information or means of information has the government as to the number or proportion of immigrants arriving in Canada during the year aforesaid who have settled in the United States of America?
5. What number or proportion of the immigrants arriving in Canada during the year aforesaid have gone to reside permanently or have settled in the United States of America?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. The number of immigrants entering Canada during the period named was 62,515; included in this were 21,016, via ocean ports, who were destined for and ticketed through to the United States.
2. 41,499.

3. United States	14,215
English and Welsh	7,162
Scotch	1,183
Irish	701
Galicians	5,549
Germans	704
Scandinavians	1,191
French and Belgians	427
Doukhobors	2,368
Miscellaneous	7,999
	41,499

4. The government has no information that any immigrants arriving in Canada have settled in the United States, except what is shown by the records at the ocean ports of the number ticketed through to that country.
5. The government has no information on this subject.

RAILWAY BONUSES.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria) asked :

1. What total sums have been voted to railways in Canada in bonuses by municipalities, viz. : counties or groups of counties, townships or groups of townships, towns and villages ?
2. To what roads were such bonuses granted, and to what amount each ?
3. Have any of these bonuses been repaid by the Dominion parliament, either directily or indirectly ?
4. Is it the intention of the government to refund to such municipalities the bonuses so voted?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I would refer the hon. gentleman to the report of the Department of Railways and Canals which, I

think, contains all the information he desires. If there should be any not to be found in that report, I will bring it down.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the answer to the last paragraph of the question ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will have to ask the hon. gentleman to allow that to stand.

EASTERN EXTENSION RAILWAY AND NOVA SCOTIA GOVERNMENT ARBITRATION.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. What is the scope of the arbitration respecting the Eastern Extension Railway and the Nova Scotia government?
2. Have the arbitrators power to hear the claims of the municipalities of Pictou and Antigonish for amount expended for right of way for said railway, or is the reference confined to the claims of the province of Nova Scotia only?
3. Has the scope of the commission or reference been enlarged, and if so, to what extent?
4. Will the government cause to be brought down at an early day all such papers respecting this reference as may properly be brought down at this date?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The scope of the arbitration covers only the claim presented by the government of Nova Scotia, and does not include the claims of the municipality. The scope of the commission of the Lieutenant-Governor has not been enlarged. It would not be advisable to bring down any papers at present.

MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST BONDS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the amount of bonds of the Montreal Turnpike Trust held at the present time by the government of Canada?
2. Since when has interest been paid upon the said bonds?
3. What is the amount actually due upon said bonds for interest?
4. Did the Minister of Finance oppose the passage of a provincial law or regulation extending to forty-eight hours the time during which a return ticket upon the roads of the Montreal Turnpike Trust would be available? If so, upon what ground was said opposition made?
5. What are the names of the trustees named by the government of Canada to represent the bondholders at the meeting held on February 12, instant?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) :

1. $195,000.
2. Interest on said bonds has been paid to 1st July, 1896.
3. The amount now due on said bonds for interest is $30,712.50.
4. The Minister of Finance did not oppose the passage of the Bill referred to in question 4. It was one of two Bills with regard to the trust introduced in 1899 in the Quebec legislature by a private member. The Minister of Finance asked the provincial authorities to suspend action on the Bills until he could make inquiries as to their effect, the Dominion government being interested as bondholders of the trust, and the interest on the bonds held by the government being then in default. The matter was referred by his direction to the trust and he was informed by the secretary of the trust that the effect of the Bills would be to diminish the revenues of the trust by some $4,000 or $5,000 a year, and that the trust were opposing the passing of the Bills. In consequence of the representations made by the trust the Bills were dropped and no further action on the part of the Dominion government was necessary.
5. The trustees named by the government of Canada at the meeting of 12th February, were: Messrs. Paul Galibert, Thomas A. Trenholme and Charles Meunier.

OWEN SOUND CONSTRUCTION COMPANY.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria) asked :

1. Who are the members of the 'Owen Sound Dredge and Construction Company,' referrred to on page V—228, Auditor General's Report, as receiving $9,960 for use of dredge, &c., from May 12, 1899, to December 11, 1899, at $8 per hour?
2. Is Mr. Horsey, now M.P. for Grey, a member of said company ?
3. Were tenders called for, for the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte) :

1. Names of members of company, not known to the department.
2. Not to the knowledge of the department.
3. No; an arrangement was made at $8 per hour for a minimum quantity of dredging of 600 cubic yards, which is in accordance with the practice of the department and has been found very satisfactory.

DREDGE HACKETT.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria) asked :

1. Who are Bowman & Porter, owners of dredge Hackett, mentioned on page V—226, Auditor General's Report, as receiving $5,840 for services of dredge, at $8 an hour, from July 12 to October 18, 1899, at Kincardine?
2. Is Mr. Bowman the Liberal member for the legislature of Ontario from Bruce?
3. If not, is he a relative ?
4. Were tenders asked for the performance of this work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte) :

1. They are a firm of experienced contractors of good standing.
2. The department has no information on this subject.
3. No.

An arrangement was made at $8 per hour for a minimum quantity of dredging of 600 cubic yards, which is in accordance with the practice of the department and has been found very satisfactory.

DEPTH OF WATER IN THE ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL.

Mr. KEMP asked :

When does the government expect that vessels of fourteen feet draught will be able to pass from Lake Ontario through the canals and St. Lawrence channels to Montreal without lightening?

What was the maximum depth, during the last season of navigation, that vessels could draw between the above-named points?

What work still remains to be done in order that vessels drawing fourteen feet may pass from Lake Ontario to Montreal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The form of this question implies that it is doubtful whether we have a through channel of fourteen feet of water in the St. Lawrence canal and lake and river reaches. This would not be and is not a correct statement of the situation. There is, and was, during the past season of navigation, a channel of fourteen feet throughout the entire length of the canal system from Lake Ontario to Montreal—that is to say, there is fourteen feet of water on the mitre sills of all the locks in the St. Lawrence canals, and more than the fourteen-foot channel through the intervening river and lake stretches. This depth of water is available without lightering, and was available during the last season without lightering. Although work has yet to be done, and always will require to be done from time to time, to ease the curves or to straighten and improve the channel, no work remains to be done in order to furnish fourteen feet of water for the purposes of navigation. An organized attempt has been made, I believe, in the interest of competing railways, to create doubts as to this depth being available throughout the entire St. Lawrence route, as also by shippers who are interested in maintaining the old system of transport ; and there is ground to believe that some elevator proprietors have been inclined to create the same impression. The only thing that can be said with truth respecting the route is that, as the channel is a new one, people who are navigating it have been less careful than they should have been, and have disregarded instructions, signals, buoys &c., and have not confined themselves to the channel. The few accidents which have occurred have been due to this cause, and have occurred on shoals and ledges outside of the buoyed channel——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the objection ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) is introducing a debatable subject that is not at all necessary in answering the question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These few accidents are believed to be due to carelessness, or want of knowledge of the pilot——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Order. The hon. gentleman is introducing subjects entirely apart from the question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the matter with the hon. gentlemen opposite ? One would think that they were disappointed to hear that the canals were in a condition for fourteen-foot navigation.

Mr. SPEAKER. In answering questions, the privilege is allowed members of the government under the rules to make their statements as long as they please. At the same time, I understand that they are not allowed to engage in debate in answering the question. I have not followed the answer closely enough to be able to say whether debatable matter has been introduced or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There will always be more or less trouble, unless people are exceedingly careful—and they rarely are—in making use of an entirely new channel ; and nothing has occurred on the St. Lawrence route that would not have occurred on any route if the like carelessness or want of knowledge were displayed. I may say that last season after the canals were opened, vessels of 12½ up to 13½ feet draught successfully navigated throughout the entire route, without encountering any obstruction whatever or experiencing any difficulty.

SHED, SALMON RIVER WHARF.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked :

What is the total cost to date of the shed constructed upon the wharf at Salmon river, Halifax county, N.S.?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). Nothing has yet been paid for the shed referred to.

CHANGES OF LIGHTS, CASCUMPEC HARBOUR.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. What changes have been made in the Cascumpec Harbour lights since 1899? What amount of money was paid in making changes, and to whom paid?

2. Are those lights now supposed to be permanent or are any further changes contemplated in the near future?

3. Is the government aware that such frequent and varied changes of lights have rendered doubly hazardous the lives of fishermen frequenting the harbour, especially from the province of New Brunswick, resulting last year in the loss of many valuable lives and destruction of a large number of fishing craft?

4. Will the government, when making changes in the location of those lights in the future, give full notice of same in local newspapers, in

order that all interested may have a knowledge of the different changes?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Before answering the question, I desire to call attention to the objectionable form in which the hon. gentleman has presented the third question. It is not permitted, under the rules, to allege facts or to suggest any improper inferences. However, I will not take advantage of that, but will give answers to the hon. gentleman's questions, as follows :

1. In the spring of 1899 the main lighthouse at Cascumpec was moved from Sandy Island in the harbour to the South Sand Head, at the entrance of the harbour, in consequence of the wasting away of Sandy Island by the sea, and in September, 1899, the range mast lights previously maintained on Savage Island were moved on to the same South Sand Head to indicate the channel through the bar outside of the Sand Head. This work was done under the supervision of Mr. Walsh of the provincial agency, and the total cost of the work was $428.57. In the spring of 1900, the two mast lights above referred to were replaced by inclosed towers so that better lights could be shown from them and so that they would answer as day beacons. At the same time, some slight change was made in the alignment to suit change in the channel. This work was done by Mr. Walsh.

2. Range lights on a low shore, like the north shore of Prince Edward Island, where the channels break through shifting sands, and are continually changing, can never be considered as permanent ; and the department can never be sure for any period in advance that the channel will remain where it is at any time marked. If the channel changes at any time in the near future, it will be necessary to change the alignment of the range lights to suit. At Cascumpec we have been obliged to change the leading marks very often, and have no hope that the present arrangement can be considered as permanent.

3. The government is not aware that such frequent and varied changes of lights can be in any way obviated. Changes in the channel are beyond the control of the department, and a certain amount of danger necessarily attends the use of shifting channels of this kind. The department is not aware that any loss of life or vessels occurred at Cascumpec in consequence of any neglect in the arrangement of the range lights.

4. When the government makes changes in the location of lights, the fact is advertised in notices to mariners, distributed to the whole shipping community. It would be useless to give notice of light changes in local newspapers, because the local seamen are always acquainted with them, and the local newspapers would not reach strangers who are mainly interested in learning of such changes. The present system of circulating Notices to Mariners throughout the Dominion is considered efficient.

CASCUMPEC HARBOUR—IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. What steps, if any, have been taken by the government to improve Cascumpec Harbour, Prince county, P.E.I., which each year becomes less satisfactory to navigators, and which is the main harbour of refuge on the whole north coast of Prince Edward Island?

2. Does the government intend carrying out the deepening of the main channel there according to the plans of the engineers employed by the late government, or have any other plans of operations been decided upon, and if so, what are they?

3. Have any measures been taken to prevent the break in the sand hills which adversely affect the depth of water in the main channel, and if not, why not?

4. From what department of the government was the money granted to provide material to close one of those little channels last winter ? What amount of money was expended, and to whom paid?

5. Is the government aware that the brush and material used was not put properly in place, that the work was not done under proper inspection, and was carried out to sea, to the great detriment and loss to coast fishermen?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) :

1. Resident Engineer Hegan was instructed on July 31 last to expend $1,500 by day labour in closing the opening through the bar. The opening, however, has so changed and increased that it was not advisable to begin work without a further examination.

2. Under consideration.

3. Engineer Hegan has been instructed to make an examination and report on work required.

4. Nothing expended by this department.

5. There is no information in the department of any such work having been done. We are communicating now with the resident engineer who has visited the locality.

BOLSOVER POST OFFICE—REMOVAL.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria) asked :

1. Why was the post office at Bolsover, in North Victoria, removed from its former site to a point about a mile further east?

2. Upon whose recommendation was the change made?

3. Was there any complaint or charge against the late postmaster, Mr. James McGirr?

4. Were petitions presented (1) for retaining the office in the former place, and how many signatures were upon it, (2) for moving it to its present site, and how many signatures were on it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

1. The location of the Bolsover post office, Victoria county, N. R., was changed in order

to remove the post office to a site more convenient for the public.

2. The change was made in conformity with a petition to the department.

3. There does not appear to have been any complaint against the late postmaster.

4. Petitions were received for and against the change of site. The petition for the removal of the office was signed by seventy-two persons. The petition against its removal was signed by 112 persons. It has been represented to the department, however, by a number of signers of the latter petition, that they signed it under a misapprehension and really desired and approved the change.

POSTMASTER AT MILLSTREAM, N.B.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has James A. Fenwick, for many years postmaster at Millstream, King's county, N.B., been dismissed?

2. If so, were charges preferred against him, and if any, by whom preferred, and of what character, and was any investigation held?

3. At whose request was Mr. Fenwick removed, if he has been dismissed?

4. Was any petition received by the Post Office Department asking for a change of postmaster at Millstream aforesaid, and if so, by how many persons residing within a radius of two miles from said post office at Millstream was such petition, if any, signed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

1. Yes.

2. Mr. Fenwick, as appeared from the statement from Lieut.-Col. Jas. Domville, ex-M.P., was an active political partisan. Under the circumstances, an investigation was not considered necessary.

3. Covered by answers Nos. 1 and 2.

4. No petition for a change in the postmastership of Millstream was received at the department.

NATIONALIZATION OF RAILWAYS—SIR WM. VAN HORNE'S STATEMENT.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like, as a matter of privilege, to set myself right before the House and the public. In this morning's Citizen, in connection with the debate I introduced two days ago, the following statement is made :

And in reply to a further question, I said that a national board of directors entirely beyond political control or influence might succeed in handling the railways of the country ; but I could not see how such a board could be established and maintained on a sufficiently independent footing.

I regard it impossible.

Now, I wish here to accept this statement of Sir William Van Horne. I do not think I contradicted that in anything that I quoted from him the other day, and while I accept this explanation of his, I regret that after his long experience with the Canadian people and with the Dominion parliament, he should think we are incompetent to administer anything that we may have to administer, even if we have to nationalize our railroads. What he says is either a compliment to the hon. gentlemen opposite, signifying that they have foiled him in some of his endeavours in regard to a national railway, or that he does consider them to have administered it in a political fashion.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Clifford Sifton) to a return ordered by the House on February 12, which I do not think it would take a long time to prepare, and which I would like to have as soon as possible. It is a return showing an itemized statement of the number of gallons of liquor taken into the Yukon, with the names of the permits. There cannot be many of them. If that return could be hastened I would be very glad.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will give it attention.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to suggest to the hon. gentleman that it is desirable to have brought down at as early a date as possible, any measures which the government propose to introduce. The right hon. gentleman will remember that during past sessions there has been some difficulty experienced in giving to government measures as full consideration as we would like, owing to the late date at which they have been brought down. As some two weeks of the session have now elapsed, I think that the House might reasonably expect that we should have the measures which the government proposes to introduce brought down at an early date.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I think that all the Bills will be introduced next week.

THE TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) when we may expect the Trade and Navigation Returns that was tabled some days ago. It is usual that they should be distributed to the members of the House immediately afterwards. I have made inquiries on several occasions, and up to this time I am unaware that they have been distributed to the members.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). A limited number reached the department and have been distributed, and I expected a full supply for the members before this. I will make inquiry with reference to the matter.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 2) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900. He said : The object of the Bill is, first, to relegate to the back of the ballot paper the name of the printer, which is now on the face of the ballot. The Act does not specify as to where the printer's name should appear. I find in some constituencies the printer's name is printed on the face of the ballot, and I think it ought to be printed on the back of the ballot. The next amendment relates to the counterfoil. As the ballot is now made, we have a stub, a counterfoil and a ballot, and as many ballots are found to be blank when they are counted on election night, I think it would be a wise policy to have the face of the counterfoil black, similar to the broad lines running across the ballot. The next object is to transfer the words that now appear on form P, section 48, 'electoral district of . . . 19 . Ballot paper,' and all other words liable to be placed there, to the back of the ballot also. By that means we would have nothing above the black line on the top or below the black line at the bottom. That, I think will make this ballot almost a perfect ballot.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am not prepared at this moment to offer any observation on the hon. gentleman's Bill. I would simply call his attention, and the attention of the House, to the fact that we have several Bills introduced this session to amend the Elections Act. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has one on the Order paper, as has also the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). I think it well that all these Bills should be brought before the House in order that they may secure the views of the members regarding them. I propose that we should not discuss this Bill any further at the present time. We will allow the Bill to take its second reading, and the same with all the Bills which are upon the Order paper, so that we may compare notes upon the amendments and see whether they are acceptable.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). That is rather a strange innovation on the order that has been followed in this House, because it is universally admitted that the second reading of a Bill accepts its principle. Now the First Minister proposes to introduce a new rule.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have several times acted as I now suggest. Moreover, I recognize the principle of this Bill in that I think there is room for amendment to the Act, and the government has in contemplation an amendment to the Elections Act. We accept the principle of the Bill that the Act should be amended, but we propose to leave the discussion of the various amendments to another occasion.

Mr. SPROULE. On one or two previous occasions that was done because the government had a Bill on the same subject, and when the government's Bill was about to be considered, then all the other Bills relating to the same subject were considered at the same time. But at the present session I do not understand that the government propose to amend the election law ; therefore, they cannot consider the Bills brought in by private members in connection with theirs.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). Before the motion passes, I would like to draw the attention of the First Minister to the fact that a number of very useful machines are being used to facilitate voting. I have seen one of them operating myself, made by a man named Craig, of Kinmount, and it operates perfectly. There is no clock work about it, it never gets out of order, the voter can see how his ballot is punched every time. I would suggest that the question of voting by machine might also be considered, so as to avoid, if possible, the ballot stuffing that so disgraced a number of ridings throughout Canada during the last few years.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Might I suggest to the right hon. premier the desirability of referring all these Bills to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act to a special committee ? I do not know myself what the practice of the House is on such a matter, but I may say that I have already given notice of an amendment to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act. I may add that I have been in communication with some of the most prominent judges in the Dominion, and the Bill, of which I have given notice, is the result of suggestions that I have received from them. Now, inasmuch as I believe these amendments will be in the interest of the entire country, would it not be a good idea for the Premier to appoint a special committee to deal with all these amendments, and to make such suggestions to the House as the committee thought wise ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am not prepared to give an answer upon this point now.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 4) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The law in regard to cattle guards that this Bill of mine is intended to remedy is in a very bad state as far as the farmers of my section, and I think, of the country, are concerned. It is by no means in the same condition that it was in when we first had legislation upon this subject. As the House will remember probably, or find out by referring to the revised statutes of 1886, the liability of railway companies in regard to cattle guards originally was that the railway company was liable for damages if animals got upon the railways from the highway, irrespective of whether the animals, as regards other questions in law, were at large upon the highway or not. To leave the railway only responsible to the owners when the animals are not at large, would be most impracticable and certainly an imposition upon the inhabitants of the country. To put myself right before the House at the beginning, I beg to state that I am not seeking to interfere with the protection that railways have in regard to killing cattle at the point of intersection of the railway and the highway. There is another branch of the railway statute which provides that if cattle are killed at the point of intersection the railway is in no way responsible for it, and not only that, but if the owner of cattle allows these animals to be at the point of intersection, not in charge of some person to control them, and if damage results to the railway property, to the engines, or anything else that belongs to the railway, the owner is liable for such damage. The part of the statute which this amending Bill is aimed at is the part which says that the railway shall be liable for not keeping up fences along the lines of their railway, and cattle guards at highway crossings. Up to the year 1888 that liability was absolute, but in 1888 there was a new consolidation of the Railway Act, and in that consolidation we find that this provision was taken out of the Act instead of leaving the liability absolute as it had been. The Act, as passed, reads:

> Until such fences and cattle guards are duly made and completed, and if after they are so made and completed they are not duly maintained, the company shall be liable for all damages done by its trains and engines to cattle, horses and other animals, not wrongfully on the railway.

There is a qualification of the obligation of the railway company in the words 'not wrongfully on the railway.' When the judges of the courts began to see what these words meant, they had to decide that if an animal was not in charge of somebody at the time it got upon the railway it was wrongfully upon the highway. What my Bill is intended to meet is this: I say that if a railway company runs its line across a highway, and is required by legislation to keep cattle guards there, in order to make the highway reasonably safe, it cannot be said that it is required for any other purpose except to make it safe for animals which are not in charge of somebody on the highway. It is nonsense to contend that they must have the guards, and to say that if they destroy an animal, which is not properly upon the highway, they are not liable. If the judges decide that an animal must be under the control of a human being in order that the railway may be liable, it is idle to say that they need to have cattle guards at all, because no animal under the control of a human being could possibly get upon the railway whether there were cattle guards or whether there were not. As long as the railways are protected, as they are in other parts of the statute, by not being liable for accidents at the point of intersection, and I submit it is proper they should be so protected, the railways should be bound to keep up cattle guards against animals, whether they are at large or not at that point. There are cases innumerable where an animal escapes from the owner's premises. If there is a cattle guard to stop it, it will go on wandering upon the highway, but, if there is no cattle guard to turn it aside, it will go down the railway in the same way as it would go down the highway. I submit that this is a matter that ought to be remedied, and that the law ought to be so that when these animals, by any accident unknown to the owner, become improperly upon the highway, it should not affect the liability of the railway company for not having cattle guards there. Of course, this is not a matter that is merely problematical. I am sorry to say that in my part of the country we have had a great deal of difficulty over these things, and it is not a matter that I am anticipating at all. It is a matter that has already occasioned a great deal of damage to the inhabitants of the country, and I believe that this is the case with the inhabitants in other parts of the Dominion of Canada wherever these railways are. We find that we are getting along into the 20th century and that railways are being constructed more closely together, that the country is well cut up with railways, and we have to consider that while we are allowing these railways all these privileges, we ought to take care that the people of the country shall not be injuriously affected in an improper or unfair way. The case to which I am alluding has happened in a great many counties. The law reports are full of cases where an animal, without any intention on the part of the owner to allow it to wander, does accidentally get upon the highway. It goes down to the railway, and if there were cattle guards no harm would be done. The statute says

that the railway company shall keep up cattle guards, but that if they do not they shall only be liable for damage for animals killed when they get on the railway from a place where they may properly be. My amendment is that animals shall not be held to be improperly there if they get upon the railway where there is no cattle guard. If my amendment is not proper we ought to abolish the law as to cattle guards altogether, because there is no need of a cattle guard at all if the animal is to be under the control of a human being, and if it crosses at the place where the cattle guard is required to be. I will not detain the House any longer; that is the object of the Bill, and it is, I submit, one which should meet with the approval of the House in the interests of the people. The railway is already amply protected by other portions of the statute at the point of intersection. If an animal is killed on the railway between where the cattle guards should be, if it is on that part of the earth which is both railway and highway, that part of the railway which is also highway, and that part of the highway which is also railway, by other sections of the statute the railway is amply protected. The law should be such that if the railway companies are bound to keep up cattle guards at all, they should be obliged to maintain them in such a way that they will prevent cattle getting on the track. At all events there should be some adequate remedy provided for the condition of things which now prevails in this regard.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I will not suggest to the House that the motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) should not prevail, nor, that he should be precluded from having his Bill go on to the committee for full discussion. The House labours under the disadvantage of not having been able to study this Bill, as it is only a few moments ago, that it came under my notice. I think it would be well that the matter should go to the Railway Committee, although I must say that the proposal is not so free from difficulty as the hon. gentleman suggests. The law which the hon. gentleman proposes to amend is that sound principle which is to be found in the ordinary common law which casts upon a person who is negligent in the care and protection of his own property a measure of liability and makes him responsible on the ground of contributory negligence for any damage which may result. I take it from the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) that he proposes to deviate from that principle, but, I will not enter into a discussion at this stage. I know that a number of complaints have been made throughout the country in respect to these gates and crossings. Those complaints, however, are not so much, because cattle guards have not been placed upon the highways, as that the character of the modern cattle guard is not of as efficient a character as that of the cattle guards which were formerly used. I have had a good many complaints from different sections of the country from people who claimed to have suffered because of the change made in the construction of the cattle guards, but, I have not heard any complaints made in the direction which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) has now mentioned to the House. I am quite content that the Bill should go to the ordinary committee, when it can be fully discussed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) has done justice to what the mover of the Bill (Mr. Lancaster) has suggested. I have not yet considered the provisions of the Bill, but the ground which was put forward was, that railway companies which are guilty of a disregard of the duty imposed upon them by statute should be held liable for that neglect, although cattle may be unlawfully on the highway. In other words, you have to choose between neglect of duty on the part of the railway company on the one hand, and neglect of duty on the part of the owner of the cattle on the other. That is a question which would present itself for the consideration of the Railway Committee, and I am not now prepared to express an opinion as to what the result ought to be. The minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) will see that you might have a neglect of statutory duty on the part of a railway company, and you might have cattle on the highway; unlawfully on the highway it is true, but nevertheless on the highway without any negligence on the part of the owner. They might get on the highway through the negligence of some other person, and then you would have the case of cattle unlawfully on the highway, but without the negligence of the owner, and you would have to choose between the position of such a person and the position of the railway company which had not provided proper cattle guards.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And the cattle guard might be neglected through some carelessness on the part of a third person.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then you would have to take into consideration the extent to which the railway companies are responsible for the negligence of their servants. I rose because I thought the minister had not done full justice to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman who moved the Bill.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I am glad the minister has decided to send this Bill to the Railway Committee, because I think it is perhaps the best place in which to discuss it. I agree with what the minister has said with regard to the kind of cattle guards now used. Since the old

wooden guards were done away with and replaced by sheet iron or steel guards, the number of accidents has much increased because the modern cattle guards are no use, as animals can walk right over them as they can on the highway. As the law stands, no cattle can be on a highway unless in charge of some person, within half a mile of a railway without being illegally on the highway, and in villages where you have cattle running at large most of the time they are technically there in violation of the Act. While this Bill seeks to remedy one defect, I believe that parliament should go further and define what a proper cattle guard is. When the law was amended before, I thought it was amended in the wrong direction. I thought it was made worse, instead of better, and I think so still. I draw the attention of the minister to the fact that there have been many complaints in my locality, and I believe that the duty devolves upon parliament to provide a remedy.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Does the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) think that this is such a Bill as should be referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals ? The alteration in the law suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) is a very simple one. We have suffered a great deal in the province of Quebec from the legislation which this Bill seeks to change. We had the recent case of Campbell vs. the Grand Trunk Railway, in which a horse during the night leaped over a fence to the highway, then wandered to the railway crossing and on account of the defective state of the cattle guards got upon the track and was killed. The plaintiff obtained judgment in the Superior Court on the ground that the railway company was in default, but in the Court of Appeal (I speak from memory now) it was held that under the law the animal was improperly upon the highway because of it not being accompanied by a human being. Well, it could not possibly be accompanied by a human being under the circumstances I have explained. The owner was not in fault for the animal got on the track and was killed because the cattle guards were defective. I certainly think the law requires to be changed, but I do not see that this Bill requires examination by the Railway Committee.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (South Wentworth). I can corroborate what the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said in regard to the poor character of the cattle guards now in use. They are constructed in such a way that the cattle can pass over them without any difficulty, and they do not at all fulfil the purpose for which they are intended. I wish also to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to the fact that either there is no suitable law with regard to level crossings or the railways are violating the law every day. In our part of the country the fences at the railway crossings have been abolished, so that it is no longer possible for one person to drive cattle across the track, but it now requires three people to do so—one standing on each side of the track and another to drive the cattle over. If a railway train comes along, the cattle rush down one side of the track or the other, and some of them are liable to be killed. Whether the law has been changed in regard to this or not, I do not know; but that is the condition of things that exists at the present time, and it is a very great hardship to the farmers through whose lands the railways pass.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman has no objection, I would move that the Bill be referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORT DUTIES ON LUMBER.

On the motion :

That in the opinion of this House, duties should be levied upon lumber imported into Canada corresponding with those now existing upon lumber entering the United States.—Mr. Bennett.

Mr. BENNETT. Stand.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I suppose the hon. gentleman will be prepared to take up the motion at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. BENNETT. I propose to go on with the next one.

Motion allowed to stand.

EXPORT DUTY ON SAW-LOGS.

Mr. WM. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe) moved :

That in the opinion of this House an export duty should be imposed upon all saw-logs cut on Indian reserves in Canada.

He said : Mr. Speaker, the question of the manufacture of our logs, particularly pine logs, in the province of Ontario has been a moot question both in this House and in the local legislature for a number of years ; and I am pleased to be able to say that those who advocated the adoption of ways and means for causing the manufacture of saw-logs in our own country are highly satisfied with the results that have been attained. It is well known, particularly to hon. gentlemen coming from the province of Ontario, that as a result of the change introduced by the local government in 1897, though a large quantity of saw-logs, aggregating probably upwards of 300,000,000 feet in a year, were exported

from different points on the Georgian Bay to points in Michigan, that business has been entirely stopped, and we have now the satisfaction of seeing that large quantity of lumber manufactured in the country. I need not say anything as to the advantage of such a change of policy.

In the province of Ontario timber cut on lands which are licensed by the Ontario government is, of course, subject to the control of that government, and subject to any rules and regulations it may adopt. But timber cut on lands known as Indian lands is not under the control of the Ontario government, but of the Federal government. As a consequence most of the logs cut on these so-called Indian lands in the province of Ontario are being exported from year to year to the United States. In answer to a question which was put on the paper the other day by myself, it was stated that no less than 25,000,000 feet of timber cut on Indian lands had been exported from the province of Ontario last year.

Now, if it is good policy to cause the manufacture in the country of timber cut on licensed lands, it is equally good policy to cause every log cut on Indian lands to be manufactured in the country ; and I have put this motion on the paper to-day in the hope that the Minister of Interior will announce a change of policy under which that desirable object shall be accomplished.

In making the motion, I am aware that there is in the American tariff a proviso by which the imposition of an export duty by this government might result detrimentally to the lumber industry as a whole ; for the amount of export duty would be added to the import duty on lumber passing from Canada to the United States. Of course, that export duty would have to be a very considerable amount. I am not prepared to say whether $1 a thousand would result in these logs being manufactured in the country. The probability is that it would have to be increased to $3 or $4. If the import duty on white pine going to the United States, which is $2 a thousand in the American tariff, should be increased to $4, it would be most detrimental to the interests of the province of Ontario and of the whole Dominion. For that reason, I do not propose to press the motion as it stands to a division ; but I do hope to evoke a statement from the Minister of the Interior that it is his intention to follow the line adopted by the Ontario government during the present year, by putting a prohibition on the export of all logs cut on Indian lands. While the amount cut last year was not large, it was sufficient to keep two or three mills of considerable size running. If the minister announces such an intention to-day, it will be fair to say that these people have had fair notice for a number of years that such a change would be brought about. They have had notice for the last ten years of an intention to place an export duty on logs, and they have had the notice in the form of the prohibition of the export of logs from the province of Ontario, adopted by the local government ; and if the minister makes the announcement that the logs cut on Indian lands during the present season must be manufactured in the country, I presume it will result in the manufacture this year of at least an equal quantity of logs to what was cut last year.

I do not propose to make any further remarks, but I shall be pleased to hear the minister make the announcement that he intends to follow the wholesome line of conduct pursued by Mr. Hardy, even if it was a death-bed repentance, and to prohibit the exportation of all logs cut on Indian lands during the present season, whether in the province of Ontario or any other province.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a very few words on this motion. The proposition to impose an export duty on logs going out of the country has been a live question in which I have taken a warm interest for very many years.

There are one or two ways in which we can remedy the evil. One is in the hands of the local government and the other in the hands of the Dominion government. One remedy consists in the changing the regulations, under which timber is allowed to be cut in the province of Ontario, and by this means compel the cutting of it to take place in this country. The other consists in the placing of an export duty on logs, which will accomplish the same purpose.

I have always been of the opinion that the proper remedy is to change the regulations, but we never could get the Indian Department here to do so with regard to the timber cut on our Indian lands, and as the Ontario government refused to change its regulations so as to compel the cutting of the timber in Canada taken off Crown lands, we were obliged to do the next best thing, and press for an export duty on logs to stop them being taken out of the country before being manufactured into lumber.

At last, however, the provincial government did move in the direction desired, and the regulations were changed, so that to-day all pine timber on the Crown lands of Ontario must be sawn in this country. This did away with one of the great evils for which we sought a remedy. But there is a large portion of our lumber still going out of the country not manufactured. Last year over 25,000,000 feet of logs were taken off the Indian reserves in the Algoma and Georgian Bay districts, principally on the Manitoulin Islands, and sawn in the United States, and a vast quantity of lumber in the log is still going out from those districts without restriction. This resolution seeks to have an export duty imposed, but I do not think that is the best way to prevent this

evil. I think the Department of Indian Affairs, which has the power to change the regulations, just as the Ontario Crown Lands Department did, should change the regulations in such a way as to compel millowners to saw the logs in this country. The department could do this at any time. It reserves the right to change the regulations in the leases at any time. By changing the regulations, we would avoid the danger anticipated by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), namely, that the Americans might bring into operation that portion of their Customs Act which provides that when any country imposes an export duty on logs going into the United States, that clause of the American Act will at once come into force which doubles the duty on sawn lumber brought into American territory from that country. I would, therefore, urge the government to apply this remedy of changing the departmental regulations as soon as possible, and thus prevent a vast business which ought to be done in this country being transferred to the other side.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I do not suppose that hon. gentlemen opposite who have brought up this important question expect more at present than that they should have the opportunity, as they have had, of pressing it upon the attention of the House.

The general question of levying export duties has been repeatedly considered by the House, and there have been good reasons why it has not been deemed expedient to adopt that policy. Circumstances, however, might arise which would lead the government to adopt such a course, and we have taken the legislative power in certain cases to do so.

My hon. friend from East Simcoe has hardly expressed in his motion all he has in his mind. He proposes that we should levy an export duty on logs cut on Indian reserves, but it may be a question whether we could levy a duty on one section and not apply it universally.

But I fancy that the real purpose of my hon. friend is, not that there should be an export duty, but that there should be regulations of the Indian Department which would effect the same object. That is a matter well worthy of consideration, but for the present the government does not wish to commit itself to any particular course. If the hon. gentleman will withdraw his motion, it will be considered in due course, or, if he desires, the debate might be adjourned and the question discussed at a later period.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I would like to hear from the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Clifford Sifton) in what form licenses are granted by the Indian Department to cut timber, and whether they are renewable from year to year. Has the hon. minister the power to alter, by regulations, after the licenses are granted, the amount of duties to be paid and the conditions under which the duties should be levied? Has he reserved the power, as the Ontario government has done, of renewing the licenses on such altered conditions as he may choose? I do not remember on what conditions the licenses are issued—whether by statute of the Dominion, which gives the Minister of the Interior power to issue licenses, or whether the hon. minister only acts as the ward of the Indians and gives licenses without any special power to do so.

For the proper consideration of the whole question, it is well that the House should know in what form the licenses are granted —whether renewable from year to year, and whether the power is left in the hands of the minister to alter the regulations in the direction suggested by my hon. friend from Simcoe.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The licenses issued to cut timber on Indian lands are issued by the Department of Indian Affairs, under the authority of the Indian Act, which gives the Governor General in Council power to make regulations for the disposal of the timber upon these lands when they have been surrendered by the Indians. First of all, the Indian lands have to be surrendered to the government for the purposes of sale, and then the government disposes of the timber under regulations prescribed by the Governor in Council, and, except in special cases, public tenders are invited. I could not say whether, in respect of the licenses issued, there is such an implied contract as would prevent our altering the terms. There are very extensive timber lands not disposed of at all—Indian lands—and as to them we can make what conditions we please. But, as to lands on which licenses have been issued, my recollection is that there has been no change in the form of license adopted in former years. The hon. gentleman will remember that when the policy now in force in Ontario was first adopted, there was very serious question as to the power of the Ontario government to alter the terms of the licenses. I think the point raised was, that there was an implied contract on the part of the government to renew the licenses annually on the same terms or without substantial change and without looking particularly into the question and examining the licenses, I would not be in a position to express an opinion at present.

I suppose my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) desires the fullest information, and if he wishes I will bring down a full statement on this point, and, if necessary, get the opinion of the Department of Justice on the power of the govern-

ment to alter the terms, so that the House may be in full possession of the facts.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). The principle adopted in Ontario, namely, the right to change the conditions of the leases, has been vindicated, not only in the courts of Ontario, but before the Privy Council in England. Since that principle has been vindicated, it ought to apply to all the licenses granted by the Indian Department here as well as by the province of Ontario.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). What Privy Council decision does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) refer to ?

Mr. MACLEAN. It went to the Privy Council within the last two years.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Of course, my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) will understand that while the principle may, to some extent, apply under the Ontario leases, it does not follow that it would apply under our leases.

Mr. MACLEAN. The principle having been vindicated now, the government could use it for the protection of the country in these cases.

Mr. BENNETT. As the motion has been on the Order paper for over two weeks—for I believe it was put on the first day of the session—I am surprised that the Minister of the Interior comes down to the House now not able to furnish the least information as to what would be the effect of passing the resolution. I am only speaking from recollection, but I have had something to do in getting these licenses renewed for friends in my own riding, and my recollection is that they stand on all-fours with the Ontario licenses in this—that the Crown reserves to itself the right, at all times, to do as it pleases. That was the ground of interposition by the Ontario government. They took high ground that they had the right to interpose at any time ; and I submit that this government has the same right. However, as the resolution might produce the result I stated at the outset, of causing high duties by way of reprisal, and as there is not a great amount exported, I will not press the motion to a division. But I hope and trust that the government will, during the present session, and at the very earliest opportunity, announce to those who are now taking away these logs, that they cannot take them out of the province as logs, but must manufacture them in Ontario. As they have had notice from year to year that this power was held in reserve, the step might well be taken now. Mills in Michigan are dependent upon these logs to a certain extent ; and, as the Ontario government has intervened and stopped the exportation of the logs of the Ontario licenses, it is humiliating to find that the Dominion government will not follow their lead. I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Before the motion is withdrawn, I would observe that the motion which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) debated to-day, and very properly, is not the motion which he gave notice of. The motion of which he gave notice was one in favour of an export duty, which involves a very large question ; but, in the address he delivered, he restricted himself to the subject of a change of regulation, which is a very different question.

Mr. BENNETT. But would have the same result.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I would like to call attention to the fact that the government, in 1897, took power to deal with just such cases—that is, they asked and were given authority to impose duties——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That was confined to minerals, was it not ?

Mr. CLANCY. No, it gave the government power to deal with all such cases as my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) has brought up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But the question brought before us to-day is one of regulation.

Mr. CLANCY. The question raised simply is whether the government would be taking a proper step in dealing with a portion of the case—that of the logs upon Indian lands—and leaving the other points involved in the same position as before.

Motion withdrawn.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copies of all correspondence, telegrams and reports that have passed since March, 1900, between the Dominion government and the Imperial government, and between the Dominion government and the provincial government of British Columbia in regard to Mongolian immigration into Canada.—Hon. Mr. Prior.

Return of all papers, reports and other data relative to the lowering of the waters of Lake Simcoe, with a view towards reclaiming certain flooded lands.—Mr. McLeod.

Return of copies of each of the hydraulic mining leases mentioned on page 65 of the annual report of the Department of the Interior, 1900; also showing what conditions or terms of these leases have been complied with, respectively ; also, copies of all reports, letters and communications respecting each lease.—Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.

Copies of all correspondence, papers, tenders, returns and other documents relating to the government wharf at or near the ferry, East River Sheet Harbour, in the county of Halifax, N.S., showing the title of the Crown, if any, to this wharf, and the use which has been made

thereof since January 1, 1897. The person or persons in charge of the wharf on behalf of the government since January 1, 1897. The moneys which have been expended by the government thereon since January 1, 1897. The dates when the sums were so expended, whether the same were expended by public contract or how otherwise; also, all such papers aforesaid as show the amount collected or received by the government, or by any person or persons on its behalf, for use of such wharf since January 1, 1897.—Mr. Borden (Halifax).

Copies of all orders in council, reports, correspondence, papers and documents relating to real estates at St. John, N.B., purchased by the government or by the Department of Railways and Canals for the Intercolonial Railway since January 1, 1897, and relating to claims for payment or compensation therefor, including all orders in council, correspondence, documents or papers showing what action has been taken or is proposed to be taken with respect to such claim or claims.—Mr. Borden (Halifax).

Copies of all despatches, letters, telegrams, correspondence, reports, respecting the subjects included in the following telegram of August 2, 1900:—

'Ottawa, Ont., Aug. 2, via Bennett, Aug. 7. F. C. Wade, Dawson,—Sir Wilfrid has handed me your message. Am endeavouring to remove difficulties caused by delays in answering communications addressed to other departments. Superintendent Taché, of the Public Works Department, is now en route to Dawson with orders for the construction of trails and public buildings. Government considering plan of readjustment of royalty which will lighten tax and, we think, prove generally satisfactory. Order granting representation in local council takes effect immediately. Ryley, of mining branch, en route to Dawson. Will report amendments to mining laws. Careful consideration, letters and petitions received here, convinces me every reasonable request regarding mining laws can be met in near future. Impossible for me to visit Yukon now. Hope to get there before many months. '(Sgd.) CLIFFORD SIFTON.

—Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.

Return showing the names and addresses of all parties tendering (where tenders were called for) for coal and wood, or either, for the use of the government of Canada since July 1, 1899; copy of the tender put in by each party tendering, copy of the specification issued in each case where tenders were called for, name and address of the successful tenderer in each case, together with the kind, quality and quantity of coal and wood, or either, tendered for; also the kind, quality and quantity of coal and wood or either, for which tenders were accepted in each case, and the prices paid; also, the location of each government building or institution supplied with coal and wood, or either, the quantity and quality and sizes of coal and wood, or either, supplied to each, and the price in each case. Also, the names and addresses of all parties supplying coal and wood, or either, without tender, since the above date to the government of Canada, the kind, quality and quantity supplied in each case by each person, the prices paid in each case, and the location of the building or institution supplied.—Mr. Clarke.

Copies of the complaints, pleas, convictions, notes of judgment and all other papers, correspondence, &c., relating to the case of Cinqmars vs. Senecal, decided by the Court of Queen's Bench (Crown side), on December 17, 1900.—Mr. Fortin.

MANUFACTURE OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel) moved:

That in the opinion of this House it is expedient that all binder twine now held by the government, together with all twine that may hereafter be manufactured by them, shall be sold direct to the farmer at a price to cover the actual cost of raw material and manufacture only, with 1 cent per pound added, and that no twine manufactured or paid for out of the Dominion treasury shall be sold or disposed of in any other way.

He said: In rising to make this motion I want to ask the kind indulgence of the House, which is usually extended to new members. I am aware that this is not a new question. It is a question that has been up for consideration in this House for a number of years; but as there are a good many new members in the House, I will give a very brief review of the sale and manufacture of binder twine as carried on by the government in the Kingston penitentiary. In 1894 the late government for the first time introduced the manufacture of binder twine in the Kingston penitentiary, and installed a plant for that purpose. In 1894-5 they adopted the policy of placing a traveller upon the road and selling the twine directly to the retail merchant, and the retail merchant sold it to the farmer. The then government entered into a contract with a Mr. Kelly, of Montreal, which contract ran for five years, and expired on September 1, 1900. But in June, 1896, that government was defeated, and a new government came into power. One of the first acts of the new government was to cancel altogether the agreement made by the former government with Mr. Kelly, and to adopt a new plan for the sale of binder twine. On coming into power they found on hand at the Kingston penitentiary all the twine that had been manufactured by the government the year before, amounting to about one million pounds. They sold that twine to Coll Bros. & Co. for the average price of $4.25 per hundred pounds. That twine had cost the country an average price of $4.66 per hundred pounds, but they sold it to this firm of political friends for 41 cents per hundred pounds less than it cost this country to manufacture it. In the year 1897 they sold the twine that had cost this country an average price of $4.43 per hundred pounds to manufacture, to another firm of their friends, the Hobbs Hardware Manufacturing Co., of the city of London, for the average price of $4.64, or 21 cents per hundred pounds over the cost of the twine during that year. In 1898, continuing the same policy, they sold the twine to H. N. Bate & Sons, another firm composed of their friends; the twine cost an average price of $4.72 per hundred pounds, and they sold it to this firm at a gain of 12 cents per hundred pounds over the cost. In the following year, 1899, the twine cost an average price of $6.25 per hundred pounds to manufacture,

and they sold it to Hobbs & Co. for an average price of $6.51, or 26 cents per hundred pounds over the cost. The government then decided to make a change in the manner of disposing of the twine made in the Kingston penitentiary. In looking over the 'Hansard' I find that on May 9, 1900, a question was put to the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister by Mr. Clancy, in these words :

What was the quality and price of each class of hemp or other fibre purchased at the Kingston penitentiary between June 30, 1899, and January 1, 1900?

The PRIME MINISTER. Pending the sale of the output, it never has been the policy of the department to make public the price either of the raw material or the manufactured product.

But that year they decided to advertise the twine, and announced publicly that the farmer could purchase his twine directly from the Kingston penitentiary. Now, I ask the House to notice the kind of advertisement they put in the newspapers. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) asked this question in the House :

Has the government sent out a schedule of prices at which binder twine will be sold at Kingston penitentiary up to March 1, 1900.

The Prime Minister answers :

Yes ; as follows :—

	Per lb.
Lots of fifty tons and upwards—Manila....	12½c.
" " " Mixed.....	9½c.
Car-load lots less than fifty tons—Manila..	13c.
" " " Mixed...	10c.
Lots of one ton—Manila.....	13½c.
Lots of less than one ton—Manila.....	14c.
Mixed.....	11c.

Now, you will notice that the twine that the government advertised could be purchased by the farmers in quantities less than one ton for 14 cents per pound for manilia and 11 cents per pound for mixed, was manufactured by the same government at an average price of $6.25 per 100 pounds. Thus, in their announcement that they were prepared to sell twine direct to the farmer, they asked the farmer to pay, for what cost an average price of $6.25 per 100 pounds, $14 per 100 pounds for manila and $11 per hundred pounds for mixed, which seems to be rather a large percentage, but that was the announcement that was put in the newspaper. In looking over the Auditor General's Report, I notice that the actual output of twine from the Kingston penitentiary, in 1899, was $34,292.45 worth. It was sold, $7,258.63 worth to H. N. Bate & Sons, and $26,085.55 worth to the Hobbs Hardware Co., making a total of $33,344.18 worth. The balance was sold to the farmers, the balance being $948.27, and it cost the government of this country to advertise that $497. In coming forward to the Auditor General's Report for 1900, I notice that the total output of twine at the Kingston penitentiary was $59,481.71. They sold the largest proportion of that to two friends of their own. The Hobbs Company got $35,672.57 worth, and one, John Connor, got $15,753.53 worth, making a total, purchased by these two friends of the government, of $51,426.10 worth, and the farmers just got $8,055.61 worth. It cost them to advertise that to the farmers of this country, according to the Auditor General's Report, $725. Now, the motion that I have before the House has two or three simple requests. One is that the cost of the twine manufactured by the government in the Kingston penitentiary shall first be made out, and that when the cost is made out there shall be 1 cent per pound added for expenses of shipping out the twine to the farmers. If, for illustration, in 1899, the cost of twine being an average of $6.25 per ton, according to their own report, they had added 1 per cent per pound to it and advertised to the farmers that they could buy the total output of the Kingston penitentiary at $7.25 per 100 pounds, instead of $14 per 100 pounds for manila and $11 per hundred pounds for mixed, the government would have sold every pound of it direct to the farmers. Then, of course, as my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) says, Hobbs would not have got it, but we cannot help that. The government promised to sell it direct to the farmer, and we want to find out whether they are fulfilling the pledges they made. In answer to a question the other day, placed upon the Order paper by myself, the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) said they would not tell this parliament the cost of the raw material for the manufacture of the binder twine that was made in the Kingston penitentiary last year. I say that this is not fair to the people of this country. If my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) were the president of a company, and I was a stockholder, and if I went to him as a stockholder and asked him for prices in respect to the purchase of goods he was selling and in which I was interested, if I asked him after one year had expired from the time he purchased the goods and he refused to tell me, I would think that I had a fair grievance against the president of my company. So, I think when the people of this country, through their representatives, ask the government what the raw material cost that was paid for out of the public treasury, the government have a right to give the people a fair and simple answer, and tell them the facts of the case. I notice one or two things in the report of the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Mills) that are worthy of the attention of this House in discussing this matter. A. Ballantyne received for services as arbitrator, $500 in 1899. I suppose that was for arbitrating as to whether an amount ought to be paid or not. If the House would adopt the principle laid down in the motion I have submitted here, there would be no $500 to be paid for arbitration. The price would be so fixed, and it would be so low, that

the farmers would willingly take up the full amount of twine manufactured, and there would be no charge of $500 to be paid by the country for arbitrating disputed accounts between the government and those who purchased the twine from them. I have here the statement of a former supporter of the government, Mr. McMillan, as reported in 'Hansard' of 1899, page 7213, Mr. McMillan says :

> I understand that in the state of Michigan, where I have friends living, binder twine is manufactured by the government of that state. The first thing they do is to advertise, and they allow the farmers to send in for a certain quantity and send the money with the order.

Mr. McMillan, on the same page, says :

> I believe the government should advertise and allow the farmers to send in their orders, taking at least 500 pounds of binder twine and sending the money along with the order.

That is a principle laid down by a former supporter of the government, and it seems to be a principle that they were unwilling to adopt and did not adopt. The motion that I submit for the consideration of the House, and I do not wish to detain hon. gentleman longer, is that the government shall sell the twine direct to the farmer for cash. They say, of course, the quantity is small that is manufactured, being only 500 tons each and every year, and that the country consumes a much larger quantity of twine. The government through their representatives have said to the farmers : The quantity of twine we manufacture is so small that we cannot supply all the farmers and therefore it would not be wise to supply any of them. I contend that the policy of the government should be that so far as the twine which they manufacture will supply the wants of the farmers, they should supply it to the farmers direct and abolish the system of first giving it to their political friends ; as for instance once in a while by advertising in the public press, and then advertising through circulars which are sent to the friends of the government who purchase twine throughout the country. I have no disposition to embarrass the government upon this small question, and when I call it a small question I mean that the amount involved is not very large, but at the same time it is of great importance to this country, and the farmers of the province of Ontario expressed themselves upon the question on the seventh of November. It was one of the most important questions for discussion in the late election, and I am quite certain that many of the Ontario electors voted against the government, because the government did not adopt the policy laid down in the resolution now before the House. Although I was elected a supporter of the Conservative party, I made the promise in my county that if the government would adopt the policy of selling the twine direct to the farmers, doing away with middlemen altogether, and giving to the farmers all the advantage that the supply of twine would warrant, that I would support the government upon that question. I am here to repeat that statement in the House as the representative of my constituents, and I am most anxious that that policy should be adopted. It is a policy that will remove altogether whatever suspicion surrounds the government in connection with the sale of this binder twine. I also wish to express my opinion that the government should furnish information to parliament, especially when that information is a year and a half old, when it is required by this House in the public interest. I wish now to refer to the quantity of manila that was purchased by the government in 1899 and 1900, and I refer to it because the Hon. David Mills in a pamphlet which I have here makes the statement that the farmers paid more for their binder twine last year because the government were compelled to pay more for the manila. I take the report of the Minister of Justice ending June 30, 1899, and I find that all the manila they purchased during that year was 125,000 pounds at 5¾ cents a pound. I would call attention to the fact that that is marked 'seconds.' I do not know that that means that the government has been selling pure manila made out of second quality, but it certainly stands there in the report that the Minister of Justice purchased second quality manila and when the government come to sell it they do not sell it as second quality, but as pure manila. It is a problem for the government to solve as to how they accomplish that. Then again I find from the report of the Minister of Justice that in the year 1900, they purchased 140,335 pounds of manila at 5½ cents; 123,344 pounds at 5½ cents, and only 8,320 pounds at 9 cents. In view of these figures I do not think that the people of Canada will agree in the statement that the reason why the farmers had to pay so much for their twine last year was that the government had to pay so much for their manila. I thank the House for their kind attention, and I am most anxious that this motion should be adopted, which I move, seconded by Mr. Johnston, of Cardwell.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The motion of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) is one that certainly should not meet with the opposition of any representative of an agricultural constituency, and I think will receive the support of every member representing constituencies in Manitoba and North-west Territories. During the late campaign there were few questions that interested the farmers more or received their closest attention and criticism than the binder twine question, and quite naturally. In that country where population is filling in, where land is being taken up and a greater acreage being brought under culti-

vation every year, where an increased quantity of binder twine will be required each succeeding season, it is of the utmost importance that our farmers should be placed in a position to secure their twine at the cheapest possible price consistent with a legitimate business profit.

When Sir John Thompson was Minister of Justice, it was deemed advisable in order not only to afford labour to our convicts in the Kingston penitentiary, but also to break the power of a combine that was said to exist in the twine industry in Canada, and to afford our farmers cheaper twine, to establish a plant for its manufacture in that institution. This action was taken with the result that twine could be purchased in those days, notwithstanding the outcry of a combine existing, at 6 and 6½ cents a pound. The argument has been used that owing to the limited amount manufactured at Kingston, 500 tons annually, it would have very little effect in lowering the price; but I think when that twine was sold to the farmers direct, as it was at that time, it acted as a great lever on the other manufacturers of twine and did result in preventing them from demanding an exorbitant figure for their output.

When the present government came into power they changed the manner of its disposal, and instead of selling to the farmers direct, they handed it over to their own political friends at a greatly reduced price so that our farmers had to pay for the same twine, only 4½ cents being received for it one year, while the consumers had to pay 10 and 11 cents the same season. The supporters of the government claim that it was owing to the increased price of the raw material consequent upon the American-Philippine war that raised the price of the finished product, but the returns brought down to the House during the last session of parliament explodes that contention; for, while there undoubtedly was a rise in the price of the raw material, it was not at all in keeping with the large price our farmers were compelled to pay for the twine: nor was any explanation forthcoming as to why the contractors were able to secure from the government the penitentiary twine at so comparatively low a figure notwithstanding the increased price of the raw material.

It has been said that tenders were called for, and the twine went to the highest tender, but that was not the case every year. It is true, as has been pointed out, that private circulars had been sent out to a number of the government's political friends inviting tenders; but it was only after considerable agitation had sprung up in the country, because of the government's action, that public advertisements in the press of the country were resorted to. Even then, as evidenced by the disclosures that took place before the Public Accounts Committee, these contractors were permitted to manipulate the tenders in their own interest and in such a manner as to surround the whole affair with great suspicion. Recognizing the justice of the outcry by the farming community, the government last year made a pretense of complying with their wishes and advertised in their party papers that farmers could secure twine direct from the penitentiary up to March 1. This was a practically valueless concession, as those of us who represent rural constituencies are fully aware, and the government seeing this extended the time to May 1. Even this was of very little account, for there is not one farmer in a thousand who will purchase his twine months before he requires it, and, as far as our western farmers are concerned, it was of no value whatever. In that country our crops do not mature before the middle of August, and how unreasonable it would be to expect them to take advantage of this so-called concession and purchase their twine during seeding time, when they are not in a position to know what amount they will require, whether their crops will be a failure or a success, or whether they will require any twine at all or not. Besides, how many of our farmers in a new country have bank accounts that they can afford to speculate by purchasing their twine four months before they will require it.

So, I say, so far as our western farmers are concerned—and I venture to say it is the same in the east—this so-called boon to the farmers is a sham and of no material benefit whatever. Had the government done as this resolution asks them to do, dealt directly with the farmers at any time and at all times during the whole season, at a slightly increased price above the cost of manufacture, the farmers would have been the beneficiaries, and, I believe, the exchequer would have derived more benefit as well; for in some instances in the past the contractors have secured the twine below the cost of manufacture.

The unfair argument made by our opponents during the late campaign in regard to the position we on the opposition benches took on this binder twine question was that owing to the government having taken the duty off, we were called upon to pay a higher price for our twine. This is an entire misrepresentation of our position. When the Conservative government left power, twine only bore a revenue tariff, and the penitentiary twine was sold direct to the farmers if they so desired. After the present government assumed the reins of office, they wiped out the duty. If, in the ordinary course of events, that action would have resulted in giving cheaper twine to our farmers, that was prevented by the government refusing to sell direct to the consumers, and by handing over the government twine to those who were the agents of the American combine, and who held up the farmers to the tune of thousands of

dollars over and above what they should have paid had it been handled in a proper business manner.

If the supply at the penitentiary is not sufficient, in the government's opinion, to influence materially the market price, they have the means at their disposal to increase that supply. And while it may be said that it is not the province of the government to embark in commercial enterprises, I think it was quite justifiable for the government, when in such an industry as that, if the removal of the duty merely hands over the business to those who are members of a combine, to utilize every means at their command to afford relief to our farmers.

Without occupying any more of the time of the House, especially as the mover of the motion has gone so thoroughly into his case, I beg to say that it is my intention to support the motion most heartily.

Mr. ROBERT JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Mr. Speaker, as a disappointed farmer, I wish to say that when the binder twine plant was placed in the Kingston penitentiary, I thought that possibly the farmers would be able to get their binder twine at a somewhat lower price than before ; but in that I have been disappointed. Although I have used some of the penitentiary binder twine, I have had to pay as much for it as I have paid private dealers. Only last year I sent for some of the penitentiary binder twine, and paid 10½ cents a pound for it ; and I could get it for the same price from private dealers. It appears to me that that is hardly fair to the farmers that the government should carry on an establishment of this kind, and dispose of the product to people who do not use it themselves, but take it simply for the purpose of selling it to the farmers and make money out of them. In this case the cheap labour of the penitentiary comes into competition with the labour of the factories of the country ; and this is done at the expense of the ratepayers, especially the farmers, who do more to keep up that plant than any other section of the community. We claim that this manufacture should be carried on for the benefit of the farmers, and yet they have had no benefit from it so far. As the question has been ably discussed by the two gentlemen who have preceded me, I do not intend to take up the time of the House any further ; but I promised the farmers of my constituency that I would do anything I could to have binder twine sold to the farmers at prices as low as the dealers pay, and I hope that the government, without regard to political pulls, and without any feeling towards the opposition, will make an effort to help the farmers in this respect.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the applause which I have received is owing to the members, most of them, knowing that I represent the only organized body of farmers in the Dominion of Canada. It is quite possible that I may not be able to speak for all the farmers ; but when I say that the body which I represent have taken a deep interest in these binder twine organizations throughout the country, and have pronounced themselves strongly upon all monopolies in binder twine, hon. members will see that I have some right to speak on the subject, especially when I hear the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) stating that the government have gone in to assist the monopolies of this country. I hope that is not true. I should be sorry to believe that the government, which promised to assist the farmers, the manufacturers, and all other classes, had gone in to assist the binder twine monopolies. I was told on my way down here that the binder twine manufacturers had held a meeting and had consulted with the minister at Ottawa, who has charge of that particular industry, on the advisability of the government assisting these manufacturers to keep up the prices; but I did not put a question on the Order paper concerning this rumour, because I could not believe possible that the government would lend its countenance to any such attempt. Governments cannot make binder twine for the farmers at less than cost any more than can individuals, but there is nothing to prevent a government which goes into that business, furnishing the twine to the farmers at very little above cost. It seems to me that the government acted wisely when it took the duty off binder twine, but when it assists monopolies, it nullifies any good that might have resulted from its policy.

I fully endorse the resolution before the House, and hope it will carry, and thus teach the manufacturers a lesson by showing them that they cannot hope to approach any government and expect that government to obtain the assistance of its supporters in any scheme to bleed the farmers.

The question has been raised as to what would be the best way to get the binder twine into the hands of the farmers. I am told that the government hesitates to trust the farmers individually, but that difficulty might be met by securing some prominent man in every township and making him the agent of the government for the sale of binder twine.

I have no desire to weary the House by prolonging this discussion, for I desire, and I think we all desire, a short session. For my part, I should wish the Prime Minister of this glorious country to have the opportunity of going over to the sounthern cross and show the people of Australia what confederation has done for this country. And when the Australian confederation has been organized, I would wish to see the right hon. gentleman go to South Africa, and there contribute to establish the great confederation which must take place in that

country under the British Crown. For this short digression, I am sure the House will pardon me, and I would just in conclusion urge this point. The government has a very easy way of settling this binder twine question. Let it appoint in every township a first-class man—and it is very easy to find a first-class man among the farmers—who will act as its representative, and let him sell the binder twine at the very cheapest rate, and be responsible to the government for the proper conducting of the business.

Mr. N. BOYD (Macdonald). The very able manner in which the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution (Mr. Blain) placed the matter before the House leaves very little to be said by me or those who follow. I do not think that the government realizes the importance of this question to the farmers of this country. It is one much more important than the duty on agricultural implements, because the cost of binder twine is an annual tax for an annual necessity. When you come to realize the fact that an ordinary farmer in Manitoba has to pay annually for his binder twine from $25 to $100, you will understand how important to him is this matter. This article is one of the necessities of the farmer, particularly of the western country. I would like to ask the House, if it were shown that any necessity of the people generally, such as tea or sugar or tobacco, was handled by the government in the way in which my hon. friend has shown that the government has handled this article of binder twine, how long would the people submit to be so treated ? Do you think that any government or any supporter of the government would be proud of the position occupied by the government ? No, Sir ; but because the item in question is one that affects the farmers, only it can be treated here by hon. gentlemen opposite as a fit subject for joking and not for serious discussion. I do not rise for the purpose of making factious opposition, or in any way embarrassing the government, but the proposition of my hon. friend is so very fair, and one which could so easily be adopted and put into effect, and which would bring that relief to the farmer to which he is entitled, that I cannot press it too forcibly on the attention of this House and the government. When the government started the manufacturing of binder twine in the penitentiaries, we expected great results in the interest of the farmer, but that industry has been so managed by this government that we have utterly failed to realize what was expected. As I have said, the expenditure on binder twine of any ordinary farmer in our part of the country averages from $25 to $100 per year, and consequently is a very serious item in his business. This matter, therefore, is one which the government will have to take into its most serious consideration, and I trust that the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Blain), and the able manner in which he has submitted it, will open the eyes of the administration to the vital necessity of dealing satisfactorily with this matter before this session closes.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). I happen to be a farmer during two or three months in the year, and, therefore, may claim some right to the indulgence of the House while I speak on this subject. When the government came into power in 1896——

An hon. MEMBER. A long time ago.

Mr. OSLER. Yes, for the country ; they were very anxious that monopolies should be prevented by Act of parliament—perhaps the most difficult thing to accomplish that a government ever attempted to carry out. But here, at least, was a case in which the government had it absolutely in their own power to prevent a monopoly. They have now a manufactory of this binder twine of their own, and, consequently, can sell it to the farmers at a reasonable price, covering the cost, and by doing so keep down the prices of other manufacturers. Instead of doing that, however, they deliberately combine with the other manufacturers to prevent the farmers getting the binder twine readily and cheaply from the government factory. The result of this combine between the government and the other manufacturers has been that the binder twine factories in Ontario have for the last two years divided among their shareholders dividends ranging all the way up from 40 to 100 per cent on their paid up capital. The government had it in their power to remedy that state of affairs. I do not object to a company which risks its money in manufacturing making a very handsome profit, because manufacturing business is uncertain. But binder twine is, perhaps, the simplest form of manufacturing we have in this country, and yet there is no manufacturing concern in Canada that has distributed among its shareholders in the past four years, or since this government has been in power, such enormous dividends as has been paid by the binder twine manufacturers. I think the resolution is a proper one. The government are manufacturers of twine, and they could sell the twine to the farmers at cost price, thereby carrying out in some small measure one of their promises, and showing that they were in earnest when they declared themselves anxious to provide that there should not be any unjust combine of capital against the farmers and artisans of this country.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). During the recent election the supporters of the present government made a sweeping statement to the farmers, regarding what they had done for them in the matter of binder twine, and took credit to themselves for

doing the first generous thing for the farmers that had been done for five years, that of selling binder twine to the farmers direct. And at what prices did they sell it ? Take one sample—they issued a sheet announcing that they would sell in less than ton lots to the farmers at 14 cents a pound for one grade, that of manila. And what did they sell it to their own friends for ? They sold it at 7¼ cents a pound.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. At the same time ?

Mr. SPROULE. At the same time, and the same quality of twine. And they ask the farmers to be grateful for their generous act to them. According to my experience one of the questions that, above all others helped to leave the government in the minority in the province of Ontario, was the way they handled the binder twine. The farmers, very properly reasoned : If, in regard to an article in which we are so directly and so vitally interested, the government have been treating us unfairly, how can we trust them in other things ? Many of the government's friends —I have it from these people privately, and have even heard it stated by them on the public platform—voted against the government on that question. It is only fair that this should be known, for the farmers resented being deceived as well as mulct in a large amount of money. Whether it would be a proper thing to sell to the farmers direct at cost price, I am not prepared to say. I still believe that the true principle was that acted upon by the former government. They sold the twine to an agent, who sold it to the retail dealers throughout the country; but, to guard the farmer against unfair treatment, the government reserved the right to sell direct to the farmer at 10 per cent above the price at which it was sold to the agent. This allowed a profit to all parties, while no injustice could be done. Had this government followed that course, they would have done right. But to sell binder twine at $6.21 to their friends, which was sold to the farmers at $16, was a thing for which they should be condemned. For my part, I made this a subject of attack of the government on every platform on which I spoke during the late election.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The government certainly has no right to complain of the manner in which my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) introduced this question. It is a very important question, and the interest evinced in it by all sides of the House shows that that importance is recognized. My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) and others who followed him have made statements which the government is not prepared to accept. The question is a large one, and, as it is understood that we are not to sit this evening, I will ask the House to agree to the adjournment of the debate, that we may continue the discussion at another time. As to the policy suggested by my hon. friend, I am not prepared to express an opinion. The arguments are not new to us, but have engaged the attention of the government. Some of the statements made by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and others are liable to be contradicted, and, at the proper time, I am confident, an explanation will be made in rebuttal of those statements. But, at least allow me now to express my satisfaction at the statement made by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson), that the government had done a good thing when they put binder twine on the free list. This is the first time I have heard that statement from that side of the House. I agree with the hon. gentleman, and he will find that the government will always be ready to help him against monopolies of every kind. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose it is understood that there will be an opportunity of bringing this matter up again. The right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows that this motion to adjourn the debate sometimes means the end of a question like this.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) knows me too well to have any such suspicion. But, to relieve his mind I may tell him that, according to the rules, this will be one of the first Orders of the Day on Wednesday evening next.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 22, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 12) respecting the London Mutual Fire Insurance Co. of Canada.—Mr. Hyman.

Bill (No. 13) respecting the Canada National Railway and Transport Co.—Mr. Cowan—by Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Century Life Insurance Co.—Mr. Monk.

DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved:

That the name of Mr. R. L. Richardson, member for the electoral divison of Lisgar, be added

to the list of members forming the Committee of Debates of this House.

He said : The hon. member for Lisgar was on the committee during the last parliament, and it is desirable that he should be there once more.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is no objection to the motion ; but I will ask that the name of Mr. McCreary be also added to the committee.

Amendment agreed to, and motion as amended agreed to.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Annual Report of the Inland Revenue Department, Part III.—Adulteration of Food.—Hon. M. E. Bernier.

The Civil Service List of Canada for the year 1900.—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

INQUIRY FOR REPORT.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) if he can give me any information when the Trade and Commerce Returns will be laid on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am afraid a little delay must occur. The hon. gentleman will understand that the Trade and Commerce Returns are necessarily somewhat posterior to the Trade and Navigation Returns.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the Trade and Navigation Returns I refer to.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They are down.

Mr. SPROULE. I inquired for them to-day, and did not get them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe the explanation is that the Minister of Customs laid them on the Table and a few copies were brought down, but there was not a sufficient number to distribute to all the members. He said he would attend to that matter.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET—INQUIRY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MONK. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire when we may expect the budget.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not in a position to give the hon. gentleman any information on the subject to-day. At a later date the information will be given.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee.

Mr. MONK.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose that we take up the Estimates of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I thought the government were going to proceed, as suggested, in the order in which the departments appear in the Estimates. It was mentioned that that course would be very convenient, as members would know what to expect, unless the government said the night before that they would take up something special.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it would be convenient to proceed in that way, and I had anticipated that the Solicitor General would be here to proceed with the Estimates of the Department of Justice, which are next in order ; but, as he is not here, I have asked my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to fill up the gap. Perhaps the Solicitor General will be here later, when we may proceed with the Estimates of the Department of Justice.

Maintenance and repairs to Government steamers $160,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). That is the ordinary amount voted every year. There will be an additional amount in the supplementary estimates as usual.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Can the hon. gentleman give any information concerning the repairs to the Minto. I understand that when she arrived at Charlottetown she was immediately put into dock and had to be repaired before attempting her season's work.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman was incorrectly informed. The Minto, on her voyage out from England, encountered one of the most severe storms her captain said he had ever experienced in the Atlantic. Some parts of her deck fittings were smashed by the ice, and the iron work twisted, but this had nothing to do with the hull or any material part of the vessel, and there never was any complaint against the builder. But certain changes, not very material, and almost always incidental to a new boat, had to be made. After her first winter's experience in the ice, the Minto had to go into dock to be re-riveted, but the same thing occurred when the Stanley was built, after she had a season's experience in the ice. There was, however, a larger number of loose rivets in the Minto than in the Stanley, and I communicated direct to Gourley Bros., asking them whether, considering the number of rivets that had to be re-riveted, they should not bear their share of the expense. They replied, giving in detail the great pains taken in their shipyard to have everything done in first-class order, and asked me, as they could not

afford to have the slightest suspicion of negligence attached to their work, what I thought they could do. I instructed my deputy to reply that I thought they should bear at least one-half of the cost of re-riveting.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How much was the cost ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. $4,900 for re-riveting and putting it up.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How much was the cost at Charlottetown, before the Minto was regularly in commission ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not recollect, but I stated the amount in debate last year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minto, I presume, was built after tender, and a regular contract drawn up ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did the hon. gentleman ask, as a matter of favour or fair-play or as a matter of law, that the contractor should contribute towards the expense of re-riveting.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no claim as a matter of law at all. I simply submitted the facts to them as first-class shipbuilders. I stated that after one year's experience in the ice, 1,300 rivets had to be re-riveted, and asked them could they afford this. I suggested that they should pay one-half. As a matter of law, she was certified in first-class condition, and the captain of the Minto intimates that he never had as good a boat before, and is thoroughly satisfied with her in every respect. We have no fault to find, except that, as the result of the year's work, more rivets require re-riveting than should be the case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How does the cost of maintenance compare with that of the Stanley ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. A little more. The Minto is 25 feet longer and proportionately broader and has a few more men, but the cost is very little more.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who is the commander ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Captain Finlayson, promoted from the Stanley, and the first officer of the Stanley is the captain.

Mr. MONK. What proportion of expenditure is attributable to repairs and what to maintenance ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nothing special. Every year we come down with the supplementary estimates whenever the repairs are more than the ordinary.

Mr. CLANCY. Why is this increase from year to year in the maintenance and repairs to government steamers ? In 1900 the amount was $145,000, and in 1901, $160,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I can hold out no hope of the expenditure being any less. It will rather be likely to be increased, because there is an additional steamer this winter. We have two steamers on the route trying to keep winter communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Mr. CLANCY. And not succeeding ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Both were frozen in fourteen days, but are running again. The Stanley got out of the ice yesterday, and the Minto three or four days ago. $160,000 is the ordinary sum voted, and when any special repairs are required we ask for a supplementary estimate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What was the amount expended last year, on which this estimate was based ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was $160,000 spent, and $20,000 supplementary voted, or $180,000, including repairs.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Why not make it $180,000 this year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because the practice has been to vote the repairs in the supplementary estimates. I think the better plan would be just to bring down the exact sum, but I simply follow the practice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think that is a new practice. The system on which the estimates used to be based a few years ago, took into consideration the total expenditure. Regardless of whether a boat was obtained by original or supplementary estimate. Bringing the estimates down in this way, a steady increase might escape the attention of the Committee. Evidently, $180,000 is the amount the hon. minister will require, for that was the amount last year and the year before; and, as I understand him, he does not hold out any hope that he will require any less this year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Referring to the question put by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), can the hon. minister tell us how much of that is apportioned to maintenance and how much to repairs ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Last year there was a supplementary vote for the Minto of $12,869, and alterations to the Aberdeen, $7,000. I shall propose this year's supplementary estimates for alterations and repairs to the Druid, the Aberdeen and some other steamers. I shall certainly require the whole $180,000. There will be the expense of running the additional steamer this winter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But, what I wished to ascertain is, how much of the expenditure is for maintenance and how much for repairs ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Substantially the whole of this is for maintenance—small ordinary repairs are included. Where there is a special expenditure amounting to five, six or seven thousand dollars, I intend to ask the House for a special vote, naming the amount and the vessel to be repaired.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. minister does not understand me, I take it that his officers have given him in detail the estimated expenditure for the maintenance of each ship, and also for the repairs of each ship. I do not ask for these details, but I desire to know how much is to be spent for repairs and how much for maintenance.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was $21,000 spent last year for repairs; the rest of the $180,000, was for maintenance.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How many ships has the hon. minister under his charge ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have all that we have had heretofore, with the Stanley in addition this winter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And the Aberdeen ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Aberdeen, the Landsdowne, the Druid, the Minto, the Stanley and the Quadra.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Newfield has been lost ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes; the Aberdeen takes her place. Otherwise the Aberdeen would be laid up. The expense is the same.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then the hon. gentleman has one ship less ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nominally, yes. But, formerly, when the Newfield was running in the winter, the Aberdeen was laid up at Quebec. Until we can get a ship built to take the Newfield's place, we have transferred the Aberdeen to the Nova Scotia shore. But the expense goes on the same.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As I understand, this amount is required for the maintenance and repairs for a certain fleet. One of the most expensive and valuable of the ships, the Newfield, has been lost. Yet, the hon. minister says he wants the same amount for maintenance and repairs. Allowing for the time that the Aberdeen is used, the amount required should not be the same, because the Newfield was running from January to December.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But, when the spring comes, I shall have to make other arrangements to supply the Newfield's place either by chartering another vessel or putting the Minto in the Newfield's place. The Minto was tied up in the summer months.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That leads up to the question, whether the minister proposes to charter a vessel ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I propose to put the Minto on, after she has done her winter navigation work, in lieu of the Aberdeen, which goes to Quebec.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the hon. minister any vessel that will do the special work, the cable work, that the Minto used to do ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is it proposed to have a vessel for that work ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. The Public Works Department, as I understand, propose to charter a vessel for that work, because the cable has to be laid to Belle Isle in the spring. The Newfield was about proceeding to that work last fall when she was lost.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the Marine Department going to abandon the idea of taking charge of these vessels ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It seems to me a pity to have the Marine Department, which has its special officers, nautical men, men who are acquainted with the repairing and the handling of ships, give up the charge of these vessels, and allow other departments to run vessels on their own account. It would add unnecessary expense. Some years ago a gradual concentration of that work was made under the Marine Department. In old times, for instance, the Customs Department had the management of a ship or two, and the

Marine Department took charge of these vessels. Now, it would appear, instead of replacing the Newfield, as ought to be done —for she did good work for the country—it it proposed that the Public Works Department shall provide their own cable ship.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think I mislead the hon. gentleman in that. I am having prepared plans and specifications of a ship for the construction of which I propose to call tenders at an early date. The new ship will take the place of the Newfield.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As a cable and marine ship ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. I have communicated to the Minister of Public Works the fact that I am prepared to build a ship on these lines and with that accommodation, if it is agreeable to him. I am not in a position to say that he has absolutely assented to that, but I have no reason to believe that he will not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That will be a costly ship. In that connection, has the hon. gentleman given attention to the efforts being made at Halifax to establish an iron ship building industry, and has he considered how far the government would be able to go on encouraging that enterprise, even if they have to pay a little more, by having the next large ship required for the use of the government on that coast built in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have given that matter a good deal of consideration and, as much as two months ago, I had the whole matter reported upon by the officers of my department. I appreciate fully the importance of this great industry of building iron and steel ships in this Dominion. So far as the government is concerned, it will be my earnest desire to do what I can to further the initiation of that great industry. I made a report to my colleagues on the subject and suggested the desirability, when tenders are being called for, of calling for tenders in the Dominion of Canada for the construction of these ships. I had obtained beforehand an estimate of the increase in the cost of building in Canada, and submitted that to my colleagues, and although the report has not yet been finally adopted, they viewed the suggestion very favourably, and I think the conclusion will be to call for tenders in the Dominion of Canada for these ships. When I say 'these ships,' I include the Newfield, which is to take her place on the Nova Scotia shore, and also the Druid, which has been reported as worn out and useless, and as too dangerous to undertake another season's navigation, and for which a new ship will have to be substituted. It is my intention to call for tenders for the construction of both these ships in Canada ; and as my hon. friend says, even if it does cost a few thousand more, it will be in the general interest of the country that the money should be spent here, when that can be done, so that we may help along this great national industry.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am delighted to hear the observations of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I hope he will be able to inspire his colleagues with the same spirit.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am glad to say that they are of the same opinion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am certain the feeling in Canada would justify the additional expense that would be incurred in patronizing what would certainly be a new industry on the coast, or anything like an attempt to build a seagoing ship, iron or steel, and to assist in that respect. It would be a mere bagatelle so far as the government is concerned. Those enterprising are risking their own capital in an effort to make a test, at any rate, whether the country can sustain such an enterprise ; and I feel sure, without having directly communicated with any one, that the spirit of the country is such to-day the people would be delighted, in every quarter of Canada, not only to see this enterprise successfully started, but to give credit to the government for any share they had in assisting in such a way to develop that industry.

Mr. BENNETT. I notice on page P—144 of the Auditor General's Report, a reference to a steam barge called the Shamrock, purchased at a price of $21,500. May I ask the minister where that craft is, from whom she was purchased, and what use she was put to ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She was purchased for the Montreal buoy service, as I explained last year. Previously to that the Montreal buoy service had been let by contract, and had been carried on by contract. But it did not give satisfaction. The boards of trade and the shipping industries of Montreal insisted that there should be better buoy service, and the government had to take it over and carry it on themselves. A ship was bought from Mr. Kane, I think the name was—the facts are not as fresh in my mind as they were last year when I gave the House all the information about it.

Mr. BENNETT. When was she paid for?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. At the time she was bought, over a year ago.

Mr. BENNETT. I call the minister's attetnion to the fact that in the Auditor General's Report it would seem that on the

17th of November, 1900, that gentleman took exception to the fact that the boat had been purchased without a compliance with the Audit Act, section 33. I will use his own words as they occur on page P—144 of the report :

Auditor General's Office,
Ottawa, November 17, 1900.

Sir,—With reference to your letter of February 27 last, informing me that the minister and deputy minister personally examined into the value of the steam barge Shamrock. I beg to say that unless the deputy minister has the necessary technical knowledge in the construction of ships, his certificate would not be such as to fulfil the requirements of section 33 of the Audit Act.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. L. McDOUGALL, A.G.

The Acting Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Now, I am not aware whether last year there was a special vote of this amount of $21,500 for the purchase of this craft. If there was, I have no recollection of it, and if there was not a special grant, then I presume the money which paid for the craft was taken out of the general grant, and if it was taken out of the general grant, what was done in face of this objection on the part of the Auditor General to the payment ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will recollect that the matter was thoroughly discussed last year, the whole information was brought down, and there was a special vote brought into parliament for the purchase of this very steamer, and everything was discussed and settled. But I will give the hon. gentleman any information he requires now. There was a special vote brought down last year for the purchase of this steamer, and carried after full discussion, and after all the information asked for had been given. If the hon. gentleman desires, I will go over it again.

Mr. BENNETT. If the money was voted it must have been last summer ; then how was it that it was not until November that the money was paid over ? No doubt the vendor was anxious to secure his money. I have no recollection personally whether there was a special grant or not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How does the hon. gentleman make out that it was paid in November, 1900 ? I think he is wrong in that.

Mr. BENNETT. Because the letter of the Auditor General is dated on the 17th of November, and at that time he protested against the payment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But that refers to the deputy's letter of the 17th of February previous, nearly a year before.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. MONK. I must say I do not find the explanation of the minister satisfactory. I think when we vote such a large amount as $160,000 we are entitled to know in a precise manner what is going for repairs and what for maintenance. When I asked the hon. gentleman that, he said : Oh, that is the usual annual vote. As a matter of fact the vote reached the figure of $160,000 in 1900 ; before that it was $145,000. Then the hon. gentleman says : I intend to ask for $20,000 for extraordinary repairs. Then he says further on : It ought to be $180,000 anyway. For his own part he was of the opinion that it was better to make it $180,000 right away. And during all this time the hon. gentleman is not able to tell us, as surely he ought to know, what amount is going for maintenance and purely annual repairs, and what amount is destined for extraordinary repairs, and what amount is destined for the purchase of new ships. I think this is a most unsatisfactory manner of getting through an item of that magnitude. When we have an amount for maintenance and repairs, why have we not for the purchase and building of new ships? why have we not the amounts separated ? It would be much clearer, and we would lose much less time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am sorry my hon. friend does not think the explanation satisfactory, but I made it perfectly plain. The vote for $160,000 for maintenance and repairs refers chiefly to the maintenance of ships, but it also embraces some ordinary small repairs, if there are any. I told the hon. gentleman last year, when I asked for a large amount required for repairs in a special vote in the supplementaries, that I proposed to ask for it this year again. They are not hidden or covered up. This amount is not for the purchase of the ship.

Mr. MONK. What is the amount of the extraordinary repairs ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not brought it down yet. I told the hon. gentleman what it was last year—$12,869 for the Minto and $7,000 for the Aberdeen. I intend to bring down a supplementary estimate of repairs to the boilers of the Druid and the boilers of the Stanley, which were nearly worn out, and a deck was also put forward on the Aberdeen this year. This will be brought down with the supplementary estimates. This item of $160,000 is the ordinary item for the maintenance of the ships.

Mr. MONK. If the hon. gentleman would allow me, why does he then contend that the vote should be $180,000 every year for just these ordinary expenses of maintenance and repairs, and why is it that the hon. gentleman cannot tell us what is the specific amount required ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The $160,000 I now ask for is practically and substantially for the maintenance of the ships. If there are any other sums required for repairs, I propose to bring them down as a supplementary estimate. I have said that I would have to ask for $30,000 this year in addition to this $160,000 for repairs. This $160,000 is for maintenance. Last year the vote was taken in the same way, and I had to bring down an estimate for repairs, and I gave the hon. gentleman the items. It is proposed to do the same thing again this year, so that the House will know what the repairs will amount to besides.

Mr. SPROULE. Why does not the hon. gentleman say in his vote for maintenance and not for maintenance and repairs ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are some repairs always included in it.

Mr. BENNETT. On looking into the matter, I see now that on the 27th of February it would appear that the deputy wrote to the Auditor General in reference to the matter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You are going back to the Shamrock case.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Perhaps it will be better to proceed with the discussion in reference to this question of repairs. I do not understand the position of the hon. gentleman, from listening to the observations he last made. When answering my question, I gathered from him that $180,000, the amount spent the year before last, and the amount that was being expended this year, is about the amount he will require for maintenance and repairs.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That the maintenance itself will come to very nearly the amount of the vote before us—$160,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And that he proposes to bring down later on amounts for repairs which would likely be $20,000, making $180,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well now, I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to two or three things here which seem to indicate that he is mistaken in that estimate, because, on page 12 of the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the amount is given, showing the cost of maintenance, and, although it says the cost of maintaining, it appears to be what we are discussing, maintenance and repairs. His vote in 1899-1900 was $180,000, and the hon. gentleman was apparently of the opinion that that was the normal amount for the last two years, and for this year as estimated, and yet, according to the table it was an extraordinary amount, and an explanation is given in a note. It says that this $180,000, which is $40,000 more than was required the year before, includes outfit and stores to the Minto in Scotland, which properly belongs to construction. There is the explanation, and if this statement of the hon. gentleman be correct, there has a tremendous leap been made in the expenditure. The amount asked for was $111,000 in 1891-92, $146,000 in 1892-93, and then it dropped down to $129,000 in 1894-95, and to $117,000 in 1897-98. Then, in 1898-99, it was $145,000. Then there is this item of $180,000 accompanied by the explanation which I have read. We have the Auditor General's Report, showing that last year it was increased to $180,000. I think the hon. gentleman says that he is going to take $180,000 this year, with one steamer less.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. One steamer more.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. One steamer less.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Leaving that out, with one steamer more, it would not make the additional amount up to $160,000 for maintenance. The hon. gentleman will see that it would be a great assistance to the committee if he could give us a statement, steamer by steamer, making up the $160,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not that here with me, but I shall take the Minto, which cost $35,000 for maintenance alone. That steamer was not owned by the government at all in those years to which the hon. gentleman refers, 1897-98. She was not here then and that reduces the expenditure in that year. The Aberdeen's expenditure that year was charged to the fishery service, because she replaced La Canadienne. I can give the hon. gentleman the cost of each ship, although the hon. gentleman will find it in the Auditor General's Report.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would not ask the item to stand, but if the hon. gentleman will bring down a table giving us the comparison of these ships, showing the basis of the estimate, it would be of service to the committee.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The estimate is based on the

cost of last year exactly. We know exactly what each ship cost then, and this estimate is based upon our experience as to the cost of maintenance for a number of years back. The hon. gentleman knows that we cannot help it. From the amount which appears there, the hon. gentleman must not imagine that it represents an increase in the expenditure of this country. The receipts which come in from the running of these ships are not credited here. They are credited to the consolidated revenue fund. From $12,000 to $20,000 will probably be collected for freight from the Minto and Stanley this year alone. That goes to the credit of the consolidated revenue fund, but the expenditure appears here. The freight carried this year has been larger than anything ever known in the history of the maritime provinces before, and it promises to go on increasing, and form a very large factor. I think we understand it now, as this item is thoroughly specific. This $160,000 is for the maintenance of the ships, which embraces casual repairs, but does not embrace special repairs, and I propose to ask for a vote for special repairs.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman said that he thought my information was wrong in regard to the repairs to the Minto at Charlottetown before she really was in commission. The Auditor General's Report seems to indicate that the information I gave was correct. At pages P—19, 20, 21 and 22, it shows that very large sums had been paid at Charlottetown for articles that one would hardly have expected to be required on a new ship, or a ship just out of the builders' hands. I take page P—22 and I find that $3,236 was paid to Stewart, Bruce & Co., of Charlottetown, for such articles as pumps, closets, pipes, and such matters of construction as that. There are several other items which are not due to the squeezing in the ice or anything like that. She apparently was not fit for service when she reached Charlottetown, or these articles would not have been purchased.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When the captain and the agent go aboard a new ship there are always additional articles found to be required, but I explained that the largest part of that expense was caused by the damage done to the Minto crossing the Atlantic in one of the severest gales that Captain Finlayson says he ever met in his life.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) if he has received any petitions this year from the people of Magdalen Islands asking that the steamer Stanley should make one trip to the islands during the month of December. As the hon. minister knows well, navigation is closed between Magdalen Islands and the main land at the beginning of

December, and it is held by the most experienced sea-faring men on the islands that the Stanley can easily make one trip in the month of December. The islands are practically closed to civilization from the beginning of December to the month of April, and every year I am asked by petitions, telegrams, and letters that the steamer Stanley should be sent to the islands in order to carry the Christmas mails to my constituents. As I understand it, the Stanley has practically nothing to do at that season of the year, and I would urge that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should grant this favour to the inhabitants of the Magdalen Islands who number 6,000 people.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) that I will be only too happy to grant the request made by the Magdalen Islands people if it can be done at all. The Stanley was asked for last year at a time when it was impossible to send her there. She was required for her work in maintaining winter communication between Prince Edward Island and the main land. She was not available early in the season because her boilers were very much out of order, and the inspector, Mr. Douglas Stevens, reported that certain repairs were essential before she could be put in a sea-worthy condition. Her boilers had to be repaired and when they were repaired she was required for the winter service at Summerside. Much as I desire to yield to the solicitations of my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) I felt that I could not do an injustice to those who are entitled to the Stanley's service in crossing from Prince Edward Island to the main land. I shall be very glad to bear in mind what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) has said, and if at any time that the Stanley is available she is required for a trip to the Magdalen Islands I shall try to meet the wishes of the hon. member for Gaspé.

Mr. HACKETT. I wish to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) why it is that when the Stanley was at Summerside on the 22nd of December no facilities were provided by which she could carry the mails, passengers and freight to Cape Tormentine. The Stanley remained there for ten days without doing any service and she was withdrawn at the very moment when she would be of some utility in keeping up communication. The engineers reported that when the board ice formed at Cape Tormentine it would be available for the handling of freight, and when the board ice did form the Stanley was taken away and was of no possible utility in keeping up communication between Summerside and Cape Tormentine in New Brunswick. I wish to ask the minister (Sir Louis Davies), why that occurred and why ar-

rangements were not made for the maintenance of that communication as we expected it would be.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is true that the Stanley was detailed to make the experiment of crossing from Summerside to Cape Tormentine in the month of December last. She would have gone earlier to her berth at Summerside but for the reason I have explained to the hon. gentleman from Gaspé, her boilers had to be repaired after the summer's work on the fishery service. The very day that the work was finished she proceeded to Pictou, coaled there and went straight to Summerside to make the experiment of keeping open the winter passage between that and Cape Tormentine. I had informed the board of trade of Summerside some time previously that there were no terminal facilities at Cape Tormentine, and that I thought it was inadvisable to make the experiment until these facilities were provided. They, however, pressed upon me very strongly that the attempt should be made and I submitted the matter to Captain Finlayson, of the Minto, who has had some twenty-two years experience, and to Captain Brown, of the Stanley, and they advised that it was possible that if the board ice formed for half a mile outside of Tormentine pier they might be able to land on the board ice, and they advised that the experiment might be made. On their report I sent the vessel there. The board ice did not form; they had to land near the pier. The pier was in such bad condition that the ballast had fallen out and prevented the bow of the vessel getting near it. There was no way therefore to land freight if they had carried it, and until my friend the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is able to get that pier repaired it would be impossible for the Stanley to utilize it as a terminus. I am in hopes that this season the minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) will be able to repair the pier. The Stanley made the experiment of crossing and recrossing every day and successfully for a time, but the smallpox broke out in the district near to Cape Tormentine. Passengers would not travel through the region where the smallpox was supposed to be, and a very large number of people in Prince Edward Island were averse to the service being maintained through an infected district of that kind. The mails were not, and ought not be sent that way, and after the Stanley had made a number of trips without carrying freight, passengers, or mails, there was no use continuing her on the route any longer and she was ordered to go to Pictou. At Pictou there was an enormous congestion of freight which one steamer could not move, and the idea of sending the Stanley to Pictou was to give daily communication with Georgetown, one boat running each way. We were very successful in moving the freight, and until the other day when we got into this terrible storm there never was a time when the winter communication was maintained so admirably as it has been this winter. I am in hopes that next winter the terminal facilities at Tormentine will be so improved that possibly the Stanley will be able to utilize it, and continue the experiment between Summerside and Tormentine.

Mr. BENNETT. I am at a loss to find that there was any special grant available up to July 1, 1900, for the purchase of the Shamrock. I find that there is no mention made of it in 'Hansard.'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I find on inquiry from my advisers that I was correct in the statement that there was a grant.

Mr. BENNETT. Then it is unfortunate for the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) that the discussion on it should be entirely eliminated from 'Hansard.'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) got the supplementary estimates ?

Mr. BENNETT. I have 'Hansard' in which the discussion would have appeared.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Has the hon. gentleman got the supplementary estimates ?

Mr. BENNETT. I have not under my hand a copy of the supplementary estimates; but there was no discussion on the question in the House at all. It follows that nothing more has been heard of it until we find this reference in the Auditor General's Report of this year ; and of course a member of the House could not know of anything that transpired between the Auditor General and the minister until it did appear in the Auditor General's Report. The Auditor General took exception, it would seem, to the payment of this amount, whether because the boat had not been purchased in open market or by contract or for some other reason ; and I think it is fair to ask for an explanation why, in the face of that letter of November 7, the amount was paid over, assuming that it has been paid.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The amount was paid over, as I think my hon. friend will see, long before that objection was made.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why was the objection made ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman knows why the Auditor General takes exception. It is a matter of faith and duty with him.

Mr. COCHRANE. He was all right when we were in power.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The ex-Minister of Railways said he was not.

Mr. COCHRANE. But you said he was.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Auditor General's objection, as I understand it, is that he did not think the Deputy Minister of Marine had sufficient knowledge to give the certificate required by the 33rd section of the Audit Act. We differed with him, that is all.

Mr. BENNETT. Was the boat purchased in an open sale ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. The purchase is a most excellent one; and I do not think any one would question it.

Mr. BENNETT. The Auditor General did.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, he merely asked if we had a certificate from a technical officer, as required by the 33rd section of the Act.

Mr. HACKETT. I can only express my surprise that the hon. minister would send the Stanley to the route between Cape Tormentine and Summerside without seeing that she had proper facilities for doing the work. The most expert captain on Prince Edward Island in connection with ice breaking, reporting to the minister on November 1, made this statement—the hon. gentleman referred to it, but his explanation was not strictly in accord with the report made by the captain :

> The only thing, in our opinion, that can be done to test the route is this: after the steamer Northumberland stops running, place the Stanley at Summerside and have her all ready and let her remain there until the board ice in the vicinity of Cape Tormentine breakwater is sufficiently strong; then a landing can be made on the ice. This has been done at Souris and Georgetown on several occasions.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. HACKETT. That condition of things arose. The Stanley was held at Summerside for ten days to make daily trips between that port and Cape Tormentine. There were no mails, no passengers, and no facilities at the Tormentine side to advance the communication. About the 1st of Janury, when the Stanley was withdrawn, the very conditions laid down in the captain's report existed : the ice had formed, and there was no difficulty in landing mails and passengers. The hon. gentleman refers to the smallpox scare. We know how important it is to the people of Prince Edward Island to have this communication. There is to-day in Ottawa a case of smallpox ; but must this city on that account be cut off from communication with the outside world ? Some smallpox may have existed in the county of Westmoreland in the vicinity of Cape Tormentine ; but the nearest case was six miles away from the Cape, and there was no danger. Mails and passengers could have been landed at Summerside without difficulty. But through some oversight the boat was taken away—it cannot have been on account of the smallpox scare. I noticed in a paper a day or two ago that when the minister was at Charlottetown, the board of trade of that city waited upon him with a memorial, asking him to leave the steamers Stanley and Minto on the route between Georgetown and Pictou in order to relieve the great congestion of freight at those points. What was the fact ? The two boats were stuck in the ice hard and fast for a week or ten days, and could not relieve the congestion of freight. If one of the boats had been left on the route between Georgetown and Pictou, and the other placed between Summerside and Cape Tourmentine and $1,000 had been spent on improvements at Cape Tormentine, there would not have been any congestion. When the Stanley was at Summerside she had on board a full cargo of coal, and still she was able to come to that port and discharge part of the coal, and make daily trips between there and Cape Tormentine. I think there has been some misunderstanding or bungling, or we would have a service between Summerside and Tormentine to-day.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There has been no misunderstanding and no bungling. I promised that an experiment would be made ; but I warned the board of trade when I made the promise that inasmuch that there were no terminal facilities at Tormentine for the landing of the Stanley, the experiment would be made under disadvantageous circumstances, and I doubted that it could be made successfully. But they pressed for it, and the experiment was made. The steamer was released for a variety of reasons which I have stated to the committee. The smallpox may have been one of them ; the absence of terminal facilities at Tormentine was another. While I do not want personally to call in question the opinions of those who believe that a route can be established there, I may state that when I crossed the other day in an open boat from Traverse to Tormentine, I found the pier at Tormentine completely covered with ice to a height of nearly thirty feet ; so that even if the Stanley were running there, it would have been absolutely impossible for her to have gone near that pier. I do not want to throw cold water on the experiment. I promised that it would be made ; and the boat was not taken from Summerside until after the captain had reported to me that he had spent two or three hours in getting out, and

that if the frost had become harder he would never have got out. I telegraphed back to him to use the best judgment he could, and to continue the test until he concluded that it was not possible to make the trip. I did not order him away without using the best judgment I could, and I think the hon. gentleman agrees with me.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman is asking us to vote $160,000 of the people's money for the maintenance of five or six government steamers, and I want to inquire if it is his intention to spend that money, or at least as much of it as goes for supplies, by calling for tenders; or is he going to continue the bad practice, which he says he followed when he came into power, of dealing it out to his political friends. As to the practice, we contradict his statement, because we say that the late government purchased practically all their supplies by tender. Has the hon. gentleman expended this money in the interests of the country as he promised us when given the vote? Turn to the Auditor General's Report of last year and you will see that the bad practice, to which I drew attention time and time again, and which the hon. minister promised he would remedy, has continued and even become intensified. I find on page 8 that twenty-four bushels of onions were purchased for the steamer Aberdeen at a $1.50 per bushel, and each of the steamers uses the same quantity. I would ask any farmer if $1.50 per bushel for onions is a price this government ought to pay. But that is not all. $1.50 per bushel is paid for turnips and the same price for carrots, and 3½ cents per pound for beans. Would anybody else pay these prices?

Then, take this new steamer Minto, my hon. friend had a political heeler in Montreal to whom he wanted to give $1,000 or more. This was B. J. Coghlin, whom everybody knows as Barney Coghlin. The hon. gentleman sent to Mr. Coghlin's retail hardware store and bought some $1,265 of supplies from him for that steamer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Minto never was in Montreal.

Mr. TAYLOR. Look at page P—19 of the Auditor General's Report.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Minto never was in the province of Quebec.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not say she was there, but Mr. Coghlin was, and you wanted to benefit Mr. Coghlin so as to help you in the elections, so you gave him $1,265. You sent your agents to Mr. Coghlin, who does not deal in crockery, and without calling for any tenders at all, you purchased from him $361 worth of crockery, for which there is not one voucher. There is an invoice for four dozen table knives, $26.06. Any gentleman in the House, who is a hardware merchant, may turn up page P—19 of the Auditor General's Report and see the prices there marked for supplies purchased from Mr. Coghlin, amounting altogether to $1,265. There are four teapots of three gills each, $40.87, or $10 apiece for a little teapot. And so the list goes on, every dollar spent without any advertisement for tenders, and every dollar spent on political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. Travel through that book from one end to the other and you cannot find a dollar paid to a Tory storekeeper. Is the hon. minister going to continue that way of doing business, in spending the $160,000 he is asking us to vote, or will he spend it in a business fashion? Why not ask for tenders and give fair open competition, and not give political heelers two or three prices for each article required.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I shall not quarrel with my hon. friend for calling respectable gentlemen political heelers, but I cannot hold out the hope to him that I will depart from the old system, in practice many years, of seeing that our friends get the patronage and not our opponents. The only question is, are we paying fair and reasonable prices or not? I can tell my hon. friend that the greatest possible care is taken against overcharging. Every account is severely and closely scrutinized before it comes to the department, and the accountants and officers in charge are specially responsible for the examination of the accounts. If they find any overcharge they must at once send back the account. The hon. gentleman singled out one case.

Mr. TAYLOR. I could single out a thousand.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But the hon. gentleman did not, and I shall deal with the one he singled out. He referred to Mr. Coghlin, of Montreal, as a political heeler. Well, Mr. Coghlin is a most respectable merchant.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, I know him well.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is a very large merchant and he happened to be in Glasgow when the Minto was being built. Mr. McElhinney was in charge of its building. Mr. McElhinney was not an appointee of mine, and I suppose the hon. gentleman would call him a Tory heeler. He was an officer of the department, in the discharge of the duty of supervising the building of the Minto, and Mr. Coghlin obtained from Mr. McElhinney an order for these supplies. Would the hon. gentleman like me to dismiss that Tory officer for having given that order? The hon. gentleman may rest perfectly assured

that the patronage of the department will go in the future, as it has in the past, to the friends of the government, provided always the latter give good articles at reasonable prices.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would refer my hon. friend to page P—12 of the Auditor General's Report, and he will find there that Louis Marois, of Quebec, supplied carrots at $1.50 per bushel. I do not object to the government giving its political supporters the preference, but I do think that it should do business on business principles, and not spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on supplies without inviting any competition. Some time when we are going into Supply, I will divide the House on that question. Can my hon. friend justify paying $1.50 per bushel for carrots and three and a half cents per pound for beans, and $1.50 per bushel for onions ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The agent of the government at Quebec is Mr. Gregory, an old and experienced gentleman, who has held that position for many years. He has been cautioned to examine every purchase himself and certify to the charges being reasonable and fair, according to the prices ruling for the goods in the province of Quebec. If the hon. gentleman will move for the accounts, they will be produced before the Public Accounts Committee, certified to by Mr. Gregory. I have no other means of stating that the prices are fair than the certificate of my agent at Quebec.

Mr. OSLER. It was quite refreshing to hear from the government the absolute repudiation of the main plank in their anti-election speeches. There is to be no calling for tenders at all, but they are going to buy fairly from their own men. They are afraid to allow Conservatives to tender, because the Conservatives might tender lower than the friends of the government. It is quite pleasant to hear the frank avowal that contract by tender is a thing of the past.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it usual for any of the agents to make objections to prices as excessive ? Has the hon. minister any cases of that kind ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Numbers of them.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. minister say what takes place then ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the sellers attempt to make an overcharge, payment is refused.

Ocean and River Service—Examination of masters and mates $5,000

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that the expenditure under this head last year was $3,700. Is it necessary to ask for $5,000 this year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In a general way, the work is carried on the same year after year, but the amount expended varies somewhat.

Ocean and River Service—Rewards for saving life, including life-saving stations $9,000

Mr. INGRAM. There are a great many complaints about the loss of life in a wreck at Long Point, on Lake Erie, in August last. I would like to ask if the authorities at Washington have complained to this government or to the Department of Marine and Fisheries of that loss of life ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As far as I know, there has been no complaint, direct or indirect, from the Washington authorities.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is there any particular object in the increase of $1,000 in this vote ? I see by the Auditor General's Report the expenditure last year was a little over $7,000, and the estimate this year is $9,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The increase is to provide a new boat at Point Pelee. The old boat was reported to be out of date.

Mr. SPROULE. What is done with the old boat ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Practically it was of no use. A few dollars may be got for it.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it the intention to improve the life-saving stations on Lake Erie?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the intention to procure a life boat for Port Credit, on Lake Ontario, in accordance with the petition presented a few days ago ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not recollect the presentation of that petition. If it was presented it may be awaiting attention. It will receive my best consideration.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister's answer to me is hardly consistent with this vote. Last year the estimate was $8,000, and this year it is $9,000. The hon. gentleman does not expect to make much improvement for $1,000, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There will be a new boat.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that all ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know if any other special improvements are required except to keep closer inspection of them. Instructions have gone out to keep up inspection of boathouses and boats, and to make the crews perform their drill more regularly

than some of them have in the past. Much will be gained, if we make the crews more efficient than they were.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister will observe that Port Stanley and Port Rowan are the only two life-saving stations on that portion of Lake Erie. The dangerous point is at Long Point, where the storms take place. I am aware that the American representative at that place has complained very strongly to the authorities at Washington concerning the sacrifice of life owing, as he believes, to the imperfect life-saving stations on the Canadian side of Lake Erie.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I can only say that nothing will give me greater satisfaction than to give the closest and most courteous attention to any suggestion that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) may make as to improvements of the life-saving stations on Lake Erie. If he will make these suggestions to me as head of the department privately, or make them publicly in the House, I can promise him they will receive full consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. This $1,000 increase is to purchase a new boat. How much does a life-boat cost ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The deputy minister tells me that the boat will cost about $600.

Mr. SPROULE. And the balance, I suppose, is for some equipment ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Ocean and River Service—Investigation into wrecks $1,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. minister proceed to investigate on the mere report of a wreck, or does he require official recommendation ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I require application to be made by some reputable person.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then the investigation is held as a matter of course ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, if a shipowner, or other reputable person, asks for it.

Ocean and River Service—Registration of shipping..... .... $500

Mr. BRITTON. I have a suggestion to make. The registration of shipping is taken care of by officers of the Customs Department, and, I supopse, the expense is counted as part of the expenses of that department. Occasionally a man in the customs is sent from his own place to another for the purpose of examining the books, to see that the registration is uniform. As a matter of fact, I may say, the books are not uniformly kept. Books are provided, as I understand, at the expense of the Department of Marine and Fisheries——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. BRITTON. Then, at the expense of the Customs Department. These books are uniform so far as the blanks are concerned, but, in filling in the blanks, there are great differences. Some customs officers are careful and some are careless ; and, in the latter case, beyond the name of the boat, her tonnage and a few essential items, the matter is passed over. My suggestion is that there should be an officer to be called inspector of registrations. No additional expense would be incurred, it seems to me ; for some gentleman now in the Customs Department, who does not have too much to do and who is familiar with the work, would be assigned to this duty. The effect of his work would be to secure uniformity as well as greater care in the registration of vessels. Although the expense would be greater in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, it would be less in the Customs Department, and there would be less money spent than there is to-day. Of course the vote asked here, $500, is not a very large amount ; and, looking at the Auditor General's Report, I see that only about $200 spent last year is properly chargeable to this item of the estimates. But I think that better service would be rendered if it was put under the charge of some man in the employ of the Marine and Fisheries Department, and if it were provided that all the registration, both inland and ocean, were systematized and better kept.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I shall have to consult my colleague in whose department this legislation is carried on. All we do is to provide books for the registration. As to appointing an inspector, my hon. friend's experience does not accord with mine. If you detail a man to do additional work of that kind you have to assign additional pay. However, we will consider my hon. friend's suggestion.

Tidal service, including salary of assistant clerk beyond $400, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act $7,500

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In regard to this, I am sorry that although some progress is being made, the government cannot see their way to expedite this very important work. There seems to me no reason for nibbling at it, as the government are doing, when the coast line of this country is considered. The amount expended is only about $4,000, because the rest of this vote is in salaries, and you have a high class man whose salary is near the appropriation outside the amount spent. This work was long ago completed with the United States, on both the Pacific and At-

lantic coasts, and completed in India, and in the British Isles. With iron and steel ships, and with the growth of these steamers in size and all that sort of thing, it is a most necessary work. Take, for instance, the question of the insurance rates. While it is true that the ordinary seaman and the ordinary mariner of the smaller class of vessels have very little concern about the result of these surveys of the tides, the officers in command of all the large ocean-going steamers are required to understand them, and it takes a technical training to understand them. But it seems to me a disgraceful thing that we should proceed so slowly. It is a smaller vote now than I was able to get at the initiation of the work. I know there is very little general interest taken in it—we have discussed that already. Some rough and ready seamen think that because they have got along so well without these tables, which many of them cannot understand, it is merely a scientific fad. But one need only to refer to the Admiralty in England, to the leading men in connection with shipping there, and also to the official hydrographic staff of the United States, and the work in India, to understand that these surveys are of tremendous importance. Now the government is committed to the principle, they are carrying it on, the $4,000 is a mere bagatelle. I am glad to see that assistance is being given, but I would be far more pleased if, in addition to that, the hon. gentleman were to take a substantial increase, which this official and his assistants could spend to advantage. He has no ships, he has no facilities such as are required. I do not think the hon. gentleman will find that the United States, or India, when they were dealing with this work, made such slow progress, or satisfied themselves with so small an appropriation. I would be glad if the hon. gentleman could expedite that work in accordance with its importance.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would be glad if my hon. friend could defer this discussion until the supplementary estimates. I am considering the matter, and perhaps I may be able to make a statement on the supplementaries.

Mr. CLANCY. I agree with what has been stated by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). It would seem that this service is somewhat at a standstill, and that some new departure is proposed to be made. Now I see there is a considerable increase, apparently, in the work to be done in the hon. gentleman's department. In 1900 I find that $4,000 was voted for that service, in 1901 that was increased to $7,200. The hon. gentleman explains a part of it there, as it appears in the estimates, by saying that an extra clerk had $400 of it. Then again there is still another addition of $300 in 1902. Will the hon. gentleman say what new circumstances have grown up in the office requiring this increase? It seems he requires to employ an extra clerk. The hon. gentleman thought that some of those clerks were only employed for a very short portion of the year, yet the vote was taken.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not quite gather that my hon. friend objects to the increase. I went into it in great detail last year when the same question arose, and I pointed out to my hon. friend the data. We have tidal stations at different places on the Bay of Fundy and along the coast of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, for gauging the rise and fall of the tides, and the data ascertained at these different tidal stations are taken and tabulated at the head office here by Mr. Dawson and his assistants. We were some years behind in this work, and Mr. Dawson intimated to me two or three years ago that unless he could get these returns properly tabulated and printed in a book, it was no use collecting them at all. So some additional clerks were given him for the purpose of tabulating these statistics gathered at the different stations, and when they are tabulated they are sent home to the Hydrographic Office in Great Britain, and printed in a book. I think last year I brought down a copy of the book, a very large book, showing the rise and fall of the tides at these different stations. From this data so gathered, tide tables are prepared by Mr. Dawson, showing the tide at different harbours in different ports, so as to be of use to the mariners, showing them when the tide rises, when it falls, when it is half tide, when full tide, with the depth of the tide, and so on. It was necessary to employ these additional clerks in order to utilize the information which was being gathered, and which, until it was tabulated, was useless.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask another question which has been considerably discussed in the newspapers in reference to a proposition to adopt some system of damming to raise the water in Lake Erie for the purpose of counteracting, to some extent, the withdrawal of water from the upper lakes by the Chicago drainage canal. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if any proposition of that nature has been made to the government of Canada by the United States authorities.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will ascertain whether it was ever made in the department in my absence. No such proposition ever came before me personally, and I am almost certain that had it come to the department, it would have come before me. It never came to the department.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would ask the Minister of Public

Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). I think he had an interview with some of the papers throughout the country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I do not think that I ever received any such proposition. There may be some letters; I have a vague remembrance, that some letters were written to us on that question, but not in the way of any proposition.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. gentleman in reference to this vote for the hydrographic survey if this work has been carried on in the Georgian Bay.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No; we will come later to that.

Winter mail service $8,500

Mr. LEFURGEY. Could the hon. gentleman tell me in what way this $8,500 is to be applied ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will be applied as far as it can be for the boat service which is now going on.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Was this service organized so that it would be in readiness ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It seems to me very strange that on February 2, the Minto crossed over to the island with the last mails before being locked up in the ice, and that ten or twelve days elapsed before we had a crossing with the mails at the Capes. If this service was organized, why was it not given. During the late election when I was campaigning in that portion of the district, my opponent was using the mail service to his advantage, saying that it would be duly equipped and organized and ready to perform the service. We find that from February 2, to February 12, there were no mails to or from Prince Edward Island, and the Board of Trade of Summerside, had to ask the post office inspector at Charlottetown, to ascertain if anything could be done to forward their mails by ice boats. They finally came to their senses and allowed this to go on. I cannot understand why this was not done at first. We did not have any mails from the province of Prince Edward Island, until the 13th February, and if this service was organized it is very strange that the mails were not brought over. We asked about this the other day in the House, and the hon. Postmaster General got up and in a very light manner said : You will get information about your mails when the hon. Minister of Marine returns. We know from the papers that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries had a very thrilling time getting across. That may interest the hon. minister and his friends as an adventure, but it has nothing to do with the commercial facilities of Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The explanation is a very simple one, but rather a painful one for me. Nobody understands more clearly than I do, why you did not have mails between Prince Edward Island and the mainland for 12 days. It was for the simple reason that a violent storm was raging during which no boat could cross. I was imprisoned myself. No one could desire to leave the island more earnestly than I did, but I could not get away. I went once or twice to the cape to see if I could get across, but the captain would not start, and the judgment of the captain's was right. They could not start. The boats started out at the earliest possible moment they could cross. The opposition boats crossed one day from New Brunswick to Prince Edward Island. They went during a north-west wind. The next day our boats crossed from the Island.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I know that right here in Ottawa, express matter came two or three days before we received our mail.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I was on the spot.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It was delivered at the hotel to me, and I know it could not have crossed before that time. It came in response to a telegraphic message I sent down. I have reports from people in that section stating that there were several days prior to the time the mails were brought across, when the crossing could have been made. I have information from reliable parties.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am afraid that I shall have to ask the hon. gentleman to accept my statement, that it was not possible having been on the spot myself, and having travelled up and down to the cape trying to get over and being unable to get the captain to start.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps it may be proper to introduce a subject which is of considerable interest to the country. It is that of winter navigation on the St. Lawrence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think we will have a vote before the estimates are through, specially on that subject.

Marine Biological Station $2,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What are the results of that vote ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The results are very satisfactory so far. They are carrying on the

work vigorously, and several distinguished scientists are occupying the laboratory tables in conducting experiments of practical importance. The memoradum supplied to me by Prof. Prince, is as follows :

In order to allow of the completion of certain somewhat lengthened researches, the marine station was not moved from its location on Passamaquoddy Bay, near St. Andrews, N.B., though the proposal to tow the building round the coast, to the Nova Scotia shore, was fully discussed at the meeting of the board of management held in June. The great importance of the fisheries and of complex fishery problems along the eastern shores of Nova Scotia, around the Gut of Canso, and the coast of Cape Breton, weighed with the board in considering the proposal to have this movable station conveyed to a new temporary site. A final decision will be arrived at at the next meeting of the board, early in February.

These scientific gentlemen are prosecuting their investigations into the biology of fish and publishing the results every year. They propose to continue that so long as they are given this assistance. We promised that this vote should be given them for three or four years, and the time is not yet up, during which the assistance is to be given. The work they do may be of the greatest possible importance.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where is the station ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is at Passamaquoddy Bay, and it is proposed to move it around to Canso this summer. The scientists decide the place.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that two years ago, in Prince Edward Island, he made a promise that this biological station would be located somewhere about the island. It was just shortly previous to the time that we were to have a by-election, and the hon. gentleman was down there wishing to help his candidate. He said to the fishermen at Charlottetown: I am going to have a biological station established in the Straits of Northumberland, and you will receive great benefit from it. His secretary interjected the remark: I have received a telegram from the captain of the boat that it is going to be stationed at Egmont Bay next week. There is no biological station, but it resulted in carrying the election for his candidate. and the people were deceived. Is it intended that we shall have the use of these scientific gentleman's opinion in the Straits of Northumberland ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The location where these scientific researches are to be carried on is a question that we do not interfere with. It is entirely left to the scientists themselves. They are gentlemen connected with different colleges, and they determine each season where they shall conduct their operations. I believe they will move around the Gut of Canso this season.

Salaries and expenses of cattle inspection. $2,800

Mr. SPROULE. Is this for quarantine ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, this is for the inspectors of cattle in the city of Montreal. Cattle come down to Montreal, and they are inspected when put on board of ships. The inspectors are Mr. Pope and Mr. Morgan.

Mr. SPROULE. There is surely more than this spent in connection with that work ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Quarantine inspection?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is not quarantine; it is cattle inspection.

Unforeseen expenses generally..... $5,000

Mr. MORIN. There is an item here, 'Reward for saving life,' page 35 Auditor General's Report, 'Montreal Watch Case Co., Montreal, 2 gold watches and boxes, $176.' Who received these watches ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not remember the circumstance of the special case to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morin) calls attention. I may say that whenever lives are saved by bravery on the part of our citizens, and the facts are reported to the department, steps are taken to ascertain the accuracy of these facts, and the information is submitted to an officer of the department, who makes a recommendation as to the reward which shall be given. The reward is commensurate with the danger incurred and bravery displayed, and it has always been the practice of the department, endorsed by parliament year after year, to recognize that bravery by giving a watch or a binocular glass or something of that kind to indicate the appreciation of the government.

Mr. MORIN. Does the minister know who received these watches ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot tell just now, but if the hon. gentleman wishes I will bring down the names.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I see an amount here in unforeseen expenses, for the lobster investigation, a charge for travelling expenses to Mr. Gallant. What was the result of that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The commission proposed a series of regulations, which, after great consideration (many days' and many hours' consideration I may say), we adopted. There was one time limit for the Bay of Fundy and another along the coast of Nova Scotia——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That would be merely changing the lines, because these districts were in existence long ago.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. The whole east coast of Nova Scotia was one district before, but now the regulation divides it by an imaginary line running out from Halifax harbour, and there are different seasons.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How did these regulations work ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would not say more than fairly well. There are always men wishing to have changes made, but so far I have adhered rigidly to the report of the lobster commission and intend to do so until we have further experience.

Mr. CLANCY. I think that last session there was considerable dissatisfaction expressed at the lines laid down by the commissioners and the minister was forced to yield to strong recommendations made to him, and to disregard to some extent the lines laid down. Is that true ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I see that $400 were paid for legal services in connection with the pilotage commission. Who received the money ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was a commission appointed some two years ago to consider the grievances, or the alleged grievances of the pilots, and of the shipping men in the district between Montreal and Quebec. Mr. Justice Lavergne, the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Commander Wakeham constituted the commission. The shipping interests, the insuring interests, and the pilots were represented by counsel. The commission recommended that the counsel retained by the pilots might be paid by the government, and they were paid under this item. The others paid their own expenses.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The minister says there were certain grievances of the pilots.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certain alleged grievances of the pilots, and certain alleged grievances of the shipping men of Montreal.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Rumour says that Mr. Langelier the counsel had certain grievances too. May I ask is this the same Mr. Charles Langelier who was sent to Russia at the expense of this country to search the archives for Alaskan documents ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The same gentleman. I have no information that he was sent to Russia, but this is Mr. Charles Langelier a member of the bar of Quebec and formerly a member of this House.

Mr. CLANCY. Were these costs taxed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and cut down largely.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What was the original claim ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that the whole sum paid Mr. Langelier ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. There appears to be another name here ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was paid to Messrs. Jules Tessier & Langelier.

Mr. CLANCY. What was Capt. R. J. Walls paid this $600 for ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was a desperate fight between the pilotage commission of the port of Miramichi and the pilots. It lasted for a long time, was taken into court, and is a very complicated matter, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has any special interest in it I will go into the details This amount was paid in connection with that.

Mr. MORIN. How does Mr. F. Gourdeau come to be paid $600 travelling expenses for going to the Paris Exposition ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This was an amount paid in advance for travelling expenses, but it will be adjusted in the exhibition expenses in time.

Lighthouse and Coast Service—Salaries and allowances to light-keepers $228,000

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister explain the increase of $8,000 in this item ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is caused by the increased number of lighthouses brought into existence.

Hon. WILLIAM ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) In connection with this item I would like to make a few observations on the salaries paid to lighthouse keepers in general. I do not think that any system has been adopted in Canada to classify the lighthouse keepers as regards the salaries paid them. In the United States—I am now speaking of Maine and Massachusetts—the lighthouses are classified and the salaries regulated accordingly. With us, the keeper of a revolving light on an island several miles from the shore gets $400 a year. It is impossible for

him to keep that light going all the time without assistance, and that assistance must be paid. In the United States these assistants get $600. In our wealthy Dominion the keeper gets $400, and perhaps the next keeper to him, who has a fixed light, gets the same salary. I do not think that there has ever been any regular system or rule applied to the salaries of lighthouse keepers by any government since confederation. If, for instance, a lighthouse is erected at a particular place, and the representative of the county has influence enough with the government, the salary may be fixed at $500, while another place where the representative may not be so influential, the salary may be less. Let this House fancy the condition of a man on an island, keeping a light going all winter, with the assistance of one man, and very often obliged to find his own fuel, and receiving only $400. I think this is a subject which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries should take into his consideration. I was disposed at first to ask for a committee of the House to deal with the whole subject, because as it stands at present it is most unsatisfactory. I have in my hands the resignation of a lighthouse keeper on an island, because it is impossible for him to remain there at the miserable salary he gets. A man in the same position in Maine or Massachusetts gets $1,000. I am bringing this subject to the notice of the minister in the hope that some improvement will be made ; because the present condition of things existed before he took charge of the department, and is likely to continue unless he deals with it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am very glad the hon. member has brought this matter to the attention of the House ; but I think he is labouring under an erroneous impression with regard to one fact. He says he has in his hands the resignation of one gentleman who is receiving $400 a year for keeping a lighthouse. All I can say is that that is the only resignation of a lighthouse keeper that has been presented to the department within five years because of insufficient salary. At the present moment there are two vacancies in the maritime provinces, and there are no less than a dozen applicants for each light. A good deal of what my hon. friend says may be true. There may be a case here and there where the salary of a lighthouse keeper is hardly commensurate with the labour he has to perform ; but it must be remembered that these people are free of all taxes, house rent, and expense for fuel and light, and that they get $400 cash in addition. There are not many parts of the country where that would be considered bad payment. I would be sorry to say that in every case it is adequate payment. My hon. friend seems to think that these salaries are fixed in some hap-hazard way. I beg to assure him that that is not the case. The same officer who has advised the Minister of Marine for many years past with regard to the salaries to be attached to these offices, is in the department to-day. You cannot fix the same salary for Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, that we have to pay on the Great Lakes or in British Columbia. What would be considered an adequate salary in the maritime provinces would be considered utterly inadequate in British Columbia and in the far-off parts of the province of Ontario. The chief engineer who advises me in these matters is very careful to consider the circumstances when a new light is established, and to fix the salary with reference to the location and the work that has to be done. Political influence is very rarely, if ever attempted, in connection with the salaries paid. I have no hesitation in saying that a member for a district occasionally seeks to obtain for a lighthouse keeper an increase of salary or a greater salary than the department thinks should be paid; but we cannot give way to these influences. We must remember that there is a large army of these lighthouse keepers, and once you depart from the well-established rule that a certain salary should be attached to a certain light, you get away from your moorings, and every lighthouse keeper in the Dominion would want an increase. The greatest care must be exercised in these matters. I never attempt to shut the door on any member of parliament who wishes to make representations as to the salary paid for any particular light ; and I will say this for the officers in charge, that whenever it is represented to them that a mistake has been made—which will happen to most men at times—and that a particular salary is too low, they are always ready to take the case into consideration. It is all very well to talk of increasing the salaries of the lighthouse keepers of this Dominion; but if you once began, you would have to go through the whole list, and it would become a very serious matter. If my hon. friend represents to me the case of any one lighthouse keeper who for the work he is doing gets less than he ought, his representations will receive the most favourable consideration at my hands. I shall be glad to sit down with him and consider the case he refers to ; but my experience is that it is not prudent to give way to these constant demands that are being made for increases to the salaries of lighthouse keepers throughout the Dominion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I heartily agree with what the hon. gentleman has said. Having given a good deal of attention to that subject, I am satisfied that a revision on the lines suggested by the hon. member for Victoria would land us into an expenditure on annual salaries for light-

house keepers of about a million dollars instead of $200,000. The number of lighthouses is, of course, steadily increasing on account of our enormous coast line and lake border, and we could not afford to go into an expenditure on the same scale as the United States. In the United States, besides, the policy is entirely different. They have an unlimited fund to draw on, for the salaries of their lighthouse keepers is a tax on foreign shipping. Our policy, however, is to furnish our lights free and keep our port dues as low as possible and make no invidious distinction against foreign shipping.

We have been very successful in getting the best men for this class of work, and I cannot recollect of any case of a lighthouse keeper having resigned because his salary was not sufficient. No doubt if there was a revision, it would be found that the department could cut down some of the excessive salaries and still get good men, because irregularities, such as those mentioned by the hon. member for Victoria, have crept in, through political pressure mainly, during a long period of years.

I would like to ask the hon. minister whether this practice does not obtain, namely, when a vacancy takes place, of giving the new appointee a smaller salary than his predecessor to begin with.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In the case of the smaller sums ranging from $50 to $100, we could not follow that practice, but in the case of the larger salaries the rule is that the new appointee begins at a lower rate than the man who was in the position eight or ten years. The new man comes in at a salary considerably below that of his predecessor, and after a year or two, when he has proved his fitness, he gets an increase of $50 or perhaps $100 gradually until he reaches the old rate.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I accept the explanation of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. My reference was altogether to the maritime provinces, and, of course, I know of several cases in which the salary paid to the keeper of a fixed light is the same as that paid to the one who keeps a revolving light. Some changes should be made, and I have several cases in which I shall make application to the minister for some improvement before the session is through.

Mr. SPROULE. In answer to my request, the hon. minister said the increase of $8,000 was due to an increase in the number of lighthouses, but he gave no information as to where these lighthouses were.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have here a statement:

Salaries of New Light-keepers of Lights Established.

Nova Scotia—	
Little Lorraine	$ 50
Inner Sambro, Halifax county	100
Quebec—	
Grand Entry (see file) (harbour light)	50
Upper Traverse	600
Point Basile	250
Oak Point (light resumed)	75
New Brunswick—	
Perry's Point (file 17453)	80
Zephyr Rock lightship	200
Gray's Point	70
Hampstead Wharf	80
Ontario—	
Toronto East gap (additional)	150
Michael Point (light resumed, F. 4752)	100
Stag Island	150
Stribling Point	180
Squaw Island (F. 17753)	180
British Columbia—	
Brotchie Ledge (Electric Light Co.)	200
Walker Rock	240
Ballanac Islands	180
	$3,115

Lights to be Built, 1901—Salaries.

Nova Scotia—	
Charlo	$ 80
Port Beckerton	80
Grand Etang	80
Hawk Island	150
Jeddore Range	200
Louisburg (fog alarm)	400
Quebec—	
Cap Charles (additional)	80
Father Point (fog alarm)	400
Ontario—	
Little Gros Cap	250
Middle Ground	800
Slate Islands	300
	$2,820

Salaries of keepers lights established	$3,115
" " " to be built	2,820
For intended increases to light-keepers and salaries for keepers new lights to be established	2,065
	$8,000

Mr. SPROULE. I saw an intimation some time ago, given in an interview with one of the ministers of this government, that it was contemplated to light the St. Lawrence very much better in the coming year between Montreal and Quebec. I understand that one reason given for the very heavy marine insurance is because the channel is not properly lighted.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I make no admission of the kind. I do not admit at all that the St. Lawrence route is not properly lighted. I do not mean to say that we cannot spend more money on that route, but I have crossed the Atlantic with five or six of the best sea captains who have ever sailed out of Montreal and have put this question to each one. I told each one that I was putting the question in my official capacity as

Minister of Marine, and intended to use his answer, and on the last occasion I had the good fortune of having two of my colleagues present. The question I put was this : Do you know of any aid to navigation between Montreal and Belle Isle which is now wanting, which you would recommend being put there, or any aid to navigation now there which you think ought to be improved. In each case the answer was no. The last gentleman to whom I put the question, the captain of the Parisian, qualified his answer by saying : You know, I think this light at Point D'Amour in the Straits of Belle Isle, has had something coming over it the last few months, and you should send an inspector to see what is the matter. I replied that with a naked eye I could not see anything wrong, but would send an inspector down the first thing in the spring. I do not mean to say that no improvement can be made, and before the supplementaries are through, we may have a special vote on this subject. We spent $40,000 to $45,000 in building a permanent pier at the Traverse and erecting a light there last year, which has been of the greatest possible benefit to the shipping interest. Instead of having a lightship there, we have this permanent light. When the cold came on and the ice formed, the lightship had to be taken away, or it would be carried away by the ice altogether. With a permanent pier and permanent light there we are enabled to prolong the period of navigation for some time with safety. It is now under consideration—and I may say that personally I favour it—to construct a permanent pier at the other end of the Traverse, about two miles and a half further down. It will cost $75,000 or $80,000. If I can get the approval of my colleagues, and if the Finance Minister is able to grant it, I may ask the approval of the House, at a future time for the vote. There may be other large votes for the improvement of the navigation of the St. Lawrence, besides this. Anything that is submitted to me and which I can be satisfied is a real improvement, will be willingly accepted by me. For, I recognize the vast importance of that St. Lawrence river trade, and the absolute necessity of avoiding cheese-paring in our expenditure upon it to put it in the most effective condition. I do not hesitate to say that I am desirous of going as far as anybody else, short of extravagance or useless expenditure, in recommending the use of every dollar that is necessary to place the navigation of that route in the very best condition. If there are aids to navigation still needed, I wish to put them there ; if any that are there are defective, I wish to improve them. I am willing to listen to suggestions from any side of the House. The subject is under consideration, and I may have some additional votes in the supplementary estimates.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the hon. minister please state what arrangements have been made for new lights in New Brunswick.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are to be new lights at Perry's Point, Zephyr Rock Lightship, Gray's Point and Hampstead Wharf. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) knows that we have, in another place, a large vote for a lightship on the Lurcher Rocks in the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I am pleased to hear the minister say that before the session closes he will bring down estimates that will have for their object to give better navigation between Montreal and Quebec. I think there must have been some misapprehension when he asked the captain to whom he refers the question, because a steamship cannot go between Montreal and Quebec during the night at the present time. There are not nearly enough lights to enable that to be done. I am sure that every member in this House will back up the minister in his efforts to provide the best means of navigation between Montreal and the sea. There is hardly a place except Montreal where steamers are confined to daylight in leaving port. On the Sault route there are sufficient lights so that a steamer can see two of them at any time. If we had a similar system of lights between Montreal and Quebec, our shipping would have great advantages, as compared with those they have at the present time.

Mr. INGRAM. When the hon. minister rises to reply to the hon. member for St. Lawrence, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), I would like him at the same time to give us some idea of the scheme for winter navigation of the St. Lawrence, concerning which we have heard.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) any information on the subject to which he referred. As to the remarks concerning lights on the St. Lawrence to make it safe by night, as well as by day, my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) must remember that the St. Lawrence, between Montreal and Quebec, is not like the St. Lawrence below Quebec. It is not as thoroughly dredged as the Minister of Public Works intends to dredge it. When the channel, which is largely an artificial channel, has been widened and deepened, as is intended, there will be no difficulty about obtaining the necessary vote—at least, I shall have no difficulty in recommending it—to light the channel with gas buoys. The importance of the route and the trade carried on will justify any reasonable expenditure for improvement.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister had better settle that with the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), who told

us how important it was to have a better lighthouse service, and said that it was the intention of the government to furnish it at the earliest date, and the hon. minister from Quebec without portfolio (Hon. Mr. Dobell) supported him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Were they speaking of the lower St. Lawrence, or between Montreal and Quebec, or above Montreal ?

Mr. SPROULE. The discussion was with regard to the river between Montreal and Quebec. I was surprised to hear the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he had found a sea-captain who was prepared to say that the channel was all that could be desired, because, I thought the impression was that there was a good deal of expenditure yet to take place.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are speaking of two different things. I did not mean to imply that the lighthouse service above Montreal, which was sufficient in former times, is all that is necessary under present conditions. The deepening of the canals has been carried out under the directions of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and they will need to be lighted with gas buoys, because it would be impossible to navigate them unless they were lighted by night as well as day. The remarks of my hon. friend and colleague, the Minister of Railways and Canals, had reference to that part of the route. I think I am correct in saying that gas buoys have already been ordered to a large amount, and a great many of them will be in place this summer. I was speaking more of the navigation to the sea below Quebec, traversed by the sea captains.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister is mistaken, because specific information was given us by the Minister of Railways and Canals that it was intended to make a channell 450 feet wide all the way between Montreal and Quebec, and when that was done and the channel better lighted, which was intended to be done at an early day, he hoped that the navigation would be all that was desired, and would reduce the cost of insurance, which was now high.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I approve of every word of that.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. The item under discussion, I believe, is salaries and allowances of lighthouse keepers, but we have wandered away from it. I would like to ask what the rules of the government are as to granting retiring allowances to lighthouse keepers when they leave the service.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Those that were appointed before 1882 come under the Superannuation Act. Those who have been appointed since did not contribute to the Superannuation Act and are not entitled to the allowance ; those appointed previously to 1892 are.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I desire to call the attention of the minister to the case of one Robert Grey, late lighthouse keeper at Entrance Island. He entered the service in 1876 and did not leave until 1897. The reason he left was that his health gave way. He sent in his resignation, accompanied by certificates of two doctors, stating that his health had given way. He had been paying into the superannuation fund for many years, and after resigning made application for his pension, but from that time up to the present he has never had any word from the department whatever. He was twenty-one years in the service, and I do not believe anything was ever said against him ; I believe he did his duty faithfully and well during the whole of that time. His salary for the first seventeen years of his service was $600, then it was raised to $900 a year, owing to the fact that a fog alarm was added to the light. It seems to me an extraordinary thing that when a man has been in the service as long as that, and has done his duty well, and has been paying into the superannuation fund, that he cannot even get an answer from the department or get his pension. He is a very poor man, he has no money whatever now. He has been kept by relatives, and, as I say, he has not been able, up to the present time, to get any information from the department in regard to the reason why his pension is not paid. I hope the hon. gentleman will look into the case and see that the pension is properly paid to him. I do not know how much it is, but it should be paid to him at once, and paid as long as he lives.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have a recollection of that case, and I do not think my hon. friend has stated it quite accurately. Robert Grey may or may not have been entitled to superannuation. He did not apply for superannuation on resigning his place. After resigning his place an application did come in for superannuation on the ground that he was in ill-health ; but the hon. gentleman knows that before a man can get superannuation on the ground that he is in ill-health, certificates of ill-health must be forwarded and must be satisfactory to the Treasury Board.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I am informed that two doctors' certificates were forwarded.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Those certificates were not satisfactory either to the department or to the Treasury Board, and an officer of the department, very high up in the department, who went to the locality and saw this gentleman, reported to the department that he was not in ill-health and was not entitled to superannuation.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Would you mind saying who this officer was ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would be glad to bring down the papers if the hon. gentleman wishes to call for them ; or, if he likes to see them privately, he can do so. All I can say is, that there were no certificates of the ill-health of this gentleman which were satisfactory to the department or to the Treasury Board ; and that the reports we have are that he was not in ill-health, or in such ill-health as would justify superannuation being granted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did Mr. Balderson produce a doctor's certificate for the Treasury Board, or did Mr. Hayter Reed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Were these gentlemen superannuated on the ground of ill-health ?

Mr. COCHRANE. It was because they wanted the place for somebody else.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would be glad if the hon. gentleman would produce the doctors' certificate.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. It seems to me in a case like that, after the man had put in 21 years, the minister might have stretched the point if possible.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not if he had misrepresented the facts to the department.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I do not think he did. Of course, I am not capable of saying whether he did or not, but I would like to see the papers.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that John Sutherland, lighthouse keeper at Port Burwell, has resigned. Is the minister going to make a new appointment ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the minister state the name of the light-keeper at Stag Island ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot now, but I will get it for the hon. gentleman.

Agencies, rents and contingencies $16,560

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The small increase of $250 is owing to a small increase in the salaries of clerks in the agencies at Quebec, Nova Scotia and British Columbia, $50 each for five.

Maintenance and repairs to lighthouses, including the maintenance and pay of crew of lighthouse steamer Brant $250,000

Mr. SPROULE. There is a large increase here of nearly $15,000. Could the minister give us some information ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will see that we require this increase for the maintenance of new lights, the names of which I read him, those now building and for supplying new buoys. On the face of the vote the hon. gentleman sees it is for maintenance, and for the pay of the crew of the lighthouse steamer Brant, which was built a year or two ago and now has to be provided for. That new steamer supplies the lighthouses on the coast of Prince Edward Island. She is a new steamer just built.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before this item is adopted, I would like to ask the minister whether he has given further consideration to the memorial from the board of trade of the city of Halifax as regards the establishment of a lightship off the harbour of Halifax, During the last session of the last parliament I brought the matter to the attention of the hon. gentleman, and quoted a memorial which, I think, had been forwarded to him previously, and also a letter from Captain Pye, of Halifax, with regard to the difficulty of hearing the bombs fired from Sambro Island during foggy weather. The hon. gentleman at that time said the matter had been investigated by certain officers of his department, and in respect to some matters mentioned in the memorial, they did not agree with the views expressed by the board of trade ; and that with respect to the best place for the location of a lightship, if one were necessary, the views of the board did not agree with the views of the chief engineer of his department. I understood from what the hon. gentleman said on that occasion that he proposed to give his further attention to the matter ; and I also understood him that he would submit to the board of trade of the city of Halifax the report of his officials in order that they might have an opportunity of considering it and of making such reply as they thought desirable.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say to my hon. friend that I have given a great deal of consideration to that matter, in conjunction with the officers of my department, both here and in Halifax, and I have taken advantage of opportunities from time to time of consulting with the captains who enter the port of Halifax and leave it, but I have not yet officially made up my mind upon it. The chief engineer of the department is rather averse to the idea of placing a lightship there, because he does not think it is even

necessary. He looks upon the Halifax harbour as one of the finest in the world, with the lights which are there now, and he is backed up by the opinion of Admiral Erskine, which he quotes from time to time, who thinks that there is no difficulty for the largest ships in the world sailing right into Halifax harbour without danger. But there are others who hold a contrary opinion, and I am inclined to think that I did carry out my promise to which he calls attention, and send to the Halifax Board of Trade the opinion of the officers upon their memorial. I may be wrong in that, but my recollection is that I did send it. I will refresh my memory upon it. The matter is not finally closed ; it is still under consideration by Col. Anderson and myself, and I do not want to shut the door one way or the other. I had a consultation with my hon. colleague the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) upon it. It was brought to my attention some time ago, and I took advantage of my presence in Halifax to consult with the officers there. I went over the charts very carefully, and took the opinions of the officers. I met the inspector of lighthouses, Mr. Hutchins, and Capt. Campbell, lately in command of the Newfield and others. But, I have not come to a conclusion which would justify me in making any recommendation to my colleagues, nor do I mean to say that the door is closed one way or the other. I will again take the matter up before the supplementary estimates are brought down.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), who has great practical experience in matters of this kind, and who has had some practical experience in respect to the necessity of a lightship at the entrance of Halifax, when he spoke of this subject, during the past session, said :

> I could easily understand that it would be of very great benefit if a powerful lightship could be anchored in such a way that, in entering a harbour, the mariner could keep the lightship on the one hand and Chebucto Head light on the other.

Further on he says :

> If it is possible to put a lightship there, it should be done.

He went on to express some doubt as to whether there was holding ground at that point, as to which I think, after what we have heard upon that matter during the past two or three years, there is really not much doubt. I understand that so far as the question of holding ground is concerned there is not really any difference of opinion among the hon. gentleman's officers. I did not observe that there was any question of that raised in the report.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think there was.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not recall it. I would like the hon. gentleman to ascertain whether the report of his officers has gone to the board of trade. I shall take it as a favour, and I may say the board of trade would take it as a favour, if the hon. gentleman would let them have a copy of it, so that they could make observations upon it, if necessary.

Wages of crew and maintenance of Lurcher Shoal lightship (revote) $10,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Why was that not spent ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have not got the lightship yet. This is for maintenance for next year.

Construction of lighthouses $42,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the list ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I read the list.

Mr. BRITTON. I want to say a word or two in reference to this vote.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Let us have the list. These lists are usually handed across the floor of the House. That was the invariable custom some years ago. Strictly speaking, they ought to be in the estimates, and all lighthouses should be mentioned separately. The course was adopted by the minister of leaving out the list and sending a copy across the floor of the House. I would like to hear the list read before we discuss the vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will send it across the floor of the House ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not have it here.

Mr. BRITTON. The reason that I speak is that the hon. minister, in referring to the list, read one or two items for maintenance at a lighthouse at Middle Ground. I assume that no maintenance will be required, unless it is intended to build a lighthouse there. This lighthouse, if built, will be to replace one at Point Pelee, which was burnt a year or so ago. A discussion has arisen in regard to where that lighthouse should be built. I understand that the department has decided that it would be rebuilt at Middle Ground, and I am informed that that is not the best place to have the lighthouse. This is certainly the most important lighthouse of any between Duluth, or Chicago and Kingston. More vessels are interested in this point than any other on the upper lakes. They say that Middle Ground is not the best place at which to build a lighthouse, and I understand that strong representations have been made to the hon. minister in that regard. It is perhaps important that a lighthouse should be put at Middle Ground, but if so there should be two lighthouses at that place. It is called Middle Ground because it is land

lying between Pelee Island and Point Pelee itself. If one lighthouse is built there, the other one ought to be built at Point Pelee, on what is called South-east Shoal, which is just near there. That is the one that will best serve the marine interests. I am told that there was a deputation of mariners down, and probably they had an interview with the minister upon that point. If so, it might be very satisfactory, and in the public interest, if the minister could say that he has been convinced that Middle Ground is not the best place to adopt, but that if he intends to build one at Middle Ground, he will have one built at South-east Shoal on Point Pelee itself. This is a very important matter, and I know that a great many people are interested in it and anxious to know at the earliest moment what the department intends to do. I am satisfied that the best interests of navigation will not be served by a lighthouse at Middle Ground, which will not answer the purpose at all. It will be good enough as far as it goes, but it is not the best place. It is not as good a place as to build it exactly on the spot where the one was destroyed. But better still would it be to put it on South-east Shoal, and better still would it be if there were two lighthouses, one on Middle Ground and one on South-east Shoal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not asking for any vote now for the construction of a lighthouse on Middle Ground or Point Pelee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We cannot see what you are asking for.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is therefore, hardly fair to ask me to give explanations in as much detail as I would give if I were asking for a vote. Last season when I asked for a vote, I brought down a chart, and the matter was argued and debated. The different locations where it was proposed that this lighthouse should be built were considered, and Middle Ground was preferred. I said in the House that the department had received petitions from a large majority of the captains of the craft in reference to the location, stating their opinion that the proper place to build the lighthouse was in the Middle Ground. I speak under correction, but I think that with two exceptions, they were unanimous in believing that Point Pelee was not the proper place, but that Middle Ground was the proper place. In addition to the opinion of the mariners, the captains of vessels, there was the opinion of the chief engineer, which was thoroughly concurrent, and there was no opinion of any weight or moment advocating the construction of this lighthouse at Point Pelee. There were very serious objections against building it there.

Mr. BRITTON. What about South-east Shoal ?

Mr. BRITTON.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There were serious objections to that too. The Middle Ground was the one which was at that time determined upon, and a vote was granted by parliament on the understanding that that was the location where the lighthouse was to be built. The lighthouse has been built and will be ready for the spring. It would have been done last fall but for the storms in October. I beg to assure my hon. friend (Mr. Britton) that if he is under the impression that the majority of the carriers favour the construction of a light on Point Pelee, he is entirely mistaken. I will bring down the petition, which will show that the vast majority are in favour of constructing the lighthouse on the Middle Ground.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Salaries of temporary officers, engineers and draughtsmen at Ottawa, at rates exceeding $400 per annum, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act $3,000

Mr. BELL (Pictou). How many officers are there ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Only two at present : Mr. Fosberry and Mr. Roberts, at $600 per annum, but Col. Anderson says that when the rush of work comes on it will be necessary to employ other officers.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the difficulty with regard to the Civil Service Act ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Civil Service Act only permits you to employ temporary officers, at $400 per annum, and you cannot get a good draughtsman in the Dominion for that. I pay Messrs. Fosberry and Roberts $600 per annum, and I cannot get any one else at that rate. I hope to get a couple of other good men at about $700.

Mr. SPROULE. Are these two employed at present retained throughout the year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They were employed by the chief engineer, and I do not know them personally, but they have been in office only about a year. I was fortunate enough to get one gentleman from the Royal Military College, but he is paid out of the civil service vote.

For the construction and equipment of a lightship for Lurcher's Shoal, supplied with electric light plant, compressed air siren and auxiliary screw power (revote) $80,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Could not a permanent structure be put there as at the Traverse ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I never thought it could, nor did Col. Anderson, but there was a memorandum sent to the department by a civil engineer of the city of St. John—I forget his name—in which he urged, that notwithstanding the great depth of water and the rise and fall of the tide, it was possible to erect a permanent structure there.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did he give an estimate ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Only in a very rough way, I think. He believed it was feasible, and if so, it would be cheaper in the end. For my own part, I do not propose to incur any part of this expenditure until Col. Anderson has visited the spot and made the necessary investigation. If his report is such as to make it advisable to adopt this course, then the construction of the lightship will have to be postponed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In a place like this, even with the best lightship, she is liable to move, and then the danger is greater than if there never was a ship there at all. That happened off Chebucto, at the time the old lightship was there. She moved from her moorings and was a source of danger, instead of a guide.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But, this proposed lightship will be fitted out in a way which I think would avoid any reasonable possibility of that. Before I proposed the vote last year, Col. Anderson went down to New York, and the engineers there gave him every information as to the improvements made on these lightships, and which are now used very largely along the American coast; and he gives me to understand that with these improvements, there will be no danger at all of the lightship moving.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman's ground for asking this vote is rather slender, especially as this is the second year it has been asked. He tells us that it is asked on a mere surmise.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I beg pardon; I did not say that. The hon. member for Pictou was asking about putting up a permanent structure, instead of a lightship, and I said that I had received a suggestion of that kind from an engineer of St. John, and that before I made any of the proposed expenditure, I would make inquiries and see if there was anything in that suggestion.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that this was a revote In fact, it was voted without very much knowledge of the subject, and only on a suggestion thrown out by the chief engineer, Col. Anderson.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is wrong. It was not on account of suggestions made by the chief engineer, but on account of representations made by the board of trade, and on account of the dangers to navigation which we know to exist in the Bay of Fundy. We know that several vessels were lost there, one particularly three years ago; and the investigation with respect to the loss of that vessel, which was pretty thorough, satisfied my mind at all events that if there had been a lightship on the Lurcher shoal, the vessel might not have been lost.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman, in trying to avoid one dilemma, gets into another, because he has given no excuse for not spending the money that was voted last year, if the vote was based on proper information at the time. So that I do not think he made his case very much better. But, what I rose for was to point to a defect in these estimates—that they do not show which items are revotes and which are new.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This does—at the end of the item.

Mr. SPROULE. I see it does. The custom has been to show the revotes in another column, and I think it would be an improvement to follow that custom.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). For what particular part of the Bay of Fundy is this lightship ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Near the entrance—about midway between Yarmouth and the Grand Manan.

Construction of lighthouses	$42,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The proposed lights and buoys for next year, are as follows :

Ontario—	
Michipicoten Island light	$3,000
Stribbling Point range lights	200
Thornbury range	250
Stag Island range	150
Quebec—	
Cap Charles range lights	1,200
Welch Rock, Lake Memphremagog, to rebuild	500
Grand Entry light	500
Gas buoys on Batture Simon	4,000
Nova Scotia—	
Low Point, re-establishment fog alarm	2,000
Victoria Beach	600
Port Bickerton	500
Charlo	500
Grand Etang pier light	400
Louisburg fog alarm	4,500
Entrance to Bras d'Or, rearrangement of lights	2,000
New Brunswick—	
Perry's Point, pole light	200

British Columbia—	
Walker's Rock light	$2,000
Brocton Point Light and dwelling	2,000
Lights and beacons en route to Ladysmith	4,000
Additional bell and whistling buoys, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia	10,000
Not yet allotted	3,500
Total	$42,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the reason for a light at Brocton ? There are two lights there now very close together, and a very good dwelling.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The engineer says there is nothing but a pole light there now. The intention is to put up a dwelling house, and a proper lighthouse.

Mr. SPROULE. How is it intended to put up the range light at Thornbury ? Is it to be put on the shore so as to range with the one at the end of the dock ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. At Brocton Point there is already a new light, and a dwelling at the entrance to the harbour; and on the point, not more than 150 yards distant, there is another light—not a pole light, but an ordinary light in a properly-constructed building.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The information I have is that there is a light at Prospect Point, and a light at the entrance. It is proposed to have both lights continued, but to substitute at Brocton Point a good light with a dwelling.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That means that there will be two keepers. Are there two keepers at present ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Though it is not exactly relevant, I would like to say a word with regard to the salary of the light keeper at Thornberry. He has been there for a number of years and his salary has been $80 a year. I think he applied for an increase and, as he is a remarkably capable and efficient man and as he will have more work to do, I hope the minister will see his way clear to give him an increase when the additional light is put there. I think the making of the range light is the proper thing to do and will be appreciated by the people in the locality. Some think that the light on the end of the dock should be raised. I do not know whether it should be raised or not, but I think that the putting in of the range light will be an improvement.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I shall be glad to bear the recommendation of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) in mind.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the estimated cost of the house and of the light ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will be one building—$2,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. For the house and light ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, that is the total.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What did the light at Prospect Point cost ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. About $3,000. That was largely on account of the foundation, which had to be made of concrete.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was very cheap. Was it done by day's labour ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will this be done by day's labour also ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I regret to see no mention in the list of Ontario lighthouses of a lighthouse at Bronte, a point about midway between Hamilton and Toronto on Lake Ontario. Last year the government received a vote of $17,000 for dredging the harbour and improving the dock at that place, and it was rumoured that a lighthouse would be placed there also. No appropriation was made for this last year, and I am surprised that the minister has overlooked it this year. I hope it is simply an oversight and that the minister does not intend to abandon the idea of erecting the lighthouse there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I shall be glad to consider carefully what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) has said. I do not recollect having the matter brought to my personal attention.

Mr. HENDERSON. I quite understand the minister when he says that the matter has not been brought to his attention. During the election in November last it was stated by the government candidate, I was credibly informed, that a lighthouse would be erected there ; and considerable use was made of that statement to secure his election. My own opinion was that no promise had been made by the Minister of Marine, nor do I think that any such promise had ever been made. I merely draw attention to the fact to show the gross abuse of the expenditure of public

money for election purposes. There is no doubt the government candidate gained greatly by announcing the prospect of this expenditure, because he succeeded in getting a larger vote there than was usually obtained by a candidate of that party; I have no doubt the real intention was to mislead the electors. I quite believe that the whole thing was gotten up merely to influence the election. However, if the hon. minister does decide to build a lighthouse there, it will be very much appreciated by the electors of that section.

Lighthouse and Coast Service—Repairs to wharfs $3,000

Mr. SPROULE. Is that in connection with lighthouses ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No—ordinary wharfs. The Marine Department is allowed this amount to spend in small repairs on wharfs without refernce to the Minister of Public Works.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You save a lot of money that way ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We do.

Scientic Institutions and Hydrographic Surveys—Observatory, Toronto..... $2,700

Mr. SPROULE. Who was appointed in the place of the late Mr. Carpmael ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Stupart.

Mr. SPROULE. He does not seem to be as successful in his weather predictions as his predecessor was.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) say that. The feeling in the maritime provinces seems to be one of surprise at the great accuracy of 'Old Probs'' predictions.

Scientific Institutions and Hydrographic Survey—Meteorological Service $77,593

Mr. SPROULE. How is this increase made up ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Salaries, $1,100; telegraphs, $1,000—we have extended our information to a larger number of towns than formerly received 'Old Probs'' prognostications and the cost of telegraphing is greater—instruments, $400; postage, stationery and printing, $1,400; expenses at stations, $783; miscellaneous, $600. The salary increases include $100 to Mr. Stupart, the director; to Mr. Webber, forecast official, $500; to Mr. H. V. Payne, climatologist, and Mr. F. F. Payne, secretary, $50 each; to Mr. F. L. Blake, astronomical assistant, $50; to Mr. Kingsford and Mr. Allan, assistant forecast officials, Mr. Menzies, observer, and Mr. Hutchinson, at St. John, N.B., $100 each. An increase of $50 is allowed also to the following: W. A. Bannon, clerk; D. O'Halloran, telegraph operator; Chas. Ross, telegraph operator; Ross McA. Cameron, clerk; Harold A. Small, clerk; Chas. E. Tweedie, assistant observer; Frank O'Donnell, clerk; and F. N. Dennison, Victoria, B.C., A station in the Yukon will cost $500, and a station on Herschell Island, $50.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. gentleman tell us approximately how much of the ground in Georgian Bay has been gone over, and what he proposes to do the coming season ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understand from Commander Stewart that they have finished the whole of that district excepting this year's work. When this year's work is finished, they will have finished the survey of Lake Huron. This year they are going down the east coast of Lake Huron toward Goderich.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I to understand they have finished up Georgian Bay entirely ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, they have some work to do on the coast of Lake Huron.

Mr. SPROULE. Has there been any charts published of late which show the survey up to the present time, and that will be available the coming season.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, charts are prepared during the winter months and sent home to the hydrographic office in London to be published, and as soon as they are published they are distributed among the mariners. The moment we get them back from the hydrographer's office they are published. I do not know whether my hon. friend has ever seen one of those charts. They involve an immense deal of accurate labour.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). I would draw the attention of the minister to the fact that the cost of these charts in Canada is about ten times the cost for corresponding works in the United States, and I do not know that they are any better. The United States charts of our great lakes are infinitely superior to the English charts, and they are purchaseable at a nominal fee. If you buy one here it costs a large sum of money.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think not, they are not sold to make money out of them.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). They are sold at 75 cents to $1.50, and you can get them for 25 cents on the other side, and infinitely better.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood these charts could be given out without charge.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, a small charge is made for them. You cannot issue valuable charts of that kind without charging for them, otherwise everybody all over the country would want them. They are charged just enough to cover the cost.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the minister tell us when the charts will be available and what the price will be for the whole of Georgian Bay and Lake Huron ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This next year we will have charts for Lake Huron and the sheets themselves for distribution. The Georgian Bay sheets are out now and ready for distribution. The whole of Georgian Bay has been surveyed and the charts are all ready for distribution.

Mr. SPROULE. When may we have the charts of the work done last summer ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Next year.

Mr. SPROULE. It is just as requisite for navigators to have charts of Lake Huron as it is of the Georgian Bay.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No time will be lost. We cannot do more than forward the charts the moment after the surveys are made. The officers come back here and prepare the charts, and the moment they finish them they are sent home to the hydrographer's office in order to be properly printed.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not complaining of the length of time, but I want to know approximately when they will be out, because these questions are asked, and I desire to give information when they will be available.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Next year we will have the first two charts, the chief engineer tells me, of Lake Huron, the first two charts only. They are generally about two years behind in getting the sheet charts ; from the time the survey is made until the sheet charts come back will be two years.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT. TUPPER. What was the expenditure on the hydrographic survey last year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. For the year 1899-1900 it was $12,600. I cannot tell what the expenditure will be for the current year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then, why does the hon. gentleman ask $16,000 if $12,600 was all he spent in the regular season before, and he does not know what amount he will require for the current year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman knows that the vessel we employ on this hydrographic survey, the Bayfield, is a very old and almost worn-out vessel. Last year I tried to get my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) to give me some money to build a new boat, but he could not see his way clear to do it. I want to get a new boat now, but I have not got the money yet. There will be quite a large sum of money, $3,000 or $4,000 at the very least, expended in repairing the boiler and the machinery of the Bayfield to make her seaworthy. It is specially for that ; the whole $16,000, Mr. Stewart tells me, will be required.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). If the minister will inquire into the cost of these maps he will find that the United States charts are infinitely cheaper and better.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will make the necessary inquiries ; but the prices of these charts are fixed by the Admiralty Office, and it is very hard to get out of routine.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Is it the intention of the minister to do any hydrographic surveying on the coast of British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not this year, but I am not without hopes that when we get the new vessel afloat we may be able to do something. We have called for tenders for her construction, although the contract has not been entered into yet. I hope she will be ready for service in a short time.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. If I understand the work these vessels have to do, I do not think they will have time to do any hydrographic work this year. No doubt these vessels are wanted badly, and they are wanted for customs work, and looking after smuggling and lighthouse service. The hon. gentleman will remember that last year a very strong effort was made by boards of trade in British Columbia to have that hydrographic survey carried on. The hon. gentleman must remember there is a tremendously large traffic going on now on that coast up to the Yukon, and also down to San Francisco. I think if he looks into it he will find that he ought to do something this year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Last year my hon. friend brought this matter up and I had it investigated. To a certain extent that coast has been already surveyed by Imperial officers but has not been as completely surveyed as it ought to be. The Quadra is now doing all the work out there, but it is contemplated to have a new ship launched, and the Quadra will be reserved entirely for marine work and the new ship devoted to the protection of the fisheries and customs. That need not necessarily absorb all her time, but neither

am I prepared to say that she would have time to devote to the hydrographic service. I have made no preparation for any hydrographic survey on the western coast this year.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. My hon. friend will remember that Captain Walldom, in command of the Quadra, has done considerable work in that regard which does not pertain to his duties.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I know he has, and the work he has done is very creditable to him, but I would not say that an officer of one of the Dominion steamers should not, when he discovers a rock, locate it properly on the chart.

Care of sick seamen in Marine Hospital and other hospitals in the maritime provinces $38,000
Shipwrecked and distressed seamen 3,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The increase of $3,000 in the first item is due to the increase of shipping, especially at the port of Montreal, where there is a very large number of seamen admitted to the General Hospital and the Notre Dame Hospital. In Montreal alone 340 seamen receive treatment, and the treatment of sick seamen at outlaying ports has also largely increased.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the charge by the hospital ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. So much per diem for each seaman—90 or 95 cents.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. According to the Auditor General's Report $35,000 covered everything.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Last year we spent $35,000, but that included $1,000 voted for the St. John cemetery. We estimate that we will require at least $2,000 more this year, basing our estimate on the increased number of patients in the Montreal hospital and the outlying ports.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this vote available for sick seamen in Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, this is strictly speaking a trust fund and does not cost the country anything. To the credit of that fund there is quite a large amount of money. The ships in the maritime provinces and Quebec are liable for the payment of a tonnage fee which goes into this particular fund. Out of this fund this expenditure is made. In Ontario the ships pay no sick mariners fee and consequently are not entitled to any share in this fund.

Steamboat inspection $28,200

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The increase of $1,000 is to provide for increases in the salaries of inspectors granted them a few months ago.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who is the inspector now at the Yukon ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Robinson.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What became of Russell ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He was dismissed.

Inspection of Dominion steamers and fog alarms $1,300

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I would like to call attention to the necessity for more fog alarms on the Pacific coast. The Boards of Trade of Vancouver and Victoria have pointed out the great necessity—a necessity impressed upon them by seafaring men—for fog alarms wherever lighthouses are placed. That means a pretty large order, but the frequency of fogs and the large and increasing traffic demand that fog alarms should be put up. Many more lights are also required, but on this subject I shall speak on some future occasion. I would like the hon. minister to promise that this question of fog alarms will receive his early and favourable consideration.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would be happy to promise that it will receive early consideration, but would not like to consent to so large a proposition by promising it favourable consideration. I will give it every consideration possible.

Mr. FRASER. I would impress on the hon. minister the advisability of seeing whether the people to the south of us might not be induced to do their share in the northern part. Our government have done five times as much as the American government have in that direction.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Where is that ?

Mr. FRASER. North, towards Skagway. It would be well if the hon. minister would communicate with the American government so as to draw its attention to the fact in order that it might do its share. I have heard American capitalists say that we did tentimes more in a short time since we have been opening up that country than they did all the time they have had any possessions there.

Salaries and disbursements of fisheries inspectors, overseers and guardians.... $85,000

Mr. SPROULE. What is the reason for this increase ? I thought when we were obliged to give up the fisheries to the provinces there would be a reduction in the expenditure rather than an increase.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. So there is a reduction. The amount originally was $95,000, and it was

reduced to $70,000 in 1900. At that time it was assumed that we would not have any officers whatever in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, but it was subsequently represented to us that we must have a few inspectors at least to inform us upon the manner in which the regulations, which it is our duty to make and prepare, are carried out by the fishery officers of the provinces. We, therefore, have in new Ontario an inspector, we have an inspector in Ontario, resident in Toronto, whose jurisdiction extends over the whole of Lake Erie and part of Lake Huron, and then we have an inspector in the eastern part of Ontario. We have two inspectors for Quebec, so that, having to pay for the inspectors and their travelling expenses, a matter of $9,000, was incurred more than was at first anticipated. Then, coming to British Columbia, we have had this last year, an additional fishery protection steamer that cost $15,000 last year, and this protection in British Columbia will cost $15,000 this year.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. What steamer was that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We had the Winetta and Tyce.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that we are getting rapidly back to the old figure that the hon. minister says the expenditure originally reached—$90,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. $95,000.

Mr. SPROULE. It came down to $70,000, but in one year it jumped up by $15,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In British Columbia our receipts from fisheries are very largely in excess of our expenditure, and I will have to ask the House next year to increase the expenditure there still more to provide fishery boats for the protection of the fisheries there. We are building one now which we will have to maintain, we are building a hatchery at Sicamous on the Fraser river, we are building another at the mouth of the Skeena river, and I have no doubt that we will be obliged to build other hatcheries and incur other large expenditures.

Mr. SPROULE. This is not the item for fish hatcheries at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, but I am pointing out that while you see one side of the account increasing, you do not see the receipts increasing. The receipts from British Columbia, largely exceed the expenditure on the fisheries.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Four times.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The reason is that when the salmon fishing season takes place, there is a matter of a thousand boats congregated at the mouth of the Fraser river. These boats have to be licensed and closely inspected, and we have to charter a steamer and to maintain a crew and officers. That costs $15,000, but the receipts are far in excess of the expenditure.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is that something new ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not complaining of that, but I was referring to the excuse given by the hon. minister for the increase. We thought when the fisheries were taken over by the provinces that we would have no expenditure in that line, but we found afterwards that we required three overseers, and that was given to account for the increase in the expenditure. Now, the increase in the expenditure is in British Columbia, which I think would be perfectly proper, but it would be well to inquire how much of that increase was due to the expenditure in British Columbia, and how much was due to the increase in the number of inspectors in Ontario. Then, we will be able to arrive at a proper estimate as to what we require.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) has mentioned three inspectors as being employed in Ontario. If I understood the right hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the other day, he mentioned Mr. Hurley, of Hastings, as an inspector. These inspectors, I understand, are to see whether the regulations are being carried out. Have the Dominion government the power to say how much the license shall be ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. INGRAM. Have the Dominion government inspectors any control over the local inspectors ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, they have no direct control over them. Their duty is to report to the department from week to week how the fishery regulations are observed in the different localities.

Mr. INGRAM. By whom ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. By the fishermen.

Mr. CLANCY. That is the duty of the local government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly, it is the duty of the local government, but we make the regulations and fix the times and seasons in which the fish may be taken. The local government have the sole and exclusive right

under the Privy Council decision to grant licenses for particular localities, they get the fees and they oppoint officers for that purpose. It is a divided jurisdiction and we appoint three officers in order to keep track of the manner in which our regulations are observed, and report to us whether these regulations are proper or not, and whether they should be amended or not in this direction or in that direction.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend will see that we derive no revenue from any source, and it is strange that we should be so anxious as to employ a squad of inspectors to look after a matter that is solely concerned with provincial interests. My hon. friend behind me very aptly says that they are employed to draw their salaries. Cannot we discover any other reason for it than that ? Some discussion took place on this same question last year. There seems to be some conflict of authority, some difference of opinion as to what is the proper sphere of action to be pursued by the respective governments in regard to the matter. I would like to ask : Has Mr. Hurley taken the place of some other inspector, or is he a new inspector ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We had a gentleman from the department who undertook the duties of inspecting eastern Ontario lying near here, but we came to the conclusion that it would be better to have an officer who would devote his whole time to the work.

Mr. CLANCY. Then Mr. Hurley is a new appointment ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He takes Mr. Cunningham's place.

Mr. CLANCY. What were the duties that Mr. Cunningham performed before ? It is necessary to know what the reasons were that actuated the government in coming to the conclusion which they did.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Cunningham's duties are chiefly in the department, and he was asked to do this work in eastern Ontario.

Mr. CLANCY. Why cannot he do it now?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because he would have to be away from his work here.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that his work was neglected here, when he perfomed these other duties ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not prepared to say that his work was neglected, but I advised my colleagues that it would be better to have him in the department to attend to the special work that he is required to do, taking charge of the accounts of the fishery expenditure and superintending the hatcheries of the Dominion. Mr. Cunningham may be required to go to-morrow to inspect the hatchery at Margaree, or at Richibucto, N.B., or at Pictou, in Nova Scotia, and to report upon these hatcheries. It does not seem to me that it would be consistent with these duties to discharge the duty of inspector of fisheries in eastern Ontario.

Mr. CLANCY. It is very strange that the hon. gentleman should have made that discovery so suddenly. I am quite sure his friends know perfectly, that there has no such state of things arisen other than the necessity of finding a place for an hon. gentleman who was defeated at the election to call for this appointment. Mr. Hurley is no doubt a very estimable gentleman, but that is not what we are discussing here tonight. But, if the reasons the hon. gentleman gives at the present moment are good now, they were good before. The minister might call upon Mr. Cummings or anybody else to go to the maritime provinces, but it would be more courageous for him to stand up and tell us that he wanted to make an appointment, and that this is the excuse.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are glad to know that you do not object to the appointment.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not objecting to the appointment of any necessary official. Why should we maintain even a small staff of officials for the purpose of maintaining provincial revenues. The minister I am sure will agree with me, that this is a useless service for the Dominion to maintain and that it should be ended as speedily as possible. If this were merely a temporary arrangement pending a decision of the courts, and if we could ever hope to receive any revenue, then I could understand it. Is it the intention of the government to maintain this service and to multiply the officers as the necessity arises ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not the intention of the department, while I preside over it at least, to multiply unnecessary officials. I appeal to the experience and intelligence of my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy)—and I have never appealed to them in vain—for he knows that the Privy Council decision gave rise to certain anomalies which we did not anticipate and cannot overcome. The exclusive power to make regulations in connection with the fisheries is vested in the Dominion government, but the provinces of Ontario and Quebec having been declared by the Privy Council to be the owners of the beds of rivers and lakes, they were held a fortiori to be the owners of the fish in these rivers and lakes, and it was held that the provinces had the exclusive right to grant fishery leases of areas in these lakes. Therefore the revenues which we formerly derived from the issue of licenses are now

handed over to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. CLANCY. We all know that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am explaining the anomaly. We must make the regulations, and they grant the licenses. With the constitutional duty cast upon us of making the regulations, are we not to see that the regulations are carried out? Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) suggest that I should withdraw the Petrel from Lakes Erie and Huron? I do not think any one would suggest that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is not the Minister (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) wrong in regard to that decision of the Privy Council, when he says the result of it was that the authority of the Dominion government was gone with regard to the issuing of licenses?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Leases?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman said licenses. We had a system of licenses in the province of Ontario which brought incidentally into the exchequer a very large sum of money. As I understand it, the decision of the Privy Council did not interfere with that system or the right to charge for these licenses because they were not for revenue but for the purpose of restriction, and preventing overfishing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would not be dogmatic on that question, because there is room for difference of opinion. I have consulted with the Minister of Justice, and the Deputy Minister of Justice and also with Mr. Christopher Robinson as to what that judgment means, and the conclusion I arrived at was that while we may have the power to levy a tax on all fishing we choose, outside of that we have no power to issue a license and charge for it in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is an interesting passage in the judgment in reference to an argument addressed to the court from an opposite point of view. It was said: If the province has the exclusive right to issue the proprietary license and charge therefor, and the Dominion has the right to regulate overfishing by licenses which they would charge, what is to prevent the Dominion practically taking over the proprietary right and getting the revenue out of the fisheries. The court said: We cannot assume that the federal authority would resort to anything in the line of bad faith, but so long as the federal legislation is not for the purpose of exercising a proprietary right and obtaining a revenue it would be intra vires.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I take it, there would be nothing wrong in our passing a regulation that no one should fish without paying, say one dollar a year. What I referred to particularly was the issue of a license for a particular location where a net could be cast, the exclusive right of which belongs to the province and not to us.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Quite so, but the curious thing seems to be that the federal authority has absolutely withdrawn from Ontario in so far as that license system is concerned.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That license system never was founded upon a revenue basis, but upon the necessity of protecting the fisheries so as to preserve them. That was the attitude always taken in this House, and when a comparison was made of the large amount taken from Ontario as compared with the other provinces, the explanation of the policy of the government was that this was a mere incident, the system not being to obtain revenue from the fishermen of Ontario but to preserve to these fishermen the fisheries, and with that end in view a fee was charged for tugs and for nets and so on. That being so, there is not a line in the judgment which says that system is wrong and that the provinces alone should charge a license. The provinces of course exercise proprietary right, but according to the statement of the minister (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) the Ontario government are carrying out that license system and obtaining the incidental revenue from it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the condition of things now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then it is a great concession from the federal government and it is a concession which causes the federal government to recede from the discharge of their responsibility to regulate the fisheries. If these are the regulations, they get their force from Dominion laws, and not from local.

Mr. HUGHES. If the Ontario government derive a revenue from the fisheries, why should not the Ontario government maintain a fishery protection service?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They do.

Mr. HUGHES. They do not pay for the Dominion boat.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is maintained from a national, or rather international standpoint. It is for the purpose of protecting the fisheries of the inland waters from the inroads of American fishermen, which one would

hardly suppose to be a duty properly relegated to the province.

Mr. HUGHES. Why not ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Inasmuch as it is international ; and inasmuch as we maintain the protection of the sea-shore fisheries out of the Dominion treasury, it is equally reasonable to suppose that we should maintain the protection of the inland fisheries from the encroachments of American fishermen.

Mr. HUGHES. Each state of the American union maintains its own fishery officers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are not in the same position as the states of the American union.

Mr. HUGHES. In this case we are.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If my hon. friend thinks we should withdraw the Petrel and abandon the protection of the inland waters, I am prepared to discuss that question with him. I hope he will not take that ground.

Mr. INGRAM. As I understand the hon. gentleman, the Ontario government own the fish in the rivers and lakes of the province. I would like to know if the Ontario government endorse the regulations of the Dominion government, and are willing to carry them out.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not mean to say that there has been no friction. On the contrary, there has been a disposition on the part of the provincial government to arrogate—if that is not an improper word—powers with regard to these regulations, which I do not think they possess. They undertook to pass regulations supplementary to ours, contending that as the proprietor of the fisheries, they had a right to make supplementary regulations. We challenge that right entirely, pointing to the words in the fishery judgment stating that the sole and exclusive right to make regulations relating to the fisheries is vested in the Dominion. That is our contention. We have taken the opinion of the Justice Department on it once or twice, and we have no reasonable doubt as to the righteousness and legality of the ground we stand upon in that regard. But there has been more or less friction. We pointed out to the Ontario government that in an Act which they passed on the subject, one or two sections went beyond their powers, because in them they took power to pass regulations which we contend is vested exclusively in the Dominion. But generally speaking, I have no complaint at all to make as to the manner in which the Ontario government and their officers administer the regulations which we pass. With certain reservations, I think they are doing fairly well.

Mr. COCHRANE. They get the fees, and you pay the officials.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, no ; the hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. They have to pay a very large sum of money for protection. They pay the fishery overseers and guardians.

Mr. COCHRANE. What do you want, then ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I want an inspector to report to me whether the regulations are being carried out. A department like the Marine and Fisheries Department has no right to be vested with the exclusive power to make regulations, unless it is posted from time to time with a knowledge of those conditions, and their modification from time to time, which should be known to the man who makes the regulations.

Mr. INGRAM. What I want to know is whether the Ontario government are willing to recognize the Dominion authorities. Is it the policy of the Ontario government to deplete the fisheries they own in the rivers and lakes ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think their policy is to protect them.

Mr. INGRAM. If that is true, and if they endorse the regulations passed by the Dominion government, what is the necessity of their having inspectors ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not sure that they will carry that out. The industry is too vast and important and valuable, and the responsibility on my shoulders as Minister of Marine and Fisheries is too great, for me to ignore. Nor would this House justify me if I sat back and ignored my responsibility by saying that inasmuch as the proceeds of the fisheries go to the Ontario government I would do nothing to protect them.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand that the Ontario officials are in no sense answerable to the inspectors appointed by the Dominion, but are solely answerable to the province. Let us suppose that they disregard in a large measure the faithful carrying out of the regulations made exclusively by the Dominion ; then, what recourse has the hon. gentleman ? One word more. I quite understand that if the provincial government pass supplementary regulations, the hon. gentleman would have his remedy by disallowing so much of those regulations as conflicted with the authorities of the Dominion. But I would suppose a set of officers who would be wholly unanswerable to the hon. gentleman's inspectors for the

faithful carrying out of his regulations, and I ask him what his recourse would be ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The one recourse, if the provincial officers refused to enforce the regulations, would be to appoint officers of our own to enforce them.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman power to do that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, yes ; and so far as the breaches of the regulations come to the knowledge of any of our inspectors, it is part of their duty to punish the wrong-doer.

Mr. INGRAM. The regulations involve the fixing of close seasons ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. The Dominion government have the right to say what shall be the close season ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The exclusive right.

Mr. INGRAM. The fishermen may differ as to the time that ought to be fixed for the close season ; and suppose the inspector of this government found that in a certain district the fishermen were not carrying out the regulations of the Dominion government in that respect. The local inspector takes no action. Has the Dominion inspector authority to have an investigation ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, full power.

Mr. INGRAM. Suppose the inspector of the Ontario government is found to be negligent, what authority has this government over him ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It has no authority over him ; but I would report to his government. But the wrong-doer himself who transgressed our regulations would be summoned and punished by our inspector.

Mr. INGRAM. In case an inspector of the Ontario government were receiving money and not returning it to the Ontario government, I suppose you would have nothing to do with that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nothing whatever.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The passage of the decision which I have reference to is not long, and I would like to bring it to the attention of the minister, because it underlay what I suggested—that these regulations under which the license fee was charged, were passed as regulations, and not for the purpose of retaining any money. Passing to the question of fishery and fishery rights :

Mr. CLANCY.

Their lordships are of opinion that the 91st section of the British North America Act did not convey to the Dominion of Canada any proprietary rights in relation to fisheries. Their lordships have already noticed the distinction which must be borne in mind between rights of property and legislative jurisdiction. It was the latter only which was conferred under the heading, 'Sea Coast and Inland Fisheries,' in s. 91. Whatever proprietary rights in relation to fisheries were previously vested in private individuals or in the provinces respectively, remains untouched by that enactment. Whatever rights might previously have been lawfully made by the provinces in virtue of their proprietary rights could lawfully be made after that enactment came into force. At the same time, it must be remembered that the power to legislate in relation to fisheries does necessarily, to a certain extent, enable the legislature so empowered to affect proprietary rights. An enactment, for example, prescribing the time of the year during which fishing is to be allowed, or the instruments which may be employed for the purpose (which it was admitted the Dominion legislature was empowered to pass) might very seriously touch the exercise of proprietary rights, and the extent, character and scope of such legislation is left entirely to the Dominion legislature. The suggestion that the power might be abused so as to amount to a practical confiscation of property, does not warrant the imposition by the courts of any limit upon the absolute power of legislation conferred. The supreme legislative power in relation to any subject-matter is always capable of abuse, but it is not to be assumed that it will be improperly used.

That was brought out much more strongly in the argument on the interruption of the counsel, when Lord Herschell made an observation directly on the illustration which counsel was making on the basis of that license system.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As a matter of policy, we have not attempted to issue general licenses.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As I understand the hon. gentleman, he has no advice from the Department of Justice that it would not be possible for this government to issue licenses. It seems to me the language of the Judicial Committee would indicate that you might issue licenses. 'Fishing regulations and restriction are within the province of the Dominion, inasmuch as the exclusive legislative authority of the parliament of Canada extends to sea coasts and Atlantic fisheries.' In the well-known case of the city of Toronto vs. Virgo, it was held that the by-law in question was ultra vires, because it destroyed the trade or right which it purported to regulate. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council held that regulation could only be consistent with the continued existence of that which is to be regulated. Here you have the power to regulate, why not exercise it by means of licenses as well as anything else ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We might do that and possibly charge for the licenses too, but I would

draw a distinction between a general license to fish and a license to fish in a particular locality. The latter would be a matter affecting the proprietary right. For instance, if we should divide off from the shore a certain location, A to Z, and give a license to fish in that location, that would amount to a lease, and should come from the province alone. A general license we might issue, saying that nobody shall fish in the province unless he has a Dominion license, but as a matter of policy we have not adopted that system.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. My hon. friend has said that the Dominion government has given up all claims for the revenue from licenses in the province of Ontario. Why have they not done so in the province of British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is a broad distinction between the two. The reason on which the judgment of the Privy Council was based is that the proprietary rights in the fisheries belong to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, inasmuch as the beds of the rivers and lakes are the property of the provinces.

In the maritime provinces, the question whether the bed of the sea, from low water mark, to the three-mile limit, belongs to the province as a proprietary right, or whether the Dominion has proprietary jurisdiction over it, is a question not absolutely determined. I have frequently expressed my opinion that the Dominion has the right over the sea coast fisheries and that the provinces of Ontario and Quebec have the right only to the inland fisheries, because they own the beds of the lakes and rivers.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. A large number of the licenses collected by the Dominion in British Columbia are licenses to fish in the rivers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not many, but there are some, and an adjustment is being made in the accounts between the province and the Dominion in that regard. I had a lengthy interview with the premier of British Columbia on the matter. I admit that if I were to give exclusive leases of any part of a river and charge for them, the fees would belong to the province ; but if I give a general license to fish and make a regulation that nobody shall fish without that license, that is within my power.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. My hon. friend said some time ago that he would have to make a larger expenditure in British Columbia than he has done in the past. To strengthen his hands with his colleagues, and especially with the hon. the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding), of whom he seems to be afraid——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, no, you will find the Finance Minister very generous.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Let me draw attention to some figures I have just taken out of the Auditor General's Report. In Ontario the revenue was $794, and the Dominion government expended there $3,704. In Quebec the revenue collected amounted to $2,563, and the expenditure was $5,549, or the expenditure doubled the revenue. In Nova Scotia the revenue was $5,494, and the expenditure $27,461, or there was five times greater expenditure in Nova Scotia than revenue collected. In New Brunswick the revenue was $12,015 and the expenditure $21,459—or the expenditure nearly doubled the revenue. But in British Columbia where the revenue was $53,195, the expenditure was only $13,662, or the expenditure in that province was only one-fourth of what the government received. The revenue collected from British Columbia was four times more than that collected from New Brunswick, and yet the expenditure in New Brunswick was one and three-quarter times that expended in British Columbia. And while the revenue from British Columbia was more than ten times that of Nova Scotia, Nova Scotia had twice as much expended in that province as British Columbia. Those figures show that British Columbia once more came out at the small end of the horn, and I trust that the hon. minister will take those figures into consideration and establish more fish hatcheries in British Columbia and appoint more overseers to look after the lakes and the rivers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I appreciate a great deal of what my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Prior) has said. He will find that the expenditure for the current year is much larger.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. It is the same old thing. Always promising.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, the hon. gentleman will find that the expenditure is larger, and it will necessarily and properly continue to increase.

Mr. HACKETT. I notice a great increase in the expenditure for the protection of fisheries in Prince Edward Island within the last few years. In 1895-6 the expenditure was $3,555, and in 1899, it was $7,264, an increase of one hundred per cent in four years. Will the hon. minister tell us what changes have taken place in Prince Edward Island to warrant such an increase ? I know of none. The fisheries are no better protected than they were. We have had a number of by-elections, it is true and several defeated candidates—and that is the only way I can account for it. Last October, when I was going about soliciting the votes of the people, I went down to Richmond Bay where the oyster beds are, and I found there a regular swarm of men paid by the government, the object being, no doubt, to

elect the government candidate. The fishermen were being watched as closely as if they were preparing to steal something that belonged to the government. The object was to secure support for the government, but it did not have that effect. The time when the fishing is going on is not the time to protect the fisheries. The time when watchfulness should be used is during the spawning season. But, when the men are fishing, do not put on a force of camp followers to watch them at their work every day. As I have said, the hon. minister is losing prestige among the fishermen by using the men in this way. Merely that he may hand over the loaves and fishes of government patronage to the men who were wandering in the wilderness for eighteen years hungering for the flesh pots of office. This may be a growing time, but the day may come when the government will require every dollar they are now throwing away in this reckless manner. I had the honour to be inspector of fisheries for Prince Edward Island for a number of years. In 1895 I found the amount placed at my disposal quite sufficient to protect the fisheries. Since then, as I say, the expenditure has increased a hundred per cent and it has been increased for a corrupt purpose, to influence the electors.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) knows, and as every hon. gentleman knows, it is not a very popular thing to enforce fishery or any other regulations, and, in the attempt to enforce properly the regulations of the department and preserve the great fishing industries of the people, an officer or a minister will not gain, but will lose popularity. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that I have not gained in popularity in my native province, but have lost. But I should be recreant to my duty if I allowed men to break the regulations I have sworn to carry out. The increase of expenditure has been made in an honest effort to protect the lobster and other fisheries. I know it is very unpopular, but I intend to do it, as I have done it in the past.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is one point respecting this fishery expenditure to which I wish to call attention. In the report of the Auditor General with respect to overseers or wardens appear sums such as these: Salary 9 months, $45 ; travel, $294.05; salary 9 months, $75, travel $264.49 ; salary 9 months, $75, travel $782.56. It seems to me that the salary is very small in proportion to the travel. There seems to be very little bread, to a monstrous deal of sack in this case. When a man travels to the extent of $782, it seems to me he should be paid more than $75 for it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is very difficult to explain to the hon. gentleman this apparent annomaly, but it is all right. A man is paid a certain sum as guardian or overseer of a certain district. If he sits at home and does nothing, he might as well not have been appointed. If his district is a large one he should travel long distances. He must keep a record of all the travelling he does, where to, and the number of miles. He must make a return, and this is checked by the officers of the department. A man cannot be expected, for $50 a year, to take his horse and carriage out or to travel by rail or boat at his own expense. Therefore, the department allows so much a mile for travelling fees. The law allows payment only for mileage actually travelled bona fide in the discharge of the duties of the office. The question is whether we have a good check upon these returns, and the officers in the department think we have.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The $50 or $75 is in the nature of a retainer then, and the other represents not actual expenses but a mileage allowance really part of the salary ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the minister had any complaints from his inspectors that the Ontario officials have failed to carry out their duties in enforcing the regulations ? If not, the only reason for the expenditure for inspectors is the burning zeal of the hon. minister to carry out a duty that is already well discharged by those who have the greatest interest in discharging it faithfully. If he is prepared to say that cases have come to his notice, that might be a reason, and if he is prepared to say further that he has taken means to remedy the evil complained of, that would be a reason ; but, if the hon. gentleman is not prepared to make a statement of that kind, then, I submit, they are absolutely of no use, and there is no reason for retaining the inspectors to do work that is being well done simply because it is in the interest of the province to do so.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I can only tell my hon. friend that he must have failed to follow the statement that I made before, that is, the absolute necessity of retaining some officials in the great province of Ontario to keep the department informed as how their regulations are observed. The hon. gentleman sees it is not a matter of whether the officials of the Ontario government carry out their duties to their superiors that I am concerned with ; they may collect their fees or they may not, they may issue licenses properly or they may not, that is not the point that I am concerned with. The point I am concerned with is this : Are the regulations that this department makes from time to time the proper regulations and,

secondly, if they are, how are they observed by the fishermen ? Now, I must have somebody to inform me from time to time whether those regulations which are made by the department as to times, and seasons, and methods of fishing, are proper regulations or whether they should be amended. It is not the duty of the Ontario officials to do that, and if I have not got an official there to do it, it will not be done at all. These officials make reports from week to week, not how the Ontario officials discharge their duties, but how the Ontario fishermen observe our regulations, and whether those regulations are right or whether they ought to be amended. From time to time we receive our information from our inspectors, which we transmit to the Ontario officials for their information, and, therefore, we keep in touch one with the other. It is not our fault if these apparent anomalies exist between the powers of the Ontario government and the powers of the Dominion government ; the Privy Council is responsible for that, for its declaration of what we formerly supposed was not the law. So, I say, it would not be good policy on the part of this government to withdraw altogether from the great province of Ontario the presence of two or three officials, who travel about from week to week and fortnight to fortnight to keep the department here informed as to whether our regulations are good and proper, and whether they are being properly observed. Now, if I found out from the reports of my inspectors that these regulations were not being observed, it would become my duty to appoint officers to enforce them. It is part of the duty of these inspectors to enforce them if they come face to face with any breach of them. On view they could convict and punish any offender against the regulations, and it is their duty to do so ; and if they fail to do so we must appoint others to do it, in case it is reported to us that breaches become numerous. So far we have no material grounds of complaint. Of course complaints are always coming in, being investigated, and disposed of ; and, speaking generally, we are getting along fairly well. There must be some friction existing between the Ontario government and the Dominion government, each not being quite sure where the line of their duty ends and where the duty of the other begins. However, this will adjust itself, it is adjusting itself now from season to season. I think my hon. friend would be well advised not to ask us to withdraw the only officials we have there, but to ask us to keep down the expenditure to the lowest possible notch.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend has still failed to make out his case, as it seems to me. The hon. gentleman bases his case principally upon the fact that he is anxious to know how these regulations act upon the fisheries of the respective provinces. Now, if it is conceded that the hon. gentleman has a right to make the regulations regarding provincial fisheries, it is a fair presumption that he makes them in the best interests of those fisheries, and in the best interests of those who are solely concerned. If that be true, is it not also a fair presumption that if they are not working well, representation will be made to the hon. gentleman's department by the provincial officers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I do not think so.

Mr. CLANCY. It is the most natural thing that if these fishery regulations are harsh and are not working well, the parties concerned will inform the hon. gentleman. He does not require a set of inspectors to inform him if these fishery regulations are not working well and require amendments. I can understand that if a set of regulations made, not in the interest of the Dominion, but in the interest of the provinces, were found to work contrary to the anticipation of those who made the regulations, representation would be made to the department at once. The true test is the fishery officials in the province, and not the inspectors over the inspectors, as the hon. gentleman has them. The provincial officials are better judges, as they report to their principals whether those regulations are working well or not. The province will always communicate to the Dominion in matters of that kind, especially since the hon. gentleman says that they always keep in touch in regard to these matters.

Mr. SPROULE. What objection would there be to imposing those duties upon provincial inspectors ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have no power to do so. I would rather be relieved of the necessity of appointing an army of these provincial officials.

Building and maintenance of fish-breeding establishments and lobster hatcheries $50,000

Mr. SPROULE. What is the policy of the government with regard to these fish hatcheries now, since the fisheries are given over to the provinces ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have made no change, we have determined to carry on the fish hatcheries. There is a slight increase here in the amount asked for maintenance of fish hatcheries in Canada. There will be three new hatcheries, one in Margaree, county of Inverness, Cape Breton, one at Gaspé, and one in Sicamous, Granite Creek, B.C., and a small one at the mouth of the Skeena river, in British Columbia also. The hatchery which as been started at Gaspé is a combined lobster and salmon

hatchery. Lobster fisheries are entirely under the control of the Dominion, being a deep-sea fish; and salmon may be considerd, while it is in the river, to be a provincial fish, but in the sea it is a Dominion fish. However, the policy in the Dominion has not been altered in respect of fish hatcheries by reason of the Privy Council decision. We have gone on, at all events, and parliament seems very generally to have approved of the fishery expenditure. I think it is money well spent. A large number of those engaged in the lobster fisheries believe that a large number of the small lobsters, innumerable almost, three, four and five inches in size are the result of the Pictou lobster hatcheries. Whether it is so or not, I cannot positively assert, but their presence in very large numbers within a reasonable area from the place where the spawn are deposited by the fish hatchery officer leads to the reasonable conclusion that they are the product of the fish hatchery. Taking it all in all, I think the money is well spent, and unless there is a very strong opinion expressed in parliament against the continuance of the expenditure, I should be disposed to advise its continuance.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not objecting to the expenditure; I am only asking whether it is the policy of the government, in view of their abandoning their rights in the fisheries, to continue this work. I approve of this policy, and I want to ask the hon. minister if he would not do justice by establishing one or two more hatcheries in Ontario. There are three in New Brunswick, three in Quebec, and he is asking——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Three in New Brunswick?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes. There is one at Miramichi, one at Newcastle and one at Restigouche.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, you are wrong.

Mr. SPROULE. They are here in the Auditor General's Report.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Perhaps you are right; I am surprised.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to ask that the Georgian Bay, where the great supply of ova of whitefish and salmon trout for the fish hatcheries of the Dominion is obtained, should be provided with a fish hatchery. There is no fish hatchery on the Georgian Bay at all, right in the locality that supplies the ova for these hatcheries. These waters are being depleted from year to year. A few years ago, I brought this question to the attention of the late government, and I also brought it to the attention of the present government. I regret that I was unable to induce them to establish some hatcheries in that part of the country. It is very important to the people living in that locality, not only to the fishermen, but to those who use the fish, that those waters should be kept as well supplied with fish fry as possible. There are plenty of suitable localities for these hatcheries. I am not objecting to the expenditure at all, but rather approving of it, and I am asking the hon. gentleman to go farther and to do a little more than has been done in the past.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The matter was brought to my attention a couple of years ago. I think Wiarton was the location suggested where a fish hatchery could with advantage be built. I am not sure it was Wiarton, but I think it was.

Mr. SPROULE. There was Wiarton and also Beaver river valley. The Beaver river empties into the Georgian Bay at Thornbury.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How far is that from Wiarton?

Mr. SPROULE. It is forty or fifty miles.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. At the time the matter was presented to me, I was favourably impressed with the suggestion. I think the original location of a hatchery at Newcastle was a mistake, but there were special circumstances arising out of Mr. Wilmot's connection with fish hatching, which I think induced the department to establish a hatchery there. There is no doubt, that it is not a proper site for a fish hatchery. The whitefish hatchery at Sandwich is all right. There is a good deal in the arguments advanced by those who believe that a fish hatchery should be established for the Georgian Bay portion of the Dominion. I have not given it lately very much consideration, but I was very favourably impressed by the representations made. I promise my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) to take it up anew at an early date.

Fisheries protection service, including maintenance of new vessels in British Columbia $120,000

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase of $20,000. What is the explanation?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman knows that we called for tenders for the construction of a new steamer there; we anticipate she will be ready, and if she is ready, $20,000 will be required for her maintenance.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. As a matter of fact you have let contracts for two vessels.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. One is for a small vessel which is more for the protection of the

fisheries at the mouth of the Fraser river than anything else, but the large one will be for the protection of the deep sea waters of British Columbia. We are taking a vote of $20,000 for the maintenance of this vessel.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether he has done anything in regard to sending out some black bass to British Columbia. I have been urging this upon his attention for three years.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There has nothing been done yet, but I am putting the Commissioner of Fisheries under bonds that they will be forwarded at the very first opportunity after he gets the ova.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Is it not a fact that the department have had some ponds where they have been breeding this ova ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES, Yes.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Has it not been a success ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, I believe it is a success. I saw a letter addressed by the Commissioner of Fisheries to a gentleman in British Columbia, saying that they were being sent forward.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I have had to ask for this for three years.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I tell the hon. gentleman that I will put the commissioner under bonds to do this.

Legal and incidental expenses $2,000

Mr. INGRAM. Explain.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is an item which is taken every year to provide in case there is any litigation. Seven hundred dollars was spent last year. Wo do not expend any more than is necessary. I am very economical in that regard.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. After the election.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Before and after. I am afraid my professional friends think I am too economical.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice an item in the Auditor General's Report : Hon. Edward Blake, legal expenses, $2,452. It is an advance.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have had for years an arbitration pending between the British government and the Russian government in respect to the seizure of certain Canadian sealing ships in Alaskan waters. We have for a long time been trying to arrive at a basis of arbitration. We think we have at last succeeded in agreeing upon a form of reference. We were instructed by the Home Office to retain counsel. We retained Mr. Blake and made up a brief for him. He accepted the retainer and entered upon his work. He has done some work and been paid, not by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but, by the Department of Justice. It arises out of these Behring Sea sealing claims.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the hon. gentleman any idea what the total is going to be ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I could not tell that, it is a large international arbitration.

Canadian fishery exhibit $2,000

Mr. SPROULE. Where is that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is at the corner of O'Connor and Queen streets.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this for exhibition at home or for some exhibition abroad ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. A great many of the exhibits were sent over to Paris. There is no increase in the vote, but during the coming year, the department intends to put in new specimens. About 20,000 people visited that exhibit last year.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the minister carrying on a hatchery there ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is the finest fishery exhibit in the world.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and we are going to improve it this year, by the introduction of new specimens.

Oyster culture $7,000

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is this money expended ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In different parts of the maritime provinces. Next year the work will consist in examining the oyster beds already planted. There has been a large area planted in Murray Harbour, P.E.I., and a very successful bed planted in the harbour of Shediac. The oysters taken off the latter bed brought $3.50 a barrel to the fishermen at the wharf. They were remarkably fine, and made a very favourable impression on those who were lucky enough to eat them. Mr. Kent hopes to spend the greater part of the present year in inspecting the beds already planted. The Caraquette beds will be thoroughly looked after. Mr. Kent has to hire a tug anad incur other expenses. He is examining Buctouche to see if there are any beds there that can be planted.

To assist in the establishment, maintenance and inspection of cold storage for bait for deep-sea fishermen, under conditions to be fixed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries $25,000

Mr. CLANCY. Is that service still being carried on ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Who is at the head of it ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am happy to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) that Mr. Fraser, the engineer, who has the control of this service has sent me a memorandum, and as the subject is somewhat new, I trust the Committee will pardon me if I shall read it. Mr. Fraser's memorandum is as follows :—

RE COLD STORAGE FOR BAIT FOR DEEP-SEA FISHERMEN.

The following Bait Freezers were operated during the season of 1900 :—

Freezer.	County.	Province.	Nominal capacity.	No. of tons bait frozen.	Bonus earned.
			Tons.		$ cts.
Ballentyne's Cove	Antigonish	N.S.	20	14	70 00
Frog Pond	Prince	P.E.I.	20	23	100 00
Alberton	"	"	30	10	50 00
Port Hood I.	Inverness	N.S.	20		
Neil's Harbour	Victoria	"	20		
				47	220 00

RESULTS OBTAINED FROM FREEZING.

Ballentyne's Cove, N.S.—Commenced operations on April 25, 1899, and fourteen tons herring were frozen and stored. The fresh bait season was exceptionally good, better than for many years past. Mackered struck in early and provided an excellent supply of bait. In consequence, the fishermen did not require the frozen supply. Owing to neglect to ice the storage room frequently enough, two tons of herrings were spoiled. The charge was ultimately converted to other uses. The presence of the freezer was, however, a guarantee that bait would at all times be available. This freezer will be operated by the fishermen during the coming season.

Frog Pond, P.E.I.—Commenced operations in April, 1900, and has proved a great boon to this fishing settlement. The president of this association, writing about the middle of the past fishing season, states : 'I am buying most or nearly all of the codfish caught in this vicinity, and am keeping a record of the kind of bait they were caught with. Our fish books show over one-half our total catch has been caught with frozen bait. Furthermore, were it not for the constant supply of bait insured to the fishermen by the bait freezer, not one-half as many people would engage in the busines for the simple reason that it would not pay the men to engage in this business without the certainty of a constant and sure supply of bait. I feel quite certain that we are on the eve of a new era in the codfishing business around our shores since the inauguration of the fishermen's bait associations.'

At the conclusion of the fishing season, in sending in the annual report of the Frog Pond feezer for 1900, Mr. Larkin, the president, further writes :

Permit me now, at the close of our season's business, to enumerate or place before you some of the benefits derived by our people from having a constant supply of fresh bait. Last year (1899) our cove, with the same number of boats and men engaged in hand and 'set' lining, took some 95,000 pounds codfish, hake and haddock. During this season the weather was fine ; we had very few mackerel along our shores, and so the men devoted the greater part of their time to the pursuit of codfish, hake and haddock. A great deal of time was lost trying to procure a supply of bait. During this season (1900) our men in this cove have landed about 210,000 pounds codfish, hake and haddock; 9-10ths of all those fish were caught with frozen bait. Men who in the first season had not any great faith in frozen bait, kept some nets out; sometimes they got a baiting, sometimes only part of a baiting. Those people tested the matter thoroughly, and so satisfied did they become with the frozen bait that they took their nets ashore. We have some very practical and observant fishermen in our cove, and they declare that so long as a supply of frozen bait is to be had they will not set any nets during codfishing season, the supply of bait from nets, they say, is no better when had. Again, there is no certainty of obtaining bait every fine day.

I might say just here that we had twelve shares of stock unsold when we met on the 22nd. During the meeting we offered them for sale ; within two minutes they were all taken—taken by fishermen who had a share each before. This will give you some idea of the faith and estimation which our fishermen have of frozen bait, and the benefits derivable therefrom.

You will observe on looking over the sheets where a record of bait taken and issued appears that our fishermen knocked off fishing early this year. The reason for this is that this has been an unusually stormy season. In all my experience I have never known anything like it. With weather such as we had last year (1899) we would have certainly doubled our catch. Another cause for more fish, codfish, &c., not being taken was that in the month of July and the early part of August mackerel struck in quite plentiful ; our men paid considerable attention to that branch of fishing at the expense of the other.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

I may say for myself that I am more than ever convinced of the benefits derivable from having a bait freezer in our midst.

Alberton, P.E.I.—Commenced operations in May, 1900 ; ten tons of fish were frozen. The directors did not provide sufficient ice to carry the charge until fall, when the Caraquette fleet from New Brunswick make Tignish and Alberton their headquarters. In consequence, no decisive results were obtained. Used locally, the bait gave satisfaction.

Port Hood Island, C.B.—This freezer was finished in October, 1900, and a supply of ice being available, a test charge of one and one-half tons of squid were frozen and used in December. The secretary of this association writs :

'We had our freezer completed about November 20, 1900. As we had some ice left over from last year, we transferred it to the new ice-house, and commenced freezing squid. We froze about 3,000 pounds on trays and in crates and kept them for future use ; the result was that after the middle of December there was no bait on the fishing ground, and the fishermen were glad to use bait from the freezer.

'Some boats caught over $100 worth of fish, using frozen bait, which they would not have caught if they had not bait from the freezer. One fisherman states that he earned his three shares in the freezer on New Year's Day, over and above his neighbours who baited on salt squid, fishing on the same ground and with more trawls than he had ; all were expert fishermen.

'The fishermen here were always doubtful about the value of frozen bait; now they are very favourably inclined towards our freezer, and expect great benefit from it next season. I also have frozen a quantity of haddock and codfish, and expect to supply fresh fish to Port Hood and vicinity during March and April.'

Neil's Harbour, Victoria County, C.B.—A freezer was built at this point by private enterprise from the department's plans, and was not under the supervision of the department's inspectors. Mr. M. G. McLeod, who was principally interested, writes : 'Our Neil's Harbour cold storage did not prove a success owing to the ignorance and carelessness of our men. A lot of squid was packed in it, but in such large quantities that they got red before they froze. Had the squid been properly frozen they would have been worth at least 1,500 quintals of codfish to us.

'When we will get the Neil's Harbour storage to work well, it is sure to pay, and possibly better than any other cold storage in the province of Nova Scotia. It was not the fault of the cold storage that the squid did not keep well. The storage, I believe, is all right, and with some experience, will be worth thousands a year to our fishermen and ourselves. If the squid had kept in our storage last fall we would have more codfish stored away for winter than we could handle for drying next spring. Next year I hope we will be able to give a good report.'

In the report of the Fisheries Intelligence Bureau, under the direction of Commander O. G. V. Spain, for 1900, Messrs. A. N. Whitman & Sons, of Canso, N.S., remark : 'The laudable efforts of the Dominion government to establish bait freezers along the coasts are meeting with gratifying success, and it looks as though in a few years every fishing port of any importance would be supplied with one. Properly managed, they must materially add to the catch of fish.'

The following is a list of the freezers completed, under construction or arranged for up to February 15, 1901, together with data as to cost and capacity :

Locality.	County.	Nominal capacity.	Cost.	Proportion Govt. grant.
		Tons.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Ballentyne's Cove	Antigonish, N.S.	20	1,361 04	861 04
Frog Pond	Prince, P.E.I.	20	1,180 18	590 09
Alberton	"	30	1,347 67	673 83
Souris	King's, P.E.I.	50	2,064 39	1,000 00
Gabarous	Cape Breton, N.S.	40	1,982 82	991 41
White Head	Guysboro', N.S.	15	963 41	481 70
Port Hood I.	Inverness, N.S.	20	1,313 60	656 80
Port Beckerton	Guysboro', N.S.	20	1,043 08	521 54
Bayfield	Antigonish, N.S.	15	829 62	414 81
		230	12,085 81	6,291 22

FREEZERS UNDER CONSTRUCTION.

Locality.	County.	Nominal capacity.	Estimated cost.
		Tons.	$ cts.
Lower E. Pubnico	Yarmouth, N.S.	50	2,000 00
Port LaTour	Shelburne, N.S.	30	1,400 00
Clark's Harbour	"	25	1,200 00
Port Maitland	Yarmouth, N.S.	20	1,100 00
Sambro	Halifax, N.S.	30	1,000 00
			6,700 00

ARRANGEMENTS have been completed to build at :—

Petit DeGrat	Richmond, N.S.	20	1,100 00

ARRANGEMENTS are under way for construction at the following points :—

Locality.	County.	Nominal capacity.	Estimated cost.
		Tons.	$ cts.
Digby	Digby, N.S.	50	2,000 00
Cheticamp	Inverness, N.S.	20	1,100 00
Caraquette	Gloucester, N.B.	30	1,400 00
		100	4,500 00

The inspector in charge of the work has received communications from other points than those mentioned above, and it is expected that at least twenty bait freezers will be in operation during the season of 1901, and that if the success attending the operation is such as is anticipated from past results, a large number of new applications will be received.

J. F. FRASER.

Ottawa, February 16, 1901.

I thought I could not do better than just read to the House the memorandum which the engineer himself wrote, giving this information.

Mr. SPROULE. If I understood that correctly, the government pays half the cost of these establishments ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, where they are built under inspection, at the completion of the work.

Mr. CLANCY. Some discussion on this subject took place last year. The ground of the objection taken then was that this measure interfered with private enterprise which would supply the want now supplied by the government. That is a very rosy report ; and if everything in it is true, there would seem to be no necessity for the government bearing any share of the cost of this undertaking. Another feature that was discussed—I am not attempting to criticise, but merely to state the objection raised in the former debate—was that this bait was sold to American as well as Canadian fishermen. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if that is true, and if so, do the government feel bound to take the place of private enterprise in order to furnish bait to American fishermen ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will remember my stating last year that the greatest possible care would be taken not to interfere with commercial enterprise. In Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island there are many places where the fishermen congregate in fishing villages, and where there is no great inducement to prompt commercial men to undertake the establishment of freezers. Most of these will be built for the benefit of the fishermen themselves. Few, if any, will enter into competition with the bait freezers established by such men as the Whitman Bros., for commercial purposes ; and I may say that the enterprise which the government have entered into has the warmest encouragement and support from such men as these. It cannot do other than increase largely the supply of fresh fish. I know of nothing which this government have put their hands to on a small scale calculated to produce better results than the assistance we have given to the bait freezers. Everywhere it is appreciated, and everywhere it is doing good. Of course, there are cases in which the licensed American fishermen may purchase bait, where the bait freezers choose voluntarily to sell it to them; but the unlicensed American fishermen cannot buy bait from the bait freezers or from any one else. Therefore, to the extent to which the licensed American fishermen could buy bait, it would be rather harsh, I take it, on our part to intervene and say we ought not to sell it to them.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not putting the objection on that ground, but on the ground of public enterprise supplying what might be supplied by private enterprise.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As a rule, I think the bait freezers will supply the bait to the fishermen who are the shareholders in the association itself. Occasionally they may have a surplus to sell to the ships, and in some cases they may sell to licensed American fishermen ; but that will be a very small proportion of the total amount.

Mr. SPROULE. Since the hon. gentleman has adopted the principle of supplying cold storage for the benefit of the fishermen, I hope he will press on his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), the necessity of granting an equally large subsidy for the supply of cold storage to the farmers of the country.

Mr. KENDALL. I take this opportunity of placing before the members of the House, particularly the members from the west, the importance of this industry which the government are endeavouring to foster in this way. The line fishermen of the maritime provinces number about 20,000, and the annual catch of fish known as line-fish

amounts to about $8,000,000. We have altogether about 45,000 fishermen in the maritime provinces, who, it is estimated lose from thirty to sixty days each in the season for want of a constant supply of fresh bait. The aggregate loss of the fishermen of the maritime provinces on this account amounts altogether to 800,000 to 1,000,000 days of fishing in the year. The fishing industry is our second most important industry. Agriculture, poor as it is with us, is still our first industry. We hear a great deal of our lumber and mining industries in the east; but our fishing industry is far in advance of these in importance, I think more than equal to both combined. So that the House can readily understand that to make provision for overcoming so great a loss as 800,000 or 1,000,000 days of fishing is a matter of vital importance to the maritime provinces. We hear it frequently stated that the fishing population along our coasts is becoming depleted. I believe it is a fact that for years past the industry has been unremunerative. At the same time, our fishermen are large consumers, and very heavy contributors to the revenues. They use large quantities of imported goods and manufactured goods from the west, and their return from their catch of fish has to depend not on any benefit which the government can give them. They have to send their fish to the West Indies, to South America, to Brazil, and to the Mediterranean, in competition with the fish of the whole world. For these reasons the government were urged, some eighteen months ago, to take this step. We recognized that a cold storage system had been established for the benefit of the farmers of the western provinces and the province of Quebec, not only on shore but on sea—a cold storage system virtually extending from their farms to the consumers' tables in the old country; and we urged that something in the same direction should be done for the fishermen. I happen to have been the promoter of this scheme, and I am entirely gratified at the success which it has achieved in so short a time. If hon. members will give it their support, we will not require a great appropriation to establish a pretty effective system all around the coast, from the mouth of the St. Lawrence to the mouth of the St. Croix river. Perhaps from 100 to 110 small freezers will meet the requirements. A considerable number of gentlemen in the maritime provinces, who are well acquainted with the fishing industry, feel sure that this measure will enable our fishermen to realize anywhere from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000 per annum more than they do at present. We expect also to establish a better class of cold storage cars, so that we may send our fish in good condition from the maritime provinces to the west, even as far as Chicago.

To-day we have not in Canada a cold storage car equal in construction to many used by the Swift and Armour firms in carrying their freight from Chicago to Portland and Boston. I may say that the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) has employed the expert who made these cars in the western states, to construct two at Moncton on the same plan. What we want is a car that will carry fish, apples and other perishable products without freezing them, and to-day we have not got in Canada a first-class cold storage car.

We may look forward soon to the time when the western part of our country will be populated to a far greater extent than it now is, and furnish a great market for fish, more particularly as the fish of the great lakes, in all probability, will not hold out. We have in our fishermen a large consuming population who are adding to the wealth of the country and contributing very largely to its revenue, and I ask gentlemen from the west, in particular, to take this matter up and give it their best consideration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would ask the hon. gentleman whether there is any probability of these establishments being built as commercial enterprises which will be self-sustaining.

Mr. KENDALL. I know of three that are to be put up by fish merchants and fishermen, who do not want to be hampered by the restrictions imposed by the government, and I have no doubt quite a number will be put up as commercial enterprises.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In the larger districts, that is likely to be the case, but in the smaller I suppose government aid will be required for some time to come.

Mr. CLANCY. It is proposed to give government aid every year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We give a small bonus each year for three years, determined on the quantity of bait in the freezers.

Mr. CLANCY. And after three years the bonus ceases.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice, under the heading of lighthouse and coast service, appropriations not required for 1901-2, $60,000, and also under the heading of fisheries appropriations not required for 1901-2, $78,-790. I would like to have some explanation of these two items amounting to $139,-000. Were these voted for election purposes, and then not required ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend must not imagine that I am animated by such unworthy motives. Nothing but the highest

motives directed us to ask this money from the representatives of the people, and political motives had nothing to do with it.

To meet expenses in connection with the superintendent of insurance service, including $2,300 to A. K. Blakadar, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act $9,300

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the usual appropriation for the insurance branch of the Finance Department. The appropriation covers the statutory increase of $50, and an increase of $150 in the case of one officer whose services are appreciated. All these expenses are only a nominal charge on the Dominion, as they are entirely repaid from levies made, under the Insurance Act, on insurance companies.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Is the $200 increase to Mr. Blakadar ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, $150 above the usual statutory increase.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 25, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS—NORTH BRUCE.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Hon. Sir John Boyd and the Hon. Mr. Justice Street, two of the judges selected for the trial of elections petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, a certificate relating to the electoral district of the North Riding of the County of Bruce, in the province of Ontario, by which the election for the said electoral district has been declared void.

In conformity with chapter 9, section 46 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, I have issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 15) to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

He said: The object of the Bill is to prevent as far as possible a new sort of intimidation for the purpose of forcing workingmen to vote for a candidate not of their choice. This intimidation consists in telling these men that the Dominion ballot is not a secret ballot. Marked instances of this occurred during the recent election. I am not going to say it was confined to one side more than another, although I am only aware of instances on the one side, but this intimidation may be used on either side. The object of the Bill is to punish by fine or imprisonment any one who declares that the Dominion ballot or mode of voting is not secret. In the Dominion Elections Act, there is provision against a somewhat analogous proceeding, namely, the circulating of a rumour that a candidate has withdrawn from the field. The person circulating such a statement, and knowing it to be false, is liable to be punished. It may be said that everybody knows that the Dominion ballot is secret. Every person who has looked well into the matter knows that; but I venture to say that more than 90 per cent of the electorate of Canada depend upon what they are told with regard to this subject. But on one side they are told that it is a secret ballot, and on the other that it is not. What, then, will the workingman be likely to do ? He will take the course best calculated to protect his own position, and will not expose himself to the chances of dismissal or other punishment that may be visited upon him for having voted as he thinks right. I venture to think that this Bill will commend itself to both sides of the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DRAINAGE ACROSS RAILWAYS.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 16) to amend the Railway Act in respect to drainage across the lands of railway companies. He said: The object of this Bill is to give farmers and others who own land alongside railways the same privileges as the railway corporations. A Bill to this effect was introduced last session; but it seems that it was so changed in the interest of the railways that it was spoiled in the amending. It is no use to introduce a Bill here, it seems to me, unless it helps all classes alike. I do hope that the government, or other parties who have the power to do it, will see to it that the law is so amended that the farmers will have the same chances as the railway corporations.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I would like to call attention to the fact that the object of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Robinson, West Elgin) is to amend the Railway Act. There is no such Act as the Dominion Drainage Act. The respective provinces, I suppose—certainly the province of Ontario—have their drainage Acts. I simply point

out this formal mistake that the hon. gentleman may not fail in his Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN PACIFIC LAND GRANT.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 17) respecting the land grant of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The PRIME MINISTER. Explain.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). The Bill is practically the same as the Bill I introduced last session, and which I was unable to bring before the notice of the House because the order of Public Bills and Orders was only reached, according to my recollection, once during the entire session. The hon. member who was going to second my Bill was not present, and I was not able to get the Bill before the House. However, I introduced a resolution with regard to it, which resolution failed to carry. I am in hopes, however, that as the Bill is introduced at this early stage of the session, it will have the fullest and freest discussion. The explanation of the Bill is this : When the Canadian Pacific Railway agreement was made in 1881, as hon. gentlemen are aware, in addition to vast cash subsidies, we gave that company a land grant of 25,000,000 acres. One clause of the contract provided that the appurtenances of the railway, the rolling stock, the road-bed, &c., should be exempt from taxation for ever, and the land grant be exempt from taxation for twenty years from the grant thereof from the Crown. Some differences of opinion seem to have arisen with regard to the expiration of that twenty-year period. Up to the present time, patents for only a small quantity of this land have been issued to the company ; and when the matter was before parliament last session, the First Minister and the then leader of the opposition took the view that it was a legal question, which could only be settled by reference to the courts, whether the exemption from taxation should expire in twenty years from the date of the contract. Last session I was able to satisfy the House, I believe, by extracts from the 'Hansard' report of speeches of public men who discussed the contract when it was going through the House, that the clear intention of parliament was that the twenty-year exemption period should expire twenty years from the date of the contract. I take the view that we should not refer the matter to the courts at all. If it was the intention of parliament that the exemption period should date from the time of entering into the contract, and if the people so understood it, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company so understood it, I take it that this parliament should settle that question and avoid any reference to the courts ; because, if we allow it to go as at present, patents not being issued, the company holds its vast land grant exempt from taxation practically in perpetuity. The object of this Bill, which is very brief, is to declare that the clause in the contract be interpreted to mean that the exemption period expired on the 15th of the present month.

Mr. SPEAKER. By whom is this motion seconded ?

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). By the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver).

Mr. SPEAKER. That hon. gentleman is not in the Chamber.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). But he agreed to second it.

Mr. MACLEAN. I will support it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is seconded by Mr. Maclean.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 18) to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.

The PRIME MINISTER. Explain.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). The object of this Bill, in brief, is to make it difficult to effect saw-offs of election protests. I may say that I have been in consultation, with reference to the object of this Bill, with a number of prominent judges on the bench, and the Bill is the result of suggestions made by them. It provides that an affidavit shall be received from the respondent, and the election agents of both sides before the petition is dismissed, and if, in the opinion of the judge, there has been any collusion, he has it in his power to declare that the deposit of $1,000 is forfeited to the public uses of the Dominion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I beg to inform the House that I have received from the Hon. Sir John A. Boyd and the Hon. Mr. Justice Street, two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Controverted Elections Act, a certificate relating to the electoral district of the north riding of the county of Bruce, as follows :—

Election of a member for the House of Commons of Canada for the electoral district of the north riding of the county of Bruce, holden on the 31st day of October and the 7th day of November, A.D. 1900.

Between James Ernest Campbell, petitioner, and Alexander McNeill, respondent.

The undersigned, two of the justices of the High Court of Justice assigned to try the said petition, do hereby certify that on the 25th and 26th days of January, 1901, at the town of Owen Sound, and on the 12th day of February, 1901, at the town of South Hampton, in the county of Bruce, we held a Court for the trial of and there tried the said petition, whereupon we held and determined, after a scrutiny of the ballots and upon evidence given before us, that an equal number of votes had been cast for each candidate, so that neither had been duly elected ; and it further appearing and being proved that a number of votes had been illegally cast and that others were so ambiguous that they could not be counted for either side, whereby such irregularity and errors had occurred as affected the result of the election, we therefore held that the said election was void and ineffectual, and made an order that each party to the said petition should pay his own costs.

In the said petition charges of corrupt practices were made on both sides, but these were not prosecuted before us owing to our determination as to the effect of the scrutiny and irregularity hereinbefore mentioned.

Given at Osgoode Hall, this twenty-second day of February, 1901.

W. P. R. STREET, J.
J. A. BOYD, J.

To the Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons,
Ottawa.

INSPECTION OF GRAIN.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to inquire whether a commission was issued to Mr. David Horn and others, for the purpose of making an inquiry respecting the exportation of grain; and if so, whetner the commission has reported, and whether the report will be brought down at an early date.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Does the hon. gentleman refer to the inquiry made in Montreal, with respect to grain inspection ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have no knowledge of it except some reference that I saw in the public press, stating that such a report had been made; and, accordingly, I desire to know whether that statement is correct, and whether the report will be brought down.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The report has not been submitted yet.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 6) respecting the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters, and to change its name to the Independent Order of Foresters.—Mr. Emmerson.

Bill (No. 7) relating to the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 8) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 12) respecting the London Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Hyman.

QUESTIONS.

CALLING OUT THE MILITIA AT STEVESTON.

Mr. MORRISON asked :

1. Was the government aware that the local militia were sent to Steveston, British Columbia, in July last ?
2. If so, was the government consulted before the militia were on that occasion called out ?
3. What was the government's position in regard to the calling out of the militia on that occasion ?
4. At whose expense was the militia called out and maintained at Steveston ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden) :

1. Not at the time.
2. No.
3. The Militia Act provides for the calling out of the militia on requisition of the civil authorities in aid of the civil power, and the senior officer of the acting militia in the locality takes action accordingly.
4. When the militia is called out in aid of the civil power, it is at the expense of the municipality. Circumstances in this case were exceptional, and expenses were defrayed by the Militia Department.

ARRIVALS OF CHINESE AND JAPANESE IN CANADA.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. How many Chinese were allowed to land in the province of British Columbia during each month of the year 1900?
2. How many, if any, are known to have left the province during said year ?
3. What was the total amount of poll tax collected during the said year?
4. How many Japanese landed in the said province each month during the same period?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) :

1. The Chinese paying fees landed in the province of British Columbia during the year 1900, were as follows :

January	154
February	253
March	422
April	752
May	634
June	659
July	462
August	317
September	213
October	73
November	129
December	144
Total paying fees	4,212
Entered as exempt during year	26
Chinese entered in transit inwards	1,591
Total number entering province	5,829

2. The total number registered for leave outwards, during the year, 896. Total number registered for leave in transit outwards, 2,220- 3,116.

Large numbers leave the province going east, of which there is no record.

3. Total poll-tax collected during the year, $210,600.

4. Japanese landed in province of British Columbia, during year 1900 :

January	298
February	416
March	933
April	2,556
May	2,666
June	1,547
July	684
August	282
September	28
October	55
November	39
December	14
Total	9,518
Japanese landed in British Columbia as in transit to other Canadian ports	998
Japanese reported as landed in transit to other than Canadian ports	5,481
Total	15,997

It is, however, to be stated that as there is no law requiring any record of Japanese entering or leaving Canada, the above figures cannot be considered as absolutely reliable ; and it is very evident that large numbers of them have been twice reported as entering Canada, first on the arrival of the vessel at Victoria, and again when landing at Vancouver.

MUNICIPAL BONUSES TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask the last two paragraphs of question No. 3, as follows :

(a) What total sums have been voted to railways in Canada in bonuses by municipalities, viz.: counties or group of counties, townships or groups of townships, towns and villages?

(b) To what roads were such bonuses granted, and what amount to each?

(c) Have any of these bonuses been repaid by the Dominion parliament, either directly or indirectly?

(d) Is it the intention of the government to refund to such municipalities the bonuses so voted?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

(c) One and only one bonus has been repaid by the government, and that was the one repaid in July, 1883, to the corporation of Pembroke. The amount being $85,250.

(d) No such decision has been arrived at.

CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR CARDWELL.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell) asked :

Has a census commissioner been appointed for the electoral district of Cardwell? If so, upon whose recommendation?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. No appointment has been made.

I.C.R.—PURCHASE OF PROPERTY AT LEVIS.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Monk—asked :

1. Has the government or the Department of Railways and Canals purchased within the past two years any property at or near Lévis, in the province of Quebec?

2. From whom have such properties been purchased?

3. What is the size of each property, respectively?

4. What price has been or is to be paid to each person from whom such property was purchased?

5. In what way was the price fixed or determined?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Yes, property has been purchased at or near Lévis, within the past two years.

2. Properties have been purchased from the following owners :

Heirs of D. D. Young.
Heirs of William Rhodes.
Estate of Chapleau or Murphy.
Joseph Turgeon.
Joseph, John and Edouard Goulet.
Edouard Couture.
Corporation of Lévis.
Elizabeth Mary Bennett.

3, 4 and 5. Heirs of D. D. Young—10,497 square feet made ground—80 cents per square foot, paid. Price asked by owners and accepted by the department.

Heirs of William Rhodes—11,583 square feet beach ; 45 cents per square foot. Price asked by owners, accepted by department.

Heirs of D. D. Young—50,000 square feet wharf and beach ; 42 cents per square foot. Paid re order in council, May 26, 1900.

Estate of Chapleau or Murphy—8,908 square feet beach and made ground ; $1.75 per square foot. Paid re order in council, October 15, 1900.

Joseph Turgeon—1,640 square feet made ground ; expropriation papers filed April 17, 1900. Not yet settled.

Joseph, John and Edouard Goulet—1,632 square feet made ground ; expropriation papers filed April 11, 1900. Not yet settled.

Edouard Couture—22,356 3·100 square feet made ground ; expropriation papers filed April 11, September 20 and October 19, 1900. Not yet settled.

Corporation of Lévis—78,868 square feet old wharf made ground and beach ; expropriation papers filed April 11, 1900. The corporation is to convey these lots to the railway free of charge.

Heirs of William Rhodes—154 71·100 square feet beach ; expropriation papers filed October 19, 1900. Not yet settled.

Elizabeth Mary Bennett—4,280 square feet land near Hadlow ; $500 considered reasonable price by railway engineer. Offer not yet accepted.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the total amount paid ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not added the total amount up, but there is the number of square feet and the price per square foot. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can add it up.

I. C. R.—PURCHASE OF LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. HAGGART—by Mr. Monk—asked :

How many locomotives have been purchased by the Department of Railways and Canals or the government from January 1, 1897, up to the present time, for the Intercolonial Railway?

How many passenger cars have been purchased for the Intercolonial Railway from January 1, 1897, up to the present time?

How many freight cars have been purchased for the Intercolonial Railway from January 1, 1897, up to the present time?

Of the total number of locomotives so purchased, how many have been purchased in Canada and how many in the United States, and from what corporations or persons have such locomotives been purchased, and how many from each, and what is the amount or price paid or payable to each such corporation or person for such locomotives?

Of the total number of passenger cars purchased, how many have been purchased in Canada and how many in the United States, and from what corporations or persons have such passenger cars been purchased, and how many from each, and what is the amount or price paid to each such corporation or firm for such passenger cars?

Of the total number of freight cars purchased, how many have been purchased in Canada and how many in the United States, and from what corporations or persons have such freight cars been purchased, and how many from each, and what is the amount or price paid to each such corporation or person for such freight cars ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). There have been no locomotives purchased by the department since the date mentioned, the 1st of January, 1897, though a number of locomotives and cars have been made as the result of tenders being asked for and of contracts entered into, and delivery has taken place. I am having a statement of them prepared which I can furnish, if desired, but there have been none purchased in the ordinary sense.

MONTREAL ELECTORAL LISTS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Have the electoral lists now completed for the city of Montreal been transmitted to Ottawa, to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery?

2. Has the printing of said lists been completed or begun?

3. Will said lists be printed in the Government Printing Bureau?

4. When will the printing of said lists be completed?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have to inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) that the lists have not been transmitted to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

ENFORCEMENT OF ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. CLARE asked :

What amount has been expended in enforcing the provisions of the Alien Labour law from June 30, 1900, up to date?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The amount thus paid is $1,066.66.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin) asked :

Is it the intention of the government to appoint a committee of all the medical men, of both parties, in this House to act with all the medical men of the Senate to inquire into the prevention and cure of tuberculosis and all prevalent diseases of both man and beast, and all other matters in connection with the health of the people of this Dominion?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is not the intention of the government.

VILLE MARIE BANK.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the government come to any decision in regard to the relief prayed for by the depositors of the Ville Marie Bank?

2. What is the decision?

3. Has that decision been communicated to the petitioners who sought relief?

4. When was such decision communicated, and by whom?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). No formal answer was given to the parties, but they have been made aware that it is not the intention of the government to assume responsibility for paying the losses of the depositors of the bank.

NEWFOUNDLAND AND THE DOMINION.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Maclean—asked :

Is any correspondence or negotiations taking place between the Imperial and Canadian authorities, or between the Canadian and Newfoundland authorities, looking to the admission of the Island of Newfoundland into the Canadian confederation?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is no correspondence. We have not received any overtures from the government of Newfoundland, and the government of Canada have not found it opportune to approach them.

Mr. WALLACE. Has this government made any overture ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We have made none and have received none.

THE 24TH DAY OF MAY.

Mr. BRUCE asked :

Is it the intention of the government to ask the House at its present session to pass legislation making the 24th day of May, the birthday of our late gracious Sovereign Queen Victoria, a statutory holiday?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is not the intention of the government to introduce such legislation.

TARIFF ACT AMENDMENT—GOODS OF GERMAN ORIGIN.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Maclean—asked :

Is it the intention of the government to amend the Tariff Act so as to debar from the advantage of the preference clause goods of German origin which may be imported into the Dominion from England?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). No tariff change is necessary for the purpose stated in the question. No goods are entitled to the benefit of the preferential tariff unless they are bona fide of British manufacture or the produce of British countries named in the Tariff Act.

MR. WILLIAM HULL, EX-POSTMASTER.

Mr. BARKER asked :

1. Has Mr. William Hull, for many years postmaster at a branch post office in Hamilton, been dismissed?

2. Were charges made against him? If so, by whom?

3. What were the charges, and was he given an opportunity to answer them?

4. At whose request was he dismissed, and on what grounds?

5. Has the location of the office been changed, and at whose request?

6. Was any inquiry made as to the wishes of those using the office as to his dismissal or retention, or as to the removal of the office, and with what result?

7. Has his successor been appointed? If so, who is the successor, and on whose recommendation was he appointed?

8. Has the Postmaster General made any inquiry as to the physical capacity of the new appointee to perform the duties of the office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

1. The Pearl street sub-post office, in the city of Hamilton, has been removed to what is considered a more convenient and suitable location, and Mr. Wm. Hull has in consequence ceased to be postmaster of that office.

2. There were no complaints against the late postmaster. The inspector stated in his report that Mr. Hull was a man far advanced in years who had the reputation of being somewhat disagreeable and of a fault-finding disposition.

3. See answer to No. 2.

4. The change is not recorded by the department as a case of dismissal, but as involved in the change in the situation of the post office asked for in a petition and recommended by the inspector.

5. See answer to No. 4.

6. The matter was inquired into by the post office inspector at Toronto, who recommended the removal of the post office to the new site.

7. Mr. Thomas S. McDonell has been appointed to the postmastership of the office. He was recommended by Mr. J. V. Teetzel, the post office inspector having previously recommended the location of the post office in Mr. McDonell's premises.

8. Inquiry has not been made on this point, no intimation having been received that the new postmaster suffered from any physical incapacity.

AIR BRAKES AND COUPLERS ON I.C.R.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

(a) How many cars on each, the Grand Trunk, Canadian Pacific, Intercolonial and Canada Atlantic Railways, are fitted with (1) air brakes, (2) standard couplers?

(b) How many cars on each of the above railways are not fitted (1) with air brakes, and (2) with standard couplers?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The department has no information with reference to cars fitted with air brakes, etc., on the roads mentioned, except on the Intercolonial Railway, which is as follows : Intercolonial Railway cars fitted with air brakes, 2,643 ; Intercolonial Railway cars not fitted with air brakes, 5,044.

COLD STORAGE—WEST INDIA STEAMERS.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth) asked :

1. What are the names of the Atlantic steamers on which exhaust fans were placed, and for the placing of which the government paid $100 each?

2. Was any effort made last autumn to ascertain if these fans or any of them were continuously in operation during the voyage across the Atlantic?

3. Will the government endeavour to procure the installation of exhaust fans in all steamers carrying apples across the Atlantic from Canadian ports?

4. What steamers plying between Canadian ports and the West Indies are fitted with cold storage chambers, the owners of which receive subventions from the government?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) :

4. The steamer Beta, running between Halifax and Jamaica, and the Orinoco, running between St. John, Halifax, the West Indian Islands, and Demerara, are fitted with cold storage. Questions Nos. 1, 2, and 3 can only be answered by the Minister of Agriculture, who alone has the information.

CENSUS COMMISSIONERS—GREY COUNTY.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

1. Have the census commissioners been appointed for East Grey, North Grey and South Grey?

2. If appointed, what are their names and upon whose recommendation were they respectively appointed?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. No appointment has been made.

FISHERY WARDEN, KING'S COUNTY, N.B.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. Has George Myers, fishery warden for King's county, N.B., been dismissed?

2. If so, for what reason, and has any one been appointed in his place?

3. At whose instance was he dismissed, if dismissed, and was any charge made against him or investigation held?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). George Myers was a temporary guardian and not a fishery warden. Because of his active political partisanship at the last general election he was notified his services would not again be required. As his employment was temporary no investigation was necessary. The minister is responsible for the action taken.

IMPORTATION OF FRESH MUTTON.

Mr. CLANCY asked :

Is it true, as stated in the tables of the Trade and Navigation Returns of the Dominion of Canada for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1900, that fresh mutton and lamb to the value of $14,-194 was imported from Great Britain for home consumption, and that such mutton and lamb were the products of Great Britain?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). The fresh mutton and lamb stated in the Trade and Navigation Returns for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1900, as imported from Great Britain, were actually imported from Australasia. Owing to a clerical error, the importations were entered as if from Great Britain.

SURVEY AT GRAND BEND.

Mr. SHERRITT asked :

Has a survey been made at Grand Bend, on the east shore of Lake Huron and the electoral district of North Middlesex, with a view of making a harbour there? If so, by whom? If no survey has been made, was a Mr. Stewart, or some other person, sent there in October last to look it over with that object in view? If so, has he made a report thereon ? Does the government intend making any improvements at Grand Bend? If so, when will the work begin?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). A survey was made at Grand Bend, in October last, by Mr. Stewart, who has made a report to the Department of Public Works. The whole subject of the report is under consideration.

CONDITION OF INDIANS AT OXFORD HOUSE MISSION.

Mr. BRITTON—by Mr. Flint—asked :

Did the government receive any report of Indians in the vicinity of 'Oxford House Mission,' N.W.T., dying from starvation during the winter of 1899-1900? If so, how many of such Indians are reported to have died from starvation? Has the government any information of the condition of such Indians during the present winter? Was there any special provision for such Indians to prevent starvation during the present winter?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Statements having been made in newspapers that a number of Indians in the vicinity of Oxford House had died of starvation, inquiries were made of the Indian agent at Beren's River and also of the commissioner of the Hudson's Bay Company, but no confirmation of the report could be obtained. These Indians reside outside of treaty limits and no recent report has been received regarding their condition. The department has an arrangement whereby supplies are at once furnished to destitute Indians in this district to enable them to subsist during the winter months.

MANITOBA SCHOOL LANDS.

Mr. BRITTON—by Mr. Flint—asked :

1. Did a commission issue to James Emile Pierre Prendergast authorizing him to hold an investigation with regard to any alleged fraudulent procedure or irregularity at any public auction sale of school lands in the province of Manitoba?

2. If so, has the investigation been held?

3. Has such investigation been concluded?

4. When will the report of the commissioner be brought down?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. Yes.

2. The investigation is being held.

3. No.

4. As soon as received. I may add that the commissioner has been urged to complete his report, and I am expecting that it will be here in a very short time.

CENSUS COMMISSIONER—SOUTH SIMCOE.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Has the appointment of chief census commissioner for South Simcoe been made?

2. If made, who has been appointed, and upon whose recommendation?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. No.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. WILSON asked :

Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation this session to amend the Canada Temperance Act in accordance with the resolution accepted during the last session of parliament?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have to inform my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) that the government has received no communication whatever from the temperance people upon this question.

GENERAL OFFICER COMMANDING.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

Is it the intention of the government to increase the salary attending the position of General Officer Commanding in Canada to $10,000, and thus enable Canada to secure the services of a senior British general?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). It is not the intention of the government at present to ask parliament to vote an increase in the salary of the Major-General Commanding.

PRINTING FOR PARIS EXHIBITION.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Maclean—asked :

1. In what printing office was the volume which was distributed at the Paris Exposition last year, entitled 'The Women of Canada,' printed?
2. What was the total issue of said volume?
3. What was the average cost per volume?
4. Who supplied the paper for the work?
5. Who furnished the cuts and other illustrations?
6. If printed in any establishmen other than the Government Printing Bureau, why was this done?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND :

1. The Herald Printing Company, Montreal.
2. 7,000 copies.
3. 64 34·35 cents.
4. The Herald Printing Company.
5. The Herald Printing Company.
6. The King's Printer states that the work had to be given out owing to pressure in the Government Printing Bureau.

BEET-ROOT SUGAR BOUNTY.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey) moved :

That, having regard to the large importations of sugar into Canada for home consumption, and that it has been demonstrated beyond a doubt that the cultivation of the sugar beet in the Dominion is not only feasible but is being successfully grown in many parts of the country at present; therefore, in the opinion of this House, in order to stimulate the farmers of Canada to engage in the growth of this valuable product, and also to encourage the establishment of beet-root sugar factories, a bounty should be offered for all beet-root sugar manufactured in the Dominion during the next ten years.

He said : I make this motion, Mr. Speaker, believing that if the government of Canada were alive to the best interests of the people at the present time, they would take action in the direction indicated by the resolution. It has always been my opinion that the policy of our government should be to assist in starting and developing any industry in the country when the conditions are favourable for its success, and when there is a good market in the country for the product. There are two ways in which a government can do this. One is by a protective tariff—by putting a duty on the same kind of product coming from foreign countries. The other is by paying a bounty upon the product in our own country. We have examples of both methods stimulating industries in the country until they have become very important. I take as one example the furniture industry. At one time in the history of Canada most of our furniture factories had gone under owing to the keen competition from the United States. There was not a sufficient duty imposed on furniture coming into the country to prevent its being dumped down here in large quantities. As soon as the national policy was introduced in 1879, and a sufficient customs duty was put upon furniture, men immediately commenced to engage in that industry, and to-day it is one of the important industries of the country. Not only do we manufacture sufficient furniture to supply the needs of our own country, but we are heavy exporters as well. This result is achieved because we have the raw material in our own country in sufficient quantities, and we have the skilled labour necessary to manufacture the product. We have an example of the other method in the iron industry of the country. A few years ago, in order to stimulate the production of iron in Canada the Dominion government offered a bounty on all iron manufactured in the country, and that action was followed by similar action on the part of the Ontario government. So that we have at the present time a bounty of $1 a ton offered by the province of Ontario on all pig iron made in the country from the iron mines of the province ; in addition, we have a bounty of $3 a ton offered by the Dominion government on pig iron made in the country, and from the ore of the country ; and we have still further a bounty of $3 a ton offered on all steel manufactured from the pig iron thus made in the country. We have thus at least $7 a ton bounty offered for the manufacture of steel from iron taken from the mines of the country. I need not say anything as to the success of the industry since that bounty was offered, or the stimulus it has given to the industry; because every one in this House knows as well as I do that within the last few years

the greatest activity has been displayed in the iron industry; to-day blast furnaces are springing up all around us, and iron and steel foundries have been started in different parts of the country; and Canada will soon be one of the great steel-making countries of the world.

With that example before us, is it not the part of wisdom for the government to go further and give aid to another valuable industry which may be established in the country by means of a bounty? There is an industry which in my judgment will be equally valuable with the iron industry. It has been much written about and talked about, and experiments have been made to determine whether it can be made a success or otherwise, for the last ten or twelve years; and the data which have been collected on the subject justify the conclusion that this industry could be and would be started in the near future if the government gave it a little assistance by way of bounty, as it did in the case of iron. I refer to the beet-root sugar industry—an industry for which the soil and climatic and other conditions of Canada are well adapted. The requisite raw material is available here in large quantities. Everything is available for the establishment of that industry if the government would only give it a little assistance; and it is for the purpose of ventilating the question and educating public opinion till it becomes so powerful that the government will be induced or persuaded to grant that aid, that I am bringing this question before the House to-day.

The first question is, have we a market for the product, if it were manufactured? My answer is in the affirmative. I take up the Trade and Navigation Returns, and I find that last year we imported no less than 312,626,731 pounds of sugar and molasses for home consumption, representing a value of $8,361,000, which was paid in Canadian money for a product which is consumed in Canada, and which could just as well have been made by the people of Canada. It would require about thirty factories to manufacture that large quantity of sugar. I think it needs no further argument to convince this House and the country that there is a valuable market for the product as soon as it is produced. We have that market at home; we need not look abroad to any other country for it; and it has always been my opinion that the government should direct its efforts towards so varying the pursuits of the people of the country that they would be working for each other, one portion producing and supplying what the other portion consumed. When that is done, I believe our energies will be directed in the best possible channels.

The next question is, could the beets be properly grown in this country by the farmers?—because it would be the farmers who would have to grow the beets if they were grown successfully. Are the climatic conditions and the soil of Canada suitable for the production of the sugar beet? Tests have been carried on along this line for the last twelve or fifteen years, and those tests have resulted in proving conclusively to any one who has taken the trouble to look up the data, that the climatic conditions and the soil of Canada are admirably suited to the growing of the sugar beet. The experiments have proven beyond doubt that we can grow it as well as Germany, Austria, France or any other country in the world, which is to-day largely producing the sugar beet and manufacturing sugar from it. I have here a little return giving the results during the last three years of the cultivation of beets grown in different parts of the country. This return covers the years 1889, 1890 and 1891, during which tests were made by the advice of the then government over the country with regard to the growth of the sugar beet. I may say that those tests were not confined to some favoured localities, but were distributed all over Ontario, and the results are as follows:—

Yield per acre 19·9 tons; percentages of sugar in the beet 16·01; co-efficient of purity 83·27. That test was made by the experimental farm at Guelph, under the supervision of its chemist. But, there were also tests made throughout Ontario in thirty-six different localities, and the result was that the yield per acre amounted to 18·3 tons, with a percentage of sugar 13·56, and co-efficient of purity 80. This shows that in the case of tests made all over the country, the tests were made perhaps not as carefully or intelligently as at the experimental farm. Consequently the yield per acre was a little less, the quality not quite so good, and the percentage of sugar not quite so high, but it all shows what can be done by intelligent cultivation of the beet, and it shows also, that our soil and climate are suited to its cultivation.

In 1900, tests were carried on by instruction from the experimental farm in the various parts of Ontario. These tests were made in different localities, and I have here a copy of the return. There were prizes offered, and the tests were made around the district of Aylmer, Newmarket, in North York and Welland. In each case six returns were made, and six prizes were given. The result was an average yield of 20¾ tons per acre, a percentage of 15·1 sugar, and a co-efficient of purity of 86·5.

I have given these so as to draw a comparison between the results of the experiments here, and the results in those countries where the growth of the sugar beet has been a great success, and the manufacture of sugar very considerable. Take Germany, and for twenty years, the highest average of the sugar beet grown was 11·70 tons to the acre, whereas last year in

Ontario, the average was 20¾. The German ton is 2,204½ pounds, while with us a ton weighs 2,000 pounds. The percentage of sugar in the German beet did not quite average 12 per cent, while in ours it averaged 15·1, and in 1889, 1890 and 1891, it averaged 16·01.

Mr. CHARLTON. What was the yield in Germany of tons per acre ?

Mr. SPROULE. 11·70 was the best average in twenty years by their returns. I give these figures to show how valuable is our country for that product, and how successfully we might engage in it, and what advantage we have over those countries that are cultivating the beet successfully to-day.

I need not mention the other countries. I could take Austria, France, Spain, Belgium and Switzerland, and in not one is the percentage of sugar as high as it has been shown to be in the beets grown in Canada and the United States. That proves conclusively that the yield of beets here justifies the belief that the business can be successfully carried on. Take the individual yields. In and around Welland :

1. F. H. Stirzinger, Fenwick—Yield, 14 tons 1,200 lbs.; sugar, 16·1 per cent; purity, 88·5 per cent; cost per acre, $33.40; net profit, $35.95.

2. David Cole, Southend—Yield, 13 tons 334 lbs.; sugar, 16·7 per cent; purity, 87·3 per cent; cost per acre, $25.90; net profit, $37.14.

Mr. MEIGS. How many acres did he grow ?

Mr. SPROULE. This gives the test of one acre.

Mr. MEIGS. Did he cultivate more than one acre ?

Mr. SPROULE. That is not shown. The return simply says per acre.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. How does he figure the value of the product ?

Mr. SPROULE. At $4 per ton, which, I understand, is the average price of the beets sold at the factory that yield over 12½ per cent sugar.

3. Chas. Taylor, Fonthill—Yield, 24 tons 83 lbs.; sugar, 12·2 per cent; purity, 81·0 per cent; cost per acre, $25.90; net profit, $64.25.

4. J. C. Sloat, Fenwick—Yield, 12 tons 500 lbs.; sugar, 15·1 per cent; purity, 87·9 per cent; cost per acre, $44.15; net profit, $13.97.

5. S. H. Van Every, Ridgeville—Yield, 11 tons 777 lbs.; sugar, 15·3 per cent; purity, 88·8 per cent; cost per acre,— ; net profit, —.

6. Philip Stirtzinger, Fenwick—Yield, 12 tons 1,000 lbs.; sugar, 15·4 per cent; purity, 88·2 per cent; cost per acre, $26.90; net profit, $29.35.

1. B. Ashley, Newmarket—Yield, 23 tons 1,555 lbs.; sugar, 14·6 per cent; purity, 86 per cent; cost per acre, $33.90; net profit, $67.15.

2. D. C. McDonald, Ravenshoe—Yield, 25 tons 833 lbs.; sugar, 15·7 per cent; purity, 84·3 per cent; cost per acre, $35.50; net profit, $72.52.

3. T. W. Roode, Holland Landing—Yield, 24 tons 500 lbs.; sugar, 15·7 per cent; purity, 84·8 per cent; cost per acre, $28.90; net profit, $80.22.

I need not go over all these, because they are very much the same, but I have given them because they are spread over various parts of the country, and this is the actual experience of the intelligent farmers who grew the sugar beet last year. I have given these figures to show how much more profitable this crop is to the farmer than the other lines he is engaged in.

The question arises whether it would be a profitable crop. I have given the net profit of these parties ; and, now for a moment, I will draw a comparison with what the farmer receives for other crops he grows. The average crop of wheat in Ontario would be less than 20 bushels per acre. But for the purpose of this comparison I allow 25 bushels per acre. Wheat did not average, last season, higher than 65 cents a bushel. That would give the farmers $16.25 for his wheat. Allow $2 an acre for the straw. That gives a total of $18.25 as the product of an acre of wheat. The average crop of peas is 25 bushels to the acre, and the price last year was 60 cents, a total of $15 an acre for peas. In oats, the average crop was 35 bushels, and the average price less than 30 cents a bushel. Allowing the full 30 cents a bushel and you have a return of $10.50 per acre ; adding $2 for straw you get a total of $12.50 per acre to the farmer for growing oats. With an average crop of 15 tons of sugar beets to an acre, at $4 a ton, the farmer would receive $60 an acre for growing sugar beets. But I shall be told that it costs more to grow sugar beets. That is true. I have given the actual experience of men who have grown them to show that if the farmer must pay more, his return is so much greater that there is a larger net profit than from his other crops. With the returns I have stated, the gentlemen whose names I have given did not mind greater expense in raising the crop in consideration of the much larger net return. I have the actual experience of those who have been growing sugar beets in other places ; I have a statement here of deliveries to a sugar factory in Illinois last year, and money returns to the farmers who delivered the beets :—

Amount realized per acre for sugar beets, Illinois Sugar Refinery Company, Pekin, Ill.

Name.	No. of Acres.	Amount per Acre.	Total.
H. Homefeldt	1½	$103 76	$ 155 66
J. S. Ross	3	101 73	305 24
John Bennett	1	93 31	93 31
Jacob Wingler	8⅔	87 25	756 14
A. Young	2	61 80	123 60
G. J. Schneider	2·6	61 00	158 53
F. Cook	5·9	54 10	319 26
Chris. Hoen	28	49 66	1,390 55
H. S. Bekemeyer	20	42 53	850 60
J. C. Leoi	10	42 10	420 88
J. T. Regor	45	41 88	1,884 71
Weller & Henn	4	40 70	162 28
Jacob Behner	44	39 44	1,735 56
Dr. Guttery	10	34 00	340 14
Fred Spinden	20	33 90	678 27

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the hon. gentleman tell us whether there is any bounty on beet-root sugar in Illinois ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. How much ?

Mr. SPROULE. Speaking from memory, 1 cent a pound for granulated sugar of not less than 80 per cent. In the little town of Green Valley, Ill., with a population of only 500, the people received from that factory $35,000 for the beets they grew. Tremont, with 700 inhabitants, received $27,000 ; and Pekin, with 8,000 inhabitants, received $10,000 for beets grown. The beets manufactured last season in Michigan yielded 48,000,000 pounds of sugar.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is there any bounty in Michigan ?

Mr. SPROULE. There is a dispute as to that. A law was passed by the legislature of the state giving a bounty of 1 cent a pound. But the courts held that the law was ultra vires of the state legislature. The question is not yet settled. The farmers of Michigan raised about 250,000 tons of beets, for which they received an average of $4 a ton. That is to say, about $1,000,000 was paid to the farmers of Michigan last season for the beets raised and manufactured there. It may be said that we cannot do the same here. But, last year, we had some experience in this line. At one point in Canada sugar beets were grown, though the farmers had no factory to send them to. But they sold them for use in Marine City, Mich. Through the company's agent, Mr. Snider, the farmers sent 9,000 tons of beets. The American duty was 25 per cent, and the freight was 50 cents a ton. The price to the farmers was reduced in consequence. The farmers were at a further disadvantage because they had to sell their beets without a test of as to what percentage of sugar they contained. They sold them on the Canadian bank of the river at $3.20 a ton. Notwithstanding all disadvantages, they sold last year 9,000 tons of beets to the refinery in Marine City. The business paid them so well that, as I am informed by Mr. Snider, he is entering into contract with the same farmers, and, in nearly every instance, the farmers have agreed to grow twice as many acres of beets as they grew last year. The farmers are satisfied with the conditions, if they cannot get a factory at home. But they have organized a company and intend to start a factory, if the government will only give a little assistance by way of bounty on the sugar produced in the factory. These facts show that, even at $3.20 a ton, the business of growing beets can be carried on successfully. Why, some of these farmers got as high as $70 an acre for their beets, which they sold at $3.20 a ton. If they can grow beets successfully at that price, it proves beyond question that we have a country admirably suited for the growth of beets. I have given you what the farmers have already realized last year from the beets that were grown here ; and the result of their own experiments over different parts of the country. I think the facts prove beyond question that we have a country admirably suited for that purpose, not only with regard to the yield per acre, but with respect to the percentage of sugar that the beets contain, and the purity of the sugar produced from them.

Now, what would it mean if all this sugar was made in Canada instead of being imported from other countries ? Let hon. gentlemen consider a moment what it would mean. It would mean, in the first place, that we would have thirty factories built and operating in this country. I say thirty factories, because I think that number would be sufficient to manufacture the product of the sugar beet in quantities sufficient to supply the home market. Each of these thirty factories would use up 500 tons of beets per day, for it is held that a factory ought to consume about 500 tons of beets per day to do a profitable business. Now, it will cost to build each one of those factories about $500,000, and this would mean to begin with an expenditure of $15,000,000 for the construction of those thirty factories. To run one of those factories, including the factory hands, clerks, chemists, experts, &c., about 200 hands are required. Multiply that number by thirty, and you have 6,000 people who would be directly and regularly employed in those factories, besides all the labour of mechanics, artisans and workmen that had been employed in building them. The season for manufacturing the product of beet roots usually lasts about 100 days, and if each one of the thirty factories used up 500 tons a day, that would mean 1,500,000 tons of beets in a year. Now, what would be paid to the farmers who grew those beets ? At an average price of $4 per ton, the farmers would receive $6,000,000 a year, a large sum to be distributed directly to them. I desire to say here that it seems to me that above all classes in the community this industry would benefit the farmers of the country. At least 60 per cent of the money paid out in connection with the industry is paid to the farmer for the beets that he raises. He will realize $6,000,000 a year for the beets that he grows on his farm, and which can be grown as well in Canada as in any other country in the world. These thirty factories would consume about 240,000 tons of coal a year, which would either have to be mined in this country or bought from abroad. That of itself would be an important consideration in the calculation that I am making of the benefit to the country through this industry. These factories would also consume about 150,000 tons of lime a year, of which we have any quantity

in the Dominion of Canada in almost any part of it. A great number of people would be employed in manufacturing lime for the use of these factories. The number of cars employed to handle the material necessary to supply these factories would be about 150,000. To supply these factories, from 150,000 to 200,000 acres of land would require to be put under cultivation in sugar beets, and as I remarked before, the farmer would get fully 60 per cent of all the money paid out in connection with the manufacture of beet-root sugar.

Now, I have mentioned several items, showing the very large amount of money would be paid to the people of Canada in the erection of the factories, in the manufacture of lime, in the growth of the beets, in the manual labour that is to be done around the factories, because each factory will require from 150 to 250 hands. I contend that all this money can be expended profitably in this country, instead of being spent in buying sugar made in Germany or France, or some other country.

The by-product of the beet is also an important consideration. Experiments have been carried on during the last few years at Alameda, in California, showing the value of the pulp after the saccharine matter has been extracted from the beet. This pulp is fed to sheep and cattle, and these gentlemen who have conducted the experiment say that the by-product is worth quite as much as ordinary hay. There seems to be no consensus of opinion as to the exact value, but it is held to be one of the most valuable products for feeding dairy cattle, and fattening cattle and sheep for market. There are farmers in California to-day fattening thousands of cattle on the by-products of sugar beet factories. In other states they are following suit. A factory that has used up 50,000 tons of beets per year will supply by-products for 1,000 to 2,000 head of cattle in a season. Each factory would turn out from 30,000 to 40,000 tons of this by-product every year, and that could be distributed amongst the farmers. It could be sold to the farmers in the wet state for 25 cents a ton, and if sold in the dry state it brings a much higher price.

Now, what is being done to-day in this line in the United States ? They, like ourselves, found a few years ago that they could run this industry profitably in their country. They first began by experimenting, as we did, and they found that the climate and soil were suitable. They carried on their experiments for some years, and then commenced building factories ; and so successful has the industry proved that they have to-day forty factories operating in the United States. Last year I told the House where these factories were situated. They have twelve in the state of Michigan, a state adjoining our own country, having a soil and climate no better suited for carrying on that industry than the province of Ontario, and some think not quite as good. There are three factories running in New York, eight in California, three in Colorado ; and in almost every state of the union there is one or more factories in successful operation. So what they have done we may do as well under similar conditions.

Now, other countries have also been carrying on this industry successfully. Germany produces the largest amount of beet-root sugar of any country in the world. What has been their experience in Germany ? A farmer who previously could only rent his land for $3 an acre, as soon as the growth of sugar beets was commenced, could rent his land for $25 an acre, and he is able to do that because of the increased profit that the land yields when devoted to the growth of the sugar beet. Germany is growing a sugar beet that realizes less than 12½ per cent of sugar ; her land yields but twelve tons to the acre, and yet she is carrying on this industry successfully and manufacturing sugar that she sends in large quantities both to the United States and to Canada. Germany is not as well suited for that industry as Canada and the United States, yet she is supplying our people with sugar. Austria is doing the same, Russia is exporting large quantities to-day, France is exporting sugar as well, Belgium has been carrying on the industry successfully for years, Sweden is doing the same, Holland is growing large quantities of sugar beets, Denmark, Servia, Roumania, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, Greece, Persia, Egypt, Argentina, Chili and the United States are all successfully manufacturing sugar out of the sugar beet. We should benefit by the experience of these countries. We should benefit by their experience in the manufacture of the product, the class of machinery that should be employed, the improvements that are being made, and the intelligence which they are bringing to bear upon their operations in that line. The question is : Are factories likely to be started without a bounty being given to them in Canada ? I do not think they are, and I give the reason why. We are living alongside of a country with a border line of hundreds of miles, where they are given a bounty in almost every state. I believe there are two or three states where they have stopped giving a bounty, because, after having given it for several years, the industry is now well under way.

Mr. CHARLTON. What states ?

Mr. SPROULE. I think they are not paying a bounty at the present time in California. I have the figures but I do not happen to have them under my hand just now. Speaking from memory, California is one, and in Michigan they cannot give a bounty owing to the decision of the court, but

they have set apart an amount of money for the purpose and under that stimulus they have commenced operations in Michigan. I do not think that such an industry is likely to start up in this country without a bounty, because it requires a large amount of capital to build a beet-root sugar factory that would consume 500 tons annually. It would require about $500,000. A party who has $500,000 to invest is not likely to invest it in Canada, where we have a duty of 98 cents per cwt. on sugar coming into the country, and where we have no bounty, while there is a duty of $1.68 on sugar coming into the United States, and a bounty of one cent per pound paid as well. He could go across the line and get a bounty of one cent a pound on the manufacture of granulated sugar. I have been in correspondence for several years with men who contemplated the establishment of factories here if bounties had been given. Three years ago I brought the question up and did my best to induce the government to give a bounty. For several years an effort was made to secure the granting of such a bounty. Up to 1885 and after 1885 a bounty was given and three factories were established in Quebec for the manufacture of beet-root sugar. They continued only for a limited time; the enterprise was not a success, the factories failed and the bounty was stopped.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How long was the bounty to be paid ?

Mr. SPROULE. I think at first five years, but I think it was extended for three years, and after that it expired.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And the industry failed ?

Mr. SPROULE. The industry failed. I was going to say one word in regard to that. A company that proposed establishing a factory here sent over two of their experts who were familiar with the requirements of the industry and everything necessary for the successful prosecution of this industry. They pursued their investigations in the province of Quebec to ascertain whether the failure was due to preventable causes, to causes which could be overcome, and the report which they made to their company was that the causes of failure were all preventable causes. The plant that was used in Quebec is now being successfully operated at Lyons, N.Y. The gentleman who runs that plant states that part of the machinery was perfectly useless, that it was not constructed in such a way as to economize labour and expense, and that this unnecessary expense was such a drain on the industry as to consume more than a reasonable profit from the business. They discarded part of the machinery and replaced it with other machinery which was improved and up to date, and the result is that they have been carrying on the business successfully ever since. He says that the country is suited to the production of the sugar beet, and all that is required is that the farmer shall receive a little education as to how to grow the beet more intelligently. With companies having more capital at their command and factories more up to date in regard to the machinery, the industry should be successful. To give an illustration; my informant says instead of throwing the beets into sluices and having the beets carried along by the current in the sluice and being washed as they go, the companies operating here had men wheeling these beets along for several rods in wheelbarrows and throwing them in. The cost of that operation would be a large item which by the adoption of modern methods would be avoided. He says: We are perfectly satisfied, so much so that we will be prepared, in the event of the bounty being a reasonable one, to go into the province of Quebec, build a factory next year and make our contracts with the farmers for the beets. We feel perfectly satisfied that we will make it a success, because, he says, previous failures were due to preventable causes. Factories will not be started unless something is done. Last year we had a deputation that waited upon the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and some of his colleagues, and I joined that deputation. I regretted to find that the deputation, which came down from the Georgian Bay, in the district where I live or from Wiarton and which represented the Owen Sound Sugar Company, said that they did not want a bounty. I said that I did not believe these people knew exactly what they did want. They were the people who had bought out the old Owen Sound Company. They said: We believe we are going to get a bounty from the provincial government, and all that we want is permission to bring in our machinery free of duty. The Dominion government were good enough to take them at their word. I said: I am quite sure that you will not induce any one who has money to invest to invest it in the erection of a factory unless that bounty is given. They went home and entered into communication with a number of men, who were acting in co-operation with me, and this man said that they would not put a dollar into a factory in Canada unless a bounty was given. Although farmers have grown beets there they have found nobody who would offer to put a dollar into the industry and they have no hopes of securing such investment at the present time. A deputation waited on the provincial government lately and succeeded in getting them to give a bounty. The provincial government will set apart $75,000 every year for three years to give assistance to the sugar beet industry in the event of it being started in the province. What they propose to give is one-half a cent a pound for all sugar turned out of

first-class quality to be distributed among all the factories. They will start by giving one-half a cent a pound the first year, one-quarter of a cent a pound the second year, and one-quarter of a cent a pound the third year, but not to amount to more money than $75,000 a year. This will not induce any one to put his money into the industry, because the time is too short and the bounty is too small. I think the Dominion government ought to do what they did in connection with the bounty on iron. The provincial government offered $1 a ton, and the Dominion government, which had previously offered $3 a ton, supplemented this bounty by offering $3 additional on all pig iron made into steel. The result is that the iron and steel industry has been started up almost like magic in the country, and it will be one of our most important industries in future. So it would be with the sugar industry if the Dominion government would consent to give a bounty. If so they would consult the interests of the farmers and of the people generally. It is sometimes said that the industry cannot be carried on successfully here. If that is so the government will not be called upon to pay the bounty. Then, again, others say that it will be carried on to an extent that it would almost bankrupt the treasury. Well, give it for a limited number of years.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How many years do you suggest ?

Mr. SPROULE. I suggest five years. Some say ten years, but my information is that if we could have it for five years it would be ample to put the industry on a good footing in Canada.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Are not the European countries still paying a bounty ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, they are paying a bounty on sugar exported from the country. The question is sometimes put: Why do you need a bounty ? My information is that the bounty is needed to induce the farmers to grow the beets, and in order to distribute the seed free for some years. It is necessary to send experts among the farmers periodically to teach them how to prepare the ground, and how to cultivate the beets and finally market them. That means an outlay for several years, which must be borne by the factories, and towards which assistance is required from the Dominion treasury or some such source. Another thing is that at first the factories would be obliged to pay a uniform price of say $4 a ton for the beets without regard to the percentage of sugar, and they propose to do that if assistance is given them for a few years. It is claimed by those interested in the industry, that after a few years the farmers themselves become experts, and then the expense of the educational work ceases. The farmers get to learn how to produce the largest yield of beets with the greatest percentage of sugar obtainable. I am assured by several responsible men, that they are ready to provide the money at any time to build factories and start operations if the bounty is given. They tell me that the bounty would not be required longer than five years, and they are quite satisfied that if it is given, the industry can be successfully established in Canada. In view of these facts, I ask the government to consider this question carefully with a view of so amending the custom law as to grant this bounty. I have here a form of contract that has been entered into already in anticipation of the bounty being given, and it provides that if the bounty should be given, a factory will be built the present year. I have here contracts made by farmers in the province of Ontario for the growth of the sugar beet, and many farmers who grew beets last year and sold them for $3.20 a ton, will grow three times the quantity this year. If the government gives this assistance, I am certain that factories will spring up as if by magic throughout the country. The farmers, perhaps, represent the majority of the population of the Dominion, and if you can benefit them you must benefit every class of the community. The establishment of this industry in Canada would retain in the country millions of dollars, which we send every year to foreign countries to enrich them, and it would promote employment for our own people at home. Why should we send away our means to Germany, Australia, France or any other country, when we can utilize it at home in giving the farmers 60 per cent of the expenditure on this industry, and enabling them to employ their labour to greater profit. In view of these facts the government ought to favourably consider this question. A syndicate has been formed at the present time who are ready to erect and have in operation during the present year a beet factory with an annual capacity of 75,000 tons of beet, producing 12,000,000 pounds of granulated sugar per year. That factory will be started the moment the bounty is given. Hon. gentlemen will readily see the great advantages that will spring from this industry. The railway companies will be benefited. Half a million dollars will be spent immediately in erecting factories. $300,000 a year would be paid to the farmers for the beets to supply the one factory that I referred to; 8,000 tons of coal and coke, 5,000 tons of lime stone, 65,000 barrels and a large quantity of other material would be required for each season's work; 150 factory hands, besides clerks, managers, chemists and expert instructors would be employed; fifty or sixty cars would be required per day for the transport of the product, and all this could be obtained if the government would only render a little assistance to the industry.

In view of all this, will not the government grant the same assistance to this farmers' industry, which they have granted to the iron and steel industry of Canada. Will they not enable the farmer to direct his attention to a product which will realize to him three or four times as much profit as he realizes from his industry at present. Let the government give this assistance to an industry for the product of which we have a home market that will consume all we produce for many years. I sincerely trust that in the interest of the farmers of the country, and in the interests of the country at large the government will grant this bounty, and if they do so they will find many factories erected next year, and they will find also that many other factories will be built throughout Canada year after year.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, I can quite sympathize with my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in his desire to see a large industry not now existing in Canada established here. I will concede everything he has said with reference to the advantages which would accrue to this country from the manufacture of beet-root sugar on the scale he proposes, and if I were satisfied that the granting of a bounty by the government was essential to the establishment of this industry, I would cheerfully support the motion of the hon. gentleman. I have followed him closely in the argument he has presented to the House. He has gone into the question very fully, and has laid before the House and the country a vast amount of information that will be of much value in considering this question. In listening to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), I was struck with the evidently not intended result, but the actual result of his arguments which led to the conclusion that this industry, as compared with other industries connected with agriculture was so promising and so profitable that nothing else offers as great an inducement to the agriculturists as the cultivation of beet-root sugar. The hon. gentleman informed us, truthfully no doubt, that the conditions in Canada for the production of beet roots were as favourable as they were in any other country in the world—that they were much more favourable than in Germany, where the industry has attained such vast magnitude, or in any other European country; and the information he gave us as to the results of the experiments made in many parts of Ontario, certainly prove that this industry only lacked a little energy and courage on the part of capitalists to prove a highly successful and remunerative one.

The hon. gentleman asked, is it possible to establish factories for the production of beet-root sugar in this country, without a bounty ? He assumed that it was not—that capitalists could not be induced to embark in this business unless a bounty were granted. Now, in the very district where the hon. gentleman says that last year beets were raised for $3.20 a ton and exported to the United States, at a large profit to the grower, I have heard it reported that it is proposed to build in the town of Wallaceburg a beet-root sugar factory, if the town will grant a bonus of $30,000 ; and this proposal is made without any reference to a Dominion or provincial bounty. And, no doubt, if the ice is once broken, and the experiment is successfully made by the managers of that proposed factory, with due knowledge of the business and proper methods of production, there will be other factories established and a great expansion of this business.

The hon. gentleman tells us that there are forty beet-root sugar factories in the United States. Eight of these are in the state of California, where no bounty is paid. Twelve are in the state of Michigan, where no bounty is paid.

Mr. SPROULE. A bounty was paid in California at first.

Mr. CHARLTON. And several of them are in other states where no bounty is paid. A comparison between the conditions in Michigan and the probable course of this industry in Canada, and especially in Ontario, would be the most reasonable basis on which to form an opinion, because the climatic conditions and the character of the soil in Michigan and in Ontario are very similar. The hon. gentleman tells us that this business was established in the state of Michigan through the passage of a law granting a bounty. It is true that the legislature of Michigan did pass a law granting a bounty of one cent a pound for the production of beet-root sugar, and that two factories were established ; and it was found that the business was so profitable that the law was repealed, and the bounty which had been voted for the first year was never paid, because the courts held, as my hon. friend truthfully states, that the legislature had gone outside of its jurisdiction in passing the law. The repeal of the bounty in that state placed no check upon the production of sugar ; new factories were built a year after the bounty was repealed ; new factories were built last year ; and there is no business in the United States that is more profitable to-day than the production of beet-root sugar in the state of Michigan, without a bounty or government aid of any other character.

The price paid for beets in that state last year was $4.50 per ton—beets that would test 12 per cent ; and the price was proportionately higher or lower for beets that went above or fell short of the standard test. Now, the product of a ton of beets that will test 12 per cent is 200 pounds of sugar, and a quantity of molasses and drips. The sugar from a ton of standard beets, at present prices, is worth between $9 and $10, and in addition to the

value of the sugar, there is the value of the pulp, which was considered valueless until recently, but which to-day, evaporated so that it can be transported, commands perhaps $20 a ton in the German market. The hon. gentleman tells us that pulp is equal in value to hay. Well, hay in the United States and Canada is worth at least $6 a ton. So that from the raw material, which costs $4.50, you have the value of the sugar, between $9 and $10, and the value of the pulp as well. It is quite evident that the business must be an enormously profitable one. The cost of converting the ton of beets into sugar and pulp is not more than $1.50 or $2. Thus, you have a total cost of $6.50, as against a selling value of $9 or $10 for the sugar and the value of the pulp besides. There is no bounty required for that business. The only danger is that it will be overdone because the profit is so great.

My hon. friend gives the result of a number of tests in Canada. He tells us that the Ontario experimental farm test gave 19 tons of beets to the acre, and that these beets analysed 16 per cent of saccharine matter; or the 19 tons of beets would produce 275 pounds of sugar to the ton. I do not know what the quotation of sugar is to-day, but at 4½ cents a pound, this would be equivalent to $12.50 worth of sugar from a ton of beets that would cost the factory perhaps $4.50, in addition to the value of the pulp, which would be either fed to stock on the ground or evaporated and exported.

Mr. SPROULE. I might correct the hon. gentleman with regard to the yield of sugar per ton of beets. It is from 190 to 232 pounds.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may say that I know that the yield of a ton of beets that analyse 12 per cent of saccharine matter is 200 pounds of sugar, in addition to a certain quantity of molasses and drips. If it analyses more than 12 per cent, the yield is proportionately greater.

Mr. WALLACE. How does the hon. gentleman make that $12.50 a ton?

Mr. CHARLTON. I was taking a test of 19 tons with 16 per cent of saccharine matter.

Mr. WALLACE. But that is not the average.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is not the average, but I was treating that particular instance.

Mr. WALLACE. Has the hon. gentleman made the deduction that only 81 per cent or 82 per cent is saccharine matter, and you have to take 12 per cent of that?

Mr. CHARLTON. I assumed, of course, that the percentage of saccharine matter represented so many pounds of sugar. You can reduce it one-fifth, and you still have over $10 to the ton. The hon. gentleman gave another test of 18·3 tons of beets to the acre, which produced 13·56 per cent of sugar. This is 1·36 higher than the standard on which the American price of $4.50 per ton is given. The hon. gentleman tells us that in Germany the average is 11·70 tons per acre, and the test 12 per cent. The difference between the yield of 11 tons per acre and a yield of 18 or 19 tons, and between a test of 12 and a test of 15 or 16 per cent, in saccharine matter, shows the enormous advantages in favour of the cultivation of sugar beet in Ontario. And if the business can be pursued successfully and profitably in Germany, where the average is 11 tons per acre and the saccharine test 12 per cent, of course it can be prosecuted with much greater chance of a successful return in Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. In Germany they use the long ton of 2,240 pounds, while ours is the short ton.

Mr. CHARLTON. Still the disparity is very great in favour of the Ontario beet producer; and it would have been well if the hon. gentleman, in making comparisons, had adopted the same standard of ton in the one case as in the other.

The hon. gentleman has told us that in no country is the yield and the percentage in saccharine matter as high as here, and I believe that as regards European countries his statement is perfectly correct. I doubt also whether in any of the American states the yield, on the whole, is as large and the saccharine test as high as in Ontario.

Then, the hon. gentleman went on to make a comparison between the return a farmer would receive from grains of various kinds and the return he would receive from the sugar beet. From $13 to $20 per acre is, he represents, the return from cereals, oats, wheat, &c., while from sugar beets the farmer may expect an average return of $60 per acre, and the hon. gentleman showed that in the state of Illinois the return was from $39 per acre to $118. So that the difference in favour of the cultivation of the beet root is enormous, and the inducement for the manufacturer to take those beets and convert $4.50 worth of raw material into at least $9 worth of sugar, and perhaps $1.50 worth of pulp, is certainly sufficient to cause men to embark in the business without the intervention of the government in the shape of a subsidy.

Mr. COCHRANE. It has not done it.

Mr. CHARLTON. It has in the various American states.

Mr. COCHRANE. We are not talking of the American states.

Mr. CHARLTON. Why, the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) was drawing comparisons between this country and the American states, and I have pointed out two

states in which there are twenty factories running profitably without any government bounty, and where the conditions as to the yield of the beets and the saccharine matter are stated to be less favourable than in Ontario.

My hon. friend tells us that 9,000 tons of sugar beets were raised in the western part of Ontario and exported to Marine City in Michigan, and although these beets paid a duty of 25 per cent and 50 cents freight, yet the business was profitable for the farmers who raised them. Well, if these gentlemen can raise beets for export to Marine City at $3.20 per ton, they can raise them to supply the sugar factories at their own door at the same price. But they are not asked to do it. The business will be profitable without the aid of a bounty at all if the sugar factories can obtain beets, with a test of 12 per cent saccharine matter, for $4.50 per ton. All it requires is a little enterprise and the investment of money in the enterprise.

Mr. CLANCY. In the beets for which $3.20 per ton was paid, there was no consideration of the quantity of sugar contained.

Mr. CHARLTON. Very probably, but there are scarcely any beets in Ontario that do not yield 12 per cent of saccharine matter, and if those beets can be sold for $3.20 a ton on the Canadian side opposite Marine City, they can be sold upon this side for that price and can be manufactured profitably into sugar. And the manufacturer can pay $1 to $1.50 per ton more than that price.

The hon. gentleman tells us that the farmer gets 60 per cent of the gross returns from the manufacture of the beet into sugar. He assumes that if the farmers receive $4.50 for these beets, the product of the beets is 40 per cent higher than the amount he receives. And if the conversion of these beets into sugar cannot be carried on by the manufacturer for 40 per cent of the gross returns from the manipulation of that raw material, that is very singular indeed. I do not say absolutely that I am right about this matter, but I know that the business has been carried on, not only successfully but with enormous profits, about 450 miles west of us, where the soil and climatic conditions are similar to those existing in Ontario. I know that this is the case; and if it can be done there, it can be done equally successfully here. It is only a question of enterprise and the risking of money in an undertaking that will lead to the establishment of a successful business. I believe that we are on the eve of having the sugar beet industry introduced into Canada, and that the gentlemen who contemplate embarking in this business are holding back, in the hope that they may receive from this government a bounty of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. CLANCY. Was the hon. gentleman not solicited to take stock in those enterprises? I think he made that statement to the House last year.

Mr. CHARLTON. If these gentlemen can secure 1 cent bounty, it will pay them to hold off until that is granted, and they can then embark in the business, and make much greater profits than the legitimate and satisfactory profits they would realize if they embarked in it without the bounty.

While I do not say that I am absolutely correct, and while I agree with the hon. member for East Grey as to the desirability of establishing this business in Canada, the question is one we want to consider very carefully and thoroughly, and I would imagine that the first step to take—if the government decided to take the question into serious consideration—would be to appoint a commission of gentlemen, who could thoroughly sift this business. Let them visit the sections of the United States where the beet sugar industry is prosecuted, and there acquire the information and compile the data that would place us in a position to give an intelligent opinion and ask intelligent action upon this very important question.

Mr. J. H. LEGRIS (Maskinongé.) (Translation). Mr. Speaker, the beet-root sugar question is one of paramount importance, connected as it is with one of the most interesting and useful inventions of modern times, a product of the glorious nineteenth century, so fruitful in great discoveries. This question, Sir, has often been agitated in this country. Within the last twenty years, several experiments have been made with regard to the establishment of this industry in various localities of the province of Quebec; but unfortunately, those efforts have proved abortive and resulted in financial failure.

The enormous capital invested in the building of sugar factories and the improvement of the various methods of cultivation; the bounties, either directly or indirectly granted to manufacturers and farmers by various governments, all those expenditures have been of no avail.

Finally, the failure of the Berthier and Farnham factories, the machinery and appliances of which were sold and sent across the line in 1896, has for the present at least, discouraged promoters and capitalists. Still, in spite of the frequently repeated failures of this industry, it would be an egregious mistake to jump to the conclusion that it cannot be introduced and carried on as successfully here as it has been prosecuted in Europe, and especially in the United States, where its success is almost an accomplished fact.

Experts, who have thoroughly mastered the question, or at least those who have written treatises on the subject, have all reached the same conclusion. They are

all agreed as to the possibility or the probability, not to say the certainty, of this industry becoming a paying one in this country.

In 1870, the Quebec government sent Mr. Edward Barnard, to Europe, with instructions to make inquiries concerning beet-root cultivation and the manufacture of beet-root sugar.

Early in 1872, Mr. Barnard was sent a second time to Europe by the Department of Agriculture, in Ottawa, in order to prosecute his previous inquiries, and ascertain whether this industry could be successfully established in Canada. That same year, Mr. Barnard published a short treatise on 'Beet-root Sugar.'

In 1875, Mr. Octave Cuisset, of Quebec, industrial chemist and manufacturer of beet-root sugar, also wrote a popular treatise on beet-root culture and beet-sugar manufacture.

In 1892, an appendix to the report of the Quebec Department of Agriculture was published on the same subject.

We have also a report from Mr. William Saunders, Director of the Dominion Experimental Farms, published in 1892, on the production and manufacture of beet sugar.

In 1897, Mr. Alfred Musy, a civil engineer, a graduate of the Paris Polytechnical School, and a former manufacturer, also wrote a book on the same subject.

We have several other interesting essays treating of the cultivation of the sugar beet, and they all come to the same conclusion, namely, that the beet-sugar industry can, in all probability, if not with absolute certainty, be made a success in this country.

But, on the other hand, we have also a record of experiments which proved utter failures. In 1881, a first-class factory was built at Berthier, which ran for two years.

In 1881-82, another factory for the manufacture of beet sugar was built at Farnham. Coaticook followed in the wake of Farnham and started a factory which was operated in 1881, 1882 and 1883. All those experiments, so to say, proved utter failures. A fresh attempt was made at Berthier in 1887, after the sale of that factory at a nominal price, and this experiment proved still more disastrous than the former experiments, but the causes of those failures are now perfectly well understood. Let me quote from what an expert, Mr. Musy, says in this connection: 'Everything was mismanaged in this experiment. At the Berthier factory, in 1887, there was nobody appointed to educate the farmers as to the best methods to be adopted for the raising of a reasonable quantity of beets. The crop did not give two thousand tons, which hardly yielded 2 per cent of sugar, with sugar contents of from 12 to 13 per cent. I need hardly add that everything seemed to have been managed so as to bring about such a result, and that the disastrous failure of 1887 was, so to say, a foregone conclusion.'

From 1890 to 1893, a fresh attempt was made at Farnham. In 1893, 1894 and 1895 operations were resumed at Berthier, with no better results than previously. The men who undertook to resuscitate it were either incompetent or their enterprise was not backed by sufficient capital. It is, perhaps, no exaggeration to say that those experiments were sometimes made by men who were either anxious to make political capital out of these enterprises or had speculation in view. All those experiments at the several points just mentioned proved abortive and disastrous.

Within the last few years we have heard a great deal about fresh efforts made to resuscitate the beet-root sugar industry in this country. The strongest objection invariably raised in this connection is grounded on the difficulty of ascertaining with some probability whether this industry could be successfully carried on here, owing to the difficulty of obtaining raw material, The greatest trouble met with was that of satisfying the men in power that this industry could prove as highly successful and remunerative here as it has proved elsewhere. Sir, I was greatly surprised, when I heard, a little while ago, the hon, member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stating on the floor of this House that this industry needed no encouragement from the government and that it could stand on its own bottom! This industry is so paying, he said, that it needs no government assistance, and the profit realized therefrom is a sufficient inducement to cause capitalists to embark in the business without any bounty. I was quite surprised to hear the hon. gentleman making such an erroneous statement, and repeating it throughout his speech, and in fact grounding upon it his whole argument. As to the data quoted by the hon. gentleman, which he borrowed from the speech of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) we must bear in mind that the tests referred to were made on certain plots of land and not on large areas, which is quite another thing. Those percentages are altogether too high. I do not call in question the accurateness of those data, but I know that similar results could never be obtained from a crop grown over larger areas.

It is all very well to talk of generalizing the cultivation of beet-roots, in order to supply sufficient raw material for the manufacture of sugar; but it must not be lost sight of that the greatest difficulty to overcome in connection with the introduction of this industry is one relating to the education of the farming community and teaching them to improve their methods so as to supply the factory with such a quantity of beet-roots as may profitably be used up.

It is quite clear that farmers are not ready without any previous experience, to supply a factory—no matter where it is located—with a sufficient quantity of beet-

roots to make it a profitable business. Farmers will have to be educated up to that standard, for several years to come.

Another thing which we must not forget is the considerable amount of capital required for building a factory, varying from $400,000 to $500,000 at least. No capitalist would be anxious to embark in such a business, and sink half a million dollars in an enterprise of that kind, with the prospect of considerable deficits looming up before him for many years to come.

It is all very well to say that capitalists are quite able to take care of themselves, and that, in consideration of the large profits they will be able to realize, it is no business of the government to come to their assistance. Those who embark in that business have to make heavy outlays at the outset. It is necessary to send experts among the farmers, during the summer season, to watch the growth of the beet, and to teach the agriculturists the best methods adapted in European countries for producing the largest yield of beets with the greatest percentage of sugar obtainable, so that the crop may yield a profitable return both to the manufacturer and the farmer. But, as I said, if we expect capitalists to make all those outlays without assisting them in some way, we cannot expect to see this industry introduced into this country.

But there is no reason for feeling alarmed or surprised at the difficulties met with here, and which are the main cause of the failures mentioned. History once more repeats itself in our case, as the rise of this industry in Europe was attended with similar experiences and drawbacks. It was introduced in Europe in 1806 with enormous bounties from the various governments. Up to 1820 it was a bounty-fed industry, enjoying enormous protection, and then only it was that it began to show some practical results. It enjoyed those enormous bounties down to the year 1840. But since 1850, it has yielded considerable revenue to the various states where it is prosecuted. In France, to-day there are 360 sugar factories and over 400 in Germany.

In the United States, the rise of the beet-root sugar industry was attended with the same difficulties as those just referred to. From Bulletin No. 52, published by the Department of Agriculture in Washington, in 1897, I gather that the first attempt to introduce this industry was made in 1830, when the yield was but a few hundred pounds of sugar. From 1831 to 1837, the output was nil.

From 1838 to 1839, 1,300 pounds.
From 1839 to 1862, nil.
From 1863 to 1871, 300 to 500 tons per year.
In 1872, 500 tons.
In 1873, 700 tons.
From 1874 to 1877, less than 100 tons per year.
In 1878, 200 tons.
In 1879, 1,200 tons.
In 1880, 500 tons.
From 1881 to 1882, less than 500 tons.
In 1883, 535 tons.
In 1884, 953 "
In 1885, 600 "
In 1886, 800 "
In 1887, 255 "
In 1888, 1,010 tons.
In 1889, 2,600 "
In 1890, 2,800 "
In 1891, 5,359 "
In 1892, 12,091 tons.
In 1893, 20,453 "
In 1894, 20,443 "
In 1895, 30,000 "
In 1896, 40,000 "

Within the last few years, the yearly output has reached over one hundred thousand tons.

As will be seen, it was as late as 1830 that this industry was started in the United States, and, just as in the case of our own country, it took several years before it yielded any results. It was even on the eve of being altogether abandoned, so unsatisfactory were the results obtained from the first experiments. Therefore we need not wonder if the introduction of the same industry into our country has resulted in so many failures.

That the problem of the manufacture of beet-root sugar is now satisfactory solved is beyond question, from the manufacturer's standpoint. As to whether sugar beets can be successfully grown with a sufficiently high precentage of first-class sugar to permit of their being manufactured with profit is now an indisputable fact. The great trouble with us here is the one I have just referred to, namely, the difficulty of inducing farmers to grow a beet which may prove acceptable as well as profitable to the manufacturer. The roots must also be raised in sufficient quantities to supply the factory for a reasonable period of time.

Now, this educational work is a question of time requiring a practice of several years. Nor can that education be brought up to the right standard, unless factories be started which will induce the farmers to grow the beet and will be willing to buy it from them at paying prices.

I shall not follow the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) in his review of all the advantages which would accrue to a particular locality from the establishment of a beet-sugar factory. All I need add is this: that the government should not view with indifference the unquestionable benefits which would result from the introduction of this industry into the country. If we consider the cost of building a factory, which is estimated at from $400,000 to $500,000 at least; if we consider that the introduction of this industry and the raising of the beets means the cultivation of several thousand acres of land, divided among 700 or 1,000 families; if we bear in mind that it means the employment of several hundred agricultural labourers, in addition to the many employees the sugar factory itself would require, it is easily seen how beneficial this industry would prove to the country.

But I have not yet pointed out all the advantages that would accrue to Canada from the establishment of the beet-sugar industry. For instance, a considerable quantity of pulp would be produced by the factory, and this by-product is known to be a very useful and desirable feed for animals, and it would thus stimulate dairying. It must be borne in mind that the manufacture of beet-root sugar also means the employment of a large amount of labour in the winter season, as well as in the summer season. There is no doubt that this industry would assist our farmers in fattening their stock and improving their farms and bringing them up to a higher state of cultivation, and so it would develop the wealth of the farming community. What happened elsewhere would also happen here. That such were the results obtained in Europe is beyond dispute.

In a special report published by the Department of Agriculture, in Washington, in connection with the beet-sugar industry, the writer points out the improvement of lands as one of the advantages accruing therefrom :

> The writer observed during his inspection of sugar-beet farms this summer that the owners of the land received in many instances as high as $5, in some cases $6, and in a few cases $7 per acre cash rent for land devoted to the raising of sugar beets, and this in localities where $3 per acre would have been the highest possible amount which could have been obtained as rent for similar land used for other farming purposes. Inquiry was particularly made into the value of land on which sugar beets were being raised around Watsonville and Alvarado, Cal., and it was rarely placed lower than $200 per acre. Rents were rated at from $10 to $15 per acre, yet those farmers claimed to be making a good profit raising beets. The sugar-beet lands of Utah were very much enhanced in value, so that the experience of this country up to the present time seems to be that the location of a beet-sugar factory in a district causes a healthy rise in rents and values of land.

I fail to see why the same cause should not produce the same effect here as in the United States. It is a matter of experience —and I have never entertained any doubt on this point—that a considerable increase in value of lands has always resulted from the location of a beet-sugar factory in any district.

Now, if such are the advantages resulting to any particular locality from the establishment of a beet-sugar factory, it is easily understood how beneficial would prove to the country the establishment of from thirty to forty sugar factories, which will be required for manufacturing sugar in quantities sufficient to supply the home market.

Now, in order to reach that end, what means are we to adopt ? It is an uncontroverted fact that the sugar-beet can be successfully grown in this country ; still, there is nothing yet in sight.

The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has referred more particularly to the bounties granted to the iron and steel industry. There are many other industries which could be added to the list.

As we all know, our industries have been developed under the favouring influence of protection and large bounties ; and in my humble opinion, no capitalist could be induced to embark in an industry which requires the outlay of such large capital, without being satisfied that he will be given aid at least for a limited number of years, so as to enable him to face the deficits which will undoubtedly occur at the initial stage of his operations.

What have we not done in the past in favour of the sugar refiners ? What protection did they not enjoy ? For many years they have been highly protected and even to-day they are still receiving indirectly a pretty high protection. But let me add here that such protection goes to benefit the refiner alone. For every ton of sugar manufactured, the refiner hardly shows $5 in the country, while the sugar manufacturer will spend at least $20. In those factories worth from two to three million dollars, the refiner gives employment to about two thousand workingmen. The building of the sugar factories which would entail an expenditure of from fifteen to twenty million dollars, would for a time give employment to mechanics, and once ready for the production of the sugar, they would require over ten thousand labourers, without mentioning the army of farmers and agricultural labourers engaged during the summer season in the cultivation of the beet.

There are many advantages accruing to this country from the beet-root sugar industry, for which the sugar manufacturer might claim credit, such as the high state of cultivation to which the lands are brought in raising sugar beets, which is intensive farming in every sense of the word ; the progressive increase of crops ; the raising of cattle on a large scale ; the increase in the output of milk, and consequently, the erection of dairies and creameries which naturally follow in the wake of factories.

The sugar refiner cannot show anything to his credit favourably comparing with those results. Now, since all governments, without any exception, have realized that it was in the interest of the community to protect sugar refineries, I do not see the reason why we should deny protection to an industry far more beneficial to the farming community than the sugar refining industry.

Should we succeed in introducing this great industry into the country, I have no hesitation in saying that it would prove most beneficial to the people of Canada in general, and that it would give a great stimulus to the farming industry. It is beyond question that whenever this industry is established in a locality it results in an all-round improvement. The culture of the beet, as I said, would have a most excellent

effect on the development of farm lands by bringing them up to a higher state of cultivation, while it would give stimulation to corollary industries, such as the raising of dairy cattle, thus increasing the general wealth of the country. Even towns have sprung up in the wake of those sugar-beet factories.

It is stated, in a report published by the United States government, that a small town, Oxnard, owes its existence to no other cause than the introduction of the sugar beet industry into that district.

Why, Sir, within the past few years, have we not seen small towns, like Grand'mère, Shawinigan, Sault Sainte Marie, springing up as if by magic, in the wake of new industries ? History will repeat itself here, and the introduction of this industry into the country will be attended with similar results ; new towns will spring up around those factories, and a new impetus will thus be given to progress in those districts and in the country in general. And once the factory is in full operation, business men, traders, mechanics, workingmen of every description, will be seen flocking thither and settling down in the vicinity of the factory, in order to supply the wants of the people employed in this industry, thus forming the nucleus of a new town. One of the by products, the refuse molasses, might also be converted into first-class alcohol, and manufacturers would no doubt avail themselves of the opportunity for starting this industry. There are many other advantages which would accrue to the country from the introduction of the sugar beet industry ; but, as I do not wish to trespass upon the indulgence of the House, I need not refer to them at any greater length.

With these few remarks which I wished to offer to the House, I hesitate not to say that I can approve the resolution which is now in your hands, Mr. Speaker. When the opinion of this House is known, I hope that the government—and here I appeal more particularly to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), who is an expert in such matters and who realizes all the good likely to result to the country from the introduction of such an industry—the government, I say, should not hesitate to grant a reasonable aid, so as to induce capitalists and manufacturers to invest their money in the building of sugar beet factories.

I am quite aware that the greatest care must be experienced in such matters, and that it behooves us to move slowly ; but I do not think there are any unsurmountable obstacles in the way, and I hope the government realizes that the time has come for them to assist this industry ; thus promoting the dearest interests of the country. The government, I have no doubt, will not hesitate to take the means of bringing about the successful establishment of this industry.

Mr. LEGRIS.

In connection with the sale of the Berthier sugar factory, I may say that those who were present when the machinery was being removed, prior to its being shipped across the line, felt, no doubt, very keenly the loss of that industry, but they thought that perhaps it was no such great loss, after all, seeing that the machinery was obsolete and without the required capacity for an output large enough to make it a paying business. It is out of question that a beet sugar factory must be provided with the most approved machinery and labour-saving appliances, with the capacity of turning out an output large enough to make the business paying. Now, this factory could utilize but 220 tons of beets per day, and as is well known, no such operations can be profitable unless a factory has a capacity of 500 tons a day.

The government are conversant enough with what is being done to-day in this line in the United States, to be able to decide upon the course to be adopted by them. Is it not a pity to see eight or nine million dollars yearly flowing out of the country, to pay for our home-consumption of sugar, an article which could be manufactured here ?

I think I have said enough to satisfy the government that they should come to the assistance of an industry which would prove so beneficial not only to the farming community, but to the country in general.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). At this early stage of the session, the government is not expected to make announcement of its policy on subjects of this kind. They are subjects which are properly to be considered, and upon which the government may fairly be expected to mature its policy in time for the presentation of the budget. As I anticipate at an early day being able to make my financial statement, I do not think that I should comment on the very interesting and able addresses to which we have listened, further than to say that we realize that the subject is one of deep interest and great importance, and that, at the proper time, the government will be prepared to declare its views on the subject. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I do not think that we should adjourn the debate, but that the government ought to be able to say whether they do or do not approve of the principle of the resolution. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) brought this matter to the attention of the House, I think, two years ago. I believe the question was brought up again last year, and a full discussion took place. On each of these occasions the government asked for an adjournment of the debate, or sought to shelve the question in some other way. But I think the time has

arrived when the government should be ready to say whether they are for or against this motion. It looks as if the old plan were being tried, and that the government, finding it more convenient, are going to have the question stand over. For my part, I am quite willing to express my opinion by voice and vote ; and my opinion is that this parliament should grant a bonus, or subsidy, in whatever form may be considered best, for the promotion of the beet sugar industry in Canada. From the figures given by the hon. member for East Grey we learned that, in the United States, where there is a great production of cane sugar, they are promoting by enormous expenditure the production of beet sugar. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has told us that the state of Michigan has given up the bounties they were paying for the promotion of beet sugar manufacture. I do not know where that hon. gentleman got his information ; but I hold in my hand a copy of an Act 'To provide for the encouragement of the manufacture of beet sugar, and to provide compensation, and to make an appropriation therefor,' passed by the legislature of the state of Michigan. This Act is dated March 26, 1897, and section 8 in it, provides :

> Every person, firm or corporation that shall have in operation in this state a factory for the manufacture of sugar from beets with a capacity of 2,000 pounds of sugar or upwards per day, while this Act is in force, shall be entitled to receive from the state one cent per pound for beet sugar manufactured from beets in said factory for a period of seven years from the taking effect of this Act.

Seven years from March 26, 1897, would bring us to March 26, 1904 ; and we have not arrived at that by three years. I would like to know where the hon. member for North Norfolk got his information, that the Act had been repealed. They could not well repeal it, because it was a contract made with the proprietors of sugar manufactories.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I rather think the governor of Michigan refused to assent to it.

Mr. WALLACE. I am aware that Governor Pingree, besides doing many other things in the same direction, tried to destroy the effect of the Act. But I rather think the governor has disappeared. But whatever else he could do, he could not put a veto upon an Act that had been passed, as I take it, before he came into power.

The PRIME MINISTER. It was vetoed by the governor.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Pingree was not governor at the time the Act was passed. He has been governor since, and tried to cause some trouble about the Act. But there is the Act passed, and no governor could veto it, for, it is not like an ordinary Act, but is a contract with others. I presume that it is the law of the state of Michigan to-day. The hon. member for North Norfolk has been, in times gone by, an ardent admirer of the people of the United States. He tells us to-day that the beet-sugar industry is so enormously profitable that we should be foolish if we gave a subsidy or bounty to these factories. But the people on the other side of the line, whose business acumen the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) so much admires, are giving, so far as the state of Michigan is concerned, one cent a pound bonus for the promotion of this industry, and have undertaken to do so for seven years. They set no limit to the amount they will devote to that bounty. Other states of the Union also are giving large bounties, usually, I believe, one cent a pound, for the manufacture of this sugar. It is true that the hon. member for North Norfolk does not now express that high admiration for the people of the United States that he formerly did. But that is because he thinks they are too sharp in their business practices, too selfish and too much inclined to look after themselves. It is an additional proof of the wisdom of the step proposed by the hon. member for East Grey that these sharp and selfish and wide-awake people see such advantages in carrying on this manuafcture in their country that they give a bonus of one cent per pound to encourage it. Another point of great importance and one that has assisted me in reaching a conclusion is that in any country where this manufacture has been established as a great industry, it has reached large proportions only through the assistance of enormous bounties. In Germany, in France, in Belgium and other European countries, they not only give a subsidy for the manufacture, but they give a bounty for every pound exported. And these export bounties are causing the British government great trouble, because Great Britain's interests in the production of cane sugar in the West Indies and other places are greatly injured by the increase of importation into the British market of beet-root sugar. One fact is certain, and that is that, while the production of beet-root sugar is increasing enormously year after year, the production of cane sugar is almost at a standstill. The total increase in the world's consumption of sugar is increasing enormously, as shown by the figures read here to-day. As against 312,000,000 pounds imported into Canada last year, only about 200,000,000 pounds were imported a few years ago, and I remember that, in 1879, when the Conservative party came into power, the importation of sugar into Canada was only about 104,000,000 pounds. We have trebled our consumption in the last twenty-one or twenty-two years. The consumption of other countries also has enormously increased, one of the reasons being

the much lower price at which sugar can be produced. The fact that other countries have become great producers of beet-root sugar through bounties is a strong argument, to my mind, why we should have bounties here. The hon. member for North Norfolk says there are men waiting to see whether we will not give a bounty, but that they are bound to put up sugar refineries here anyhow. Well, all I can say to them is this, we have been going on for twenty years, and during all this time the beet-root sugar industry has been increasing enormously each year, but we have been doing nothing, and we are doing nothing to-day. If we want to promote an industry in this country that will save $6,000,000 of the people's money—yes, $9,000,000, because we can save 312,000,000 pounds at three cents a pound, leaving the cost of manufacture out of the question altogether, we would be saving nine or ten million dollars a year and giving employment in our own country to our farmers, mechanics and carriers and so forth—it appears to me that this is an enterprise that should receive the encouragement and support of the government.

House divided on amendment of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Blair,	McGugan,
Borden (King's, N.S.),	McIsaac,
Bourbonnais,	McLennan,
Britton,	Malouin,
Calvert,	Matheson,
Christie,	Maxwell,
Copp,	Meigs,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Mignault,
Desmarais,	Monet,
Emmerson,	Morrison,
Fielding,	Oliver,
Flint,	Paterson,
Fraser,	Proulx,
Geoffrion,	Reid (Restigouche),
Gibson,	Roche (Halifax),
Gould,	Ross (Ontario),
Guthrie,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.)
Holmes,	Russell,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Scott,
Johnston (Lambton),	Sifton,
Lang,	Stephens,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Sutherland (Essex),
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Sutherland (Oxford),
LeBlanc,	Tarte,
Lewis,	Thompson,
Loy,	Tolmie,
Macdonald,	Turgeon,
Mackie,	Wade, and
Maclaren (Huntingdon),	Wright.—59.
McEwen,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Kendry,
Barker,	Kidd,
Bell (Addington),	Lancaster,
Bell (Pictou),	LaRivière,
Bennett,	Lavell,
Birkett,	Lefurgey,
Blain,	Lennox,
Borden (Halifax),	McGowan,
Boyd,	McLeod,
Broder,	Monk,
Bruce,	Morin,
Calvin,	Northrup,
Cargill,	Reid (Grenville),
Carscallen,	Richardson (Grey),
Clancy,	Robinson (Elgin),
Clare,	Rosamond,
Culbert,	Sherritt,
Earle,	Simmons,
Fowler,	Sproule,
Gourley,	Taylor,
Hackett,	Tolton,
Henderson,	Vrooman,
Hughes (Victoria),	Wallace,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Wilmot, and
Kaulbach,	Wilson.—50.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Messieurs	
Talbot,	McIntosh,
Horsey,	Pringle,
McColl,	Ward.
Hyman,	Gilmour,
Dobell,	Brock,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Logan,	MacLaren (Perth),
Lavergne,	Ingram,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Robinson (Northumberland, N.B.),
Bernier,	Haggart,
Mulock,	Osler,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Smith (Vancouver),	Maclean,
Marcil (Bonaventure),	Casgrain,
Davis,	Prior,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
McCreary,	Cochrane,
Carroll,	Roddick,
Cowan,	Corby,
Galliher,	Pope,
German,	Clarke,
Kendall,	Kemp,
Brown,	Ball,
Parmelee,	Hale,
Bickerdike,	Ganong.
Schell,	Ward,
Heyd,	Seagram,
Murray,	Roche (Marquette),
McCool,	Smith (Wentworth),

Amendment agreed to.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

GEN. HUTTON AND LIEUT.-COL. HUGHES.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria) moved for :

Return of the following data, correspondence, letters and reports, between General Hutton and Lt.-Col. Sam. Hughes ; or concerning the action of the latter in volunteering men for service of the British Empire in connection with the South African struggle.

1. Address, official, Major General Hutton to the district officers commanding and commanding officers of regiments, at his first inspection, 1898.

2. Letter, Major General Hutton, to Lt.-Col. S. Hughes asking for criticism of and suggestions re same.

3. Official reply of Lt.-Col. S. Hughes.

4. Letters, Lt.-Col. Hughes to General Hutton, by request, re—

(a) Canadians in wars of 1812, 1837, 1866, 1870 and 1885, and offering to raise a corps for Imperial service.

(b) Copies of former applications to Imperial and Canadian authorities for Colonial assistance in Imperial wars, and renewed offer of service.

(c) Plans for colonial brigade in Imperial wars; and renewal of offer to raise a corps.

5. Requests, General Hutton to Col. Hughes, to state his qualifications and record as soldier, and to show why a permanent corps officer should not be preferred.

6. Circular letter, Gen. Hutton to Hon. Col. Gibson and Council of the Dominion of Canada Rifle Association.

7. Reply of Hon. Col. Gibson to Gen. Hutton.

8. Reply of Council of D. R. A.

9. The plan originally proposed by Gen. Hutton of annual camps, making 3 and 4 military districts drill in September, while 1, 2, 5 and 6 should drill in June, annually.

10. Report or communication of Gen. Hutton to the Canadian press just prior to the opening of the session of parliament, 1899, that no member of parliament would be allowed to speak on military questions in the House of Commons, if he were also a militia officer, without permission of General Hutton.

11. Reports, or data on same subject to the Minister of Militia and Defence.

12. The proposals of Gen. Hutton to amend the law, or regulations and orders, so as to prevent militia officers retaining commission if or while a member of parliament.

13. Report by request, Col. Hughes to Gen. Hutton re staff ride.

14. The authority under the law which makes the application of Col. Hughes, 24th July, 1899, to Hon. Dr. Borden, Minister of Militia, an irregularity and breach of military discipline, vide Gen. Hutton to Minister of Militia, 31st July, 1899.

15. Application Col. Hughes to Gen. Hutton (through D.O.C.) to raise a corps for Imperial service in the Transvaal, July 24th, 1899.

16. Reports to Gen. Hutton of two militia officers of the city of Toronto and others, stating that few, if any, men or officers could be obtained in Canada for such a service.

17. (a) Application, Col. Hughes to Hon. Dr. Borden, Minister of Militia, July 24, to raise a corps for service in the Transvaal.

(b) Reply of the Minister of Militia thereto.

(c) Report and papers connected with the application before the Privy Council of Canada.

(d) Gen. Hutton's reprimand to Col. Hughes for applying to the Minister of Militia.

(e) Gen. Hutton's letter, July 31st, 1899, to Minister of Militia re same.

(f) The authority upon which Col. Foster, C.S.O., based the statement in his letter of Sept. 19th, 1899, to Col. Hughes, 'after which you withdrew it.'

18 (a) Application of Col. Hughes to Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain to raise a corps in Canada for service in Transvaal.

(b) An acknowledgment by Mr. Chamberlain.

(c) Letters, Military Secretary to His Excellency to Gen. Hutton re same.

(d) Gen. Hutton (C.S.O.) to Col. Hughes, August 24, 1899, reprimanding him for having written to Mr. Chamberlain re the raising of a corps.

(e) Col. Hughes to Gen. Hutton (C.S.O.) September 2, 1899, in reply.

(f) Col. Foster, C.S.O. to Gen. Hutton, to Col. Hughes, September 19th, asking him to withdraw the letter of September 2nd, 1899.

(g) Complete letter—not an extract—from Col. Hughes to Col. Foster, C.S.O. to Gen. Hutton, Sept. 22nd, 1899, in refusal to withdraw the letter of Sept. 2nd.

(h) Col. Foster, C.S.O to Gen. Hutton, to Col. Montizambert, D.O.E. Mil. Dis. 3 and 4, Oct. 9th, re Hughes' letter of September 2nd re having it withdrawn.

(i) Letter, Col. Montizambert forwarding same to Col. Hughes and urging withdrawal.

(j) Letter, Col. Hughes to Col. Montizambert refusing to withdraw the letter, and giving reasons therefor.

(k) Letter, Col. Montizambert to Col. Foster, C.S.O. to Gen. Hutton, re the same.

19. (a) Letter, Col. Hughes to the press of Cananada, re troops from Canada for service in the Transvaal, dated September, 1899, referred to in the letter—Col. Foster, C.S.O. to Gen. Hutton, to Col. Hughes, Sept. 25th, 1899.

(b) Telegram, Gen. Hutton (C.S.O.) to Col. Hughes, Sept. 25th, 1899, re above letter and section 98, Army Act.

(c) Letter, Gen. Hutton (C.S.O.) to Col. Hughes re same.

(d) The evidence upon which Gen. Hutton sent the telegram and the letter of Sept. 25th, 1899.

(e) The authority under the law empowering Gen. Hutton to send such letter and telegram.

(f) Despatch dictated by Gen. Hutton and published in London, (Eng.) Times stating that in his letter to the Canadian press, Col. Hughes was usurping the functions of the government of Canada, Sept. 25th, 1899.

(g) Despatch, Gen. Hutton to the Canadian press re the same, Sept. 25th, 1899.

(h) Despatch, Gen. Hutton to Canadian press, Sept. 28th, 1899, re Col. Hughes being liable to fine or imprisonment under section 98.

(i) Col. Hughes' telegram in reply to Gen. Hutton (C.S.O.), Sept. 25th, 1899.

(j) Letter, Col. Hughes (Sept. 30th) to Gen. Hutton's (C.S.O.) letter of Sept. 25th re sec. 98.—Official.

(k) Gen. Hutton's letter to Col. Foster, Oct. 11, 1899, re Col. Hughes' letter of Sept. 30, 1899.

(l) Letter, Col. Foster, C.S.O. to Gen. Hutton, to Col. Montizambert, Oct. 16th, 1899, threatening to suspend Col. Hughes from the command of his battalion for writing the letter of Sept. 30th, 1899.

(m) The authority under the law, permitting Gen. Hutton to make such threats.

(n) Letter, Col. Montizambert (Oct. 17th, 1899) to Col. Hughes re above.

20. (a) Letter, Col. Hughes to Gen. Hutton, Oct. 10th, re the press reports against Col. Hughes, dictated by Gen. Hutton.

(b) Gen. Hutton (C.S.O.) to Col. Hughes, and to Minister of Militia (Oct. 25th and 26th respectively) re above.

21. (a) Col Hughes to Gen. Hutton, Aug. 18th, 1899, by request re qualifications.

(b) Reply of Gen. Hutton, Aug. 26th, 1899.

(c) Letter, Col. Hughes to Gen. Hutton, Aug. 28th, 1899, in reply to above and to the words of Gen. Hutton 'You' Canadians 'might as well try to fly to the moon as to take the field alongside British regulars, short of three years' training, and not then unless led by Imperial officers.'

22. Letter, Col. Hughes withdrawing controversial matter on his receiving notification of his appointment to the Transvaal force.

23. Letter, Col. Hughes to Gen. Hutton, Oct. 23rd, 1899, in friendly parting.

24. Letter, Col. Hughes to the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, on Gen. Hutton's declining to accept proffered friendliness—demanding that General's recall, Oct. 27th or 28th, 1899.

25. Report of the speech delivered by Gen. Hutton to the officers of the Canadian contingent in the Chateau Frontenac, Sunday, 29th Oct., 1899, against Col. Hughes.

26. Letters of Gen. Hutton to South African British generals, against Col. Hughes.

27. Copies of the reports furnished to the press of Canada, Great Britain, the United States and South Africa, against Colonel Hughes by General Hutton's agency, during November and December, 1899, and January and February, 1900.

28. The legal authority for General Hutton to write officially to South African generals without the sanction of the Minister of Militia, against Colonel Hughes.

29. Letter of Colonel Hughes from Upington in Gordonia, South Africa, about 30th March, 1900, to Hon. Dr. Borden, Minister of Militia, Canada correcting errors, omissions and misstatements in General Hutton's brief as submitted to parliament last session.

30. The authority under the law permitting General Hutton and Colonel Foster to use personal, unofficial, confidential and private correspondence in official returns.

31. The authority under the law permitting the G. O. C., General Hutton, to receive official correspondence from His Excellency the Governor General, through the military secretary.

32. A copy of the 'notification to Lieut.-Col. Hughes that they, private letters, would be so submitted' by General Hutton, referred to in the letter of Lieut.-Col. Pinault, March 16th, 1900.

33. The authority under the law forbidding a Canadian who chances to be a militia officer, not of the permanent corps, from volunteering to Great Britain to serve in South Africa.

34. The authority under the law authorizing General Hutton, as G. O. C., to reprimand a Canadian militia officer, not on duty, from volunteering to the Minister of Militia of Canada, to raise a corps for the service of Great Britain.

35. The legal authority for General Hutton, through Colonel Foster, vide letter of Sept. 19th to Colonel Hughes, to use the language :—'but as officer commanding a battalion, it would, I am sure, be quite impossible for any general to overlook the character of your letter (Sept. 2nd), which, from a military point of view, could only be considered as inconsistent with discipline.'

36. The legal authority of Major General Hutton for stating (Oct 9, 1899), 'No officer has the right to dispute the authority of the Major-General commanding as his superior officer, or to question his action ; still less that of the Governor General, the representative of Her Majesty in Canada.'

37. Reports or recommendations of General Hutton producing changes in the command of the R.C.R.I. in 1899.

38. Report of Col. Herkimer showing that General Hutton declined to treat as official or public, a telegram and a letter written in his capacity as Major General to Col. Herkimer, the general claiming he had the right to regard them as not official, but private, and that they were not binding on him.

39. The 'authority' referred to in the letter of Col. Hughes to General Hutton (vide D.O.C.,) Sept. 2, 1900, in paragraphs (a) to (g).

40. The following letters and data :—

(a) Gen. Hutton to Minister of Militia, Oct. 26, 1899.

(b) Col. Hughes to General Hutton, Oct. 27, 1899.

(c) Gen. Hutton (C.S.O.) to Col. Hughes, Oct. 28, 1899.

(d) Gen. Hutton (C.S.O.) to Col. Otter re Lt.-Col. Hughes going to South Africa &c., Oct, 1899, and Oct. 29, 1899, and Oct. 30, 1899.

(e) Gen. Hutton to the Deputy Minister of Militia, Nov. 14, 1899.

(f) Telegram, January 31, 1900, C.S.O. to Col. Sam. Hughes, Cape Town, re Strathcona Horse.

(g) Gen. Hutton to Minister of Militia, Feb. 2, 1900.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

He said : Mr. Speaker, I make no apology, Sir, for introducing the motion which I have placed on the Order paper, here this evening. The fact that a return ordered by this House one year ago, when brought down, was incomplete, garbled and distorted, is sufficient excuse why a full record should be required to be placed on the Table. There are other reasons, Sir, why I feel that the events in connection with the conduct of the late general officer commanding, the incidents in connection with this matter, and other matters which may properly be ventilated before this House, have not tended to bring about that growth of good feeling which theretofore existed between Canada and the mother land; not that it has materially interfered with it, but that it has more or less, Sir, so to speak, thrown a wet blanket over that growth of good feeling that existed and is still existing between this and the old land. Inasmuch as the late general officer commanding is not in Canada, it is not my intention to enter at any length, other than the mere necessity the motion requires, into his conduct in relation to myself. In other words, I do not purpose to make an attack upon the late general officer commanding in any sense whatever. I merely desire to place the facts as tersely before the House and the country as it is possible for me to do. In this connection it may be well that I should take the opportunity of informing the House, why, in the first place, I volunteered corps for service in South Africa, why thousands and tens of thousands of Canadians throughout the length and breadth of our country were desirous of taking part in assisting the mother land in the struggle, or why they offered to assist her in previous struggles. I may say that for years, Canadians had observed that England was occupying that position of splendid isolation to which reference has been made on previous occasions. We saw that Great Britain, through the growth of her commerce, through the liberties her people enjoyed, and through the great advantages she possessed throughout the world had incurred the enmity of the nations of the earth. Therefore, no better time could arise for the children of the mother land to stand shoulder to shoulder with her than on an occasion of this kind. We also saw that while Canada was of more or less advantage to Great Britain, we

Canadians enjoyed very great advantages from being associated with the mother land. We saw ourselves benefited in fiscal matters, we saw ourselves protected by England's armies and navies, we had the prestige in the money markets of the world, and we saw that our consular service was performed for us by the mother land at no cost to Canada. Therefore, viewing it from the aspect of material advantage, Canada being a nation of six million inhabitants, as populous and powerful as was Great Britain at the time of the Spanish Armada, we saw no reason why Canada should not step to the front and bear her fair share in the upbuilding of the empire. And, I may say incidentally, that I believe there is not an hon. gentleman before me to-night, but will cordially agree with me, that, great as the expense and great in some respects as the loss has been to Canada in connection with the war, it has been many times returned by the advertisement which we have had as an immigration scheme alone. Canada is known to-day by the world as she was never known before, and I venture to say that the money that has been expended in this war has been more than returned by the immigration attracted to our shores. More than that, Sir, for years Canadians have observed an attempt being made to disrupt the empire. We saw a movement in this land aiming towards commercial union and closer trade with the United States, but, whatever the promoters of that scheme may have had in view, it could have had but one termination, and that was the annexation of this country to the United States of America. We saw an attempt made, Sir, out in the Australasian colonies to produce the independence of those colonies and the formation of republics, and we have seen for many a long year the attempts of the Boer population in South Africa to establish a Boer republic stretching from the Zambesi to the sea. On this ground also many thousands of Canadians who were favourable to the maintenance of the British Empire, saw that the time had arrived for the colonies to stand shoulder to shoulder with the mother land in seeking to upbuild the empire, and in teaching the foreign nations of the earth that when they touch the mother land they have to account to the colonies as well. We saw an attempt made to bring about the establishment of a Boer republic in South Africa. I may be excused, Sir, for quoting on this subject from Mr. Wessels, himself a prominent Boer in South Africa, who, like many more in that land, I am pleased to say, has been a loyal Boer. Mr. Wessels, in the course of a very interesting review which he has written on this subject, points out that for many years the Boer population in South Africa has aimed at the formation of a Boer republic stretching from the Zambesi to the sea, and driving the English flag, as they term it, into the ocean. Speaking of the aspirations of the Boers and of their party, he says :

> It wants the complete independence of South Africa. The British flag shall no longer protect its shores, or at the most it may obtain the voluntary concession of a right to protect. But do these people realize what the position of the Cape would be if it were not a portion of the British Empire ? Do they know that it would be exposed to the first naval power that came along, and that it is not impossible to conceive that the shrieking members of the bond might become the subjects of some Asiatic sea power like Japan. It was therefore not only an honour ; it was an advantage to be a member of the British Empire. Can you understand how any one could wish to exchange his right of British citizenship for the privilege of being ruled over by President Kruger and his family ? Advisedly I add his family, for any one intimate with political life in the Transvaal, would know that the family of Paul Kruger had a greater influence there than the grandsons of the Queen have in the territories of the British Empire. To many there is a fascination in the word 'republic.' They think you have but to baptise any form of government with the name 'republic,' and then freedom immediately sets her throne there. Unwise men. If they will make themselves acquainted with the history of Venice and the Italian republics, they will soon find that the word 'republic' does not always spell freedom. If by republic we mean political equality, freedom of thought and freedom of language and religion, then the British Empire is verily the greatest republic in the world, and its sovereign its permanent president. But, ladies, if by republic we mean a narrow and selfish oligarchy, then heaven defend us from republics.

This is the view of Mr. Wessels, one of the prominent Africanders in South Africa. This aspiration of the Boers for an independent republic is not of modern growth. The Boers took possession of South Africa many long years ago, about 1651, when the Dutch East India Company made a settlement there. From the very earliest time that people showed a determination not to follow in the footsteps of William the Silent, or his successor, William Prince of Orange, the leader in the great Stadt holdership in Holland, but they were actuated by the opposite spirit which characterized the descendants of the Puritans in the early days of Massachusetts, of the men who had left the old land for liberty of conscience, and who were no sooner settled in their new homes than they embarked themselves upon the same spirit of persecution which they had condemned in the old land. So, these men whose ancestors had fought for liberty for many a long year had no sooner become centered in South Africa than they showed that same tyrannical spirit which characterized the conduct of the Puritans in the United States of America. Towards the close of the seventeeth century, when the French Huguenots, the men who were driven from their country by persecution, sought homes in that far-off clime, they were forced immediately to give up the use of the French language and to take that of the Boers. Therefore, these people have shown a tyrannical spirit from the outset. Prior to this the Britishers who settled in the colony had been forced to leave. In

1795-6, when Britain was at war with France, she lost upwards of 1,500 vessels by French cruisers operating from the Mauritius, and the Boers have in recent years pointed this out as a very material fact ; boasting that one of the surest ways to cripple the British Empire was to deprive her of her naval stations in South Africa. The attack by the Boers on British rule was long premeditated. Britain conquered that country and handed it back in 1802. In 1806 she reconquered it. She acquired it by treaty in 1815, having paid £6,000,000 sterling for it and for Dutch Guiana to the Dutch government. The next step in the history of the Boer government in South Africa is this. In 1815, when by the Treaty of Vienna, Britain was confirmed in her right to South Africa, the Dutch or Boer settlers rebelled, their excuse being that they did so because of the liberal treatment Great Britain had accorded to the native population. They fought the British, and five of their leaders were arrested, and after trial by a Dutch judge and Dutch jury, they were sentenced to death and hanged. To-day we find men in South Africa pointing back to this as a reason why the Boers should now drive the English out of that country. Why, we in this country might as well ask, that on account of the persecution of the Huguenots, and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes ; we might as well call on our kinsmen to drive our fellow-countrymen of French Canadian descent out of Canada to-day, were such arguments to hold in the discussion of a question of this kind. From the outset the aim of the Boers was to establish a Boer republic all over South Africa. They quarrelled with the Dutch East India Company, and when in 1820 the British sought to plant 5,000 good Scotch people in that territory, the Boers raised such a row, that from that day until this Britain (pursuing that policy, which I regret to say, has been characteristic of her in recent years, of bowing before these unjust demands)—from that day to this, Britain has made no effort whatever to bring about the settlement of that country.

But there was a greater cause which those Canadians who were desirous of upholding the empire saw at the root of all this, and that was the violation of the principle which was established by the American war of Independence, namely, that taxation carried with it the right of representation. Since that day this principle has been recognized as an essential of proper government throughout the length and breadth of the civilized world. In South Africa our fellow-British subjects were taxed without being represented. They paid, at the very lowest estimate, 80 per cent of the taxes that went into the Transvaal treasury, but neither directly nor indirectly had they a voice or vote in the management of the affairs of that community ; but, Sir, some of those little Englanders, some of those who are always ready to take the side of the enemies of their country, now rise up and say : But why did not these men become citizens of the Transvaal and obtain the franchise ? Well, they could not become citizens of the Transvaal. They had to give notice of their intention of becoming citizens, and that took two years, and they had to record themselves within three weeks of their first entrance into the country, so that if they failed in this they were at the mercy of the field cornets as to whether they could again register their intention to be naturalized. They had to swear allegiance to the Transvaal, and they had to foreswear their allegiance to their native land. Then, after dangling between the devil and the deep sea, for twelve long years——

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). I said nothing about the hon. gentleman. These Britishers living in the Transvaal might succeed in becoming citizens of the country after fourteen long years. Mark you, Mr. Speaker, before they were granted citizenship, they had to prove they never attended a public meeting where anything had been said against the Transvaal government ; that they had never written anything against the Transvaal government, and they had to have a two-thirds vote of the burghers of the locality where they resided before they could be enrolled as citizens. Therefore, when these little Englanders in Canada, or the old land, side with the enemies of Britain as they sometimes do, and tell us that these men should have become citizens of the Transvaal, they either know not whereof they speak or else they are deliberately suppressing the facts and talking against the dictates of their conscience. As an additional reason why Canadians were determined to stand firm and loyal by the mother land, I may point out that the Boers had deliberately violated the convention of 1881. Those Canadians who went to the aid of the empire saw that the Boer policy was not a policy of liberty, but a policy to perpetuate the Kruger oligarchy. A Boer said to me in South Africa : The last thing in the world that Kruger and his friends want is an independent republic, either in the Transvaal or the Orange Free State, because a republic would mean that every citizen would have a right to vote, and then the electorate would not be numbered by 15,000, but by 150,000, and the majority of them would be Britishers, who would become Transvaal citizens, and would swamp the Kruger government. That observation of the Boer explains the situation.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, however, that the keynote of the whole cause of Boer antipathy to British rule is to be found in the negro question. We have heard in the press and on the platform, and perhaps in this

House, how the Boers were forced by British tyranny to trek from their happy homes on the sea coast, and across the mountains and the Karoo, to settle in the inhospitable regions of the Transvaal and the Free State. We have heard that time and again, but what are the facts ? In 1833 the Wilberforce Act was passed, abolishing slavery in the British dominions. In 1834 the Boers were paid $170 for every man, woman and child slave they held, and which cost them nothing, because all they had to do was to round up a native tribe and get all the slaves they thought they needed. It may be that all this money did not reach the Boers ; it may be that financial agents pocketed a good deal of it, but the fact stands forth that $170 for each slave was voted to them. Following this, in 1835-6 and 1837, began the great trek of the Boers into the Transvaal and the late Orange Free State. Why did they go there ? They were actuated by four motives. The first was that they might hold slaves ; the second, that they might be freed from taxation unless that taxation was levied by themselves on negroes or on foreigners. The third reason was that they might acquire possession of those rich and fertile valleys which, from the reports of missionaries, were for many years known to exist there ; because missionaries had traversed the Orange Free State and the Transvaal long before the Boers settled in those countries. Another reason was that they might establish a little republic of their own, with a seaport where the present Durban is situated. These were the reasons which actuated them in treking away to that remote region.

I shall not discuss any further the causes of the war or the reasons which actuated Canadians in desiring to assist the empire in these troubles. But I might point out that evidence is forthcoming which cannot be contradicted, of the fact that the Boers for a number of years had a deliberate intention of forcing a war on Great Britain and driving her from South Africa in order to establish a Boer republic in that country. A letter is extant from the late Secretary of the Orange Free State, in which he wrote :—

> The only thing we are afraid of is that Chamberlain, with his admitted fitfulness of temper, will cheat us out of a war and consequently out of an opportunity to annex Natal and Cape Colony, and to form a republican United States of South Africa.

Matters went passably well with these people ; their scheme was being carried out ; the Bond had control in South Africa, and everything seemed favourable to their scheme, when, by one of those happy strokes of good fortune, Mr. Chamberlain became colonial minister of Great Britain, and he had the wisdom or good fortune to select as the representative of Great Britain in South Africa Sir Alfred Milner. From that moment the rights of Britishers in South Africa were placed on a better footing. Sir Alfred Milner took hold of the question in a kindly and temperate spirit, and endeavoured to bring about by fair means a settlement of the issues between the two nations. But, unfortunately, the Boers were determined on war in the hope of driving the British out of South Africa, and the war began. I might quote from an article written anterior to the war by a leading citizen of the Swiss republic to show what his theory of the problem was. He said :

> Once more, let it be said, we refuse to draw a parallel between this oligarchy, gorged with the Uitlanders' gold, and our fathers, our ancient magistrates, or the heroic shepherds of Montenegro. But the Transvaal is in existence, and there are good elements in it, and it may reform. In our opinion, no reform will come without freedom. May the Transvaal not present to the world the spectacle of a small country in which liberty can only be established on the ruins of independence. May it accept the proposals offered. May it fashion out of the Uitlanders citizens interested, even as the Boers, in the welfare of the country, and in its prosperity ; and with the undreamt-of material resources at its disposal, it will be in its power to become one of the most flourishing states of the old and new world.

That was written on October 25, 1899, by Edouard Naville, a very prominent Swiss authority.

Now, Sir, Canadians saw another aspect of the case also. We desired to assist the old land, not only for the reasons I have mentioned, but because of certain weaknesses that characterized her. We saw that Great Britain was unprepared for a great war of this kind. As usual, she had been going along in that happy-go-lucky style which has characterized her for the last generation or so. We saw that she was still controlled in trade matters by Cobdenism ; that fad, if I may so term it, was still dominant throughout the length and breadth of the British islands. We saw that at the time of the transition from sail to steam, factories and foundries had sprung up all over the country ; we saw that the transition from oak to iron in British ships had added immensely to the trade and commerce of Great Britain ; and we saw England ascribing her success, not to these two improvements, but to the fact that Mr. Cobden had once preached in favour of free trade. In military matters—I say it with all due respect—we felt that Great Britain was not prepared for a war of that character ; for, powerful as she might be, she was distant from the scene of action 7,000 miles by sea, in addition to 1,500 miles over a narrow gauge railway over which her forces had to travel to meet the enemy in the mountain passes. It is a rule of warfare that one man behind a breastwork four feet high, and provided with a long range rifle, is equal to eight men similarly armed who are advancing against him. We knew the nature of the country, and we knew that the Boers had from 80,000

to 90,000 fighting men whom they could put in the front of battle. According to the rule of Germany, France and other European military powers, how many men would England have to put in the field to meet those men on an equal footing ? She would have to put in from 500,000 to 600,000 men ; and where could she get that number of regulars to take the field ? Canadians were irregulars—men whose individuality and power of initiative was developed, as is always the case with men in a new country ; and we felt, a great many of us, that Canadians could very properly assist the mother land as irregulars, to do what colonial troops have been largely called upon to do in this war, act in the capacity of scouts.

I regret to find on the part of some British military authorities since the war a disposition to criticise adversely the British soldier. I shall refer to one case of this kind ; though I trust this is a false report of a statement attributed to an officer of the name of Sir John Hay MacDonald, who is said to be a celebrated tactician. There was a saying going in Africa that in order to be a first-class failure it was necessary that a man should have written a book on tactics before he went to South Africa, and after he came out he would have the reputation of not being able to apply his own tactics in the field. However, I do not know whether or not this officer was in South Africa, and if it is true that he made this statement, he slanders the British soldier. This is what he says :

> There is a pitiable lack of soldierly initiative in the rank and file of the British army. Instead of feeling himself a live unit, Tommy Atkins is a mere plank glued into a palisade. He is an unintelligent 'look-straight-to-the front' automaton, in whom any natural mode of motion is a crime. He spends in acquiring a chesty front and a fancy swing the time he ought to employ getting acquainted with his rifle. He is taught that his gun is a mere burden, to be lugged about, shouldered, ordered and presented.

Then he adds :

> Our commanding officers also have something to learn. They still shout orders which can be heard a mile off. They do not realize that the new conditions of war demand leading in absolute silence, and signalling not calculated to attract the enemy's attention.

Then, following on this officer, who was slandering the soldiers who had fought so well, I find another, the late general officer commanding in Canada, General Hutton, who has lately returned from Africa—I find him stating :

> Better men would be available for the British army if the pay were bigger, and he cited the higher standing of recruits existing in the United States army, which was due to the increased pay.

I am not responsible for this statement, but it has been said that the British officer is all that his training fits him for. A very eminent English authority has stated that the ordinary British officer is not supposed to devote much attention to war or the subject of war, that his chief function is to parade Piccadilly, practice dancing, and sacrifice the profession of a soldier for that of the society favourite. I am not aware whether that is true or not. The statement is not mine, but has been made by an eminent gentleman in the old land. But what I do say is this, that having seen the British soldier and the British officer in South Africa, and having read a great deal of the history of the British army, I believe that the manhood of the British soldier or officer never came to the front to the same extent as during the present war. They suffered from disadvantages there, which very few people realize, but I also stand here to give my opinion that whatever faults may be found with the British army, are due not to the men or the officers, but to the system under which they are trained. The fact is, as I said in this House ten or eleven sessions ago, and have frequently repeated since, this glueing to the plank idea of discipline is not the way to make soldiers. I have seen officers pass me on the street in Ottawa and other cities, and decline to speak to me in days gone by, because I dared to point out that the permanent corps were run too much on the martinet principle, and there was not enough of the discipline from within, for unless you can govern men from within, government from without is merely the discipline of the prison or the slave.

Having foreseen all this, a number of Canadians determined to do their best in assisting, as far as possible, to stir up the spirit of colonials in favour of assisting Britons in this war. With this object in view, it was my privilege to be commissioned informally to visit Australia and New Zealand. I may state that I was not commissioned by any government, but went on the invitation of friends in 1897, and part of 1898, in order to encourage as far as possible the spirit that I knew to be existent in those lands in favour of the colonies assisting the Imperial troops in time of war. I need not say that Australia and New Zealand have both magnificently come to the front in this war, and it was my privilege to meet a great many officers and soldiers in Africa that I met in Australia and New Zealand.

Having briefly led up to the beginning of this matter, I may say that from the time of the appointment of the late general officer commanding in Canada, I took the question up with him. I wish here to state that among the general officers commanding, who have been in Canada the last ten or fifteen years, only one—and that was General Herbert—directly or indirectly gave any encouragement to the idea that Canadians could be of any service in England in the fighting line. Every one of them

pooh-poohed the notion that we could possibly be of any use even in guarding base points. I may say that among those may be classed the late general officer commanding, General Hutton. From the outset to the latter part of July, he persistently repudiated the opinion that Canadians directly or indirectly could be of any service in South Africa, and went so far as to get the opinion from Canadian officers that Canadians would not volunteer, and that if they did, they would not be of much use. However, I shall not follow his example and attack him in his absence. I merely wish to place a concise statement of the case before this House, in order that the legal aspect of the case—and that is the point that I wish specially to bring up—may be clearly presented and discussed if necessary, so that in the future we may not commit any of the mistakes that have been committed in the past.

I find, in glancing through the return brought down to this House, that a number of private and confidential letters have been included. I took the liberty of asking the hon. the Minister of Militia on my return, how this occurred. He pointed to the report of General Hutton in the return, which stated that he had notified me that these were going to be produced, and that I had acquiesced in their production. I never knew directly or indirectly, until a short time before I stepped on board the steamer, that he had prepared his brief. I never glanced at the brief until I was sailing down the St. Lawrence, and in hurriedly glancing over it, I saw that one very important letter was omitted. I did not notice until later that a dozen or two important documents were omitted, and I wired back to the Militia Department from Father Point to that effect. I would not withdraw one line of any private letter I wrote or apologize for any line I ever wrote privately, provided the late general officer commanding had placed before the public the communications from him which drew forth these letters. We had fought this thing out for many a long day, whether the militia of Canada could or could not take part in Imperial wars, and it finally culminated in his stating to me that we might as well try to fly to the moon as to take the field alongside British regulars, short of three years training, and not even then, unless led by Imperial officers. On that occasion I took the liberty of resenting the imputation cast upon me. I failed to see why we Canadians should not be as good soldiers as our kinsmen across the waters. We were trained and accustomed to have our individuality developed as was the case of people in all new countries ; and having this taunt thrown at me for the hundredth time, I repudiated it, possibly in language more forcible than polite. And when I found this sent out all over Africa in printed and typewritten documents, distributed among the officers, to handicap and injure me, I feel I am justified in placing this matter in its proper light before the House.

I wrote to General Hutton :

> It must not be forgotten that we in Canada know of Britain's fossil ways in many things. We are not in love with her because of that, or because of the barnacles and other creatures fastened upon her noble body. We love her in spite of very many characteristics that belong to the dark ages, and because of her noble institutions; her love of individual liberty as presented in her people, the detestation of tyranny in great or small, and her love of laws and obedience thereto so long as they are the laws of the people, and are not arbitrarily administered.

I may say that the letter was written, possibly, in a little hurry, but I would not change much of its language even to-day.

> We love her also for her glorious record in war and in literature; for the noble men and women who have helped to upbuild her in ennobling humanity. But we have no love for those who imagine that Britain's greatness depends on officialdom, nor for those Britishers—'remittance men,' chance offspring and others sent out to the colonies, and too often placed in positions of trust which they are incapable of filling. It is our desire to form part of the great empire; and so far as I am concerned, I am ready now to have Canada assume her direct responsibility and consequent control in the Imperial machine. But such movements must be approached gradually; public opinion must be quietly or at least effectively educated.
>
> Let me point out that wherever British regulars have fought with Canadian volunteers, side by side, victory has ever been theirs. Wherever disaster occurred in the war of 1812 there were no Canadians. Imagine the Boers catching Canadians as the British were bagged at Brankhurst Spruit, Laing's Nek, Ingogo or Majuba Hill. A few Canadians would have seen the traps laid, and would have endeavoured to catch the enemy instead of being caught.

I admit that it may not have been very palatable to the general officer commanding to have a statement like that made to him. But he had drawn it upon himself by his repeated utterances. I had been assured that we could not march, and could not stand should we get into battle. I had been assured that from a physical or from a drill and discipline viewpoint, we were unfit. I tried to point out to the general officer commanding that the discipline that had been known in the English army, the French army, or the German army was not discipline fit for anything but slavery and the jail. I say that advisedly. Sir, it is the turning point with any army. Point out to me the great British military successes of the past, and I will point out the individuality of her sergeants and her private soldiers, the capacity in them to take advantage of situations as they arose. Individuality—it is the lack of this that will cause any army to be smashed by second-rate powers on any and every occasion. I pointed out, on the same occasion, possibly in language a little warm, but still constitutional and true—and language, used, be it remembered, after

I had been taunted with my desire to serve Her Majesty in the field—

But my anxiety for active service is inspired by the knowledge or the belief that the trend of government to-day, as of societies, is towards centralization and control by the few great powers. Realizing that for years influences operated by foreign powers and aiming at the disintegration of the British Empire were potent, not alone in the colonies, but even in the British Islands themselves, I have striven in my humble capacity to preserve and perpetuate the spirit of patriotism to the mother land, not imperialism in the red tape, narrow sense ; but in that of broad, tolerant, responsible government, that which develops the principles of intelligent personal liberty, to its greatest extent. It is that principle, and not red tape officialdom which has won Britain's battles by land and sea; made her famous in language, literature and learning; given impetus to her mechanical and scientific inventions and discoveries; caused her judges and jurists to be respected ; and developed the highest purity in social life.

Then comes a little point from which considerable capital has been attempted to be made against me :

I say nothing of religion, for religion and so-called 'religion,' which loses in form the spirit, are essentially different—the latter has ever been the foe, implacable and steadfast, to personal liberty and progress.

I do not retract anything from that statement either.

Therefore, my anxiety is not for active service for employment's sake; but the upbuilding of the empire with its many attendant blessings is the motive principle. From a boy, I longed for some one to lead in the movement. All feared to touch it. Finally, when but nineteen years old, I first advocated the question of an Imperial union, military, commercial and political. My views have never changed, other than to broaden. The lesson that time, but more especially instruction, inspiration, education and the overcoming of prejudices in the minds and hearts of a people are essentials to the accomplishment of every great design, has been learned.

Here is a point that, with others, was sent broadcast among British officers in South Africa.

Why should I from personal motives, have 'anxiety' to go to South Africa and probably be placed under some Imperial incompetent, such as have brought dishonour and disgrace on Britain's arms in the past; and by falling in the cause only assist 'to fertilize the soil' of that inhospitable country, merely 'for employment on active service?' I can secure decent burial in Canada, or live respected and honoured by my friends. But I am willing, for the honour and upbuilding of the British Empire and for British humanity, to go and take my chances. With my practical ideas, I feel that I would not be an injury to the cause. At least no ambuscades would be walked into; no atttempts to capture Boer positions as they desired would be made, no fool policy of putting 600 men in a place where 6,000 were necessary, would be adopted, on data or advice furnished by me.

The next paragraph was pointed out in his report to the Minister of Militia or perhaps,

I should not say his report, but his letters, to South Africa—as something henious :

My dear General, that is a lovely sentence, 'Those great qualities of self-effacement,' &c. ; but permit me to inform you that I have for upwards of thirty years been a careful student of history, and have had favoured opportunities of getting 'behind the scenes' re the 'Horse Guards' and 'War Office' methods of influence and appointments. Therefore, your beautiful sentence re self-effacement in great officers is entirely lost on me. I am desirous of learning where any British officer of note has, outside of vacancies caused in actual warfare, been promoted to high command on his merits alone ; Lord Roberts alone excepted. What the 'Horse Guards' and 'War Office' do not know about intrigue and influence, and the absence of self-effacement in one's friends if not directly in one's self, cannot be learned from the most noted body for such in the world.

—and so on. Another point in the letter that was considered a criminal offence almost—was so treated at all events, because I was persecuted as, I believe it has been the luck of no other Canadian officer to be :

I do not profess to be skilful in leading expeditions to the moon——

That had reference to the statement that we might as well attempt to fly to the moon as to take the field alongside the regular British soldier short of three years' training and not then unless led by Imperial officers :

History shows that Britain has had many experts at such and not so many skilled or capable of leading men against fighting men. True, battles have been won by British generals' and minor officers' plans, such as Wellington and his colleagues; Roberts, Kitchner and others, but to the British soldier is due victory again and again, despite the stupidity and blundering of British officers. These, as you know, are not alone my own views. You say I would be incapable to serve alongside British regulars ; why? Could not I retreat or surrender quickly enough to the Boers? History shows that the Yankees, whom Canadians could always defeat, though with great odds against us, repeatedly dressed and combed down British troops, led by British officers ; while the old plugs of Boer farmers wallopped the British though the odds were often against them.

I do know that I was cut out for a prophet, but this seems almost prophetic :

In the coming Boer trouble a similar result will be found to arise if ordinary British tactics be employed. We claim to be as good men and as accurate riflemen as are the Boers who have repeatedly 'licked' your British officers. Therefore, I fail to see wherein I am unfit to serve alongside British troops. Of course, the Boers have no 'Horse Guards' pull.

I am free to admit, on reading it over, that that does seem a little what you might call incisive. But after being turned down as I had been, after having been told, not once but fifty times that we were unfit to take the field alongside these men, and being tauntingly told that we might as well try to fly to the moon as to think of such a

thing, I thought I was justified in hitting straight from the shoulder—and it came. Mark you, this was a private letter to General Hutton. Speaking of the use of private letters, I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman very recently, speaking in reference to a letter, not marked private, but an ordinary letter written in friendship, and speaking of the use of that letter, said that a man was unworthy to associate with respectable citizens who would dare make use of a letter so written. What then can be said of a man who would seek to take advantage of such a letter as this, written privately and in all confidence, and in answer to his taunts, and most of the contents of the letter being in reply to invitations from him to give my views on certain questions ? What, Sir, can be said of the use of such a letter ? I am very glad the Minister of Militia and Defence is able to clear himself of what to me looks so strange at first sight, that is, allowing the use of any of those letters in the return brought down. But I see it is clearly intimated in the return that these were all sent to me some time previously. Sir, I never received them, never heard of them until they were handed to me by the quartermaster general shortly prior to my stepping on board the steamer at Quebec. More than that, there is a distinguished officer, Col. Herchmer, who held a telegram and a letter written from the general ordering him to join his corps. When Col. Herchmer presented himself, he was emphatically informed by this same officer that these letters were not official, and he declined directly or indirectly to recognize them.

Now, I will come down briefly to the questions at issue. For many long years, as members of this House know, I have advocated colonial assistance in Imperial wars. I have always got along as well as I possibly could with the general officers commanding ; I never had a quarrel with any of them which could be called a quarrel, until this one. Why did I quarrel with General Hutton ? Was I foolish enough to run up against the general officer commanding without good and sufficient reason ? He was a personal aide de camp to Her Majesty, he was reputed to be immensely wealthy, he stated that he controlled the columns of the London Times. He boasted that he had upset one government in Australia, and that he would upset another in Canada if things did not go his way. It was to my interest to stand in with the general officer commanding. But it was evident from the outset that he was determined no one should hold an opinion different from his own. The militia throughout the country bowed to him in every way. But from the outset he gave us to understand that there was to be no questioning, that he was to be superior and supreme over every one.

My first meeting with him took place in the beginning of 1899. In the fall of 1898 he issued an address, that address is in the department to-day. If it is not in the department I will be pleased to furnish the Minister of Militia and Defence with a copy. In that address he deliberately slanders the officers and men of the rural battalions throughout this country whom he had never seen. More than that, he goes on and lays down what he terms a system of instruction. Then he issues these circulars, and requested criticisms thereon. I gave a criticism, a fair and temperate one, and it is on file in the department to-day, and I stand by that criticism on the question of instruction. His plan was that drill sergeants from the various permanent corps should go and take charge over the officers in the various camps of instruction throughout the country and give instructions in drilling. The ground I took was that the proper place for a drill sergeant to get in his work was in the training of officers in the military schools and I addressed the Minister of Militia and Defence—he has heard of it often, and I hope he will hear of it again —saying that the proper place for the drill sergeant to get in his work is in training the officers at the schools. We want none of them, I will not have them, and I give fair warning that I shall not have a drill sergeant put over my battalion to drill me. When it comes to that I shall resign, and so will every self-respecting colonel in the Dominion of Canada. When it comes to having a drill sergeant from the schools put over the commanding officer to drill him and his battalion in camp, it is humiliating to the man who wears a uniform, and if he has a spark of manhood he will either go and qualify himself or get out of the force. The proper place for the drill sergeant is in training these officers in schools of instruction, and so I told General Hutton, as I had frequently told him. But I was not forgiven for that, I had committed an offence in answering his own request for criticism, and in differing from him.

Then followed a long discussion. As I said he opposed a corps going. I am sorry the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is not in his place. The Minister of Public Works at that time, strange to say, seemed to be on the opposite side from the general. At that time the Minister of Public Works was a staunch advocate of sending a corps to South Africa in case of war. I interviewed him on several occasions before he went to Paris on what he thought might be his last illness—I am glad it was not. At all events he was very loyal ; and pledged himself that he would see to it that his fellow-countrymen, at all events, were represented man for man, according to population with other parts of the Dominion in case a contingent should go to South Africa. At that time the gen-

eral officer commanding opposed it. Later on they changed sides, the general officer commanding took action, and I think—I have no authority to make the statement, and I am open to correction—but I believe he himself volunteered a corps without consulting either the Minister of Militia and Defence or the Prime Minister, after having opposed it up to the eleventh hour. Then forthwith the quarrel began between the late General Officer Commanding and the Minister of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works, I believe, flopped over to the other side, and decided that a contingent could not go except parliament were first consulted. However, I leave that to the two gentlemen concerned to fight it out themselves. It was most interesting to watch the various changes.

Now, I want to draw attention to what was the most important constitutional error, as I think, on the part of the general officer commanding, and I bring this up, not for the purpose of hurting General Hutton at all, but in order that general officers commanding, and the militia men of this country, and members of parliament, may know where they stand. The House will remember that in 1899 I placed a motion on the paper in relation to sending a corps to the Transvaal, or, at all events, in favour of colonial assistance in Imperial wars. I was sent for by General Hutton the morning afterwards, and in telling this House what took place between General Hutton and myself, I mention only what transpired in his office with him in his official capacity. I shall not refer to anything that did not transpire in his office. He sent for me, and I thought when I got the message that he was going to give me some pointers, and I went over to his office as delighted as a child would be with a tin whistle. I thought at last I had got the ear of the general. When I got there, imagine my surprise to be told by the general officer commanding that I could not speak on these motions in the House of Commons without his permission, and that he would not give me his permission.

Mr. BOURASSA. Military rule.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). It was in vain that I cited the history of the British constitution to show that on one occasion a British officer, in the presence of the enemy, had left his force and had returned to take his seat in the British House of Commons, and had exposed the weakness of the ministry of the day. In vain I brought this to his attention, and showed him the British constitution, what the powers of a British regular officer were in this respect. He was unyielding, and positively forbade me to rise on my feet in this House and speak on military questions without his permission, and his permission he would not give. All I need say on that matter is that if hon. gentlemen will turn to the speech that I made on that occasion in the House, they will see that the first third of my speech was devoted to quoting from authorities here and in the old country, the very highest authorities, to show that I was perfectly within my rights in speaking on military questions in the House. I presume that I should have taken different steps at that time, a little more severe, but I was anxious to do things as smoothly as possible, and I think when the whole thing is reviewed, it will be found that I have acted courteously in the matter. I shall not take up the time of the House in referring to a lot of the letters that I have called for, although they were omitted from the last return, but will proceed now with matters that affect the constitution. As incidents in connection with the South African affair gradually got warm, I had repeatedly offered to the Imperial authorities and the general officer commanding here, to raise a corps for active service, and every time I was turned down by the General. Then I wrote officially, as will be found in the return, a letter on July 24, 1899, directly through the official military channel, to the officer commanding, offering my services in the Transvaal. That letter was forwarded to him through the office of the district officer commanding. Therefore, no charge can be brought against me of having ignored the proper military channel. I knew that I was not required by law to do it; except in regard to matters concerning my own battalion. I was not called upon to make an application to the general officer commanding through the district officer commanding, except as a matter of courtesy, but I was determined that not the slightest stone should be left unturned to smooth the way and that I should go to the utmost point to satisfy the general commanding. I therefore officially applied to him. The letter was sent to him and I got a mere acknowledgment of it. It was filed, and I believe, was never forwarded to the minister. I asked the question on several occasions and there is no return that that letter was laid before the minister. On the same day I applied directly to the hon. Minister of Militia, and here is a point. I signed this letter as commanding officer of the 45th Battalion. If I want to keep a Chinese laundry, I can put my sign up and sign my full military title in connection with it. I can use my military title, and not bring myself under the military law in the slightest. I trust my military friends in the country who may not know much about the military law, will note this: that a military officer may sign himself Col. Prior or Major Fowler, as often as he pleases, and not bring himself under the military law of the country. I wrote to the hon. Minister of Militia, the following letter:

House of Commons,
Ottawa, July 24, 1899.

To the Hon. F. W. Borden, M.D., &c.,
Minister of Militia and Defence.

Sir,—I have the honour to renew my offer made thrice previously in writing, and several times orally, to enroll and lead on active service abroad in the Imperial service a regiment or a brigade of Canadians.

As I had offers from scores of officers and more than 1,500 men on former occasions when my proposal became public, so to-day with the lowering clouds over the Transvaal many offers are renewed. I may merely quote one as an example, Lt.-Col. E. Harrison, of the 49th, as well as many more, is anxious to serve under me in such a contingency.

I am prepared to serve either as leader of a Canadian regiment under pay of Canada, or, which I deem better policy, under pay of the empire.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
SAM. HUGHES, Lt.-Col.,
Commanding 45th Victoria Batt.

This was referred by the hon. Minister of Militia, very properly, to the general officer commanding. It was also referred, and I thank the hon. minister for his very manly conduct throughout all these proceedings, to the Privy Council. I did not know till my return, that it had ever been before the Privy Council. Therefore, so far as the hon. minister could do it, he placed it before the Imperial authorities. What was the conduct of the general officer commanding? He sent a note to the Minister of Militia noting the offer.

July 31, 1899.

The Hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence.

1. I note the offer of Lieut.-Colonel S. Hughes to raise and command Canadian troops in active service.

2. The letter speaks well for that officer's military spirit, and his application will be considered in the event of a contingency arising which would necessitate Canadian troops being raised for active service.

Here is the point which shows that at that time he had animus :

3. I would add that there are many officers with greater experience and an equal zeal to that shown by this officer.

4. I note that Lieut.-Col. S. Hughes has corresponded direct with you in his military capacity as commanding the 45th Battalion, and has, moreover, offered his military services without my sanction or approval. His attention has been directed to this irregularity and breach of military procedure.

EDW. T. H. HUTTON, Major-General.
Commanding Canadian Militia.

But General Hutton's letter to me reprimanding me for writing to the Minister is not published. I want to see a copy of that letter. I have it, but I wired from Father Point to have it included, although it is not included. I see a statement which bears on the face of it a misstatement that the letter is included—'see the preceding.' It is not the same as the preceding. I replied to the letter, which is omitted, as follows :

Headquarters,
45th 'Victoria' Battalion,
August 2, 1899.

From Lt.-Col. Sam. Hughes, C. O. 45th Batt.,
to Lt.-Col C. E. Montizambert, R.C.A.,
D.O.C. Mil. Dis. 3 and 4, Kingston.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of a letter, No. 69122, July 31, 1899, from the chief staff officer, directing my attention to the fact that I had addressed to the Minister of Militia an offer of my services on active service, and informing me that I have thereby committed a breach of the Queen's Regulations.

Having believed myself possessed of a knowledge of the Queen's Regulations and the superior authority, the Regulations and Orders for the Canadian Militia, I was, and am still, innocent of any knowledge of having violated any regulation. I made my official military application in the regular way through you, sir, and I have yet to read the regulation which deprives me as citizen soldier of Canada from addressing the Minister of Militia on this or any other subject. Further, I have made a direct offer to the Imperial authorities as well, in order that delays might be avoided.

Will you be good enough to inform me the number of the paragraph which I have violated?

Permit me further to state that I am duly qualified to command my corps, and therefore deem the concluding paragraph of the letter of the chief staff officer quite uncalled for.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
SAM. HUGHES, Lt.-Col.,
C.O. 45th 'Victoria' Battalion.

In reference to this matter, as referring to the letter, I may state that on the receipt of the letter in the department, I was waited upon by the chief staff officer and was asked to withdraw the letter. I point-blank declined to do it, though subjected to a great deal of solicitation, but I believe the officer commanding withdrew his letter. I said that I would not withdraw mine, but he could withdraw it if he chose. Yet I find he has withdrawn his letter, which was condemnatory of me, and included mine, which I am not sorry to see printed. That ended the aspect of the case in which I applied to the Minister of Militia. There were three applications : I applied officially, out of pure courtesy, to the general officer commanding. I applied directly to the Minister of Militia, and you have the treatment of that letter. I applied also to the Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the Colonies, at the same time, and almost in the same terms as I applied to the others. The first intimation I had of a letter from Mr. Chamberlain was the following letter, which I received from the chief staff officer.

Headquarters, Aug. 24, 1899.

From the Chief Staff Officer to D.O.C. 3 and 4.

1. The Major General Commanding has received the commands of His Excellency the Governor General, through his military secretary, to inform Lieut.-Col. Hughes, commanding the 45th Battalion, that the right hon. the

Secretary of State for the Colonies has received a letter from him containing an offer to raise a Canadian regiment for Imperial service abroad.

His Excellency directs that Mr. Chamberlain's expression of high appreciation of the loyal and patriotic spirit shown by Lieut-.Col. Hughes and those who have volunteered to serve with him may be conveyed to that officer.

2. The Major General Commanding has received the commands of His Excellency to point out to Lieut.-Col. Hughes that such an offer of service should have been made through the General Officer Commanding, and the forwarding of such a communication direct by an officer on the active militia is quite irregular.

3. You will be good enough to call upon Lieut.-Col. Hughes, commanding the 45th Battalion, for his reasons in writing for committing an irregularity which reflects so seriously upon his knowledge of military affairs and the customs of Her Majesty's service.

By order,

H. FOSTER, Colonel,
Chief Staff Officer.

When I received that letter I was amazed. I knew we did not live in a Crown colony. I knew we had responsible government in Canada and when I saw that the general officer commanding was receiving commands from His Excellency, I felt satisfied there must be some mistake. I do not wish to follow up the matter further, but I find that the military secretary has taken upon himself to write two letters to the general officer commanding relating to the matter. Lest this might be taken as a precedent, I wish to enter my protest here and now against any officer of the Militia Department, unauthorized by an order in council or by his minister, receiving a command from His Excellency the Governor General. In England, in 1810, when General Dundas, who was in command of the British forces, undertook to go before the sovereign for consultation, he was distinctly informed that he dare not lift his hat officially to the sovereign without the consent of the First Lord of the Treasury. Time rolled on and we had responsible government in Canada and I knew there must be some blunder in connection with this letter in which General Hutton directed on command of His Excellency that I should apologize for having done my duty. I knew I was not subject to military law at the time ; I knew that if any command could come from His Excellency it could only come by and with the advice of his responsible ministers and through the Secretary of State or Minister of Militia. I knew also that General Hutton determined that he would crush me if he could ; I knew I committed no wrong in applying to the Minister and he found out very quickly that he had no justification under the constitution, and so he withdrew his letter and it has never appeared publicly since, although all the rest of the correspondence in connection with it has. He saw that the command of His Excellency, as set out in that letter, would not make us Canadians bow down and tremble.

It has been said that in the old land—when I speak of the old land, I want you to understand that those people who are sent out to Canada, and to whom I referred a little while ago ; remittance men and so on, do not represent England. I want the House to understand that men who pursue a line of conduct such as was pursued by the late general officer commanding are not types of the British general, because my experience of the British general is that he is a gentleman as well as a soldier. These men do not represent in any sense either British generalship or British generals. The statement often goes in the old land that we in Canada are strange creatures, that we are not English, nor are we aboriginies, and possibly this officer who had experience in banging Egyptians and negroes up the Nile thought all he had to do was to come to Canada and pursue the same course here. At all events, I know that he was very much annoyed that I criticised his address in January, 1899. I knew he was much offended because certain officers of us in the Dominion Rifle Association council would not accept certain suggestions he had intruded upon us. I know he had never forgiven me because I had declined to allow the troops in the third and fourth military districts to be shoved into drill in the fall of the year instead of in June. I need not enter into the details of that, but I will say that it was a scandalous transaction on the part of General Hutton. He afterwards told me that I should have helped him through with that scheme, although I felt personally that I would not be doing justice to the forces if I allowed them to be called out for drill in the fall when the men could not possibly attend camp. I knew that General Hutton was annoyed because I had refused to obey his order not to speak as a member of parliament. I knew also that he was very much annoyed because I refused to obey his reprimand when he ordered me to apologize for having written to the Minister of Militia. I knew that he was annoyed further when I told him that Canadians could take the field alongside any troops in the world in time of war and do no discredit to Canada. I knew all this. Therefore, when I got this letter I determined, come what might, to bring the thing to an issue and insist upon my rights as a citizen of the British Empire. I replied to General Hutton disputing his authority to receive a command from His Excellency the Governor General. I claimed I was acting well within my rights, and asking that the law should be quoted to me which I had violated. I pointed out that I was merely following the custom in vogue for years in Canada of applying direct to the British authorities to raise forces in time of war. The letter is in the correspondence and will speak for itself. I challenge the best constitutional authority in Canada to criticise

that letter and to point to one statement in it that is inconsistent with the law in any respect. As General Hutton repeats his reference to this, let me quote what I wrote to him as to why I refused to obey the command :

Headquarters 45th 'Victoria' Batt.,
Lindsay, September 2, 1899.

From Lt.-Col. Sam. Hughes, C.O. 45th 'Victoria' Batt., to Lt.-Col. Montizambert, R.C.A., D.O.C. Mil. Dis. 3 and 4, Kingston.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your order of August 26, 1899, subjoined to copy of a communication to you from the chief staff officer, No. 69122, August 24, regarding :—

1. The command of His Excellency to the General Officer Commanding to inform me of the receipt by the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies of a letter from me to raise a Canadian regiment for Imperial service abroad; and transmitting Mr. Chamberlain's appreciation at the loyal and patriotic spirit shown.

2. Conveying the command of His Excellency to point out to me that such offer should have been made through the General Officer Commanding; and that the forwarding of such communication direct by an officer of the active militia is quite irregular.

3. Directing you to call on me for my reasons in writing for committing an irregularity which reflects so seriously on my knowledge of military affairs and the customs of Her Majesty's service.

While I cannot find from the laws and customs of the Canadian constitution the authority for any one to question my action in volunteering as citizen of the British Empire to enrol a corps; yet inasmuch as a soldier's first duty is to obey, I make haste to furnish my reasons in writing, not 'for committing an irregularity,' for as I read the laws and understand the customs of the Canadian constitution, none has been committed by me; but for having applied direct as a citizen of Canada and the British Empire to the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies to enrol a corps for active service abroad.

The circumstances are :—

1. I made official application as an officer in the Canadian militia through the regular channel of the district officer commanding, to raise a corps for Imperial service abroad.

2. Concurrently therewith I made application direct, as citizen of Canada and the British Empire to the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the Colonies, for a similar purpose.

3. An application similar to the second was made to the Minister of Militia of Canada.

The reasons are :—

1. The official application was made merely in the hope that the present General Officer Commanding might lend some encouragement to the principle of colonial troops as such being utilized in the Imperial service; and so recommend to the Minister of Militia. It is needless to say here that I have for many years endorsed and encouraged as citizen, parliamentarian and militia officer, such a proposal, and have invariably, with the one exception of General Herbert, been discouraged and rebuffed by General Officers Commanding. Hitherto all such applications were pigeon-holed by General Officers Commanding and were never laid before the Minister of Militia.

2. The application to the Minister of Militia was made so that if the Canadian government should think favourably of such a plan, my wish might be known and it might be communicated with the prestige such endorsation would confer, to the home government, and the enrolment could proceed under direction of Canadian authorities. In short, I provided against the official application being pigeon-holed.

3. That to the right hon. the Secretary of State was made in order that should the plan be favourably considered in Great Britain steps might be taken by the home authorities—of course with the consent and approval, but outside of the Canadian government—to enrol such a corps here. In the event of failure of action in Canada, through the failure of the General Officer Commanding to bring the official military application before the Minister of Militia, or through the Canadian government not deeming it advisable to act in the premises, the Imperial authorities would be aware that whether or not the General Officer Commanding, or the Canadian Government had faith in such plans, yet the Imperial authorities would be made aware of the fact that there are tens of thousands of Canadians ready to assist in the upbuilding of the empire by enrolling for active service abroad.

4. I had on former occasions made similar applications, viz., official military ones for similar purposes through my District Officer Commanding, and learned a few years ago, to my surprise, that such had been pigeon-holed by the then General Officer Commanding, and had never been submitted to the Minister of Militia much less to His Excellency, or to the Imperial government. Of course, the Minister of Militia is the officer through whom the General Officer Commanding must act, therefore, in order that the home as well as the Canadian authorities might be in possession of the facts, and that no officer, be he never so capable, should of his own notion, pigeon-hole applications designed to reach at least the Canadian Minister of Militia, and through him, if deemed proper, the Imperial authorities, I followed the plan for which there are precedents for at least upwards of twenty years, of applying directly to the home government as a citizen of Canada and of the empire.

5. While a Canadian, I am also a British subject, and should Canada try to cut adrift from Britain, I as either soldier or citizen, would not be disloyal in recognizing the home authority rather than the General Officer Commanding in Canada, or the Minister of Militia, or the Secretary of State for Canada. Any citizen of Canada, civilian or militiaman, can properly volunteer to the Imperial authorities direct, to enrol a corps. I cannot find that I am debarred, as an officer of the militia from any privilege, Canadian citizenship confers upon her sons. Any citizen of Canada can enrol himself in the Imperial service independently of the General Officer Commanding or of the Canadian government. In case I, for example, undertook to enrol a corps of Canadians for Imperial service, or enrolled myself alone, I could do so, merely resigning my Canadian commission before accepting the Imperial, i.e., even supposing the Canadian authorities were adversely inclined to such action. Were they friendly they could and would arrange as is now done for Imperial officers in Canada's service, that both commissions be retained.

It is with regret that in defence of my loyal action I am called on to dispute the reference in section 3 of the letter of the chief staff officer,

implying that I have departed from the customs of Her Majesty's service. Permit me to say, I have rightly adhered to the custom prevailing since 1878 (though I have differed in applying as citizen), a custom which has on other occasions been recognized in words of loyalty, love and encouragement to the principle of Canadians seeking service in the Imperial army.

In 1878, an officer high in authority in Canada, a then deputy adjutant general, volunteered in his military capacity direct to the Imperial government to raise a Canadian corps. He was courteously thanked and encouraged by the home authorities. On subsequent occasions others made direct application, and I never learned of but one instance before where the procedure was questioned, and that only questioned before action. A Halifax officer made direct application, not as a citizen as I did, but officially as a militia officer of Canada, to enrol a corps for the Imperial service. My information is that the right hon. the present Secretary of State for the Colonies at first deemed the proper course of the application to have been through the Canadian government and His Excellency, it being an official military application. The decision, as I am informed, was that while a Canadian officer, yet the gentleman had the same rights as any English, Scotch or Irish subject in the empire, that any one in Great Britain could volunteer to the right hon. the Secretary of State for War, or to him for the colonies and not through the Home Secretary, so in case of the Halifax officer, it was not deemed necessary for him to apply through the Canadian government and His Excellency. Such is my information from very high sources, and it has the advantage of seeming sensible.

Further, I have on two former occasions made direct application (after finding previous official offers had been suppressed by the then General Officers Commanding), each time as on this occasion as citizen, viz., not signing myself officially, merely stating my qualifications and Canadian positions; and in each instance I was thanked most courteously by the Secretary of State for War. The procedure was not in even the slightest called in question or deemed irregular. Therefore, the custom is all in favour of my action.

Furthermore, I fail to find in the laws and customs of the Canadian constitution anything against my acting as I did, and I respectfully ask to have pointed out the authority which any one in connection with the government of Canada has for catechising me as officer of the militia of Canada for my legal, loyal and honourable conduct as citizen of the British Empire.

May I also inquire, for my information and guidance, to have the authority quoted which permits the General Officer Commanding, as officer directly under the Minister of Militia, to receive and transmit as General Officer Commanding, commands from His Excellency? As citizen and as militia officer, I have ever understood the law and custom of the constitution to require commands in the militia to emanate from the Minister of Militia, directed, it may be, by order in council. Further, where is the authority for communications from His Excellency to come through the General Officer Commanding instead of the Secretary of State?

Therefore, while I am determined to obey those in authority in militia affairs, be the command right or wrong, yet I am equally desirous of becoming familiar with the laws and customs bearing on those matters. May I respectfully

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

request that you will be so good as to quote me the authority—

(a) Which forbids me as citizen of the British Empire, though an officer of the Canadian militia, from offering to the British government to enrol a corps for the Imperial service, especially when I had concurrently made an official military application through my district officer commanding to the same effect.

(b) Which authorizes my being reprimanded as militia officer for my honourable act as citizen of the British Empire.

(c) Which permits the General Officer Commanding to receive and transmit any commands from His Excellency without its being an order in council, and then only by order of the Minister of Militia.

(d) Which enacts that I as militia officer am deprived of any privilege enjoyed by any other citizen of Canada, not a militiaman.

(e) Which sanctions the notion that honourable and loyal acts of one as citizen of Canada who chances to be a militia officer can possibly be subject to the militia authorities just as if the person were in the permanent service.

(f) Which allows an acknowledgment from the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies to me to be forwarded through the General Officer Commanding without the order of the Minister of Militia; and

(g) Which recommends such an acknowledgment to be embodied in the same letter as one calling upon me to give reasons for my conduct and in another paragraph making assertions not consistent with the facts.

Inasmuch as the letter was doubtless dictated without a correct knowledge of the facts of the case, or of the law and custom of the Canadian constitution, I shall be glad to return it if desired; otherwise I must respectfully ask permission, in the absence of authority being shown in support of the position therein taken, to use the letter to test the matter further.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
SAM. HUGHES, Lt.-Col.,
C.O. 45th 'Victoria' Batt.

Later on, the general points out that I had disobeyed the command of His Excellency, and which command, I say with all due deference, His Excellency had no more right to give than that child there. I have already referred to the action of the British government in relation to the commander-in-chief; an officer who holds a much higher position than does the general officer commanding in this country. In reply to that letter I wrote asserting my rights as a citizen. I find a letter from Col. Foster, written to me direct, in which he views the situation and states:

September 19, 1899.

Lieut.-Col. S. Hughes, M.P.,
Commanding 45th Battalion,
Lindsay, Ont.

Dear Colonel Hughes,—Your long official letter of 2nd September regarding your application to raise a Canadian regiment for Imperial service abroad, has reached headquarters and awaits the return of the Major General Commanding next week.

I am writing privately to you to ask if you will not take advantage of the delay before your letter must be laid before the General, to with-

draw it, which I would earnestly ask you to do before the General has to take official notice of it. You will remember that in the case of a former letter of a similar description you were good enough to allow me to have a long talk with you about it, after which you withdrew it as likely to cause friction and lead to no good result. I was much relieved by your decision in that case, and I cannot help hoping that on reconsideration you will perhaps allow me to persuade you to take the same action with regard to the present letter. Of course as a citizen you are at liberty to express your views in any way you like and on any subject, but as officer commanding a battalion, it would, I am sure, be quite impossible for any general to overlook the character of your letter, which from a military point of view could only be considered as inconsistent with discipline.

There is no one who has a better appreciation of your value and good points as a commanding officer and as a soldier than the General and myself; and in writing to you privately I am, believe me, entirely actuated by a wish to prevent trouble arising in connection with a matter as to which you have received the appreciation of Mr. Chamberlain, His Excellency and the General. It would seem an infinite pity if the loyalty and patriotism you have shown in your offer should only result in making your military position here untenable, and I sincerely hope that you will not hastily decide to reject my friendly suggestion. Before answering this letter, I would ask you to carefully and patiently consider it. It is indeed prompted only by very friendly feelings, and I trust you will receive it in the spirit in which it is written.

Believe me, dear Colonel Hughes,
Yours very sincerely,
HUBERT FOSTER.

I draw your attention to that letter, Mr. Speaker, merely to show that it was written to me direct. I replied to that letter refusing to withdraw my letter, and stated that I had decided, come what might, to see the matter through. I draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to the fact that only a part of my letter in reply was published. I want the whole of that letter brought down if the House will be good enough to pass an order.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. What page is that?

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). Page 10; a letter dated September 22. Now, Mr. Speaker, these were both private letters, and yet I find them brought down to this House, while other letters that were public were suppressed. One explanation of this is that these letters must have been worked in by mistake, as they were brought down after the general had gone. I would like to know how a letter to which the general's name is not signed could possibly be worked in after he had gone unless the brief had been prepared before his departure. Here is the most wonderful letter of the lot, and I will read it:

Headquarters, October 9, 1899.

From the Chief Staff Officer to D.O.C., 3 & 4. (Confidential.)

Sir,—I have the honour to state that the letter of Lt.-Colonel Hughes, commanding the 45th Battalion, dated the 2nd instant, addressed to yourself, in reply to my minute of the 24th ultimo, has been laid before the major general commanding, and I am directed to observe as follows:—

1. The letter in question is, in the opinion of the major general commanding, a highly improper and insubordinate communication for an officer in the position of Lt.-Colonel Hughes to put forward for submission to the major general commanding.

2. Lt.-Colonel Hughes was called upon to give his reasons for committing the irregularity in diverging from the usual routine of conducting correspondence, as laid down in regulations, in that he offered his services by letter direct to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with a view to raising a regiment for service in South Africa in place of through the general officer commanding the militia and the Governor General in Council.

You will notice that I had declined to withdraw that official letter which I had written in reply to the General's demand for apology for applying to the Colonial Secretary.

Lt.-Colonel Hughes's plea for his conduct would appear to be that he acted in his capacity as a citizen.

I may say that was never my plea. He had no military command of me—that was the position I took:

I am directed to observe that Lt.-Colonel Hughes, who is now in command of the 45th Battalion, Canadian militia, offered his military services in his military capacity, to raise a regiment. It cannot be, therefore, considered that his application was made as a citizen, but as an officer of the Canadian militia, serving under the command of the general officer commanding.

It is not within any officer's power to dissassociate himself from his duties and responsibilities as an officer holding Her Majesty's commission, and to plead as an excuse for disregard of regulations and orders that he is a citizen and, therefore, not amenable to discipline.

3. Lt.-Colonel Hughes has received orders which have been conveyed to him through the major general commanding, acting upon instructions of His Excellency the Governor General. No officer has the right to dispute the authority of the major general commanding as his superior officer, or to question his action, still less that of the Governor General, the representative of Her Majesty the Queen in Canada.

4. I am, in conclusion, to observe that the tone of the letter forwarded by Lt.-Colonel Hughes is of such a character that unless it is withdrawn, with a complete apology, it will be the duty of the major general commanding to submit the correspondence in question to the honourable the Minister of Militia for reference to His Excellency the Governor General.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
HUBERT FOSTER, Colonel,
Chief Staff Officer.

Now, Sir, inasmuch as this is a matter which concerns the whole framework of our constitution and our military system, I most emphatically dispute the whole tenor of that letter. When our permanent corps was established, hon. members who were then members of the House will remember that

the law had to be amended so as to bring that corps under the Militia Act; otherwise they would have been amenable to the Militia Act for only a small period—sixteen days at the most. If these statements were true, my good friend Col. Prior might have a second lieutenant who would be aggrieved at something in performing drill, and after the drill was over, he would still have to obey Col. Prior on the street; because if the general officer commanding could order a man around at all times, there is not an officer in the force who could not do the same thing. You can easily see how absurd the whole thing would become. Why, Sir, what is the law? The law is that if a commanding officer or any officer happens to offend one of his privates or one of his junior officers, the man offended, when not under military law, can slap the colonel's ears or punish him in some other way, and the only redress the colonel has is in the civil courts. We are citizen soldiers, and once we divest ourselves of our uniform, we are no more under military discipline than any other citizen of the country. In this connection I have taken the liberty of getting an opinion from the highest military authority in the community: I refer to Col. Henry Smith, the late district officer commanding of Toronto; and I may say that Dicey, the famous author of 'The Law of the Constitution,' clearly points out not only where officers may disobey in the regular army, but where privates may disobey their commanding officers when they give them orders which would be contrary to common sense. When I mention the name of Col. Smith, there is not a military man or a legal man who will for a moment hesitate to bow to his opinion. He says:

> When a man accepts a militia commission or enlists into a corps, he takes upon himself two kinds of obligation: the obligation to perform certain services, and the obligation to obey and be governed by a code of laws in addition to that which governs him as a citizen. In order to ascertain what his liability to serve is, he must look to the Militia Act and to nothing else, for no kind of service or duty which is not laid down in that Act can possibly be imposed on him. To ascertain what his duty of obedience is, and what are the penalties to which he has made himself liable, he must look primarily to the Militia Act, and secondarily to the laws and regulations referred to in that Act. These laws and regulations are: The Army Act, the rules of procedure, the King's regulations, and the militia regulations and orders.
>
> First, as to the services His Majesty may order the officers and men of the several corps of the active militia, or any portion thereof, to drill for a period of not exceeding sixteen days or less than eight days in each year.
>
> The officer commanding any military district or division, or the officer commanding any corps of active militia, may, upon any sudden emergency of invasion or insurrection, or imminent danger of either, call out the whole or any part of the militia within his command, until the pleasure of His Majesty is known.
>
> His Majesty may call out the militia, or any part thereof, for active service either within or without Canada, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of war, invasion, or insurrection, or danger of any of them.
>
> The active militia or any corps thereof, or any part of a corps, shall also be liable to be called out for active service, with their arms and ammunition, under special or general regulations made by the Governor in Council to act as guards of honour, escorts, or as guards and sentries or to fire salutes in the following cases:—
>
> (a) The opening or closing of any session of the parliament of Canada, or of the legislature of any province of Canada.
>
> (b) For the purpose of attending the Governor General of Canada, or any member of the Royal Family while in Canada.
>
> (c) For the purpose of guarding any armoury or other place where arms, guns, ammunition or other military stores are kept.
>
> The Governor in Council may make regulations for calling out for active service as guards or sentries at the residence of the Governor General, or of any member of the Royal Family while in Canada, any corps or part of a corps of the active militia.
>
> The active militia, or any corps thereof, shall be liable to be called out for active service, with their arms and ammunition, in aid of the civil power.
>
> Those are the only occasions on which the militia can or may be called up. To call it out on any other occasion or for any other purpose, would not only be unfair to the officers and men called out, but would be unlawful, and they would be justified in refusing to comply. It should be noted that an individual may not be called out for any duty except with his corps, or that part of his corps to which he belongs. For example, when his corps or that part of his corps to which he belongs, is not up on service, an officer may not be ordered on any duty (court-martial or court of inquiry, for instance.)
>
> When his corps is not up on one of the services mentioned, an officer or man of the active militia is not subject, even to the slightest extent, to the orders of his military superiors. Indeed, they are not then his superiors, for they have not the least authority over him.

If an officer should rob a bank and the fact is brought under the notice of the Minister of Militia, the Minister of Militia—not the general officer commanding—may very properly remove that officer.

I noticed in a Montreal paper the other day, that an officer had stated he was aggrieved because a judgment given by the general officer commanding regarding him had been made public. If it were proven that one of the officers, to whom that official communication was addressed, had violated the code of honour and published that communication, that man could be brought to task, not for having violated the militia law, but for having violated the code of honour. He could be brought to task by the Minister of Militia, but not by the general officer commanding, because the latter had no control over him. I am not speaking now of custom, but of the law. Unfortunately, however, the custom has been to allow people to be trampled on just as the general officer commanding might think fit. Col. Smith continues:

During that period his military status, and their military status as respects him at least, are in abeyance so to speak. Let us suppose, for example, that the commanding officer of the G.G.F.G meets one of his captains when the corps is not on service, and says to him: 'Jones, I want you to come down to the drill hall and show me your stores, I wish to inspect them.' Jones replies : 'I beg your pardon, sir, but I am busy at present and cannot well go.' The officer commanding then says : 'I order you to come at once and show me those stores.' Jones again replies : 'I respectfully refuse to go, sir ; it is not my duty to go.' In the event of the commanding officer reporting the circumstances to superior authority and asking for Jones' removal, it would be the duty of the superior to sustain Jones, and to tell the commanding officer that he had exceeded, or had tried to exceed his rights and his jurisdiction.

Second, as to the obligation to obey, or as to the liability to military law.

The act of accepting a commission or of enlisting into the active militia, does not of itself make a man liable to the military code, and if parliament had never made any provision in the matter, the citizen soldier would not at any time be subject to any other than the civil law of the land. That body has, however, declared :

'That the active militia shall be subject to the King's regulations and orders for the army.'

Before going on it may be as well to say that refusal or neglect to comply with the King's regulations is not punishable as an 'act of disobedience,' even when committed by a regular officer or soldier though it may be punished as an 'act or neglect to the prejudice of good order and military discipline.' The meaning of the words 'subject to' in this connection is a moot point. Like so many other terms in the Act, they require explanation. In the regulations are many things which cannot possibly apply to our militia, such, for example, as 'duties of the commander-in-chief,' 'enlistment, transfer and discharge of soldiers,' and 'army books and forms'; and yet our generals have made use of them without discrimination.

Our parliament has further declared that 'Every officer and man of the militia shall, from the time of being called out for active service, and also during the period of annual drill or training under the provisions of this Act, and also during any drill or parade of his corps at which he is present in the ranks or as a spectator, and also when going to or from the place of drill or parade of his corps, and also at any other time while in the uniform of his corps, be subject to the Army Act passed by the parliament of the United Kingdom, and all other laws then applicable to Her Majesty's troops in Canada, and not inconsistent with this Act ; except that no man shall be subject to any corporal punishment but death or imprisonment for any contravention of such laws ; and except also that Her Majesty may direct that any provisions of the said laws or regulations shall not apply to the militia force.'

Here too the words 'subject to' are doubtful and unsatisfactory. Parliament could never have intended the words to be used in their full and unrestricted sense, for if it did, the militia would be under the jurisdiction of certain officials mentioned in the Act, namely, the Secretary of State for War, the commander-in-chief of the forces, the adjutant-general of the forces, and the general officer commanding His Majesty's forces in British North America; and it would mean, too, that the last named officer has power to convene courts-martial for the trial of militiamen. All of which would be absurd. At all times not mentioned in that 82nd section, not only is the militiaman not subject to his otherwise military superiors, not only is he not commandable, but he cannot then commit an offence against military law. Thus, if an officer goes into the general's office, and, in an altercation, slaps the general's face, the latter has no military remedy; he must content himself with thrashing the offender, or with citing him before a civil court. Indeed, the general himself is not subject to military law, nor can he be unless the whole of the militia is called out for active service. 'Corps enlisted for continuous service' are, under the terms of the statute, 'held to be called out for active service.'

That was the amendment which was made to the law when our permanent corps were formed. They are held to be called out for active service.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. What about city corps ?

Mr. HUGHES. My hon. friend from Victoria asks what about city corps. The city corps are subject to military duty, and while going to or performing their drills every drill evening they are subject to military law, but at other periods they are not.

But that is not the case with the general and other staff officers. There is never any 'period of annual drill or training' for the general, he never can be present at any 'drill or parade of his corps,' and he never can be in 'the uniform of his corps,' for he has not a corps. Strange as it may appear, there is nothing for which the general officer commanding, the adjutant-general, or the quartermaster general may be court-martialed, except they are actually on active service. The adjutant-general may go in and kick the general out; it is not a military offence.

More than that ; the general has not the slightest official connection with officers unless their corps have been ordered to perform their annual drill or have been called out for service. In the meantime the officer, is, in a military sense, dormant, and may not be officially communicated with, until awakened—until 'switched on,' to use a telephone expression—by the general order affecting his corps. And in the same way, and for the same reason, the officer cannot act in a military capacity, he cannot, legally perform a military act, he cannot give a military command which any one is bound to obey.

Colonel Foster, in a letter, dated October 9, 1899, and addressed to the district officer commanding, Nos. 3 and 4, stated : 'I am directed to observe that Lt.-Colonel Hughes, who is now in command of the 45th Battalion Canadian militia, offered his military services in a military capacity to raise a regiment.' That showed ignorance on the part of Col. Foster, or on the part of the general who instructed him, as regards our military constitution. Lt.-Colonel Hughes was not in command, he had nothing to command—but even if he had been in command, he could not offer his services in 'his military capacity,' for his military capacity would be limited to commanding the 45th. As a matter of law, and as a matter of fact, he was then an ordinary citizen and nothing

more, no matter how much he might put 'commanding 45th' after his name.

That goes even further than I thought, on looking into the law. I knew that unless we were out in annual camp, we were not amenable to the law. To-morrow morning the Minister of Militia may retire any officer of the force he chooses. My second lieutenant could kick me around the streets of Lindsay, or any officer in Ottawa could do the same to his colonel, and he could not be punished for a military offence. The facts could be brought to the notice of the Minister of Militia, and the minister could say that such a junior officer was not a fit and proper person to be retained in the force, and could retire him ; but that young fellow, if he were dismissed under any so-called construction of military law, could appeal the case and beat the other every time. I think that ended the letter which I addressed to the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain. And, so far as that is concerned, I have not a word to retract. On the contrary, even if I had been subject to military law, that letter might be read and construed in the light of the closest criticism, and it would be found quite within my province. But when I was not subject to military law the letter of the general to me was an outrage. Time wore on. I need not enter into the details ; but the matter at length reached a crisis. I found out that there was a hesitancy on the part of the government in taking action to send a force. They had not been officially asked to do so. But General Hutton, who at first opposed a contingent going from here, suddenly veered round and offered a contingent without consulting his minister. Things were in a mixed condition ; and, in order to bring the matter to a focus, I wrote the following letter to the press of the country. I may say that this letter was omitted from the return brought down last year, although it is referred to, and ought, properly to have been before the department. I quote from the Montreal Star :—

To the Editor of the Star :

Sir,—Inasmuch as war with the Transvaal now seems certain, and as repeated offers and requests from Canadians of prominence in civil as well as in military circles, have been made that I should raise and offer a Canadian corps for service in the Transvaal, with the object of advancing the cause of mankind by assisting to upbuild the British Empire and render justice to one's fellow-countrymen, even at great sacrifices, and in order that as little delay as possible should result, on the outbreak of hostilities, in enrolling such a corps, may I respectfully request the publication of the following:—

I ask hon. members to note carefully what I wrote. Then they will be able to judge the treatment I received with regard to it.

Will those who are desirous of enrolling men and serving with me on active service to assist the Imperial forces in South Africa each be good enough to write me, stating fully:

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

(a) His qualifications.
(b) Age.
(c) Physical condition.
(d) The number and quality of the men each can enrol, and
(e) The number of days required for mobilization after notice.

Before leaving for Europe last spring, Hon. Mr. Tarte gave me the assurance——

I am glad the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is present. He will be able to bear me out that this is true.

—that should war break out he would assist in raising for my command, on active service, a proportionate number of his fellow-countrymen, who would, he felt assured, be second to none. Subsequent incidents have convinced me that each and every province will do its duty in the hour of need.

It is needless here to dwell on the causes of the trouble. One fact overshadows all. The principle advanced in defence of the American war of independence, and almost universally endorsed since, that 'Taxation must bear with it the right of full representation and citizenship,' has been systematically and brutally represented and denied by the Transvaal authorities. There is no freeman or lover of personal liberty but must justify Great Britain in insisting in full redress of every Uitlander grievance.

Two commanding officers of infantry battalions, as well as many majors and captains, one an Imperial guardsman, have already requested me to take in hand the raising of a Canadian corps, and all have expressed the wish to serve under my command—therefore have I taken action.

The newspapers of Canada, always potent in advancing a good cause, are respectfully requested to give this publicity, in order that the best results may be accomplished.

All letters should be addressed to Lindsay, Ont., at the earliest convenience, in order that details may be attended to and official sanction be received as soon as possible, after hostilities begin.

SAM. HUGHES.

Lindsay, September 18, 1899.

I draw attention to this point—I referred in the letter to the fact that official sanction would be sought to the enrolment of a corps as soon as war should begin. I was surprised to received the following telegram :—

Headquarters, Sept. 25, 1899.

From the Chief Staff Officer to D.O.C. M. D. No. 3 & 4.

1. The following telegram was forwarded this day direct to Lt.-Colonel S. Hughes, commanding the 45th Battalion, Lindsay :—

'General officer commanding directs me to inform you that your action in inviting recruits to enrol for service under you is unauthorized, and is in opposition to section 98, Army Act. Further efforts on your part, however well intentioned, are not approved.'

2. Upon the return of the major-general commanding from Nova Scotia on Saturday last, the action of Lt.-Colonel S. Hughes in inviting the enrolment of recruits for special service in a corps under his command in South Africa, through the medium of the press, was brought to his notice. The telegram above quoted was thereupon forwarded to that officer.

3. You will be good enough to direct Lt.-Colonel Hughes' attention to the Army Act, section 98, which is, under section 82 of the Militia Act, equally applicable to Canadian troops. The section in question is as follows :—

'If a person without due authority :—

(1) Publishes or causes to be published notices or advertisements for the purpose of procuring recruits for Her Majesty's regular forces, or in relation to recruits for such forces; or

(2) Opens or keeps any house, place of rendezvous, or office as connected with the recruiting of such forces; or

(3) Receives any person under any such advertisement, as aforesaid; or

(4) Directly or indirectly interferes with the recruiting services of such forces;

He shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding twenty pounds.

4. The action of Lt.-Colonel Hughes, no matter how well intentioned on his part in the interests of the empire, is entirely unauthorized. It is a matter of extreme surprise to the major-general commanding that an officer of Lt.-Colones Hughes' length of service and general knowledge of questions involving constitutional government, should have taken upon himself to assume the functions that alone rests with Her Majesty the Queen. You will, in the latter connection, direct Lt.-Colonel Hughes' attention to Army Act, section 94, as follows :

'For the purpose of the attestation of soldiers in pursuance of this part of this Act :

'In a colony, any person duly authorized in that behalf by the Governor of the colony.'

5. You will, accordingly, direct Lt.-Colonel S. Hughes, commanding the 45th Battalion, to desist from further action in this matter, for which no authority has been given.

By order,

H. FOSTER, Colonel,
Chief Staff Officer.

There was the message that greeted me from the general officer commanding, and for nothing more than if I had asked a man on the street, 'In case of war will you go to the Transvaal ?' I replied to the letter as follows :—

Sir,—I have the honour, in reply to your memo. of September 26 instant, inclosing memo. No. 84,496 (copy) from Chief Staff Officer, to state that I am at a loss to understand the communication directing my attention to section 98 of the Army Act, inasmuch as neither in spirit nor in letter have I violated it.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
SAM. HUGHES, Lt.-Col.,
C.O. 45th 'Victoria' Battn.

I need not take the time of the House in quoting authorities on this subject. I had written a letter to the press actuated by the kindliest spirit and most patriotic motives, and here, from the general officer commanding, an officer of the British service, an officer who was supposed to consider the interests of the whole empire, I received this communication. I had not asked the enrolment of a solitary man, but merely the names of those who, in case I should receive the necessary authority, would be willing to go. I did not ask a man for the British regular army, and neither directly nor indirectly had I left myself open to the reproof of the general officer commanding. If I had violated a law, which I had not done, I was open to the censure of a magistrate, but in no sense had I laid myself open to military censure. I will quote the same high authority on that subject :—

In the Hughes-Hutton correspondence, it appears that a telegram was sent from the C.S.O. to Col. Hughes, in these words :

'G.O.C. directs me to inform you that your action in inviting recruits to enrol for service under you is unauthorized, and is in opposition to section 98, Army Act. Further efforts on your part, however well intentioned, are not approved.'

And, further, the D.O.C. Nos. 3 and 4, was instructed 'to direct Col. Hughes' attention to the Army Act, section 98, which is, under section 82 of the Militia Act, equally applicable to Canadian troops.' What is meant, or intended to be meant by the words 'equally applicable to Canadian troops,' is an enigma. It could be intended to mean only that it is an offence against section 98 to recruit Canadian troops without authority. If so, such construction could be put on the two sections, 98 and 82, by a 'legal idiot' only, and the same must be said if the meaning was that the members of the Canadian force are subject to section 98, for section 98 is in no sense directed against the military, or persons subject to military law, but against 'a person.'

Section 98 forbids the procuring of recruits for 'Her Majesty's regular forces.' 'Her Majesty's regular forces,' according to the definition laid down in the Army Act, means those who are liable to render continuously for a term militia service to Her Majesty in any part of the world,' as distinguished from those who engage to serve in some locality. The corps that Colonel Hughes had in view was certainly not one of that class. It was to be an irregular corps, and so far as his letter showed, it was to have no connection with the Imperial forces, but to assist the Imperial forces in South Africa. It was not to be for service in any part of the world, it was not a force in any way contemplated by section 98. So, if he had published a 'notice or advertisement for the purpose of procuring recruits' for such a corps, he would not offend against the statute. But, he did not publish a notice for the purpose of 'procuring recruits,' he did not ask for recruits, he did not invite a single man to enrol. He merely wrote to the press a letter in which these words occur : 'Will those who are desirous of enrolling men and serving with me on active service to assist the Imperial forces in South Africa, each be good enough to write me stating fully (a) his qualification; (b) age; (c) physical condition; (d) the number and quality of the men each can enrol ; and (e) the number of days required for mobilization after notice.'

Now, that was all Col. H. did. He did not ask a man to enlist, he did not propose to enlist any one, he did not call for recruits, he asked only for the names of those who would be willing to act as enrollers in a great emergency, which was then imminent, and who would be willing to serve with him in the event of his being authorized to raise a force ; and there is not a word about the troops being Imperial, much less 'regular forces.' Even in Britain a

call for men to fill the militia or the volunteer force is not against that statute.

Still, the D.O.C. was instructed: 'You will, accordingly, direct Lt.-Col. H., commanding 45th Batt., to desist from further action in this matter, for which no authority has been given, and it was pointed out that the proper person to authorize the attestation of 'soldiers in pursuance of this part of the Act' (regular soldiers) is the governor of the colony.

A more marked exhibition of intense ignorance, more astounding presumption on the part of quasi superior military authority, was never exhibited.

In the first place, the action of Colonel H., even if done in the U. K., was not an offence against the law; in the second place, the better opinion is that no statute of the U. K. like the A. A., extends to the inhabitants of this country, except so far as our own statute has extended it to the militia at certain times; in the third place, an offence against section 98 is not a military one, the section is directed against not officers or soldiers, but 'a person.' If Col. H. could be said in any way to have offended, he would be cited as 'Samuel Hughes,' not as 'Colonel Samuel Hughes,' and he would be cited before a civil tribunal and not a military one, and his puishment, if it could be imposed at all in this country under section 98, would be a fine or summary conviction by a magistrate or magistrates.

In view of these facts, then, and in view of the further fact that Col. Hughes, at the time, was no more under the authority of the Canadian military superiors than he was under the Commander-in-chief in England ; it was nothing less than a piece of downright impertinence for General Hutton to take upon himself the office of calling Col. Hughes to account. Suppose that Col. Hughes had advertised a lottery, contrary to the statutes in that behalf, would General Hutton call on the colonel to desist? Certainly not. Yet it would be quite as legitimate, quite as decorous, and as little impertinent, in the lottery case as in the recruiting case. The officer in military command of the militia is not the 'conscience keeper' of militia officers, especially those who are under him but twelve days in the year. If they choose to run counter to the laws of the land, that is their business not his; their responsibility is not to him or through him; how much worse is his interference when they have not committed any offence whatever.

Of course, under sec. 34, 'Every person subject to military law who . . . . wilfully contravenes any enactments or the regulations of the service in any matter relating to the enlistment of attestation of soldiers of the regular forces, shall on conviction by court martial be liable to suffer imprisonment, but Col. H. was not subject to military law, and he did not, even in seeming to contravene the law ; he could not possibly be tried by a military tribunal.'

Now, Sir, there is the communication on that mater, which I have given at length. I regret to take up so much time of the House in reading these communications, but this is a matter of considerable concern to many members of the House. It is a matter of considerable importance to the country. I venture to think that a great many militia officers, some of them high up, will read this with interest, not only on this side, but on the other side of the water.

Now, I have read you my reply to that letter. I said this :

I have the honour in reply to your memo. of September 26 instant, inclosing memo. No. 84,496 [copy] from chief staff officer, to state that I am at a loss to understand the communication directing my attention to section 98 of the Army Act, inasmuch as neither in spirit nor in letter have I violated it.

Yet, here is the response he gives to that. If any one will tell me how I could have replied to that letter in a more kindly spirit, in a more submissive spirit, I would like to have him do it. I see nothing insubordinate whatever in my letter, yet here is the answer to it. These things do not appear in the return brought down last year in such a way as that they could be understood at all. Here is the letter from General Hutton to me :

Revelstoke, B.C., Oct. 11, 1899.

Chief Staff Officer :

1. I have read the letter of Lieut.-Col. S. Hughes, commanding 45th Battalion, in reply to your minute of the 25th ultimo, with extreme surprise.

2. You will forthwith cause this officer to be informed I am extremely dissatisfied at the highly improper and insubordinate tone of his official communication.

3. You will further cause Lieut.-Col. S. Hughes to be informed through the D. O. C. Nos. 3 and 4 district, that in the event of my orders conveyed through you being disobeyed, he will at once be suspended from the command of his battalion.

EDW. T. H. HUTTON, Major General,
Commanding Canadian Militia.

There was a letter in response to my letter, in which I stated that 'I was at a loss to understand the communication, because neither in letter or in spirit had I violated the law.' I had not violated the law, even though I had been an officer in the British regular army ; but when I was merely an officer of the Canadian militia, even if I had been on active service, I would not have violated the law ; and when I was not on active service, triply had I not violated the law.

Now, about this time, another very interesting incident occurred. In the London Times of September 25, 1899, appears this cablegram :

Ottawa, Sept. 24.

Although there has been no official announcement of the government's intention in the event of an outbreak of hostilities in South Africa, it is understood in ministerial circles that arrangements have been completed promptly to place the service of a Canadian regiment at the disposal of the home government when the hour for action comes.

It was a little anterior to this, I may say, that the general officer commanding was seized with a fit to command a corps himself.

All the details have been carefully worked out. The Canadian contingent will be a composite one, consisting of 1,200 men, regulars and militia, representing the three arms of the service, and

drawn from every province of the Dominion. The Canadian forces have just completed their annual training, and as a result of the changes introduced by General Hutton, the militia was never in better shape. While appreciating the patriotic effort of Colonel Hughes to raise a regiment for service in the Transvaal, the Dominion government, of course, could hardly permit a single officer to assume the functions which pertain to the Dominion parliament. Colonel Hughes, therefore, is likely to drop his project.

Mr. Speaker, when I tell you that I traced that cablegram up, and traced it to General Hutton as the author, that I ascertained that General Hutton had dictated that cablegram, that little bit of taffy for himself and condemnation of myself, in much stronger terms than it appears here, but the representative of the press at Ottawa would not send it in the terms in which it was first dictated, then you will understand a little the character of the officer who was commanding our forces. At the same time a similar intimation to that appeared in all the Canadian papers. I will not quote it here, but I will say that it pointed out that Colonel Hughes had usurped the functions of the government; it is stated in that communication that the government felt that I had usurped their functions. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he felt I had usurped the functions of the government in anything that I did at that time. I do not think he ever expressed himself so.

At the same time, as soon as my communication appeared in the press of Canada, I received an offer of $1,000,000 of insurance on 1,000 men. I regret exceedingly that I am not at liberty to make public the name of the gentleman who so kindly placed that insurance at the disposal of the officers and men of the Canadian forces going to South Africa. I may say, however, that I believe the offer came from the same source as the insurance which Sir Charles Tupper managed, and which has done so much to alleviate the sufferings of the families of the volunteers who went to the front in this war. I regret that I am not at liberty to make use of the gentleman's name, but that offer of insurance did the yeomanry, the volunteers of this country, much service, in encouraging them to go to the front. These inspired attacks on myself in the papers came from the general officer commanding. The statement in the Canadian papers I also traced home to General Hutton, as having been dictated to the press reporters. On September 28, three days after the other had appeared in the Canadian papers and the English papers, the following appeared:

Ottawa, September 28.—Major-General Hutton has notified Col. Sam. Hughes that he is not authorized to call for volunteers for service in the Transvaal. Still the gallant colonel evidently has not paid any attention to the gentle hint. He has gone on calling for volunteers. Attention is now drawn to the fact that section 98 of the British Army Act makes it an offence punishable by a fine up to $100 for anybody, without due authority, attempting to procure recruits for the army

This I traced home to General Hutton, it having been directly furnished to the press of this country. I then took the liberty of writing a communication to him drawing his attention to the fact that I had not violated Sec. 98, and asking him to be good enough to place me right before the country. He did not do so; on the contrary he followed it up by a series of threats and letters which were very much aside from his duties as general officer commanding. Previous to this, though I had been spoken to by officers who were friends of General Hutton to say that if I withdrew the controversial matter it would all be settled. Accordingly, at the request of Colonel Foster who, throughout, making all due allowance for his being under the direction and control of Major-General Hutton, has acted the part, to my mind, of a perfect gentleman, I wrote:

October, 17, 1899.

Dear Col. Foster,—I beg to withdraw the letters written by me to General Hutton re application for service and other matters

Yours truly,

SAM. HUGHES.

That was forwarded by Colonel Foster with a very kind note to Major-General Hutton. Major-General Hutton replied, and I want you to note this, Mr. Speaker:

C. S. O.

The foregoing has been received by me this evening. I do not consider that the irregular form which Lt.-Col. S. Hughes, Commanding 45th Battalion, has adopted in treating so grave a breach of military discipline as in any respect whatever adequate to the extreme gravity of the circumstances.

This officer's treatment of the official correspondence, as exemplified by his half private and half official communication to you by name, is sufficient indication in itself of his ignorance of the military fitness of things and of his ignorance of the elements of military discipline.

EDW T. H. HUTTON, M.G.,

Commanding Canadian Militia.

Ottawa, October 26, 1899.

I want hon. gentlemen to note that, and I trust that the hon. Minister of Militia will give this matter his attention. I would thus briefly refer him to the correspondence to see who has been the sinner. This is the first irregular letter I had written, the first one that was not addressed officially except those marked 'private.' On July 31, Colonel Foster wrote a letter to the district officer commanding Militia District No. 3 and 4, in which he says:

Headquarters, July 31, 1900.

From the Chief Staff Officer to D.O.C. 3 & 4.

Herewith for your information is a copy of a letter addressed direct, by direction of the Major-

General Commanding, to Lieut.-Colonel Hughes, Commanding 45th Battalion.

By order,
H. FOSTER, Colonel,
Chief Staff Officer.

(For copy of letter referred to above, see preceding.)

So that, as early as July, General Hutton began himself the half official form of correspondence, because Colonel Foster wrote that letter by direct order of the general officer commanding. Following on we find, on September 19, Colonel Foster, again, by order of General Hutton, writing to me addressing me directly and complimenting me as dear colonel, etc. That letter was written by order of General Hutton, and is a half private half official communication. Then we find the telegram referred to in the letter of September 25, sent to me direct by Colonel Foster, by order of General Hutton. We find also his unofficial correspondence with the London Times of the 25th September, and we find also his correspondence with the Canadian papers. So that, he began it and carried it through. I only wrote one letter, and yet I am held up to the ridicule of the people of this country, because I only wrote one letter and he a dozen of the 'half-private, half-official' class. Now, I have about done with the letters, with this one exception, and I shall read it as being from the general to the minister. I have clearly traced up the whole business. I shall not refer to anything that transpired before the applications for service began. Let me review the incidents as I have stated them. I wrote three letters, one out of mere courtesy through the district officer commanding to the general who paid no attention to it and never laid it before the minister. Then, I wrote direct to the minister, and I may say that I was treated most courteously by the minister. I never knew how my communication was treated until I read the report in 'Hansard.' He seems to have done everything that a soldier, a gentleman and a minister should have done. I speak of him just as I find him. The only thing that I thought he had acted unfairly in was in allowing the private correspondence to be published, until I saw that General Hutton had distinctly stated that he had communicated this to me, a statement which was untrue. I had never heard of such a thing until I saw a copy of the correspondence on the steamer, and I can very well excuse the minister on that point. I wrote that letter to the minister, and I was reprimanded by the general for writing it, but, he withdrew his letter. The third application was a letter to Mr. Chamberlain, which has also been referred to. For that, I was reprimanded by the order of His Excellency. I gave my reply, and they saw that they were wrong. As far as the publishing of this letter in the papers drawing attention to the war is concerned, I may say that I was reprimanded by telegram for having laid myself open to section 98, when a child could have told the general officer commanding that I had not left myself open. Major-General Hutton knows nothing as to why section 98 was drawn up. It was drawn up to prevent soldiers being enlisted in barrooms and over drinking tables, and from being entrapped into taking the shilling, when they did not know they were being enlisted. There is not a man who knows anything of the reason why section 98 was adopted, who could consider my letter as bringing me under the operation of that section. Yet, I was rapped over the knuckles by General Hutton in the London Times and the Canadian papers. Then I was met with the statement that I was liable to a fine and imprisonment; all these things belittleing me before the country. You will see that I put up with a great deal before I wrote back in rather warm language. Here comes the crowning letter of the lot:

October 26, 1899.

The Honourable the Minister
Militia and Defence.

Sir,—

1. Knowing that there is an anxiety on your part and believing that there exists a similar feeling on the part of some of the members of the cabinet, that Lieut.-Colonel Sam. Hughes, M.P., commanding the 45th Battalion, should be employed on active service with the Canadian forces now proceeding to South Africa, I deem it my duty to place on record in an official form my reasons for having declined to recommend this officer's employment with such force in any capacity whatever.

2. I regret the necessity for my action in this matter, as I am well aware of the leading and praiseworthy part which Lieut.-Colonel S. Hughes has taken in bringing the patriotic necessity for military service in the cause of the empire before the Canadian public. I should, however, fail in my duty if I recommended the employment of an officer, however well-intentioned, whom I now know and whose correspondence shows to be, not only devoid of any proper spirit of subordination, but to be also deficient in military judgment. I need hardly remind you that the selection of officers for the command of troops about to engage in a serious campaign is one involving the greatest responsibility. It is a matter in which the lives of our soldiers, the credit of Canada, and the honour of the empire are directly concerned.

3. I therefore submit for your perusal and information the following facts and papers:—

(a.) Minute from Chief Staff Officer to D.O.C., M.D. No. 3 and 4, dated August 24, 1899, re despatch from Secretary of State for the Colonies, and reply of Lieut.-Colonel Hughes thereto. Marked 'A.'

(b.) Minute and telegram from Chief Staff Officer to D.O.C., M.D. No. 3 and 4, dated September 25, 1899, re advertising for recruits in Canada, and reply from Lieut.-Colonel Hughes. Marked 'B.'

4. I have further, with great reluctance, deemed it necessary to submit for your perusal and information the following additional unofficial correspondence sent by Lieut.-Colonel S. Hughes to myself personally. I am impelled to this course from the necessity of proving to

you that this officer's want of judgment is conspicuous, and that his reflections upon Imperial officers generally, even those of the highest rank now employed in South Africa, make Lieut.-Colonel Hughes' employment absolutely prohibitive :—

With reference to his communication of the 10th instant, I deem the matter so serious that, in the interests of discipline, I recommend that Lieut.-Colonel Sam. Hughes be removed from the command of his regiment, and be placed on the retired list.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
EDWARD T. H. HUTTON,
Major-General,
Commanding Canadian Militia.

I am glad that he had learned by that time a little constitutional law, and that he cannot place me on the retired list. He admits here for the first time that he has a superior in this country because 'he recommends' to the minister to do certain things. General Hutton talks about insubordination. Why, I have read in the 'Hansard' about his being turned out of this country for insubordination himself, and I need not refer to his record elsewhere. I am going on 35 years a Canadian volunteer ; I have been under a great many men in my time, and I have never been charged directly or indirectly with insubordination. My record as a volunteer and a soldier in Canada or elsewhere I leave to those whom I served under. Not one will say that I ever refused to carry out an order. Although I have received orders given by my seniors in active service for which they had no authority, I nevertheless obeyed them. I carried out every order that General Hutton himself gave me, although I am free to say that many of them were contrary to the drill book and to common sense. General Hutton says further, that I am deficient in military judgment, and he talks as if he knew something about it. He says :

'It is a matter in which the lives of our soldiers, the credit of Canada and the honour of the empire are directly concerned.'

Since that letter was penned, General Hutton and I have had an opportunity of facing the music, and I leave it to the official records of the British Empire to show which of us has best looked after the lives of our soldiers, the credit of Canada and the honour of the empire.

Now, Sir, in all this correspondence I have not one word to retract from any letter I wrote. Possibly, had I known that the private letters were going to be published I might have softened the tone. Possibly, if I had waited 24 hours, I would not have written quite as sharply to him as I did in face of his taunts. Neither directly nor indirectly do I retract one word as untrue. Some of the private letters I can infinitely strengthen, should any gentleman challenge me on the floor of this House. Hon. gentlemen know to what I refer, and I am in a position to give evidence as to it much stronger than anything I have stated in my private letters. I do not wish to do so, but I am ready if I am challenged. The statement in that letter of General Hutton's about my reflections upon imperial officers was written with the direct object of being published and circulated in South Africa and that was done. I have nothing to retract in that respect. I slandered no general in South Africa ; I said nothing about any British general which has not been intensified by British officers themselves. I call the attention of the minister to the fact that one letter dated 'On the train, Oct. 28,' is either intentionally or unintentionally incorrect, as the date should be Oct. 23, and I trust the minister will have that corrected when the return is brought down.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer. As to refusing to permit me to be second in command of the Canadian corps—I say it is all for the best in the end—I had been assured by the Minister of Militia that I would be second in command ; I knew that I had been selected by Col. Otter for the position, and I did not know until I reached Ottawa on the morning of the 26th or 27th of October that I was not second in command. I was determined to go to Africa if I had to swim there. I was determined to go to Africa either by way of England or direct from Canada as I was enabled to do by the kindness of the Minister of Militia. Imagine my being handed the following note through Col. Otter :

October, 1899.

1. The following minute has been forwarded to the O. C. the 2nd (Special Service) Battalion, proceeding to South Africa by ss. Sardinian on Monday, October 30, 1899 :—

'Permission has been granted for Lieut.-Colonel S. Hughes, 45th Battalion, to have passage to South Africa by ss. Sardinian, conveying the Canadian troops.'

'It is to be clearly understood that this officer does not proceed in any military capacity whatever. He will accordingly not wear uniform on board ship.'

2. Leave of absence is granted you from this date with leave to travel abroad.

By order,
H. FOSTER, Colonel,
Chief Staff Officer.

October 29, 1899.

This letter addressed to Col. Otter says leave of absence is granted 'you' ; that is to Col. Otter. In this connection I draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to the fact that I have never been granted leave of absence, and so far as the official records show, I have seen no official notice that I ever returned to Canada. I characterize that letter as one of the most impudent pieces of meddling that any officer ever perpetrated. He had no more authority over me than that child has. Nevertheless, I found that followed by another similar letter to the commanding officer in South Africa. I demand to know why the general officer commanding in Canada dared to

write to a general outside of this country. He might as well write to the general commanding the United States troops in the Philippines as to write to General Buller in South Africa. What was it his business or their business. How dare he write that Lt.-Col. Sam Hughes, of the 45th Battalion, was without military status. He had nothing to do with me outside of the three mile limit, and yet he wrote :

I am not prepared to recommend his employment in any capacity in South Africa whatever.

More than that, Sir, he got Col. Otter to do a little bit of meddling on shipboard. Col. Otter, acting on his instructions, thought he had control over me. He did not seem to know that there was one officer only bossing that ship, and that was the captain of the ship. If the captain had wished, he could have put Col. Otter himself in irons, as well as every other man on the ship. He was the one man who was supreme there, and to him alone did I owe allegiance. Col. Otter and I are the best of friends, as we always have been, and as I trust we always shall be ; but in pursuance of this contemptible order, he undertook, of course very politely, to issue instructions to me. I at once informed him that he had nothing whatever to do with me. I was very sorry to find an officer like Col. Otter committing the mistake of following such an order as that of General Hutton.

There is another matter in this correspondence to which I wish to refer ; that is, a cablegram which I received at Cape Town offering me a command in Strathcona's Horse. I wish to say here that I would have been very much pleased to have had the command of a Canadian regiment. I do not hesitate to say that it was my ambition to have such a command, and I wish to say, in all modesty, that I think I have proven that I was and am capable of commanding a Canadian regiment. I would have given a very great deal to have been permitted to command Strathcona's Horse. But when I received an offer of a captaincy in that regiment, signed 'chief staff officer' —I do not know who he may be—I looked on the whole thing as a piece of impudence. The cablegram read as follows :

Col. Sam. Hughes, Canadian Regiment, Cape Town.

General proposes recommend you captain in Strathcona's Horse. Reply if you accept.

Chief Staff Officer.

I need not say that I deemed this one of the greatest insults ever offered me, and I did not reply to it. I find that followed up by a letter from General Hutton to the Minister of Militia, in which he makes this statement :

Lieut-Col. S. Hughes, 45th Battalion, having written a full and complete apology, and expressed regret for his insubordinate and improper conduct, I request that the final paragraph of my letter of October 26, 1899, may be considered as cancelled.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

I may say that bears on its face a deliberate falsehood. From the time I left Canada I never, either directly or indirectly, communicated with General Hutton ; I had nothing to do with him.

That, in brief, is the correspondence. I have brought this matter up, not in order to vindicate myself, and not because I have any objection to the general officer commanding the Canadian forces being a British general. On the contrary, I desire that our general officer commanding should be a British general. I know that a great many of my friends, both on the other side of the House and on this side, in view of the conduct of some of the general officers in recent years, have expressed the wish that a Canadian officer should be appointed to that position. I wish to say, standing here, that it is my desire that the general officer commanding should be an Imperial officer, and I believe that if we paid that officer $10,000 a year, which is the pay of a major-general in England, and is about what little New South Wales pays to her general officer commanding, we would get an officer to come out here to take command of our troops who would be a credit to the position and to the empire. A man would not be sent here to be got rid of because he was cranky in the office in England, or to make use of the position as a stepping-stone to some other position. One reason why I have brought this matter up is to let these men know that we have responsible government in this country, and that no military officer can step outside of the law in dealing with the officers under him. I wish the papers to be brought down in order that the officers throughout the country may know what their powers are. Would you believe it ?—fully one-half the officers of this country think that because I or any officer may command a battalion, the men under the colonel, even when off duty, are subject to his whim in military matters. The idea is childish and absurd, but, nevertheless, it exists, and I would very much like that these men should be disabused of it. I have brought this matter before the House in the hope that any harm which may have resulted from the unconstitutional conduct of that general officer commanding in the whole matter may be wiped out. I have brought it up in the hope that the good which has resulted from the colonies participating in the war in South Africa may continue to grow, and that in the very near future we may find the Imperial parliament divesting itself of parish politics and entering the arena of Imperial politics proper, and that we may soon see Canada represented in an informal council, ultimately to become a formal council, for the promotion of the best interests of the British Empire and the upbuilding of the human race. I must thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for the patient hearing of this rather long and uninteresting

legal discussion ; but I felt that the circumstances required that this matter should be clearly placed before the House, in order that there might be a better understanding in the future of the respective duties owing to the various authorities, from the Governor General down, in military matters.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). Mr Speaker, I am sure that neither my hon. friend nor the House expect me to enter into any lengthy discussion of the very many subjects to which our attention has been called this evening. I think, however, that the House, and probably the country, did expect, after what took place last year, after the well-known and well-discussed differences of opinion which occurred between my hon. friend and the general officer commanding, that my hon. friend on his return would make, as he has made, some statement to this House in reference to his conduct ; and I am sure that we have all been very well pleased with the manner in which he has discharged that duty.

I have no doubt that the country will be interested in the statement which the hon. gentleman has made to the House this evening. I do not propose to enter into any discussion. The hon. gentleman has acquitted me as minister, and also, I understand, the government, of any intention to injure him, or of having injured him in any way. The quarrel is one between the hon. gentleman and General Hutton, and the hon. gentleman has stated his side of the case. He did, at the opening, make a reference, which he corrected later on, to the character of the papers brought down in reply to a motion for a return, during last session, and described them as incomplete and garbled. I am quite sure, from the subsequent remarks of my hon. friend, that he did not intend that as a reflection on the officers of my department, and therefore, I have nothing to say on that point. He also took some exceptions to the publishing of private letters, but later on in his speech he disavowed any charge of impropriety against myself and the officers of my department. As a matter of fact, as the hon. gentleman has said, General Hutton did place before me the letters which were brought before the House last session, and stated that he had notified my hon. friend that he had done so, and that those letters must be considered official letters in the future. And I may say in passing, that without those letters his whole discussion would have lost a great deal of its point and interest, and would be very much like the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out.

I do not know that I should say anything with reference to the long legal opinion which my hon. friend read to the House, regarding the relations which officers of superior rank in the militia bear to officers of inferior rank, or privates. I am not a lawyer, nor have I studied as much as I ought the military law, but I am bound to say that if the construction which my hon. friend puts upon the military law of Canada be correct, then it is very necessary that law should be changed, because it would be impossible to enforce military discipline, and our militia system would be absolutely a farce. To say that if the officer commanding a district issued an order to have the rifles and equipment of a rural battalion inspected, and the captain, who had control of the armoury, refused to allow the inspection to be made, the officer commanding was powerless to enforce the inspection, is, it seems to me, at variance with common sense, and with everything I have been taught concerning the militia in the past. However, I do not propose to discuss the matter at all, and will do my utmost to bring down every paper to which my hon. friend refers. I am not quite sure whether I can lay my hands on them all, but if he will suggest where I may find any which may be missing, I shall do my utmost to procure and lay them on the table at the earliest possible date.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. the minister says that if the law is as I have stated it to be, it should be changed. Well, I can assure him that when he brings in any change, he will find stern and serious opposition from one seat in this House at all events, if I happen to be a member. I never stated that the district officer commanding had not the right to notify the captain of a rural battalion that he was going to inspect the armoury, but I stated that he had no authority to oblige the captain to submit his armoury to inspection. I was not speaking of the district officer commanding at all, but of the officer commanding a battalion, who has no right, under the law, to inspect the arms of the company. But should the district officer commanding notify a captain that he is going to inspect the arms, and the captain refused then, as the law clearly imposes the duty on the district commanding officer of inspecting the arms, all the latter has to do is to report to the minister and the minister has power to retire that officer from the force. Therefore, there is no necessity for the hon. minister to amend the law. But should he bring in an amendment to provide that, I, as colonel of my battalion, shall have the authority to order any of my fellows, when not subject to military law, to do this or that, I assure the hon. gentleman that I will fight him to a finish. Once my men have done their drill, they are free men, and not subject to military law until they don the uniform again. The hon. the minister brought up the case of a district officer commanding, but I referred to the case of a commanding officer in Ottawa or elsewhere ordering one of his captains to let him into his armoury for the purpose of inspecting the arms. The com-

manding officer has no military authority to go there.

The hon. gentleman says he will bring down every paper. I assure him that he will not.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. All I can find.

Mr. HUGHES. He will not find all. It is currently rumoured that a great many of the papers have been removed from his department. A good deal of this is private correspondence—and I would scorn to bring down private correspondence myself—but inasmuch as the late general officer commanding has placed himself in the unenviable position of producing private correspondence, when it suits his purpose and convenience, I would give him the opportunity of producing such further private correspondence as would speak strongly in my favour, but I have no doubt it will not be forthcoming.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 11 o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 26, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth) moved :

That the time for receiving petitions for private Bills be extended to Friday, the 15th of March next, and the time for presenting private Bills be extended to Friday, the 29th of March next, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I have repeatedly, for years, brought the disadvantage of such proposals as this to the attention of the House. This is the commencement in a new parliament of an evil which always results in lengthening our sessions. The time for presenting petitions for private Bills and for the introduction of private Bills cannot be unknown to the public, and they ought to be ready with their Bills at the proper time. I think that the beginning of a new parliament is the proper time for us to put our foot down on a custom which has obtained very largely of late, and which is a very inconvenient one for us. I think that if it were given out early in the session, and in this parliament, that these extensions would not be made as easily as they have been heretofore, the people would govern themselves accordingly, and this would assist us greatly in getting through our work in much more reasonable time than is usually done.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I altogether agree with my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). The practice of extending the time for private Bills became an abuse during the life of the late parliament. At the beginning of this parliament we should insist on the rule being strictly carried out. Though I will not, at the moment, object to this motion, I must say that if any further delay is required, for my part, I shall have to ask the House not to agree to it.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 19) respecting the Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company, Ltd.—Mr. Borden (Halifax).

Bill (No. 20) respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—Mr. Prior.

Bill (No. 21) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Prior.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 23) respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Ottawa and Hull Power and Manufacturing Company.—Mr. Champagne.

Bill (No. 26) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Fortin.

Bill (No. 27) respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.—Mr. Talbot.

FREIGHT AND PASSENGER RATES ON RAILWAYS.

Mr. JOHN D. REID (South Grenville) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 28) to regulate freight and passenger rates on railways. He said : I may say, in briefly explaining this Bill, that it is the same Bill that I introduced last session, and also the session previous. It is for the purpose of appointing a commission to regulate freight and passenger rates on railways. The Bill provides that the railway commission shall have power, in case of any difficulty arising between railway companies and shippers, to settle those matters. When the second reading comes up I shall go into the matter more fully. I hope that at this session the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) will kindly give this matter his consideration, and help me to pass it. I believe there is a general desire through the country for the appointment of a railway commission of some kind. This Bill may

not be perfect, but if we pass it now we will have an opportunity before next session of seeing exactly what is required, and any defects in it may then be remedied. In preparing this Bill I have taken the Interstate Commerce Act as a guide. On the other side of the line, I understand, that Act is doing a great deal of good, it makes the rates uniform and protects the shippers to a great extent. I hope that my Bill will have the support of the House, and that I shall be able to get it through this session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 29) to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said : I may say in explanation of this Bill, that its various clauses relates more or less to matters of detail in the administration of Dominion lands. The first clause needs no explanation. The second clause is for the purpose of enabling another officer to sign official documents in place of the commissioner of Dominion lands in his absence. The third clause relates to the date at which the settler is required to perfect his homestead entries by going upon the land. It provides that the entry may be declared void at the end of six months in the discretion of the minister of the department. At the present time, and for some years past, that has been the actual practice, and my attention was called to the fact that the practice has not been in accordance with the statute, and I propose to ask the House to amend the statute so as to make it accord with what has been the practice. Strictly to follow the statute at present might work a great injustice, because sometimes settlers are not able to go upon the land within the exact period of six months. The fourth clause enables the settler who comes from the United States to have one year from the time he is making his entry to perfect it. It is found that is necessary in the case of people who come from the western states, who sometimes, after selecting their land, are not able to come back as soon as they intended. Under this clause he may have one year to perfect his entry. The fifth clause relates to an amendment made a year or two ago with respect to the homestead law under which a settler was enabled to perform his residence upon the second homestead by living upon his first homestead. It was the intention that that clause should apply only in cases where homesteads were taken up in the vicinity of the first homestead. But the settlers display considerable ingenuity in interpreting the law, and some have attempted to make it apply where the homesteads were in different parts of the country altogether. The amendment adds these words : 'If the second homestead is in the vicinity of the first homestead.' The sixth clause is for the purpose of removing a provision which was contained in an amendment made at the instance of the then member for Western Assiniboia, Mr. Davin, some three years ago, to enable the homesteader to get his patent for a second homestead by having a certain number of cattle instead of doing cultivation duties. The provision requiring that he shall cultivate at least one acre of land has also been found to be of no practical benefit, and we propose to remove it. The seventh section is for the purpose of removing a clerical error that existed in the amendment made a couple of years ago. The eighth section is for the purpose of removing a doubt in regard to the construction of a clause in the Dominion Lands Act, relating to assignments which settlers might make before they were entitled to their patent. The law does not permit a settler to make an assignment before he is entitled to his patent, but it was found in operation to be very hard, because a settler might make an assignment without knowing the provisions of the law and without intending to violate them. Two or three different provisions were made in regard to this particular subject. This clause is for the purpose of making clear the effect of the last amendment. I will go into it more fully when the Bill is before the Committee and when the legal effect of the amendment may be explained.

The 9th clause is for the purpose of enabling the Department of the Interior to issue a patent to a settler or a company who may have made an advance to a settler under the provisions of the Act which was passed a number of years ago, providing that companies might make advances to settlers upon the security of their homesteads. There have been cases in which settlers have got advances, have complied with the requirements of the law as to residence and cultivation of the soil and have left the country without getting their patents, thinking perhaps that the land was not worth any more than the advance upon it. In such cases it is quite clear that the companies are entitled to the patent for the land so as to realize the security which was provided for under the original Act. A technical difficulty has arisen in this case by reason of the fact that some of these settlers were not British subjects and consequently the department could not issue the patents. The purpose of the amendment is to enable the department to issue a patent when the settler is not a British subject and has not taken out his naturalization papers.

The 10th clause is to enable the Department of the Interior to issue grazing leases under regulations made by the Governor in Council without each individual lease coming before council. It has been found to be extremely troublesome and to cumber

the work of council very much, when the requirement of the law is that there should be an order in council for each lease.

The 11th clause is for the purpose of avoiding the necessity of leases of public lands issued by the Department of the Interior being under the Great Seal of the Crown. The Deputy Minister of Justice has lately advised the department that this amendment ought to be made.

Clause 12 is for the purpose of providing that in all cases where interest is accruing upon the sales of Dominion lands the rate of interest from July 7, 1900, when the Act which was passed last session relating to the rate of interest, shall be 5 per cent instead of 6 per cent, as it was before.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) to expedite the return of the papers in connection with an order of the House touching any recommendation for reports as to irregularities in the administration of the present Dominion Lands Act, before the second reading of this Bill, so that we will be in possession of whatever material there is on the subject before the hon. minister asks the House to agree to the second reading.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have not the least objection to expediting the return, or in fact, anything that is ordered, but, I may say that I found considerable difficulty, and the officers of the department found difficulty, in knowing what papers the hon. gentleman meant by that motion. If he has any particulars in his mind, if he will write me a note specifying what they are in such a way as to help us to find out what he is referring to, I will be happy to do what he suggests.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that the officers of the hon. minister are not more acute in connection with these matters. The order of the House is for :

> Copies of all reports, official memoranda and papers dealing with irregularities, mistakes by order in council or otherwise in the administration of the provisions of the Dominion Lands Act in the Yukon district.

Now, the hon. gentleman has mentioned, as I understood him, in the introduction of this Bill a question with which he proposes to deal, the question of the execution of some leases. They may not relate to this district, although the Act itself does. Touching, for instance, the execution of these leases and the affixing of the Great Seal for the purpose of validity—this is one suggestion, but the order of the House expressly refers to any question of irregularity. When we see the provisions of this Bill there may be some retroactive clauses—I fancy there are, as it has generally been the case, and the effect of these provisions will be to make valid or cure any irregularity that has occurred. I am not in a position to give a definite statement as to any case that has come up. I have no particular case in my mind whatever, but it occurred to me that in the administration of that Act there may have been, and it is a natural supposition that there must have been, irregularities, especially as relates to that far-away district in connection with the operation of that Act. If these reports or memoranda are in the possession of the department this order of the House will, of course, attach to any of them. If, on the other hand, there are none, none will be brought down. But, following the minister to-day, it occurred to me, that one of the provisions that he mentioned of his Bill has reference to some irregularities in the issue of leases. It may not be as confined as this order of the House is, to the Yukon district. That may be, but I am not able to particularize any more than the order of the House has done in regard to such irregularities.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is not the least objection on my part to expedite the return in every possible way. When a general order of that kind is made in connection with the department where the transactions have been very many and the amount of business very extensive, it is, of course, more satisfactory for the minister, if there has been any special transaction in the mind of the hon. gentleman who moves for the return, to know what transaction is referred to, so that he can see what papers there are on the subject. However, I will do everything possible to see that the papers are brought down without delay.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The only case that suggests itself to my mind is in regard to the water front at Dawson. There may be some action in regard to the leasing of the water front where, the hon. minister will remember, there was no formal lease executed and yet the parties went into possession as if a lease had been formally executed. I did not have that in my mind when I made the motion ; still it would cover it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 30) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said : Mr. Speaker, I shall take the liberty of following the example set by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), and acting in accordance with a very wholesome practice in the British House of Commons where it is customary to explain the character and nature of Bills

upon their introduction, to offer a few remarks upon the measure that I propose to submit to the House. The Bill which I shall have the honour to place in your hands, Mr. Speaker, provides for certain amendments to the Dominion Lands Act. It provides that subclauses 2, 3, and 4 of clause 29 of the Dominion Lands Act, chap. 54, R.S.C., be repealed, and the following clauses substituted therefor :

Subclause 2. The sale of the public lands of the Dominion suitable for agricultural purposes shall be to actual settlers only upon reasonable terms of settlement and in such areas as can be reasonably occupied and cultivated by the settler.

Subclause 3. No grants of public lands of the Dominion shall in future be made to railway or other corporations.

Subclause 4. Subclause 5 of class 29 aforesaid is hereby amended by substituting the word 'may' for the word 'shall' wherever the same occurs in the third line of the said sub-clause.

The provision of this Bill as embodied in the first subclause with reference to the reservation of the agricultural lands of this Dominion for actual settlers only, is a provision which was adopted by the opposition in the House of Commons in the year 1879, and it formed a portion of the policy which they presented to this country from that time on. It is a provision which was embodied in the platform, adopted by the great Liberal convention which met in this city in June, 1893. It is a provision which I believe, Mr. Speaker, has been practically adhered to and honoured in the observance by the government during the past five years. Still, I think it well that this provision should be placed in explicit terms upon the statute-book, and should not be left as a provision to be carried into effect by departmental regulations, and by the action of the government in a sense, where that action may under certain circumstances be made to vary from the principle laid down. It is unnecessary for me at any length to enlarge upon the justice of this provision, or to enlarge upon the necessity in the public's interest for endorsnig and preserving this principle. The future greatness of this country will depend upon the settlement and the cultivation of its public lands, and any measure or policy which is calculated to lessen the hardships that beset the pioneers in their struggles against the difficulties incident to the task that they undertake in a new country, is a policy which should meet with the approbation of every citizen of Canada. The more rapidly these public lands can be settled and the more favourable the conditions under which the toiler settles these lands, the greater is the benefit that Canada will derive from the extension of civilization and the bringing under cultivation of these waste areas. It is an outrageous thing, Sir, to allow the middleman to step in between the settler and the government, and purchase large areas of land to be doled out by him afterwards to the settler at three times or four times or mayhap five times the price which the government received from him for these lands. The interests of the country are in no sense benefited by such a transaction. The settler is injured; the government receive no greater advantage than would have accrued had it reserved the land for sale direct to the settler, except, possibly a small item of interest upon the sum it received from the speculator in anticipation of the time when it would sell these lands to the actual settler. For reasons, which I might enlarge upon to a great extent, the policy which I propose is one which ought to commend itself to the favourable judgment of every member of this House. It is a policy which the government has practically recognized, and it is a policy which should be placed upon the statute-book as a mandate to this government, and to all future governments in reference to the management of our public domain.

With regard to the second subclause of this Bill, which provides that in future no land grants, whether of agricultural lands or otherwise, shall be made to any railway or any other corporation; I think it is high time that this matter should receive the careful and candid consideration of this House. I have it upon the authority of the Minister of the Interior, that we have at this moment 67,000,000 acres of land locked up in the North-west. Not all of these acres are lands that the railway company will acquire but all of this—an empire in itself—is withheld from settlement till the railway corporations deign to inform us what portion of these lands they will take for their grants. These lands can not be settled; these lands must lie waste; not only are they not susceptible to settlement, but the condition prevailing, that these lands intervene between the railways and the public lands of the Dominion, that are available for settlement, is a condition which is in the highest degree detrimental to the interests of the country. These lands cannot be taxed, and where in some cases these lands are located by railway companies, the settlers are scattered here and there upon alternate sections struggling with the difficulty of having one-third or perhaps one-half the land of a township that can be cultivated, taxed or settled upon, and this one-third or one-half the area of the township must bear the expense of making roads for the whole township, the expense of establishing school sections, and all the expenses incident to civilization in this far western country.

It always causes me a pang to think of our fatuity in the past in granting such enormous areas so recklessly as we have done. Sixty-seven millions acres tied up now, to say nothing of the lands that have been appropriated by the railways. And what are 67,000,000 acres ? Why 67,000,000 acres is an area large enough for two or

three provinces, and the holding back from settlement of this vast area is not only a drawback, but positively a disaster to the country. It is time to change our policy. We gave in 1881, 25,000,000 acres of land to one corporation. We gave to that corporation $25,000,000 in money. We gave to that corporation certain sections of the Canadian Pacific Railway constructed by ourselves, and which cost us $30,000,000. We loaned to that corporation $20,000,000. We took back from the corporation at $1.50 an acre, lands for $10,000,000 of this money. We paid for the Canadian Pacific Railway. We paid every dollar that it cost, and if we had built this road as government property we would have had it to-day without expending one dollar more than we have expended, and we would have had all the lands that have been granted to boot. Now, I do not make any attack upon the Canadian Pacific Railway. They coped with gigantic difficulties. That enterprise was put through with brilliant success and energy, and it has been a great work to keep that road open. It was an important national undertaking. It produced important national fruits. We might possibly have built that road and lost a good deal of money in running it. We might have demonstrated our incapacity to run the road as well as this private corporation has done; but, whatever may be said upon this question on one side or the other, I hold that the time has now come when this system of recklessly giving away the public domain of Canada to railway promoters with the intention of developing the country that we give away, is a policy which we had better cease to pursue. The policy of the United States in this respect might furnish us with a wholesome lesson. The same spirit of recklessness prevailed in that country when they had an enormous public domain. They did not realize that this land would be wanted in the near future by the settler. They failed to realize the greatness of the heritage they had in their possession. They failed to recognize the importance of husbanding these resources, and dealing with this vast public domain in a common sense and proper manner, and it was given to railway promoters—given in millions, tens of millions, hundreds of millions of acres ; and one day the United States government woke up to find that they had practically no public land left—that the whole of the public domain was in the hands of corporations ; and these corporations have gone on rolling up their wealth, until now we have a syndicate owning nearly all the railways of the United States and the United States government has, by its land policy, contributed to the result which the whole country deplores to-day. We do not want to follow their example. We want to realize before it is too late, that the entire policy of making land grants to railways, was an ill-conceived and mistaken policy. For these reasons I think the time has come when this parliament should, by legislation, affirm the principle that land grants of this character are not in the public interest, and shall not hereafter be made. These are the leading features of the Bill ; and, without entering more fully at the present time into the discussion of them, I beg to submit the Bill for its first reading.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). I beg leave to support this Bill with all my heart. I believe, as the hon. member for North Norfolk has said, that the land of this country belongs to the country for the people who till it ; and if that fundamental principle is kept in view, our country will increase as it never has done before. I will go further than the hon. member. Not only would I prohibit the giving of any land to large corporations, and give it only to those who would become bona fide settlers upon it, but I would to-morrow find some means of estimating the value every acre of land that belongs to the Canadian Pacific and every other corporation, and I would pay them what they are entitled to for their land, and throw it open to actual settlers. We never can succeed in a country like the North-west except by the settlers settling down as near one another as possible, and under the most favourable conditions. Indeed, there are those who think that it might perhaps be a good investment for the government to make it still easier for the settlers by building small houses for them, and in the meantime holding the land as security. I will not go that far, for I think that any man who gets 160 acres of land in that country under the conditions now prevailing will have no difficulty, if he is a diligent and careful man, in making a better living there than he could in the older provinces. But I would not hamper him at all. I would give him the opportunity of getting the land. I would open every district in the country, making it as free as it was before we obtained possession of it, to every good man who wanted to go in and settle there. That country will never become as great as it was destined to be until these restrictions are removed. It is right in principle, and what is right in principle will always work out in practice. This is not the first time that I have declared in this House most emphatically, and I will continue to declare, that any government of this country would do a wise thing for the country if they could again obtain possession of the lands which we have given to various corporations, and throw them open to the people. The effect of this Bill will be that the land will only be given to bona fide settlers. That will have a double effect. In the first place, settlers knowing that they can get land there, and that it will not be tied up, will be more ready to go into that country ; and in the next place,

the alternate sections not being held by the corporations, the settlers will come nearer to one another. Their roads, their schoolhouses, and all their material interests, are bound up in this question. I support this Bill, and trust that it will receive the sanction of this parliament.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). We shall perhaps have a better knowledge of what this Bill is when we come to the second reading; but I cannot allow the first reading to take place without referring to the remarks of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), as to the application of the Bill. I do not understand the position they take, in view of the statement which I understood the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) to make last session, that all the lands which it was possible to give to railways, had been granted already. He has not any lands to give, and therefore the Bill is of no use.

Mr. CHARLTON. Oh, no; he has not reached the Peace River Valley yet.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well, that was the statement made by the Minister of the Interior last session. A sudden change has come over the spirits of the hon. member for North Norfolk and the hon. member for Guysborough. But a short time ago we had introduced into this House the celebrated Yukon Railway Bill, the object of which was to give a large grant of land to a railway company, and, if I remember rightly, both the hon. member for North Norfolk and the hon. member for Guysborough supported that Bill. I congratulate both of these gentlemen on their change of view; but the practical application of this Bill is all nonsense. The lands that have been granted for railroads in fact cover all the lands that are at the disposal of the government. They have no more land to give to railroad companies, and to introduce a Bill to stop the giving of lands when they have none to dispose of, is a perfect absurdity. As to the rest of the lands, the conditions which the hon. member for North Norfolk wishes to impose by the Bill, are already imposed by the Dominion Lands Act, namely, that they are to be given to actual settlers only.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I have no intention of speaking at any length on the Bill; but my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) referred to his understanding of a statement which I made, and it would be hardly proper for me not to put the matter right. The statement I made to the House last session, or the session before, was with regard to the ability of the government to satisfy the demands of a railway company under its contract; and the statement I made was that the government had not been in a position to offer those gentlemen from the odd-numbered sections such lands as they were willing to accept. The statement was not quite so unreserved a one as my hon. friend has said.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). I would like to point out for the information of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the way to get all these lands back, is to go in for the scheme of government ownership of railways, which I proposed the other day. That was one of my main reasons, which I forgot in the heat of my argument. I pointed out that we could secure the Canadian Pacific Railway by lease, but I forgot to point out that if we leased that road, we would get back every acre of its land grant. True, I believe the land is pledged for the bonds of the road; but the land would come into the hands of the government again, and we would have it for the people; and I believe there is enough land owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to-day, if taken back into the hands of the government, and used to the best advantage, to pay every bond and every other indebtedness of the Canadian Pacific Railway. If these gentlemen wish to have the land returned to the people, and settled under the best auspices, there is the way to do it: nationalize the railways, get the land back, and use that land to bring settlers into Canada.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I presume it will be better to have the Bill placed in the hands of hon. members before entering upon any extensive discussion of the questions involved, and therefore, I do not rise for that purpose. I rise rather for the purpose of calling attention to the statement which my hon. friend made, who introduced the Bill, and which seems to imply an erroneous idea, and one which I think it would be well to correct. My hon. friend stated that he thought the time had now arrived when we should reverse our policy of giving settlement lands to railways in the form of subsidies or land grants. I take exception to the implication, because I submit that that time has already arrived and that we reserved that policy some years ago. This government reversed that policy, and resolved that it would not give any settlement lands by way of subsidy to any railway, and have adhered to that resolution.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I repeat the government has adhered to that resolution. I am not now speaking of mineral lands, for I think there could be no possible objection at any time to giving mineral lands, if thereby we insure the prospecting of mines and the development of the country as well as the construction of railways. But there is a clear and manifest distinction in the mind of

any one who considers the subject, between grants of mineral and grants of settlement lands, and that distinction the government has drawn and adheres to. No legislation therefore is necessary, so far as this government is concerned, in order that the policy we have adopted of not giving settlement lands as railway subsidies shall be adhered to.

At the same time I have not suggested any objection to the Bill itself. I do not know precisely what the Bill is, and when it comes to be closely examined in its details, it may be found desirable to modify it. But so far as regards the general objects which the hon. gentleman states he has in view, I think they will be found to commend themselves to the House generally, as I am sure they commend themselves to the government.

PACIFIC CABLE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House resolve itself to-morrow into Committee of the Whole on the following resolution :

That, whereas by 'The Pacific Cable Act, 1899,' His Excellency in Council is authorized to guarantee payment of five-eighteenths of the principal sum of £1,700,000 sterling to be applied in establishing direct submarine telegraphic communication between Canada and Australia.

And whereas, in lieu of said sum of £1,700,000 it is estimated that for the purpose aforesaid there will be required a sum not exceeding £2,000,000 sterling, which sum of £2,000,000 the government of the United Kingdom is willing to advance.

That the Governor in Council is authorized to guarantee payment of five-eighteenth parts of the principal and interest of and upon the securities to be issued by the government of the United Kingdom for raising the said sum, namely, £2,000,000 to be advanced.

That section 3 of said Act be repealed.

He said : This resolution has received the assent of the Crown.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—THE CORONATION OATH.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. JOHN COSTIGAN (Victoria, N.B.) It was my intention, Mr. Speaker, to move an amendment to that motion, but on consideration, I have decided to pursue a course, the wisdom of which I have already experienced in a former session. I think I would be treating the House more courteously, and also the government, if, instead of availing myself of this opportunity to move the amendment, I put my motion before the House and parliament, in order that parliament and the country may know its nature, and be prepared for it when presented.

I regret to say that my experience convinces me that with regard to the motion I intend to move, and the reasons that impel me to move it, the House would, to some extent, be taken by surprise in entering upon a debate on the question this afternoon. Therefore, I think it is better simply to give notice of my intention on the next occasion on which this House is moved into Committee of Supply, to propose in amendment to the motion to go into Supply, the following resolution. And I wish to declare here that in moving that amendment, I expect the government to receive it as a friendly one—that is, one not inspired by any political reasons, and which should not be received as a vote of want of confidence, because if it is moved as an amendment to going into Supply, that is simply because that is the only way of obtaining a fair expression of opinion on a proposition of this kind.

There are many precedents, which the older members of the House may remember, for the course I am taking, which I might quote. I wish, therefore, to announce now that on the next occasion when the motion is made for this House to go into Committee of Supply, I will move this resolution in amendment.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If my hon. friend would allow me, I would suggest, since he intends to make the motion as a friendly one, that probably it would be just as well, before submitting it to the House, to give us its subject-matter and nature.

Hon. JOHN COSTIGAN. I was going to read the whole motion. My object in postponing it, is to have it before the House before submitting it. It is as follows :—

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

Most Gracious Majesty,—

Your Majesty's most faithful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled, beg leave most humbly to represent :

That as a token of the civil and religious liberties and of the quality of rights guaranteed to all British subjects in the Canadian confederation as well as under the British constitution, the British sovereign should not be called to make any declaration offensive to the religious belief of any subject of the British Crown.

That by virtue of the Act of Settlement of 1689 the British sovereign, on the first day of the meeting of the first parliament, or at the coronation, is called upon to make the following declaration :—

'I, A. B., by the grace of God, King (or Queen) of Great Britain and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that I do believe that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever ; and that

the invocation of adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that I do make this declaration, and each and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope or any other authority or person whatsoever, or without any hope of any such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope or any person or persons, or power whatsoever, should dispense with or annul the same or declare that it was null and void from the beginning.'

That such declaration is most offensive to the dearest convictions of all Roman Catholics.

That the staunch loyalty of His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Canada, comprising about 43 per cent of the entire population of this Dominion, and throughout British possessions, should not be rewarded by their being chosen alone amongst believers of all creeds and branded as adolaters by their sovereign.

That in the opinion of this House, the abovementioned Act of Settlement should be amended by abolishing the said declaration, and the British sovereign freed for ever from the obligation of offending the religious principles of any class of his faithful subjects throughout the British Empire.

That is the motion I intend to move as an amendment on going into Supply, on the first occasion I have the opportunity of doing so.

VISIT OF THEIR ROYAL HIGHNESSES THE DUKE AND DUCHESS OF CORNWALL AND YORK.

Hon. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House, and especially of the government, to a matter that I think of considerable moment to Canada, particularly to the Pacific coast. I see in the newspapers an account of the proposed visit of their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, and it is as follows :—

In connection with the proposed visit to the colonies of their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, the London Times states that it has been decided to commission the Ophir this month, and that their Royal Highnesses will leave England in March. The cruise, which will extend to Canada, will probably occupy about six months; and, according to present arrangements, the following places will be visited: Gibraltar, Malta, Colombo, Singapore, all the Australian colonies and two ports in New Zealand, one in each island. The homeward voyage will probably include Mauritius, the Cape, and possibly one of the West Indian Islands, as well as a Canadian port.

With regard to the escort, two cruisers of the Channel squadron will accompany the Ophir to Gibraltar——

—and so on. From that account and from all the accounts in the newspapers that I have seen, it seems that their Royal Highnesses are not to visit the Pacific coast, and, if they come to Canada, as we trust they will, they will come to Halifax, and probably then come inland a little way, perhaps to Montreal and Toronto, but not further west. I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that, if such is the case, it will be a thousand pities for the good of all concerned. When our present King was here as Prince of Wales in 1860, he did not go any further west than Toronto.

Mr. MACLEAN. He went to Hamilton.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. But, as in those days the splendid province of Manitoba, and the great North-west and British Columbia, were, to all intents and purposes, a terra incognita to most people, and very sparsely inhabited, they were not visited by our present King. But, see the change that has taken place in the last few years. These provinces and territories are now populated by thousands and thousands of loyal and staunch people, who would give anything to have the same chance of seeing their Royal Highnesses as the people of eastern Canada will have. In the first place, it would strengthen the ties that already so strongly bind the colonies to the mother land, and it would also show our future King and Queen the immense value and immense area of this great country and also the affectionate regard in which they are held by the people. Not only that, Sir, but, coming down to a less important matter, though one of great importance to us, it would draw the attention of the whole world to the great possibilities of this country of ours. We all know that every movement of such distinguished people as the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York are heralded by the press and brought to the notice of the whole world. Nothing that could take place, I think, would bring Canada more to the attention of the world than a trip of these distinguished visitors from one side of the continent to the other. I, therefore, thought it was my duty, as representative of the Pacific coast, to bring this matter forward, and to impress upon the government what I consider the necessity of their doing their best to cause this route, which has already been mapped out, to be altered to some extent, if possible, and to bring about such a change as will allow their Royal Highnesses to come to the Pacific coast, and from there, travel across the continent and take ship on the Atlantic.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I may inform my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Prior) that correspondence is now going on between Ottawa and London on this very subject. The correspondence at this moment is confidential, and it

is not in my power to give communication of it to the House, or to go into particulars as to the tenor of that correspondence. But I may say that I am altogether with my hon. friend in thinking that it would be most unfortunate if their Royal Highnesses of Cornwall and York have not an opportunity of visiting every province in the Dominion when they come to Canada next summer. The most convenient, and, I believe, the best mode of all, would be for their Royal Highnesses, who are to return from Australia next September, to come by way of the Pacific instead of the Atlantic, landing at Vancouver, visiting British Columbia, the Territories, Manitoba, and so on, down towards Halifax. That is the view, I think we can assume, that is being represented at this moment to their Royal Highnesses. More than this I cannot say at this moment.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). We will take up the Post Office estimates.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What has become of the understanding that we were to proceed with these estimates in the order in which they appear in the book ? We have not begun yet.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid my hon. friend did not attend late last night. Announcement was made that this would be the business to-day.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But that does not answer my question. I thought that when we began this year, for purposes of convenience, a special understanding was reached that we would proceed with the estimates from cover to cover.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would certainly be desirable, but it is not always possible to follow that rule. It may be that the minister in charge of the item which appears next in the book may not be able to be here. I agree that there should be timely notice given of the business of the following day.

Post Office—Outside Service—Salaries and allowances, including James A. MacDonald, London post office, at $720, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.	$1,296,915 39

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) to tell us now to begin with—we might as well have it now—what is the deficit in the management of the Post Office Department this year, to the beginning of the month ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). We have not got it. We do not balance up our accounts except once a year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Give it to the 1st of July.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On page 4, of the Postmaster General's Report, you will see the gross revenue was $4,345,826.62 to the end of the 30th of June, last.

Mr. MONK. Can the hon. gentleman tell us exactly what the deficit was on the 30th of June ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That also appears in the Postmaster General's Report, page A—II, $461,661.87.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad the hon. the Postmaster General has given us this information, because I remember not very long ago a speech made by that hon. gentleman in our part of the country. I want to read the Committee a report of his speech that appeared in his own paper, the 'great speech of the Postmaster General at Meaford,' in support of his friend Mr. C. W. Hartman, whom he was bound to elect. He went on to decry what had been done by his predecessor, and said with regard to his own conduct of the Post Office Department :

> Hon. Wm. Mulock stated that he had practically wiped out a deficit of $780,000, and left a million dollars in the pockets of the people.

I denied that statement at my nomination. It was made in my presence by his candidate, Mr. Hartman, and I had with me then the Public Accounts and gave them as my authority. In answer to that, my opponent said: But, these Public Accounts are a year old, and I am authorized to say that that deficit is wiped out. Now, I have the hon. gentleman's report for the last year in my hand, and what does it say :

> The deficit on June 30, 1899, was $398,917.

Just as I gave it to that audience then, and my hon. friend the Postmaster General misled that audience by telling them there was no such deficit. On the 30th of June, 1900, the deficit given in this same return is $461,661, as the Postmaster General has given it now. Yet he had that information in his own department last November, but he told the people of Grey that he had wiped that all out, and he asked the people to vote for his candidate, because of the successful management of the Post Office Department by himself. Now, what does this Committee think of the twaddle dished up to an unsuspecting audience back in our country by the Postmaster General when he misleads them by such a statement ? I want this House to know it, and I want the country to know it, because I said then as I say now, that when that return comes down which I am perfectly satisfied that the deficit will be larger instead of smaller, and instead of being wiped out it will be at least $400,000 if not more. His own report verifies that

prediction, and it proves the correctness of what I said, and the incorrectness of what the Postmaster General told the people of the east riding of Grey, when he was up there in the last campaign.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it is only fair to the Postmaster General to remind the Committee that the figures are not down to the present time. While there was last year a deficit of $46,000, that deficit may now be turned the other way, because the Postmaster General gave the assurance that before long the deficit would be wiped out in its entirety. That was the statement made by the premier himself on the authority and on the assurance of the Postmaster General. Now, the premier happened to be in the town of Stratford, and it is a noteworthy circumstance that wherever the premier went in the province of Ontario, devastation followed the Grit candidate. At Stratford, the premier told what the deficit was in 1896, and said that the Postmaster General had reduced that deficit to a nominal amount. And, mark you, at that time the premier must have been aware that there was a deficit of $461,000, because that speech was made subsequent to the 1st day of July. But, the premier was bound to go one better on that occasion, and he said :

> And he had the Postmaster General's authority for further saying that by the end of the present year the revenue and expenditure would balance one another.

Now, I think the premier is to be commiserated in this, that he went out on a public platform and made a statement on the assurance of the Postmaster General that that deficit was wiped out in its entirety. Now, the premier is placed on one of the two horns of a dilemma: Either the Postmaster General made the statement to him or he did not. If the Postmaster General made that statement to the premier, he tried the confidence game on him; and, I say that here, and now is the proper time for the Postmaster General to apologize to the premier for having misled him into making that statement.

Mr. WALLACE. While the Postmaster General is apologizing, I will give the Committee another fact. He told us a few minutes ago, when asked by members on this side of the House to give his statement of the present fiscal year so far as he could, and he said : We do not keep any accounts, we do not balance till the end of the year. Well, Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a statement of accounts of the Post Office Department for the five months ending with the month of November, 1900, showing a comparison between November, of 1900, and November, 1899, and it is as follows : In November, 1899, the department expended $260,000; in November, 1900, $309,000 or $49,000 more. That was furnished by the Post Office Department. For the five months ending November 30, 1899, the expenditure was $1,150,000; for the five months ending November 30, 1900, the expenditure was $1,279,237.50, or an increase in these five months of $129,237. Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. Postmaster General to explain why we have statements made here by the Department of Trade and Commerce which he said could not be given in this House, because they kept no such record. We have the record here.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not wish to be bound by the reports of speeches, nor, in saying that, Mr. Chairman, do I desire for one moment to depart in the slightest degree from anything stated by me, or by my authority, publicly or elsewhere, in regard to my administration. Perhaps, when I have made my observations, it will not appear that matters are so far astray as some hon. gentlemen would seem to prove and perhaps desire. On January 1, 1899, the government reduced the rate of postage in Canada from three to two cents, and a week before a reduction of the rate from Canada to the greater part of the empire from five to two cents took place. That necessarily for the moment caused a shrinkage in the revenue of the department. Some gentlemen estimated it at one figure and others at another. The late hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), speaking in 1895, if I remember correctly, estimated the loss at $700,000. That was in his budget speech. The late leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) subsequently, in addressing the public, estimated the loss of revenue at $1,000,000 a year. It is not necessary to ascertain, nor can it be definitely ascertained, what that loss will amount to. It is sufficient to know that if for the moment you reduce the revenue from the domestic letter rate of three cents to two cents you, for the moment, cut down the revenue by one-third, that you do very materially, for the moment, affect the revenue, and when, in the spring of 1898, I asked parliament to authorize us to reduce our rate from three to two cents, I stated that for the time being there would be a substantial shrinkage in our revenue and that for the moment I thought it would necessarily lead to a considerable deficit between revenue and expenditure. Without being bound then or even now as to what would be the time limit when the volume of revenue would attain its former position, I ventured the prophecy in parliament then that the revenue would recover its former volume in about three years. I said that until it recovered we must expect substantial deficits in the working of the department, but that month by month as the people came to appreciate the advantage of cheap postage and took greater advantage of the postal system, there would be a considerable growth of revenue, and in

time it would attain its former proportions. I am not here to compare results, because the time has not yet come; the time in which I ventured to say that the revenue would attain its former position has not yet been reached, but I would say that the reduction went into effect on January 1, 1899. It, therefore, only had six months' effect on the public accounts of the department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899. For the fiscal year, during the last half of which the rate of postage was reduced, there was a deficit of $398,000, or we may say $400,000. Twice $400,000 would be $800,000. Of course, the whole of that deficit was not occasioned, I presume, though a large portion of it was, by the reduction in the rates. Now, the next fiscal year closing June 30 last found us with a deficit for the full year of $461,000. For that deficit the country had for one whole year enjoyed the advantage of the reduced rates which hon. gentlemen prophesied would mean a loss of revenue of as much as $700,000, while others said that it would mean a greater loss. If we had had during that year the higher rates that my predecessors enjoyed, or if we had had the same amount of business, there would have been a very considerable surplus, but, when we began the fiscal year on July 1, 1899, we had only six months in which to recover the revenue, and therefore, the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1899, began with a very largely reduced revenue because of the reduction in the rates, but, Sir, the loss of revenue in July was very much less than it was in the previous January. In January, the first month of 1899, when the country had the reduced rates, there was a large loss of revenue. If that loss had represented the rate of loss throughout the year it would have represented a great shrinkage in revenue for the year, and in that case it would have proved the assertion of the former leader of the opposition, that this change in the rate meant a loss of revenue amounting to the best part of a million dollars. As months went by, our revenue began to increase, and it has steadily increased from that time to this. There is one feature in connection with the revenue that surprised me. Though the revenue grew month by month with varying proportion, but generally growing as compared with the corresponding month of the previous year under higher rates, I assumed that the growth would continue uninterrupted. Our revenue in the month of August, I think, was $4,000 above what it had been in the former August under the higher rates. I did not anticipate any interruption in that steady growth of revenue beginning with a deficit in January, 1899, and that deficit being almost wiped out within a period of less than a year and nine months, but, I found, a short time ago, that there had been an interruption. Hon. gentlemen may draw their own conclusions; I give them these statements and they may explain the cause. For the months of September and November, 1900, we lost revenue, as compared with the corresponding months of the preceding year. What is the cause of that? My theory is that as during the fall of 1900, Canada, Great Britain and the United States were undergoing the struggle of a general election, the volume of our trade must have been affected by these disturbances, and so the extraordinary circumstances happened of a loss of revenue in the post office for September and November, 1900. There was a surplus in the month of October, but taking the three months together the revenue only represented a growth of some $13,000 per month, which was less than we enjoyed from the time we reduced the postage. My calculations have been disturbed to that extent, and to that extent only. What I sought to represent on the platform was, and what I state here is, that having practiced wise economy—not penury, but fair economy—in the administration of the department, this, with the reduced postal rates and the general prosperity, and increased trade that Canada has enjoyed owing to the government of this country, have made their mark upon the post office revenue so that what I prophesied in 1888, has been fully realized, if the experience of the past month is to continue. When we point to a deficit for the year 1900, of $460,000, we must remember that the reduced postal rates had only been in force for six months. We began that fiscal year with a revenue suffering extremely from that cut, but each month it gradually recovered itself. Even if it recoverd its former position at the close of the year, that would still leave us a shortage which would be felt upon our accounts by reason of the loss of revenue for the preceding months. And so it has been a sort of a stern chase; the revenue seeking to overtake the former figure, and now I may say that for the month of January, 1901, that is, two years after we reduced our postage rates, the revenue is $29,000 greater for that month than it was for January two years ago under the higher rates.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am sure that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will be pleased with that information. We began with a great shrinkage in 1899. I ventured to prophesy that our revenue would attain its former figure within a period of about three years, and now in the twenty-fifth month; in this month of January, 1901, we have a surplus of $29,000 over the revenue which we had under the higher postage rates.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the revenue for that month?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will send for the figures and get them for the

hon. gentleman. What I desire to say to the country now is, that if our revenue continues in this buoyant state, the department may in a short time be considered to be on a paying basis. I repeat that statement. Of course, the country is growing, and I would not wish to starve the service. It would be unwise to do so, and if we do not increase the service we might, on the present basis of revenue, let the department pay its own way. When an hon. gentleman gets up and produces the accounts which appear in the official Gazette month by month, I would point out that they by no means represent the net results of the operation of the Post Office Department, or of any other department, up to that moment. There may be receipts and expenditures not fully accounted for, and it is only a month or two after the close of the fiscal year, when you have all the figures in that you can balance up the revenue and expenditure. I have not got the figures for the current year. The current year began in July last, with a loss of revenue as compared with the month of July, at the higher postal rate. We had not attained the volume of revenue we attained in the seven months of the year, and therefore, whilst the expenditure goes on the same throughout the whole twelve months, we did not get the full benefit of the high revenue for the whole year. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) ventured to express the opinion that the deficit this year would exceed the deficit of last year. He may be right.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not make that statement.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understood some hon. gentleman opposite to make that statement. I venture to say, at all events, that when the accounts are balanced, there will be no such result. I believe it will be found that for the fiscal year we are now in, our revenue and expenditure will be much closer than they ever were under the preceding government—not than they were under the present government, because in 1898, we had only a deficit of $47,000, as against a deficit of $781,000, the year that I took office. This year we are now in, the deficit will be much less than it was last year, notwithstanding the fact that the public will have reaped whatever advantage there is in having to pay two cents only instead of three cents under a former administration. When we enter upon our next fiscal year ; unless we are compelled to incur large expenditures—and as I have said I would not wish to impair the usefulness of the department by unwise economy—I think that with the fiscal year beginning the 1st of July next, you will find but little difference between the revenue and the expenditure of the Post Office Department. I do not know that I can add anything further, but, I shall be extremely pleased to give any information that I may be asked for.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Postmaster General persists in sticking to the statement, which has been so thoroughly threshed out in this House in the last two sessions, in regard to that deficit of $780,000. I think he ought to know by this time that there was no such deficit. He makes that deficit by including in the accounts for the year accounts which had not matured in that year, but which were paid in the succeeding year, and which his predecessors were accustomed to charge to the year in which they were paid. He charges virtually the accounts for eighteen months against one year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend is entirely wrong.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, I am not wrong. Not eighteen months, perhaps, but nearly that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am sure my hon. friend does not want to misstate the facts. There are included some old accounts, amounting to $600,000 or $700,000 ; but if the accounts he refers to had been included, the deficit would have been nearly $1,400,000 instead of $780,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. My hon. friend knows that I do not mean anything of the kind. What I do mean, is that there were certain contracts running which were payable in July, and it was the habit of the department, as the accounts could not come in before the 1st of July, to pay them in the succeeding year. These accounts the hon. gentleman charges to the preceding year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. My hon. friend is quite mistaken.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am not mistaken at all. We threshed out the question again and again. I took the trouble of going to my old deputy, Colonel White, and getting a statement of all the facts from him, and he showed me conclusively that that was the reason. Why is it that the hon. gentleman shows a deficit of nearly $400,000 more for the year 1896 than for the preceding year ? I am so certain of the matter that there cannot be any doubt about it. The hon. gentleman has charged to the year all the accounts which he thinks ought to be paid before the 1st of July, although they did not come in until a couple of months afterwards, while we had been in the habit of charging them to the year in which they were paid. The consequence is that he cannot now balance his accounts on the 1st of July, but has to wait for two or three months after the expiration of the year to find out all the accounts which he

thinks ought to be charged to that year. It may be a better system of book-keeping, but I do not believe it is. I believe the proper system is to charge the accounts to the year in which they are paid. It is impossible to keep the accounts hanging over for three or four months for the purpose of making a balance. But the hon. gentleman, by an alteration in the system of book-keeping, which he introduced when he came into office, made the deficit appear far larger than it really was, in order to show—and the statement was made boldly from one end of the country to the other—not perhaps that the books of the department were falsified, but that they were placed before the public in such a manner as to deceive them—that, in fact, he found that accounts amounting to $300,000 or $400,000, which ought to have been charged to the previous year, were left out altogether. As a consequence, he was able to show a very favourable statement for the next year, because the amounts to be charged to that particular year would be only for nine months of the year, unless he waited for three or four months after the end of the year, in order to give a correct statement of the whole amount accruing to that year; and then, necessarily, the statement for the succeeding year would be a deceptive one. What I mean to say is that the department was managed under its predecessor as economically and as faithfully as it is under the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman may claim credit for a reduction of postage from a three-cent to a two-cent rate. That may be an advantage to the country, and the country may feel gratified at it. I am glad to hear his statement that he expects that at the end of the fiscal year that reduction will be found to involve no loss to the country, and that probably at the end of two years both ends will meet. I made the same recommendation to my colleagues when I was Postmaster General, but they thought the time had not arrived for a reduction to a two-cent rate. The hon. gentleman is perhaps right in saying that we could not continue to charge three cents when a letter could be carried from any part of the United States to any other part for two cents; we had to adopt the same rate that they had, and if a deficit resulted, I believe the people would willingly make it up. But let the statement no longer be made in this House that in the last year of the Conservative government there was a deficit in the Post Office Department of $780,000. There was no such deficit. I see that the right hon. premier, in an address in Toronto, stated that the Postmaster General, by his able administration of the department, besides reducing the rate of postage from three cents to two cents, had so succeeded that there would likely be no deficit in that department, and he compared that condition of things with a deficit of $780,000 under his predecessors, with a three-cent postage rate. The right hon. premier was entirely mistaken in that, and I shall have an opportunity of going into the details of the matter at a later stage.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if he accurately stated the deficit of 1900 in the Post Office Department, when he put it at $461,661?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I put it in the book, and am willing to be bound by the book.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the public accounts, he will find that it is not at all correct. He knows perfectly well that he left out the Yukon service, and that instead of the deficit being $461,000 it is $552,479. Why does he conceal that from the public? Perhaps he will explain why he made a statement in his report different from that in the public accounts.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I hardly think my hon. friend is fair in suggesting that I am trying to conceal anything. We might as well conduct the debate in a more proper and courteous manner. In the Finance Department a day is fixed when accounts are closed. After that date, if any items come in affecting the previous year's accounts, they will not be considered by the Finance Department in balancing the year's accounts. But any other department may, for the purpose of giving a more accurate statement, carry on its balancing of the year's operations so as to include these items which affect that year, but shall have come in after the date fixed by the Finance Department. I was trying to compare the services under this administration with those under former administrations. There was no Yukon under former administrations, and we are not concealing anything. I would refer the hon. gentleman to the Postmaster General's report on page A—XI. Referring to the total financial operations for the year, it states:

> The total net revenue of the Post Office from all sources except that from the Yukon and Atlin districts exceeded that of the previous year by $1,053.25, and the total gross revenue exceeded that of the previous year by $20,391.09. On the other hand, the expenditure of the department, omitting from the comparison the special expenses incurred in the Yukon and Atlin districts, exceeded that of the previous year by $63,797.33, the excess being distributed somewhat evenly over the larger items of Post Office expenditure. It appears therefore that a considerably larger volume of postal business, sufficient to nearly balance the loss arising during the first half of the year as compared with the corresponding period of the previous year from the reduction of the postage, was handled at an increased expense of slightly over one and a half per cent.

Mr. CLANCY. How does the hon. gentleman justify submitting a table from 1896

to 1900, showing each year the net revenue, expenditure and deficit, and excluding the Yukon district ? He took exception to my stating that there was concealment, but I tell the hon. gentleman that no milder language could be used to properly mark the course taken by the hon. gentleman. In his statement he has excluded two items—the item of revenue, $21,550, and expenditure $112,368—which would make an addition to the deficit of $90,818. How does he attempt to explain this ? He said that his department had one way of keeping the accounts, and the Finance Department another. But, Sir, the accounts correspond if you take in these items. Yet the hon. minister professes to give a true statement when he makes the deficit $90,000 less than it really is. But some hon. gentlemen opposite say that we had not the Yukon in former years, and therefore, to make a proper comparison, the Yukon should be left out. Well, if the hon. gentleman had said that there was a deficit of $461,000 in 1900, but that he had not included the Yukon service, which would have increased the deficit $90,000, that might be a frank statement, but he did not. And if his report went to the country without the public accounts, what inference would be drawn ? The only inference that could be drawn would be that there was simply a deficit of $461,000, instead of a deficit nearly $100,000 more.

I see in a campaign sheet that the hon. gentleman boasts that he reduced the deficit in 1898-9 from nearly $800,000.

An hon. MEMBER. What paper ?

Mr. CLANCY. It is marked 'Record of Progress and Prosperity under Liberal Rule.' This is what appears in this paper :

The Hon. Mr. Mulock, by the application of proper business principles and sound economy, cut down the deficit of about $800,000 to $47,602 in two short years—thereby making possible the reduction in the rates which quickly followed.

In the first place let me say that there was not any such deficit. But let us suppose there was, how did he reduce it ? By an act of bad faith and repudiation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CLANCY. Hon. gentlemen opposite may jeer as much as they like, it was an act of repudiation and bad faith to the public. What was it ? Why, the hon. gentleman took advantage of the Queen's jubilee to issue jubilee stamps, and these the public purchased from patriotic motives. Largely actuated by the proper sentiment which prevails in matters of that kind, the public bought these stamps, ranging in value from a half cent up to large figures. But, there was also in the minds of the people the belief that these stamps had a value. The Postmaster General, however, refused to exchange these for other stamps ; and the result is that he has unloaded, practically—beyond a few that were used—nearly half a million dollars on the public, which they hold to-day, and which the Postmaster General will not redeem. That was an act of bad faith. The hon. gentleman stated, on a former occasion in this House, that these stamps were being used. Any one can use a five-dollar stamp to carry a letter from one post office to another if he likes, but only in this manner will the stamps be redeemed. It is not greatly to the credit of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Mulock) to make the statement that there was a very large deficit under the former government. As was pointed out by the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), that was largely a mere myth, a mere matter of book-keeping. The Postmaster General would have us believe that he reduced that deficit by the economy and wisdom that characterized his management of the department. As a matter of fact, he did it by means which his friends cannot defend. I defy the hon. minister, for instance, to rise in his place and deny that he has been guilty of the act I charged him with a moment ago. With regard to the Yukon postal service, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the mounted police are now performing any service that is not included in the charges made here ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. None.

Mr. MACLEAN. In view of the Postmaster General's statement that the revenue of the post office about meets the expenditure, I would like to ask whether he will take into consideration the unfair taxation put upon some newspapers by way of newspaper postage. The law is not made general, but is so arranged as to impose a special tax upon newspapers in the large cities. It is time to treat all newspapers alike and remedy the grievances that now exist in connection with the hon. gentleman's department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has not indicated in detail the amendment he would suggest. I would be glad to consider any suggestions he may make.

Mr. MACLEAN. What needs to be done is to make a law that will apply to all newspapers that deliver through the post office. As it is, a heavy burden is imposed upon the newspapers of Toronto and Montreal, instead of being distributed over the whole country. This is a tax that men would be justified in refusing to pay, because it is an unequal tax and unjust. If the revenue is in the condition the hon. minister says it is, I hope that he will remove this special tax upon one class of newspapers and subject all newspapers fairly to the incidence of the taxation levied by his department.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the long and rambling statement of the Postmaster General evades the charges brought on this side of the House. It was charged that the First Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made statements which were not supported by the facts. He would not have made those statements, relating as they did to the Post Office Department, without the authority of the Postmaster General. Therefore, the Postmaster General cannot dismiss the matter with a wave of his hand, and the remark that he is not responsible for newspaper reports. He is responsible for the information he gives to the First Minister. Then, with regard to the statements made by the Postmaster General in East Grey. These statements were made, not only at Meaford, but at Thornbury, Singhampton and Feversham. After repeating these things at four different places, it will not do for the Postmaster General to tell us that he would not pay any attention to newspaper reports. He said that he had wiped out the deficit of $780,000, and had left $1,000,000 in the pockets of the Canadian people. He tells us to-day that the deficit is $460,000. But the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has proved that he should add to that $90,000, the receipts from the Yukon having been $21,000 and the expenditure $113,000. Why does he not place that where it belongs, among the expenditures of the Post Office Department ? In 1898, he entered in his report an amount of $48.33 as the post office expenditure in the Yukon. Does not every member of this House know—does not every citizen know—that that is not a correct statement of the expenditure of the Post Office Department in carrying the mails into and out of the Yukon ? The department were simply utilizing the North-west mounted police for the service and not paying them. Therefore, the Postmaster General's statement is misleading and unfair to the people of Canada. It is an untrue statement to make, that the deficit for the past year was $461,000, when, including this $91,000 which ought to be included, it would amount to over $550,000. The hon. Postmaster General says that he does not propose to pay any attention to what was said in the campaign. Does the Postmaster General intend to say to the country : I am going to make speeches on the public platform, but before I begin I warn you not to place the slightest reliance on anything I may say. We are coming to a nice state of things when a minister of the Crown declares before the whole country that he will ignore utterly what he has said upon the public platform. Here is one thing that he said, as reported in a friendly newspaper :—

Mr. Mulock was pleased to say that many independent Conservatives of Grey county had thrown party to the winds, and had decided to vote in their country's interests. This sentiment was not confined to Grey county alone, but the independent vote of Canada was lining up with the Liberal party.

The province of Ontario, where the Postmaster General, the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), and the other ministers from that province, did their fine work, in the last parliament gave hon. gentlemen opposite a majority of a round dozen. To-day there are eighteen or twenty of a majority of independent stalwart members against them. Therefore, the prediction of the Postmaster General was not verified where he had any influence or did any work.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is the leader of that Ontario majority ?

Mr. WALLACE. Their leader, and the leader of the Liberal-Conservative party, is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to my left, who is a credit to the party, and who, judging by appearances, such, for instance, as the division we had last night, will not be long in leading us to victory.

Mr. Mulock then put a poser by asking the electors if they endorsed Dr. Sproule on the present occasion.

Well, Sir, the poser was answered a few days later by the intelligent electors of East Grey, and they said just what the Postmaster General wants them to believe now, that they are not to believe anything said by the Postmaster General. He went on :

Dr. Sproule had never brought the advantages of Meaford before parliament.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think if he had consulted the 'Hansard' he would not have been able to make that statement, because Dr. Sproule, in season and out of season, has not confined his efforts to the county of East Grey ; while he has brought the necessities of that county to the attention of the House, he has been one of the foremost men in parliament in advocating a broad and comprehensive policy that would develop every portion of this Dominion. He said furthermore :

He could build five harbours on the former postal deficit alone. Some time ago he (Hon. Mr. Mulock) asked the town council to send him a plan of the harbour.

How generous and considerate he was.

The request was complied with, but the council had asked too little.

What a generous man! Why does he not pay his officials what is due them ? Why does he not pay the letter carriers what, by law, they are entitled to receive, instead of going up to the electors of the county of East Grey and saying to them : You electors of Meaford, why, you are not asking half as much as I would like to give you. He said :

I want to make a great harbour of Meaford. It might do for the present, but would not answer for the future. The harbour would have to be large enough to accommodate the largest ships.

The Great Eastern must sail into the harbour of Meaford, Mr. Chairman ; Meaford must be made a harbour for every vessel, not only vessels on the lakes of 6,000 tons or 8,000 tons, but a harbour that will accommodate ships of the Atlantic, which will make Meaford their headquarters, according to this generous statement of the Postmaster General, a man who is squandering the public money with bribes, who is not fair enough to give the employees of his own department what the law says they should have. Now we will have to have revised editions from the Postmaster General of the statements that he has made, and of the statements he has put in his report, which are misleading to the extent that he has laid aside that Yukon matter. The Yukon is a part of Canada, it has been opened up in recent years, there is no reason why Yukon expenditures for the post office work should not be treated like any other expenditure, and included in the expenditures of the department, and thereby increased by the amount stated by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy).

Mr. BRITTON. I cannot understand the ground of stating that there is any deception or misleading statement in the report of the Postmaster General. The amount of the revenue that we are speaking of is one thing in itself, and the amount of the expenditure is another thing. You are speaking of, or comparing the amount of one year with another, and taking the different items on which comparison is made. But to talk about deception and concealment is entirely beside the mark ; because if hon. gentlemen will look at the report that they have in their hands, on page 3, they will find the whole thing. The Yukon expenditure is there, the Yukon receipts are there, and anybody can add the items of the revenue to each other and the items of expenditure to each other. All that is in the report actually in the hands of hon. members, and they have no ground whatever for talking of deception or of cooking the accounts. Hon. gentlemen will find it on page 3 of Appendix A : Statement of the revenue of the Post Office Department of the Dominion of Canada for the year ended June 30, 1900 (except that from Yukon and Atlin districts). And just below is given the revenue from the Yukon and Atlin districts.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Read what it says about the revenue and returns of the Yukon district.

Mr. BRITTON (reading).

Statement of the revenue of the Post Office Department of the Dominion of Canada for the year ended June 30, 1900, from the Yukon and Atlin districts, not included in above, $20,788.49.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. What is the expenditure ?

Mr. BRITTON. On the fourth page the expenditure is stated in the same way, giving the expenditure of the Post Office Department, but not including the Yukon and Atlin districts. Then it gives the Yukon and Atlin district services, not included in the above, $112,368.57. I am saying that there is an entire absence of deception when the figures are all given in the report in the hands of hon. members.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the items of expenditure, does the hon. gentleman find any amount put down as incurred for the use of the police, or are the police, so far as this service is concerned, paid entirely under other headings ?

Mr. BRITTON. The figures on this page from which I am reading are : Mail service, $80,433.06 ; salaries, $28,885.80 ; miscellaneous, $3,049.71. I am not in a position to know, nor is any one, without looking at the public accounts, whether the mail service, costing the sum I have mentioned, includes something for the police.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As I understand, the Postmaster General explained last session that there is no item in the post office account for the payment of the mounted police for the services they performed as mounted police for carrying the mails, etc., in the Yukon district. They are paid entirely from another department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The mounted police for the fiscal year that is now being discussed, beginning on June 30, 1899 and closing June 30, 1900, performed no mail service that I am aware of for the Post Office Department.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Up to 1899 my statement would be correct, that the service they performed up to July, 1899, was not charged by the Police Department against the Post Office Department. I would be obliged if the hon. gentleman would tell me if that is correct.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not brought any figures with me about the previous year. The subject was thoroughly discussed, and my recollection is that in a debate which took place last year upon the subject, I explained what I am trying to explain to-day, that I desired as far as possible to keep the Yukon service apart from the rest of the service in order the better to compare one administration with another. Whilst mail service was performed at the commencement by the police, it was treated as previous governments had done

in the case of the North-west Territories. In opening up new territories the late government used the police. They had the North-west Territories fund which covered services that later on were distributed among the various departments. We followed that example.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That practically comes to what I stated. I was not making an argument in the matter at all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think that the hon. gentleman should assume that I am admitting more than I intend to admit. There were some services which may have been included in the Yukon and some may not; some may have been performed by the police. But, it was not intended at any period to include in the general balance of the department the cost of administering the Yukon service.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That leaves the fact as I put it. My information was from memory listening to the hon. Postmaster General's own statement. The expenditure to July, 1899, was of course very extensive in a new and unsettled country, and the police did perform a very large amount, if not the whole, of the postal service, the carriage of mails, and so on. Not all the cost of that service was charged in the public accounts to the Post Office Department; that was charged to the maintenance of the police or the vote out of which they were paid. The argument that you would make out of this is another matter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Parliament voted money for the Yukon. I first brought in my estimates for a fixed sum, there being an item for the Yukon, and subsequently, when the estimates were being voted, it was included in the Yukon service —I think under the Department of the Interior—and the police were paid that sum, but when it appeared in the Supply Bill it was ear-marked as for the Yukon service, and in my report to parliament I think I gave the figures just as they have been given here in the text accompanying the annual statement.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand exactly what the hon. gentleman has said, but, outside of the questions that have been suggested and argued today and putting aside the tu quoque argument altogether, what the country wants to get at, irrespective of party views, is the real cost of the postal service. I do not understand why the hon. Postmaster General should wish to argue, instead of giving us the exact information at this stage that we are seeking to get. Instead of justifying himself, and saying that he has done exactly as was done before, it seems an easy road to reach as to what the service has cost the country, and it is not an accurate statement, whether it occurs under Liberal or Conservative auspices, to exclude the cost of the service rendered by the police in carrying the mails from any statement as to the cost of the postal service. That was proportionately a very small affair until the Yukon was developed, but, after that, and under the hon. gentleman's regime, it was a very considerable matter. There is no question about that, because we can see what an enormous amount the police have cost. There is this singular coincidence about that, regardless as to whether one or both parties pursued that system of making a statement to this House as to what each service has cost, that it does not appear in regard to other departments. For instance, if the Marine Department, or the Department of Public Works, rendered a service to the Customs Department in connection with their vessels and matters of that kind, we find these charges are made by one department against the other for the service showing what each particular charge was, and what each service cost the country. It is a matter of book-keeping, it all comes out of one purse, but the statement would not be accurate, unless the books were kept in that way. That system obtains between all the departments, I think, but not in the Post Office Department, and the hon. gentleman's boast, a large part of it, perhaps, justifiable today in regard to the buoyant condition of matters in connection with the postal service which he has been able to make, would be materially affected if he had disclosed the whole of the facts, and had not desired to exclude from the cost of the postal service a large amount that was paid out to the police which does not appear in the statement which he has made.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) comes to the rescue of the hon. Postmaster General, and says that any one taking up the report must, after looking over it, see where the discrepancy is, and is not likely to be misled. If any person unfamiliar with the report wished to see whether the Post Office Department was self-sustaining or not, where would he look for it ? Would he not look in the column of figures which the hon. Postmaster General has given us in his own report, and which contains the following :

> The following statement shows the deficit upon the department's operations for the year ended June 30, 1896, and the revenue, expenditure and deficit for each of the succeeding years.

Would he not be likely to look there for it ? If not, then it is certainly misleading the public, because this is the only place that it should be expected to be found. He takes up the report and finds by it that there was a deficit of $461,661, for the last financial year. Any one who contradicts that, is contradicting the blue-book, which is the

only official record we can look to for information. I take up the public accounts and find that they give some of the items of expenditure and revenue of the Post Office Department which is not in this list. The report shows that $112,368 are left out, being the expenditure of the Yukon district, and if you add that to the other you have a deficit, not of $461,661, but of $553,000. Yet the hon. Postmaster General says that it is not misleading, and the hon. member for Kingston comes to his recue and says that no person would be misled by it. Surely in private life he would not conduct his book-keeping in that way. That part of the hon. gentleman's remarks was very interesting to me, but there was another part of the hon. Postmaster General's speech which was also interesting, and that was the acknowledgment that he would not stand by any reports of the speeches that he had made in the country during the late election. It will be rather interesting reading to the people of East Grey, who listened to him during the campaign when he told them so positively and when his candidate told them so positively of the marvellous things he had accomplished during the time that he has been in charge of the department. This was said not at one place, but at four different places from the Monitor's report of his and Hoolman's speeches at Meaford :

Mr. Hartman briefly reviewed our postal service, which under the Conservative administration had a yearly deficit of over $700,000, and which, under the able management and wise economy of Mr. Mulock, had been reduced to less than $100,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Hon. gentlemen cheer that, and say hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Do they mean to say by that cheer that this statement is correct ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Do they, or what do they mean ? Do they mean to cast ridicule upon the words of the friend who stated it ? Do they mean to say that the hon. Postmaster General was worthy of respect when he misled the people by such a statement ? Is that why they cheer ? If it is, then I can only say they cheer to their own shame.

And it would soon be self-sustaining. All this had been accomplished with the present reduction in the postal rates from 3 to 2 cents.

I do not wish to detract one iota from the credit due to the hon. Postmaster General for anything that he has accomplished. I say that he is entitled to credit for reducing the rate of postage, and for anything he has accomplished in the way of economy or good management I am willing to give him the utmost credit. But I am not willing to allow the Postmaster General to mislead the people of my constituency without trying to set them right. When he tells the House to-day that he will not be bound by that statement he then made, it will be interesting reading to the people of East Grey who listened to him in November last. One of his friends on the platform, speaking against me, said : 'This is only the statement of the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) against the statement of the Postmaster General ; whose statement will you take ?' He followed that up by saying that a minister of the Crown who would stand up on a platform and make that statement, if it was not correct, was unworthy of respect as a public man. But now the Postmaster General stands up here and tells us that in the month of July of that year the revenue was running behind, that it ran more behind in October and November, and yet it was in the month of November that he made this incorrect statement in East Grey. His friends then told us that if they had the report of the last financial year it would show that there was an increase in the revenue of the Post Office Department all the time, and a decrease in expenditure, and it would prove that the Post Office Department was self-sustaining. But now the Postmaster General tells the House that the revenue was decreasing at that very time. As a defence, he tells us that in the month of January of this present year, there is an increase in revenue, and that what he meant to convey to the people of Canada was that if he took into account the present increase of revenue, he would be justified in asserting that the revenue and expenditure would balance in a short time. But does he not see that this increase in revenue took place two months after he made that misleading statement to the people of East Grey ? When he tells us to-day that he is not willing to stand by the statement he made solemnly on the platform, he makes an admission that I do not believe that any other member of his party would be guilty of. I am glad to know that the people of the country have been set right in this matter, because in future they will know just how much weight to attach to any statement made by the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock.)

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). It certainly does seem to me that the statement on the first page of the Postmaster General's Report is, to say the least, somewhat misleading. If any one were sufficiently familiar with the report and should carefully look through it, no doubt he might find out after some research, that the Yukon expenditure is not included, but on the page before me there is not the slightest qualification to show that this expenditure does not include the

whole of Canada. The Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) explains that for the purpose of comparison, we should not include the Yukon, because the Yukon was not included in previous years. I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that his brother Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) is a sinner, if the Postmaster General himself is right, because I notice that the customs revenue for two or three years past has included very large sums from the Yukon, and last year it included no less a sum from this source than $613,-191.97. I desire to point out to the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Mulock) that when the Minister of Customs is comparing one year with another he includes the Yukon, but when the Postmaster General goes on the platform to compare one fiscal year with another, he omits the Yukon. If the Postmaster General thinks it fair to leave out the Yukon with respect to the expenditure in his department, I trust that he will see that his brother ministers will leave out the Yukon when they come to compare the revenue of one year with the revenue of another. The two things are exactly on the same basis, but in the one case the ministers do not charge the expenditures on the Yukon, while in the other they take good care to credit themselves with the revenue from that territory.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) will turn to the report of the auditors who balanced up the account of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1896, he will there find the following results. Over the signatures of the auditors in question, is the following :

> The revenue of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, amounted to $3,957,798.51, which, deducted from the cost of maintenance, $4,985,327.53, leaves a deficit of $1,027,529.02. Heretofore it has not been the practice to treat the amount expended under the head of civil government as a charge against the department, and were such a practice adhered to the deficit of $1,027,529.02 would be reduced by $246,376.83, leaving the outside service shortage $781,152.19.

That audit is purely and simply for services rendered for the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1896, and it does not include any disbursement for service prior to that year. That was all carefully eliminated by the auditors, and the sum given represents the gross cost of the service for the year, on the theory that you pay and charge each year for the service rendered in that year. If the old deficit, rolled up year after year, amounting to between $600,000 and $700,000, were to have been added, instead of the auditors reporting a deficit of $781,000, they would have reported a deficit of nearly twice that. This deficit of 1896 does not include any overlapping. It does not include any five quarterly expenses on contracts or anything like that. It is simply for the actual year 1896, and that was the shortage for that year, according to these auditors.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I will take the published accounts of the Post Office Department of revenue and expenditure, and I suppose it will be accepted as a final settlement of our dispute on this matter. In 1896 the gross revenue of the department was $4,005,890.77 ; net revenue, $2,-964,014.13. The deductions from revenue were $1,041,876.54, and paid by check, $3,-593,647. I would like to know what changes were made in the law when we went out—in July, 1896, if I remember rightly—leading to increased receipts in the department in 1897. The gross revenue in that year was $4,311,242 ; the net revenue was $3,-202,938 ; the deductions from revenue amounted to $1,158,840 ; and the amount paid by check was $3,575,411. All the possible economies for which the hon. gentleman can take credit must be in the deductions from revenue. Of course, he did not alter the amount of the receipts of the post offices in the different cities, towns and villages. His reductions must solely be in the amounts paid by check. Was there any alteration in the law or in anything else for which he could take credit by which the revenue would be more buoyant ? If he takes credit for reductions in the payments for carrying mails, these reductions must be found in the gross payments made by check ; and the difference between that year and the preceding year was the difference between $3,789,000 and $3,575,-000. His gross revenue for 1899 is $4,-325,000 and his net revenue $3,182,000, or $400,000 less than that of the preceding year ; the deductions from revenue amount to $142,000, or only $16,000 less than those of the preceding year ; and the amount paid on contracts, notwithstanding the deductions from revenue, is greater by $6,000 than that of the preceding year. The amount paid by check is $3,381,000. Now, we will take the year 1900. The gross revenue is $4,345,822 ; the net revenue is $3,183,984 ; the deductions from revenue are $1,161,000, or more by nearly $20,000 than those of the preceding year, although the rate was nearly the same ; and the amount paid by check was $3,645,646. These are the figures of the hon. gentleman's own report, and I would like him to explain to me where his economies are, and what his alterations in the management of his office have been to cause those economies. What are the reductions made between 1896 and 1897 ? The only possible reductions would be in the amounts paid to contractors for carrying the mails, and these, I will venture to say, could not have been more than $40,-000 or $50,000. Therefore, we have this misleading statement put before the country, that by some act of the Postmaster

General since he came into office, a deficit of $780,000 was virtually turned into something that was not a deficit at all. The hon. gentleman admits now a deficit of nearly $500,000, which he says was caused by a reduction from the three-cent to the two-cent rate. Very likely that is so ; but there is a deficit of $500,000 ; and the hon. gentleman promises that three or four years from now the accounts will perhaps balance. I doubt that very much. If they do, it will be entirely owing to the prosperity of the country. It may be that the reduction in the rate of postage does not actually cause a reduction of revenue, as people may send more letters ; but the fact remains that in the payments made by the department, which is the true test of economical management, there is no such saving as the hon. gentleman states.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the hon. Postmaster General tell the House whether he has under consideration an improvement of the parcel delivery system, and also, whether it is his intention to unify the postal notes and the money orders ? Of all the public departments the Post Office Department is the one to which the people are constantly looking for improvements. I believe great improvements can be made in the parcel delivery system, and still further improvements in the transmission of small sums of money by mail, and these are certainly divisions of public service which can constantly be expanded for the benefit of the people. I trust that the post office will go ahead of the express companies and cheapen in every possible way the transmission of parcels and small sums of money.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With regard to an improved system of handling parcels, we are now establishing parcel post boxes, and we are endeavouring to make use of the automobile system to facilitate the collection and distribution of mail matter, including, of course, parcels. Last fall we bought two or three locomobiles, and we are having made six quadracycles for the city of Toronto. With reference to postal notes and money orders, I cannot say that we are considering at the present moment the subject of abolishing either one or the other, or amalgamating the two classes of service. They are very different in their character. The postal note is for the transmission of small sums not exceeding $5, and is somewhat in the nature of a check. The money order is a different thing altogether, the name of the payee not appearing on the face of it, and the order not being payable except to the person named in the advice note which is sent by the postmaster who issues the order to the postmaster on whom the order is made. Whether in time they can be united into one document remains to be seen. In the United States, they are getting up an order now that looks very much like a fusion of the postal note and the money order. A few months ago an officer of the United States postal department came to Canada and had an interview with our officers on the subject of a free interchange of money orders, and negotiations are now going on with the view of facilitating that business. They have sent to us a form of order, which looks to me very much like a fusion of the postal note and money order. They have no postal notes, and their money order differs very materially from ours ; and as ours has been in force in its present form so many years, I hesitate to make any material change by abolishing it and adopting instead something like the postal note or check payable to the person named in the face of the document itself.

Mr. MACLEAN. With regard to parcel delivery, there is great room for improvement. I need only point to what has been done in England to-day to show how the public can be accommodated by the parcel delivery system in force there. That system can be extended to Canada, and the people will be willing to see it developed, and, if necessary, have the government take over the business done by the express companies. That business could be done through the Post Office Department, and the country will justify the Postmaster General going fully into the matter and greatly developing the parcel delivery system in connection with the post office.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the government is, perhaps, going too far in the direction indicated by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean). It is carrying parcels of goods to all parts of Canada at rates which are four or five, and sometimes seven or eight, times less than those charged by the express companies. Either the express companies—companies chartered and under the control of the Dominion parliament—are making exorbitant charges or the Post Office Department is carrying parcels for almost nothing. I do not think that the government is doing right in carrying goods all over this country at such reduced rates—less than the cost of carriage. The carriage of letters and newspapers is the purpose for which the Post Office Department was organized, and if the department besides decides to carry parcels of merchandise, it should charge at least the cost of carriage, which it is not doing to-day. The department is allowing the business of this country to be turned into wrong channels. Take those large departmental stores in Toronto, for which this department is carrying goods thousands of miles at utterly ridiculous rates. The government has no right to carry these goods for departmental stores, which enter into competition with country storekeepers who are doing legitimate, proper business. By this policy the govern-

ment is destroying mercantile industries in all parts of this Dominion.

At six o'clock, the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FOWLER. Before this item passes, I would like to ask the Postmaster General by whose advice he is guided in the dismissal of postmasters and in changing post offices. I do not know whether it has been the case in other counties besides that which I have the honour to represent, but, in that county since the election of the 7th of November last, and just previous to the election, a great many changes in post offices were made. Many postmasters, who were very competent officials, and had been for many years discharging their duties with credit to themselves and benefit to the community have been dismissed, and without any charge as far as the public know, without any investigation, having taken place. From my place in the House, I have asked questions with respect to two of these officials, and have received the somewhat curt answer of the minister that it was done upon his own responsibility, and that these men were partisans. Not only have postmasters been dismissed in this manner, but post offices have been moved from one part of a community to another, greatly to the detriment of the service, and post offices have even been closed up. I presume, though I do not know for certain, that the Postmaster General has been guided in the past by the advice of the gentleman who represented the county that I have the honour now to represent. When it became my fortune, whether good or ill, to replace that gentleman in this House, it was greatly to his annoyance, and he has sought to wreak his spite, on these office holders throughout the county; and not only upon the office holders, but upon the people in the county where the post offices have been changed or closed up. I have in mind a small place in a country district, Donegal, a name familiar to many of the gentlemen of this House, situated in the parish of Waterford, another name that is familiar. The post office there has been closed up entirely, and I understand that the government are going to open another post office in a neighbouring district where there is one already. As a matter of fact, this is a mountainous district and a high mountain intervenes between these two places. Therefore, the people of Donegal—and there are ten or twelve heads of families to be served by this office—will be obliged to go two or three miles, and to climb the mountain to reach the other office. That is a great hardship. It seems to me that post offices are not placed for the benefit or the advantage, or the interest of the friends of the party in power, but that the Post Office Department is intended for the benefit of all Canadians irrespective of party. It seems small to gratify spite by taking it out of these poor people in the remote district. Life for them is hard at the best; give them what advantage you can. If they are to be deprived of postal accommodation, it is a very great hardship indeed. I trust, therefore, the minister will take the advice of his responsible officers, especially the post office inspector, who is directly charged with the direction of these matters and not the advice of irresponsible parties, even though they are supporters of the government.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Though we have lost a good colleague in losing the predecessor of the hon. member of Kings, I have to congratulate the House on having an accession to its members in the person of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler), who has just spoken. I think the case which he has made—perhaps, I may be permitted to say, from very insufficient material—justifies one in assuming that, with a good case, he would make a most powerful argument. The hon. gentleman exclaims against our having closed up Donegal post office, and says it was a great offence against the public. Then he complains because we have opened a post office near it, and in a more convenient place. I cannot pretend to charge my mind with all the details of the removal or change of postmasters. If my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) has any grievance or any particular case which he thinks ought to be explained, I shall only be too pleased if he will direct my attention to it in a way that will enable me to come with the exact information necessary to reply to him. With reference to Donegal. I cannot pretend to give from recollection the circumstances and the reasons connected with changes in postmastership or location of offices. But, I may say that if, for example, a post office happened to be located in a place unsuitable for the public, that would seem a sufficient ground for the change. That may have been the reason for the change in the case of Donegal. My hon. friend says that that closing involved hardship to a number of people. I suppose that the number of patrons of that office, to some extent at least, would be indicated by the revenue of the office. If that affords the Committee any information whatever, I may say that the returns for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1900, indicates a gross revenue from that office of $3, or somewhat less than a cent a day——

Mr. FOWLER. If I did not make myself quite clear to the Postmaster General when I first spoke, it must be accounted for by my youth and inexperience. The hon. gentleman was so good as to congratulate me, and I must return the compliment. It is marvellous that a gentleman at the head

of a department so great as this should be able to carry in his mind the petty details of every post office. But, considering that we have had certain statements of the hon. gentleman challenged in this House, I would like to have something a little more definite than the hon. gentleman's ipse dixit as to the revenue.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am speaking from the official report.

Mr. FOWLER. Suppose that it is true, and that the revenue from this post office is not large, yet the hon. gentleman cannot deny that it served a number of families. And shall it be said that justice is not to be given to these people, that they shall be denied postal accommodation, because the revenue of their office is not so large as some others? It seems to me, that the poor should have as fair treatment as is given to any.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWLER. I am glad to hear that, applauded by the hon. gentlemen opposite. It is not altogether in accordance with their course, but I am glad to hear them applaud the sentiment. Whether a post office is needed in any particular locality or not should not be decided merely by the question of revenue. I admit that should have something to do with it, but it should not be the only point considered. The number of people to be served should be regarded as a very important point. However, I am glad to know that the Postmaster General will look into these matters, and, in the future, will be more guided by his responsible officer than by those gentlemen who happen to have suffered defeat at the polls.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Referring to the subject we were discussing before the House rose, the deficit of 1895-6, I promised to look into the subject. I have done so, and I think I can make it so clear that the Postmaster General or the Prime Minister will not, after this, make the statement that there was a deficit of $780,000 in 1895-6. From the figures that appear, it must have struck the Postmaster General, if not some of his assistants or deputies, that such a deficit was abnormal. The hon. gentleman, to confirm his statement, read a report of two auditors, experts, who, he thought, proved his case. I am going to base my statement entirely upon their report, and I can prove conclusively to any gentleman who listens to me, that his statement is most fallacious. I do not blame the Postmaster General, because he may have been deceived by the figures, but any officer of his department that furnished such figures to him, ought never after to retain the confidence of the Postmaster General. The report is signed by Mr. W. H. Cross and Mr. W. F. Munro, the two auditors, and this is the conclusion of their report:

> At the beginning of the fiscal year 1895-6, as the result of the deficits of previous years, there were outstanding liabilities of the department in the shape of unpaid accounts to the amount of $616,712.99.

That is not for the year 1895-6, but for the previous years.

> At the close of the fiscal year 1895-6, the liabilities of the department in excess of all parliamentary appropriations applicable thereto amounted to the sum of $685,447.63. Thus the liabilities had increased during the year 1895-6 to the extent of $68,734.04.

Instead of the deficit of that year being $685,447.03, if he will look at the report of his auditors, he will see the deficit that year was only $68,734.04.

> The actual cost of the maintenance of the department in all its branches for the year 1895-6 was $4,985,327.53. The revenue of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, amounted to the sum of $3,957,798.51, which, deducted from the above-named gross cost of maintenance, namely, $4,985,327, leaves a deficit of $1,027,529.

From which has to be deducted, as the auditors put it correctly, the amount which has never been charged to the expenditure of the post office, the amount expended on civil government at headquarters in Ottawa. If the amounts that I had mentioned before dinner as overlapping, had been deducted, that deficit, instead of being $780,000, would be over $1,000,000. It is an amount which he deducts from his returns, and which was not deducted in the post office returns.

> Heretofore it has not been a practice to treat the amount expended under the head of Civil Government as a charge against the department, and were such practice adhered to, the deficit of over $1,027,529.02 would be reduced by $246,376.83, leaving the outside service shortage $781,152.19.

From that deduct the amount which the auditors report, with the amount of the years previous to 1895-6, $616,712.99, and it leaves an actual deficit in 1895-6 of $164,439, instead of $781,152. It is so clear that I wonder the hon. the Postmaster General ventures the statement; I wonder that the hon. the Prime Minister ventured the statement. Is he to include in the expenditure of 1895-6 all these experts say were deficits of the previous years? The only amount to be deducted is, as I stated before, $68,734. The hon. gentleman may laugh, he may try to explain it, but there is no explanation possible, except that the actual deficit of the Post Office Department in that year was $164,439 This is proved conclusively by the report of his auditors, and I hope the hon. gentleman, in making comparisons again—he is very chary of them in this House—in making comparisons in the country, must

never say again that there was a deficit of $780,000 in 1895-6 ; because the receipts and expenditures balanced in those years, and show conclusively that instead of the deficit being of that amount, it was really only $164,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend has entirely failed to appreciate the report of the auditors. This report deals with two perfectly distinct transactions. It shows that for many years there had grown up in the Post Office Department a practice of exceeding the appropriation for the year, and if the appropriation was not suffito pay the expenditure for the year, then the shortage was taken out of the appropriation of the succeeding year. This practice went on for many years, and when we took office we found an accumulation of arrears amounting to over $600,000. For example, my hon. friend says that at the commencement of the fiscal year 1895-6 these accumulations amounted to some $600,000, and at the close of the year to $668,000. That is merely the transaction as between a vote of parliament and the expenditure. It is an entirely separate transaction from the question of how much it cost to manage the department for a year, and what the revenue of the department for that year was. Surely, I am not to blame for what happened before we took office. The hon. gentleman admits that for the year 1895-6 they ran behind the appropriation by $68,000. Well, for the fiscal year ending 1st of July, 1895, according to the figures with which I have nothing to do, there was a deficit of $707,000. My hon. friend will find it in the books ; he won't hold me responsible for this book of 1894-5. The book he quoted from shows that he began the fiscal year 1895-6 with a deficit on the previous year of $707,000 ; that is, your revenue was that much short of paying up your expenditure. Will the hon. gentleman explain to me by what process of reform they reconstructed that department in that last sad year of their administration, so that they came out with a deficit of only one hundred thousand odd dollars ? No, he won't do that, but instead of that, he tells me, and tells me truly, that he exceeded the appropriation in the year 1895-6 by $68,000. Add that $68,000 by which he overrun the appropriation in 1895-6, to the rate of shortage amounting to $707,000, for the previous year, and you have got $775,000, or within some $4,000 or $5,000 of the deficit the auditors bring out. Let my hon. friend keep quiet.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am quiet.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is one thing to deal with appropriations ; it is another thing to deal with the earning power of a department and the cost of running it. Parliament votes a certain sum of money to carry on the department. The paragraph to which the hon. gentleman has referred has given proof of the vicious system of the late administration, who spent more each year than they disclosed to parliament, and who, instead of coming down frankly to parliament and asking parliament to vote the shortage failed to disclose it. I do not say it was intentional. I think it was very bad book-keeping owing to the loose state of affairs in the department, but there was the fact that year after year they were spending more than they had the courage to ask parliament to vote, and the result was that when the 1st July came each year, they had to pay out of the year's vote, beginning on the 1st July, an enormous sum of money for debts and services of the past which sum should have been available to carry on the services for the current year. That paragraph that the hon. gentleman has alluded to, shows that at the beginning of the fiscal year 1895-6 there was a deficit of $600,000, representing debts which should have been paid out of the provision of the previous year, but for which there was no money, and which they paid out of the service of 1895-6. They went out that year owing $668,000. When I come down here and ask for money to carry on the service from the 1st July next until the end of the fiscal year, it is not right, and it is contrary to constitutional principle, that I should be at liberty to take money voted to carry on the servic from the 1st July next to the end of the year, and expend it in paying for services now being performed, and that paragraph in the Auditor's report is an illustration of the loose practice which had grown up and continued for years. If my hon. friend wants some comfort I will give it to him. He has made a mistake; he does not understand this report, and when he comes to think it over to-morrow, he will be surprised that he committed himself to such a view of it. He and I are excellent friends. I know he is incapable of suggesting a thing that he does not believe to be correct. I know that he is speaking conscientiously of what he believes to be the result of this audit. All the same he is entirely in error. I think he will not contradict me again after he has thought it over. I will ask my hon. friend to take the Auditor General's Report, and to take the previous reports, and I will go over them with him, and if he is wrong he will admit it, and if I am wrong I will admit it. But, there is no way of getting over the fact that we receive so much money from the public for the service we perform, and that we pay so much out for the service performed, and that the balance is so much. That is what the auditors tell us in regard to the year 1895-6. They say that for that year the Receiver General received from the public as revenue $3,957,798.51. That was the gross amount the Receiver General obtained from the public.

They gave us the gross revenue from the public for that year, and the gross cost for carrying on the service for that year, $4,985,327.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, no ; $600,000 of old debt.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman does not understand anything about it. The old debt was paid by a special vote of parliament. The Finance Minister came down to parliament, reported that debt, and parliament voted a special sum of some $680,000 to wipe out the debt. It was voted to clear off the old debt over and above this $4,900,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What is the difference between the receipts and the expenditure ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The difference between the receipts and expenditure for that year was $1,027,529.02, and that includes the cost of the inside service. Deducting the cost of the inside service, amounting to $246,376.83, it leaves a shortage between the gross revenue of that year and the gross cost of the service of that year of $781,152.19, the deficit for the year 1895-6.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am sorry that I cannot make the Postmaster General understand what is perhaps the simplest thing in arithmetic. Surely the hon. gentleman has to ask himself what were the receipts of the post office that year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have given them to you.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was the expenditure ? In the expenditure is this $616,000 included ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, not a copper of it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is included ; every copper of it is included. The $780,000 is included in the amount, and the way he makes this $780,000 of deficit is by including the $616,000. Let the hon. minister look at the figures and he will tell you at once that you are wrong. The hon. gentleman took a vote to pay off the $616,000 or the $680,000, which was simply to correct the book-keeping. The hon. gentleman talks about an expenditure in the post office more than the amount voted for it. It has always been so. The amount voted for the post office is never fixed exactly at the amount which is required for the service, because the Post Office Act places the whole of the moneys received by the department, along with the amount voted by parliament, at the disposal of the Postmaster General. I cannot understand why it is that the hon. Postmaster General cannot see it. It is impossible that he should not do so if he looks at the figures from 1879 down to 1901. The auditors have included in the amounts to be deducted from that four million odd dollars the deficits of the previous years, $616,000 and $684,000, which leaves a deficit of $780,000, but, if you deduct from that $616,000 which belongs to previous years, the deficit in the post office is only $164,000. I will ask the hon. gentleman to get some expert book-keeper to look into it again, and he will find that my statement is literally and verbally correct to the cent. There is no mystery about it. It is one of the simplest sums in calculation that could be imagined. The simple question which the hon. minister (Sir Louis Davies) asked him is this : In the deductions or in the amount charged for expenditure, is the $616,000 charged ? If it is charged, the deficit of the previous year is included in the year 1895. I stake my reputation on the statement that the $616,000 is the deficit of the previous year entering into the calculations of the years 1895-6.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Let me tell the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) how he operated in 1894. His own report shows that in 1894 his expenditure was $3,421,203 ; his revenue, $2,773,507, and the deficit $647,696. If he sends to the library and gets his own report he will find that is correct. Another year went by and I will take his own figures again. The auditors say that the vicious system had been adopted of not getting a large enough vote and carrying a shortage forward and taking the deficit out of the succeeding appropriation. The same thing happened in 1895. Leaving out the appropriations which only appeared to confuse the hon. gentleman, and taking simply the revenue and expenditure, we have in 1894 a shortage of $647,000, and, according to his own figures for 1895, a shortage of $707,000 ; an increased deficit in one year of $60,000, and again the auditors say that the deficit in 1896 was $781,000. The hon. gentleman says that for 1895-6 there was only a deficit of $100,000, if so will he explain how he can justify a deficit of $707,000 in the previous year and $647,000 in the year previous to that again. What reforms did he bring into effect to reduce this deficit which was steadily growing. Surely the hon. gentleman would not discredit the skill of these auditors. One of the auditors, Mr. Cross, is known by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), and the other, Mr. Munro, is also known to gentlemen opposite, and no one will question either their skill or their integrity. They had no object except to bring out the actual results. I have every confidence in the accuracy of their audit, and I am sure when my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) thinks over the matter he will accept it too.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I accept it entirely, and my argument is based altogether on the report of the auditors. If the Postmaster General lets the Minister of Finance express his opinion on the question, I will be perfectly satisfied.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On page XXIII of the Postmaster General's Report of 1894, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) will find the following : Net revenue, $2,773,507.71, and on page XXIV he will find the total expenditure by check, $3,421,000. Deduct the revenue from the expenditure and you have the deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894. I need not explain to the hon. gentleman, as a former Postmaster General, that our revenue is to some extent always depleted from the fact that postmasters who are paid by way of commission have their salaries deducted from the gross revenue, so what we get is the net revenue and the balance is the same.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see by this vote that the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) asks for an increase of $78,714.55. I wish to ask him if it is his intention to put the post office service in the rural districts—I refer to my own county particularly—in the same state of efficiency as it was before he took office in 1896. In my county where we had a daily mail service through several of the most populous districts before 1896, the Postmaster General immediately on taking office reduced it to a tri-weekly and in some cases to a bi-weekly service. I hear complaints from one end of the county to the other as to the poor mail service at present. An hon. member here complained of a post office being closed in his constituency which served seven or eight families, but in my constituency Marble Rock post office was closed, a post office which for the last twenty years supplied 70 or 80 families. But simply because the postmaster was a Conservative and the mail carrier a Conservative and there were no Liberals living in that part of the country to get the job, Marble Rock post office was closed up and these 70 or 80 families have now to go seven or eight miles to Gananoque to get their mails. I ask him whether it is his intention to restore that office. Another post office in my constituency was closed up, and I put a question on the paper in reference to it, and the Postmaster General gave me the same answer that he gave to my hon. friend, that it was closed because it produced only $6 or $8 of revenue—a statement which I know was not correct ; the revenue was more than the amount stated. As soon as I made the statement in the House, my late opponent, Mr. Fredenburg, came to Ottawa and represented to the Postmaster General that there were a few Grits in that district and that the post office must be restored immediately, and it was restored.

An hon. MEMBER. That is right.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman says that is right, but is it right that 70 or 80 families must go without their postal service because they are Conservatives ? Is the Post Office Department of this country to be run on political lines ? No doubt the Post Office Department ought to make a better showing financially if the service has been reduced in every rural electoral district as it has been in South Leeds. In view of his getting this large amount, I ask the Postmaster General to restore the service there to the same position in which it was when he took office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am most desirous of maintaining the efficiency of the post offices in every part of Canada, even in those parts which have the misfortune to be represented as my hon. friend's constituency is. He has called my attention for the first time to a number of supposed shortcomings in his constituency. He alluded to the case of Soperton. I recall the name of that place, but I do not remember my hon. friend calling my attention to the other deficiencies to which he now refers, and I must rebuke him as an active member of this House for having during past years neglected the interests of his constituents in failing to do so. I assure him that it is only necessary for him to present a good case, and it will receive fair treatment. I remember a case being made out which warranted the closing of a post office of the name of Soperton, though I do not remember it sufficiently to discuss it. My hon. friend says, no doubt correctly, that on the argument of Mr. Fredenburg it was reopened. I presume he made a good case, and it was quite right for me to yield to his argument ; and if my hon. friend makes a good case, he will receive the same treatment. I can only say that each case will be dealt with on its merits. I do not think it will be found that any service has been withheld that should not be withheld or granted that should not be granted for any political reasons. I regard the mail service as something which the people have a right to, apart from political considerations. My hon. friend has only to present a proper case and he will get justice.

Mr. FOWLER. On looking over the report of the Post Office Department, I find that there are over 100 post offices in this Dominion with a revenue of less than $4. When the hon. Postmaster General made the statement he did, I observed that the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) was very vociferous in his applause ; and on looking up the report I find that in that hon. gentleman's constituency there is a post office which only had a revenue last year of $1, and that post office is still flourishing. I may say that there are post offices with-

out any revenue at all. In the county of Antigonish alone there are twenty post offices with a revenue under $4. There is one post office in that county with a revenue of $2 in which the postmaster receives $20. It seems to me strange that this doctrine of economy should be applied to the poor people who have the misfortune to live in that part of the county of King's to which I have referred, and the misfortune not to see eye to eye with hon. gentlemen opposite; but from the kindly manner in which the hon. Postmaster General referred to me, I feel satisfied that he will consult his inspector in the province of New Brunswick, who is a very decent man and a competent officer, before he makes such changes in the future as he has made in the past.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the Postmaster General, and also the Minister of Finance, who holds the purse strings, if every account connected with the postal service belonging to a particular fiscal year is charged up to that year, and if there are no arrears by reason of overlapping. If they are prepared to say that in no case does that happen, it will greatly simplify this discussion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As the hon. gentleman has referred to me, I may say that it is most desirable that the accounts of one year shall include the payments for that year, and as far as possible that is done in all the departments. I am not prepared to say absolutely that in every case it is done to the last dollar ; but, in order that it may be done, our Audit Act provides that accounts may be kept open for a reasonable period, and we may be able to extend that period for the purpose of getting accounts in from a distance. I think it will not be incorrect to say that that is the practice of the departments generally to-day. My hon. friend the Postmaster General held that view very strongly, and always assured me that he was carrying it out in his department.

Mr. CLANCY. That seems, no doubt, to be the theory, but we happen to have the practice as is disclosed by the Auditor General's Report of last year. On a single page I find half a dozen cases of payments made on contracts performed in 1899. If the hon. gentleman will look on page S—11 he will find one case there, partly made up of services in 1900, and partly of services in 1899. On the next page, he will find six cases. I have not examined the Act very closely, but just glancing over it, I find a half dozen cases on the next page of a similar character. It is perfectly clear that whatever the theory of the hon. gentleman may be, the practice has not been carried out. I am not finding fault with that in any sense, because I can well understand the impossibility of preventing some overlapping from year to year, but when hon. gentlemen pretend to say that they square it all off at the end of the year, and pay every account, the facts are entirely against them. No doubt there were balances in 1896 from 1895, and no doubt there are also balances unpaid belonging to 1899 that were paid in 1900, and in 1900 that were paid in 1901.

Mr. McGOWAN. I find on page 14 of the Postmaster General's Report that A. Gale was paid $122.85 for carrying the mails from the railway station to Alma. Well, Mr. Gale has not been there for several years. At one time he lived there and carried the mails from the station to the post office, but he has not lived there for several years. He lives thirty or forty miles further away. I did not know the hon. gentleman was carrying on business in that way. It looks very much as if this contract was farmed out.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The contractors for carrying the mail are not required to personally perform the work nor to live in any particular locality. All that is required of them is to have the work performed to the satisfaction of the inspector of the district. Their case is different altogether from that of persons appointed to positions, the duties of which they are supposed personally to discharge. In such cases there is objection to farming out the work, but that objection does not apply to mail contractors, and I never knew that point to be taken before.

Mr. MONK. Before this item passes, I would like to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this consideration. I think we have evinced on this side, since the beginning of the session, a desire to advance the work of the session and proceed with the estimates in a business-like way. But if we are put to such straits as we have been this afternoon in order to obtain information, I am afraid our task will be more protracted than we anticipate. The discussion arose greatly out of a question I put as to what the deficit was during the past year in the Post Office Department, and reluctantly the hon. minister admitted that there was a deficit of $461,000. Then it took an hour and a half of discussion before we found out—and it was due in great part to the criticism of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) that we did find out—that to that deficit must necessarily be added the sum of $90,000 on the service in the Yukon district. That is now admitted by the hon. the Postmaster General. But if we take the statements made by him during the last election and spread broadcast through the province of Quebec, there was a deficit in the postal service in 1895-6 of over $700,000. This statement, my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart),

has shown this afternoon to be absolutely incorrect. Instead of a deficit of $700,000, my hon. friend has shown that the deficit was $164,439, and not one cent more. Then the hon. the Postmaster General stated at a public meeting in East Grey, not only that the deficit in 1895-6 was $700,000, but that we would soon reach a period when we would have no deficit at all. In the early part of the afternoon, I questioned the hon. gentleman as to how far we were suffering from a deficit at present, and he would give no answer save the general observation that probably this year there would be no deficit at all. I think the hon. gentleman must admit that a great deal of time has been lost in arriving at the facts. And when I saw my hon. friend the member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), with his extremely outwardly virtuous appearance, rising in this House and saying he could not see—just like a man who was exhibiting a juggler—where there was any deception, I must say the lack of frankness displayed was significant of anything but business methods by a business administration. It would have been a great deal better for the hon. the Postmaster General to have come down and told us exactly, at the very inception, what the amount of the deficit really is in a service, in which there must necessarily be a considerable deficit, if it is properly carried on. And the three or four hours that we have taken to find out the facts and place them before the country might have been better occupied in remedying certain individual grievances which have been pointed out by several members and met by the Postmaster General in a very flippant spirit. We had the hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Taylor) pointing out that a certain post office had been closed and then reopened on the representation of Mr. Fredenburg, and then closed again. Why, we have no explanation from the Postmaster General, who simply got up and smilingly told us that Mr. Fredenburg had made out a good case, and that no doubt if the hon. member for Leeds would come before him again with a certain case decided not long ago, and make out a good claim, he too would have justice. If we are to get through the estimates with expedition, we require a little more frankness on the part of ministers of the Crown. I have confidence in the Minister of Public Works that when we come to the estimates of his department, we will have less trouble in arriving at the basic figures and dealing with those estimates promptly and in a business-like manner.

I find an increase of $49,523.88 in salaries and allowances, outside service. Is the Postmaster General disposed to give us some information as to what that increase consists of ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This increase is arrived at in this manner :—

Increase.	
674 increases	$23,470 00
38 additions to staff	14,960 00
37 appointments from labour class	16,880 00
Increased mileage	3,555 00
Short estimate, 1900-1	1,658 88
	$60,523 88
Decrease.	
Increases voted for 1900-1, withheld	$ 1,320 00
Mr. James, special agent at Skagway, provided for in Yukon vote	800 00
Difference between salaries of persons promoted or retired from service and salaries of persons appointed to fill vacancies thus created	8,880 00
	$11,000 00
	$60,523 88
	11,000 00
Increase	$49,523 88

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Postmaster General charged me with dereliction of duty in not bringing to his attention the matter of the closing of Marble Rock post office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not speak of that particularly.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the 'Hansard' of May 17, 1898, page 5713, he will find this :

> I know that the Marble Rock post office in my constituency served fifty families, but the postmaster was a Conservative, and the mail carrier was a Conservative, and the only way the Postmaster General could dispose of them was to close the post office, and he did so. These fifty families have to travel miles to the nearest post office for their mail, and although he gives them a reduction of a cent on their letters, some of them have to spend a whole day going to the post office. I have received two letters from prominent men in my constituency in reference to the postal service the Postmaster General is now giving in that country. Mr. R. Harvey, miller of Lyndhurst, writes as follows:—'George Taylor, Esq., M.P. :
>
> 'Our people of Ellisville, Long Point and Sweet's Corners are all up in arms about the change of mail routes. It is a shame to withdraw the daily mail from that section. Mail going to these post offices now lays over in Lyndhurst from Friday until Monday. Here are three cheese factories and a well-settled community of intelligent people placed in a worse condition than if they were in the backwoods.'
>
> For years these people enjoyed a daily mail, but now they have got it only twice a week. On that route there are four cheese factories, and a thickly settled community; they are worse off for mail service now than if they were in the backwoods.

So, it will be seen that I brought this matter to the attention of the Postmaster General over two years ago. Marble Rock post office, which served fifty families, was closed, and no steps have been taken yet to reopen it. The mail route, changed from daily to tri-weekly, remains the same as before. A thickly settled community are served with a tri-weekly mail, and have been for two years.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understand my hon. friend to enumerate a great many defects in the management of the post office with regard to the mail services and other matters. He mentioned Marble Rock and the change of mail route, but his observations were general enough to cover much more than these two cases. He spoke of reduction of services and discontinuance of services——

Mr. TAYLOR. And I mentioned two cases.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Having mentioned two cases, the hon. gentleman has done his duty with regard to these. But, if there are other grievances, has he done his duty with regard to them ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Am I right in understanding that most of the increase of $49,000 is required for the administration of the post office in the Yukon territory, in connection with salaries, &c. ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This has nothing to do with the services mentioned on page 70 of the estimates ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the object of the Post Office Department in making this rather extraordinary division ? For instance, in bringing down the items in the estimates, I notice in the vote we are considering that the items give the offices, ending with Vancouver, and so on, and not including the Yukon. There is a note that on page 70, services in the Yukon are provided for. Turning to page 70, we find this item, which I suppose to be the one covering the postal services :—

Government of the Territory—Salaries and expenses in connection with the administration of the territroy	$270,000

Turning to the Auditor General's Report, we find that the post office proportion in 1899-1900 for post office salaries, &c., the same items, and the same services as are given elsewhere, is included under this item of a million dollars. What is the reason, or is there any good reason, for the paying out of this extent for this branch of the post office, and putting it under an entirely different head, such as I have mentioned—the administration of the Yukon territory ? Is there any advantage in this ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Yukon is an addition to the territory we have to administer. The government of which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was a member, had to do with it only to a very limited extent. It seems advisable, in order to be able to compare service with service and administration with administration that the clear line of service should be kept intact. You can, if you like, add the shortage of the Yukon to the general shortage for the Dominion. It does not cloud the case, but rather makes it clearer for the purpose of comparing the cost of service.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then these estimates, instead of being prepared for business purposes, are prepared for hustings purposes. That argument is the smallest kind of political clap-trap. The facts, when looked at, have to do with the post office service, and so far as bearing the burden goes and finding out what is spent for the service, it matters not whether it is for the Yukon or for the provinces on the Atlantic coast. Surely, business men would expect to find all these services which are managed by the Postmaster General under the head of the post office estimates. The hon. gentleman tells this Committee that he has arranged a heading apart from the post office estimates under which is to be found an item of $100,000—and it will be a growing item, no doubt. And the object is that he may have the satisfaction of making comparisons with his predecessor's figures and showing to his own advantage what would not be to his advantage if he told the whole story instead of telling only half. I do not think that is creditable to the Postmaster General or fair to this Committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. gentleman will find his criticism will apply with equal force to other services and to other portions of the estimates. The purpose of putting this on page 70 is to group it with the other items of expense of administrating the Yukon, and so show the total of that service. This administration of the Yukon is a new service, one in which the people are deeply interested, and it was thought convenient to group the Yukon items under one head. When they appear in the public accounts, they will appear charged to the proper departments. There is no danger of anybody failing to notice the division of the vote, for the hon. gentleman's own remarks show that there is a note inserted to call attention to the matter. The object is to show the Yukon estimates together, and I think my hon. friend should see that there is much in that object.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not easy to find those things. For instance, one has to go through three or four books and follow that note out. It gives no suggestion that the item under consideration purports to be complete. 'Salaries and allowances for the outside service of the post office.' These figures are given at $1,000,000 in round figures. Down below there happens to be under all these items 'See also page 70 for services in the Yukon territory.' Taking that book, no one would

be able to say for a moment that any of these services on page 70 had to do with the post office, because it says on page 70 that for the government of the territory there is an amount of $270,000 required. One has to take the Auditor General's Report and go into these items of expenditure. Is the hon. gentleman able to say when the other territories were given the advantage of a postal service, when postmasters were appointed in cities and towns ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask another question, which the hon. gentleman can answer at the same time. In regard to the item 223, which we are now considering, how much of that increase of $35,000 is due to the Post Office Department ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is reading the wrong item. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is under the same error, because he spoke of the item as being the government of the Yukon. That is not the item. The item distinctly says it is for post office service of the Yukon.

Mr. MONK. I think with the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that there is, I would not like to use the word 'deception,' but it looks very much as if there were what we call mental reservation in regard to this vote ; because, as pointed out by my hon. friend from Pictou, we have under one item, salaries and allowances for the outside service, but no special reference. It is only when you come to the foot of the page that you see a note : 'See also page 70, services in Yukon territory.' At page 70 there is a whole string of services and nothing to indicate that it is the post office.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman will look at item 224, on page 70, he will see there an item for the post office.

Mr. MONK. Why, when this note was inserted at the foot of the page, connected with no previous item, were we not referred to the expenditure in connection with the post office, instead of to the services in the Yukon, on page 70 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because he will find the same note applying not only to the post office, but to the railways, to public works and to the Department of Justice, in each of these cases, in order to show that there are appropriations other than those set forth where the note is put in.

Mr. MONK. We have now, at any rate, the certainty that the deficit on last year's operations was $461,661.87, plus this special service of $91,580.08, in all a deficit of $553,-241.95. Now, I asked the Postmaster General early in the afternoon, what he expected the deficit would be this year. So far as I recollect, he stated that he anticipated that there would be no deficit, or a very small one. Now, we are nearly four months from the end of the fiscal year, and I think the post office must be managed in such a way as to give us an approximate idea, when we are voting these large sums, of what this year's deficit will be. I would ask the Postmaster General this general question, if he thinks the deficit this year, from present appearances, will exceed the sum of half a million dollars ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend appears to me, I won't say disappointed, with my illustration, but he seems to be troubled a little as to the way the accounts turned out last year. I am sure it would have been more gratifying to him if I could have reported no deficit whatever. But let me say that when we took office there was a deficit on the years immediately preceding, of $780,000. I take my hon. friend's own statement now, which probably is the worst that can be said, because he has added to the $460,000 deficit, a deficit for a service in a part of the country with which the previous administration had nothing at all to do, which he says is some $90,000 ; he adds that to the $460,000 and makes $550,000. I presume that is the worst my hon. friends can say about the finances of last year. Put that alongside the deficit of $780,000 which existed when we took office, and the net result is that while, under the previous administration, the public paid 5 cents per half ounce on letters from Canada to Great Britain and many other parts of the empire, 3 cents as the domestic rate in Canada and to the United States, for the last fiscal year we enjoyed these services at the reduced rates of 2 cents instead of three ; and in addition to that, instead of costing the taxpayers $781,-000, as before, according to my hon. friend's own showing, it has only cost them $550,000. I won't comment upon that result, I leave these figures to speak for themselves. In answer to his question whether, in view of the fact that we are within four months of the close of the year, the deficit, in my opinion, will exceed half a million dollars, I emphatically say, it will not, I think, amount to anything like half a million dollars.

Mr. CLANCY. I waited for the hon. gentleman to answer the question that I asked him, in view of the statement that was made by the Minister of Finance, how he explains the overlappings, that we deny, by the figures appearing on pages S—11 and 12 of the Auditor General's Report. Turn to S—12, and he will find: 'Clifford Lewis, semi-weekly service to December 31st, 1899, 41 trips, at $28, $1,148.' That is one item, and is a sample of many others which I will not read. That is a service that really belonged to a part of the year. I am only

pointing that out to settle the question as to whether there are overlappings or not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, that belongs to the year in which it is paid. It belongs to the year 1899-1900.

Mr. CLANCY. It was paid in 1900.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was paid in the year in which it was incurred.

Mr. CLANCY. Surely the hon. gentleman does not pretend to say that we are now quoting from the Auditor General's Report for 1899. The Auditor General's Report is for the fiscal year 1900, and has absolutely nothing to do with accounts of former years. The hon. gentleman will not pretend that it is for a service charged in 1899, and which was not paid until the following year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My instructions to the department, since I took office, have been to have every expenditure for the year paid and charged against the appropriation for that year, and I have made a special appeal to the Department of Finance to keep open the accounts for the year until everything can be included. My officers here assure me that my wishes in that respect have been lived up to, and they are not aware of any accounts for the fiscal year having been allowed to be unpaid until the succeeding year.

Mr. CLANCY. How does the hon. gentleman explain that item ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That item, on the face of it, is a statement of service rendered to the 31st December, 1899. It is an account for the year from the 1st July, 1899, to the 1st July, 1900, and I do not see where else it could appear. It is for work done up to December 31, 1899, and the first half of the fiscal year covered by the Auditor General's Report. In what other place should it appear ?

Mr. CLANCY. It commences early in the season, before the 30th June of that year, and, therefore, half of the service had been performed at the end of the fiscal year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend is quite unfamiliar with the accounts.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not unfamiliar with the accounts.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The service in the Rainy River district is performed during the summer by water and during the winter by stage. This contractor was performing the service by water or stage. I feel sure upon that point. The water service is performed in the summer by steamers. We have a mail service by stage from Wabigoon, and another service from Rat Portage, 160 miles, following the route of the Rainy river to Fort Francis in that district. These were very expensive services. This may not be the water service, but the service after the close of navigation. I may be in error. I cannot recollect the name of the contractor, but the water service was performed by the company owning the steamboat plying between Rat Portage and Fort Francis.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). May I ask the hon. Postmaster General to explain how he provided for the deficit of $781,000 that existed in 1896 ? In 1897, the following year, he claimed that he had a comparatively small deficit. How did he provide for that $781,000 of a deficit which existed and which disappeared apparently in some way in the course of the following year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My recollection is that the hon. Finance Minister applied to parliament for a vote of $680,000, and that parliament voted the money and wiped the deficit out.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). How can the hon. Postmaster General, in the face of that, maintain that he should fairly compare that deficit of $781,000 with the deficit which he had apparently in the next year when he admits that to provide for the deficit he got a sum of money given to him by the hon. Finance Minister, by special grant, and which was charged to capital account ? How can he ask an intelligent House and country to accept his statement ? The Postmaster General here informs us that during the year ending June 30, 1896, there was a deficit of $780,000, and that he had only a deficit of $60,000 the next year. He has, I think, conclusively established the contention made by the hon. the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Haggart), that there was no such deficit for 1896. He has proven that hon. gentleman's contention by the facts and figures given in his own report. There was nothing in the receipts or expenditure of the department in the year 1897, that would account for the disappearance of that alleged deficit, and I think we may accept as a matter now satisfactorily established that the deficit did not at all belong to the year terminating on June 30, 1896, but was the increment of a series of arrearages extending over a number of years. Therefore, I think we must charge the hon. Postmaster General with a lack of ingenuousness when he seeks to put the deficit for 1896 at $780,000, as compared with the deficit that existed in the following year. There are one or two matters to which I want to call the attention of the hon. the Postmaster General. I suppose he is exceedingly anxious to make his department self-sustaining as soon as possible. I know he is claiming a great deal of credit for cutting down the expenditure by refusing to let contracts to mail carriers without tender, and that he has saved a great deal of money, by, in some cases, breaking up contracts and reletting

them during the term in which they were to run. I would like to call his attention to the fact that some person is taking liberties with his department in the county of Pictou, in Nova Scotia, that he is taking contracts from men who have efficiently discharged their work, and giving them to others who have not tendered for them. It may be a coincidence, but it is a fact nevertheless, that a man who has been deprived of the privilege of tendering and who has lost two contracts, the requirements of which he has performed in a manner so efficient as to secure the commendation and support of the people of that locality, is a Conservative, and a very active one, and that the gentleman to whom the contract has been given without tender is one, whatever his other qualifications may be, who is a strong supporter of the hon. gentleman and his friends. I am sure the hon. Postmaster General will put that matter right now that I have, in my place, in parliament, brought it to his notice and showed him how seriously some of his officials are departing from that magnificent line of conduct that he marked out for himself when he took office. Mr. Gammon, of River John, was deprived of his contract, and another gentleman, Mr. Ritchie, of River John, received the contract although he did not apparently ask for it. Certainly he did not tender for it. There is another matter. I find, that, like my hon. friend from King's county, N.B. (Mr. Fowler), certain postmasters in Pictou county are marked for destruction or promotion. In many cases, despite largely-signed petitions from those in the neighbourhood, they have been dismissed and the post offices removed to other places for no reason whatever except a political reason. That is a shame. It is a pity that men can be found in our country so small as to covet an office of $10 or $20 a year, and that an administration can be found so contemptible as to listen to the demands of defeated candidates who wish to wreak their vengeance on men who refused to support them, and who stood in a manly fashion by their party. It is a sad thing to know that Canada is governed by a set of men who will lend themselves to such contemptible conduct. Even in cases where Liberal friends asked the post office to be left where it was, at the instance of defeated candidates the whole public service of Canada is being dragged down by the acts of this administration. It is a miserable, petty, picayune piece of business. The government is raising up for itself a fine monument in showing that it is the tool of creatures who are capable of asking the dismissal of men holding these small offices, simply on the ground that they refused to vote Liberal.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I beg to associate myself with the observations which have been so well made by my hon. colleague from Pictou (Mr. Bell). In fact, in view of the rules of the House, I would not like to trust myself to express my own opinion of what I think of these transactions, and of the petty vengeance of the government, which has been referred to. I do not believe that the Postmaster General is cognizant of the facts surrounding that small contract from the town of River John to the station which was obtained during his own term of office. If my information be correct, Mr. Gammon got that contract by tender, and has done the work to the satisfaction of every one, including the officers of the department. This gentleman who has cut him out did not get the contract, I am informed, by open competition. I would like the Postmaster General to take a note of it, because it may not be too late to see that the pettiest party politics of that character should not be permitted to prevail. Mr. Gammon, I am glad to know, is not dependent on that small contract, and it should be known that he was not cut out of the contract fairly in open competition. If it is not too late by a day or two, the Postmaster General would do no injury to the service or himself if he gets all the facts before him prior to his making this change.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot recall the circumstances of this particular case——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We will try to make emphatic representations of them to you.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The officers will take a note of this case, and see to it.

Mr. POPE. I call the attention of the Postmaster General to the dismissal, or rumoured dismissal, of Miss Sanborn, postmistress of Bulwer, which, I understand, is on account of the alleged partisanship displayed by that young lady during the elections which took place in Compton. While we are all accustomed to the peculiar character of vengeance which the present government visits upon those unfortunate gentlemen who have votes and who voted intelligently and independently, I wish to present to the Postmaster General the case of a young lady who has no vote. This post office is in a small community, and the house answers for the Canadian Pacific Railway station as well as for the post office. I understand that the office has not as yet been removed, and I take this early opportunity of calling the attention of the Postmaster General to it. The post office, together with the keeping of the railway station, is the only means of livelihood which this young lady has, and I trust she will not be removed as postmistress. I wish to know if the Postmaster General will grant my request.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Pope) to discuss the question with me later.

Mr. POPE. With the greatest of pleasure.

Mr. CLARE. I wish to ask the Postmaster General why it is that the post office at Freeport, between Berlin and Preston, in the county of Waterloo, has been closed up recently ? That post office has been in existence for some forty years, and the excuse given by the Postmaster General in other cases does not apply here, because the revenue from that office is quite large and the expense small. It is situated in a very populous part of our county, and although the salary attached to it is small, it is considered so important that a number of the farmers around there pay a portion of the expenses of keeping it up. I do not know whether or not the post office has been removed into another riding, because South Waterloo sent a representative to oppose the government, but I do say that it is unjust that this post office should be closed. If the Postmaster General were to investigate, he would find that it is in the interest of the public that this post office should be returned to its previous location.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Clare), I will say that his observations shall not pass unnoticed. I will ascertain why the post office is closed, and will be happy to discuss the question at a later period, if the hon. gentleman desires. I will express the hope that while the constituency of the hon. gentleman may not have sent him as a supporter of the government, it did not send him here absolutely to oppose the government.

Mr. CLARKE. I was not in the House this afternoon when the Committee began the discussion of this item, and I do not know whether the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) made any statement as to his intentions with regard to the petition which reached him some time ago from the letter carriers all over the Dominion. Has the Postmaster General made any provision in the estimates—which I see have been increased—to grant the prayer of that petition, and is it his intention to do so ? I would also ask if the Postmaster General has made any provision to give to the letter carriers of Canada the statutory increase of salaries to which they are entitled ? These are matters of great importance to a number of my constituents, and I would like an explicit statement from the minister (Hon. Mr. Mulock) about them. I would ask, too, if the Postmaster General would vouchsafe us information as to whether he has given any consideration to the question of reducing the drop letter postage ? In large centres of commerce, like the city of Toronto, it costs commercial firms less to distribute their drop letters by messengers than to send them through the post office, and in addition to the reduced cost they get them more expeditiously delivered. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General for more information on these matters. I do not desire to take up the time of the Committee by speaking at length on them. I would rather give the time to the hon. minister to make the necessary explanation.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With reference to the pay of the letter carriers, I would say that the pay of the officials of the Post Office Department, inside and outside, letter carriers included, is regulated by the Civil Service Act which the previous administration, supported by hon. gentlemen opposite, placed upon the statute-book, and at present we are voting moneys in accordance with that Act. It will be premature, therefore, to provide for salaries not provided for by any existing statute. I am at this moment, however, considering the subject, and have been considering it. I have not yet had an opportunity of discussing it with my colleagues, but I will do so at the earliest moment. I cannot say more than that to-night. My hon. friend will excuse me if I cannot be more explicit, as I have not the power to be. With reference to reducing the rate on drop letters in cities from two cents to one cent, that is a subject which has received a good deal of attention in cities, where there is already free delivery, and where public opinion is altogether in favour of the reduction. But I very much doubt if the same view obtains outside of the cities. The cost of maintaining a free city delivery is very considerable, and until the rest of the country gets free delivery, I fail to see how you could justify giving a special preference to the inhabitants of cities. There are others to be considered who pay largely towards the expenses of the service. If a city is desirous of having a reduction from two cents to one cent, let it pay for the reduction by commuting the amount of the difference at a fixed sum per annum, and obtain the one-cent drop letter rate in that way. But up to the present moment I have not seen my way to discriminate in favour of cities.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the minister tell us what he intends to do for the farmer in the way of a rural mail delivery ? I believe that subject is under consideration, and that an experiment is to be made. Would he mind telling us where he purposes making the experiment ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is a very large question. A rural mail delivery has been tried for a short time in the United States, and one of my officers has been there taking observations, and is now preparing a report upon it. Mr. Ross, the assistant postmaster at Toronto, has been specially charged with that duty. I do not

know what conclusion he has arrived at, as he has not yet made his report. I would not be right, probably in criticising the United States administration, but I think it will turn out that they are undertaking a much larger project than they contemplated when they began it. As to what it will cost, no one can very well anticipate. I had some conversation with some of the officers charged with the matter, and if I rightly understood them, they view with some alarm the task they have undertaken. It would mean a rural delivery over an area equal to that of Europe, with a population only one-fifth of that of Europe ; and Canada has an area equal to that of the United States. It is a very large problem, and could only be entered upon after the most careful consideration.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I have listened to the discussion to-night with considerable interest. The Postmaster General has laid down the rule that a post office may be cut off on the ground of its small revenue. We have also heard a great deal about the benefit of the two-cent postage rate. Those of us who live in the rural districts are not so much concerned in that reduction as we are to have the post offices at convenient points, where we can get daily mails. An office in a country place may be a very good distributing office, but a very poor receiving office ; and if we should be deprived of our post offices on the ground of their small revenues, while we have now to travel considerable distances to get our mails, we would be compelled to go a great deal further. Then, with regard to the payment of postmasters, I think the postmasters of towns and cities are paid a great deal better than the country postmasters, who have probably to keep their offices open much longer. In the rural districts we want the daily papers—though it would be a good thing for the government if the daily papers did not come—because they inform us of what is going on. A rural postmaster may sometimes be obliged to have his office open as early as six o'clock in the morning, when the stage goes by, and also late at night. I want to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to these points, so that he will consider that while a rural post office may not produce much revenue, it may be a very useful distributing office, and the postmaster may have to keep it open even longer hours than the city offices.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The remuneration of postmasters is a constant subject of discussion in this House. It has been so, I am told, long before any of the present members enjoyed seats here, and it will doubtless continue to be so for years to come. No one will pretend that the allowances made to postmasters of the class to whom my hon. friend refers represents in any respect a remunerative salary. The communities are pressing for an increased number of post offices, and a neighbour is willing to take the office and serve a dozen of neighbours. He has the mail brought to him instead of having to go for it to the post office, and a nominal fee is allowed him. That has been the practice since confederation. If my hon. friend will think for a moment, he will find that if we were to give $50 increase to every postmaster in Canada, there are 10,000 postmasters, and that would involve an increased expenditure of $500,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I think it would be possible to take something off the men in the cities and towns who are getting large salaries and add that to the men in the rural districts who do not get enough. We have in our settlement men getting $10, $15 and $20 for keeping post offices, and they have to keep these offices heated and open longer hours than in the cities or towns, and besides they are responsible and have to furnish security. I say we should put them on a basis somewhat equal to the others, and give them something worth while, even if you have to take it off those who have large salaries.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I hope the hon. the Postmaster General will give careful consideration to some communications he has had from me on the subject of free rural mail delivery. I do not expect that such a system could be started all over this Dominion in one year, but the hon. gentleman could begin in the county of Elgin, and then follow it up in the county of York. He would then find that this service would be so much appreciated that the country would never allow these hon. gentlemen to remain in their seats on that side of the House unless they continued it. There is nothing you can do more calculated to keep the boys and the old men on the farm and make them love the farm as to give them a rural free mail delivery. They would then get their newspapers every evening, and be able to discuss all those questions which come up before this House and know nearly as much as some of the gentlemen—not the gentlemen opposite, of course—in this House.

I cannot refrain from putting in a plea for those postmasters and postmistresses who have to keep these rural post offices open almost day and night, because in the country, when our work is done and we have had our supper, it is often late in the night before we can go for our letters, and these postmasters and postmistresses have to keep their offices open to wait upon us. I think their case is deserving of every consideration, and I hope that when Christmas time comes, the hon. gentleman will have something on the Christmas tree to repay them for the work they are doing.

Let me add just another word. I often come down to the city, and of course, like

people from the country visiting the city, am quite an observer, and I see strong, double-fisted fellows—as big as the Postmaster General himself, walking to the post office two or three times a day just to see if there is anything there. It would be economy to have the mails brought to their addresses at least once a day and utilize these big strong fellows in some other kind of work. I think that every city of 10,000 inhabitants or even less, should have a free mail delivery. It would expedite business and in every way be an advantage to the community.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to the fact that a petition has been presented from a part of my constituency asking for a post office to be erected in the township of Edwardsburg. The people have been agitating to have a post office there for some years, but although it is a very thickly settled district, they have not been able to get it as yet. Consequently they are obliged to travel quite a distance for their mail, and I understand that an arrangement has been submitted to the Postmaster General by which the route could be changed without any extra expense and give them this post office asked for. A number of people have expressed their willingness to take charge of the post office, and I hope the hon. gentleman will try and accommodate that section. He could do so without any extra expense. It would be a great convenience to the people to be able to get their daily paper and keep in touch with the times.

Mr. SPROULE. The subject was brought up this afternoon as to whether the Postmaster General had considered the question of changing the postage on newspapers, and I am not aware that he made any observations on the matter. I have heard from several rural publishers, who express the opinion that they would much rather have a straight postage on paper without regard to distance, than the present arrangement. The present arrangement occasioned a great deal of trouble and annoyance in separating the papers that must be carried a long distance, from those within the free zone, and the delay often results in their not being able to be mailed at the earliest possible moment.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The publishers who enjoy the free zone can very easily get over the difficulty complained of by not taking advantage of the privilege. Some have done so. They find the exemption is so trifling that they voluntarily pay the postage. Last year I introduced a Bill dealing with the subject, which passed this House, but did not meet with favourable assent in the Senate.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have heard numerous attacks made upon the Postmaster General this evening—some, I am afraid, with a tinge of bitterness—and it, therefore, affords me a great deal of pleasure to call the attention of this committee to a little incident which proves conclusively, to my mind at least, that the Post Office Department is not administered in that partisan spirit of which we have heard so much. Shortly after the general election in 1896, a small post office in my constituency of Haldimand was about to be deprived of a daily service, a tri-weekly service to be established. Being somewhat interested in the matter, I wrote as strong a letter as I could to the Postmaster General, asking him to continue the daily service, and, in my letter, I pointed out that in the polling subdivision where the post office was situated, only three Conservative votes had been polled in the general election. This, I told the Postmaster General, was not said to influence his judgment according to lines of political bias, but merely to show him the high grade of intelligence of the people in that neighbourhood, in the hope that such an intelligent people might not be deprived of the daily service and the daily newspaper. The reply came back from the Postmaster General, in terms courteous, but firm : I do not consider it in the public interest to continue this as a daily service ; I must insist on a reduction to a tri-weekly service.

Mr. CLANCY. I wish to dispel any doubt that may be in the hon. gentleman's mind with regard to the statement appearing in the Auditor General's Report. If he will turn to that report, page S-13, at the bottom of the page he will see this item :

Dominion Atlantic Railway and Steamship Company, six months, Dec. 31, 1898	$379 27

It seems perfectly obvious, from inquiry into the matter since this discussion began, that there has been, and is now, overlapping which caused what hon. gentlemen are now claiming as the deficit of the past. The same state of things that obtained when the Conservatives were in power, still obtains. I am not laying down the irrevocable rule that the Minister of Finance laid down, that all these amounts will be paid at the end of the fiscal year. I am simply pointing out that they are not, and possibly cannot be. This is not an exceptional case, but is one of many.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I explained some time ago, that, in spite of every effort to include all accounts for the year in the public accounts of the year, that there were at times unsettled accounts that could not be adjusted before the Finance Minister closed the books. That will ever occur. This is an amount of something over three hundred dollars——

Mr. CLANCY. It is only one.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My recollection is that in this case questions arose

between the department and this company. It would appear that some old system had existed, under which the company were paid a proportion of the postal revenue for carrying the mail. This led to a controversy, and probably made it impossible to close the account within the fiscal year. Isolated cases of this kind must always occur, but, substantially, all the expenditures for carrying on the service of the department for the fiscal year are disposed of in time to be included in the accounts of the year. I have given most explicit instructions to the accountant of the department, and have not the slightest doubt that those instructions are lived up to as far as possible.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. minister know that where there are contracts for the season of navigation, the service must be performed partly in one fiscal year and partly in another? I think I can point to several cases, showing that the case I have given is not an isolated one at all. Of course, these are somewhat exceptional, but it is out of these exceptional cases under the late administration that the hon. minister has tried to make capital. He seeks to lay down one rule for those who preceded him and another for himself. Whether there has been greater laxity in one case or the other, may be open to question, but the same state of affairs that formerly prevailed still prevail.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I desire to ask the Postmaster General if he has taken into serious consideration the application that I understand has been made to him by the H. G. & B. trolley line to carry the mails twice a day to and from Hamilton? At present they are carried by the Grand Trunk, and the people living along the line get their mail from the adjoining offices on the following day. But, if it were carried on the trolley line they would get it the same day.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That application, I think, has been forwarded to the officers in Toronto for their report.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I would like to refer to the question of the salaries of rural postmasters. I think the Postmaster General might well discriminate between the class he refers to as farmers, who take the post office merely as an accommodation to their neighbours and distribute the mail matter among them, and the class of postmasters who keep the post offices in villages and small towns. As a matter of fact, these men in many cases, have no revenue except from the post office. Their remuneration, as the Postmaster General will admit—I remember he admitted it a year ago—is very small, ranging sometimes from $200 to $500 a year. Many of these provide a building for the accommodation of a post office and keep the place heated, yet receive no remuneration for doing so. There was a very general complaint a year or two ago that, owing to the reduction of the postal rate from three cents to two cents, the revenue of postmasters was reduced. I brought the subject up in parliament last session, and, if my memory serves me correctly, the Postmaster General observed that he thought the revenue would still be practically the same. I am still informed by postmasters that they suffer on account of the reduction in their revenues. I would re-echo the sentiment expressed by one or two other members here to-night that the Postmaster General might well consider the desirability of reducing the salaries allowed to postmasters in large cities, like Toronto, Montreal and Winnipeg, where postmasters receive from $3,000 to $5,000, and possibly more, and allow the rural postmasters some extra allowance or increased rate. I feel strongly on this matter, because I have been memorialized in this matter in many cases, and asked to press it on the attention of the Postmaster General.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The Postmaster General has expressed himself as willing to do justice wherever a case presented to him has been made out. There is in my riding a case which was supposed to have been brought up by the member representing the constituency in the last parliament, the case of Abrams Village and Cape Egmont. In that locality there are 400 or 500 voters, and of course a much larger population, and they only have a mail twice a week. These people have been asking for better mail accommodation for some time; I do not know whether the matter has been brought to the attention of the Postmaster General. There are also in this locality a number of factories along the shore, and the population is considerably augmented during the summer months. There are also a number of cheese factories, and in Abrams Village a number of stores. These people have a grievance in being deprived of a daily mail. It is only about five miles to a railway station, and there is every reason why there should not be a daily mail to that locality. The country served by these post offices is fifteen or twenty miles in extent, and I notice the revenue is nearly treble the salaries received by the postmasters. I would like to have some assurance from the Postmaster General that this matter will receive his attention.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the matter will receive careful consideration. If application has been made to the department, I am sure it is now receiving attention. Since I have been in the department there is no instance that I am aware of where such application asking for increased service has not been dealt with on its merits, looked into and disposed of favourably or otherwise. That is the invariable practice, and

takes place automatically. With reference to the observations of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richarson) suggesting that the salaries of the city postmasters should be reduced so as to increase the salaries of country postmasters, I fear I should not have the support in such a step of the hon. members for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke and Mr. Osler) and Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), as well as members from other cities.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Following the example of the hon. member for East Prince P.E.I. (Mr. Lefurgey), I desire to bring to the notice of the government, the case of the dismissal of the postmaster of Strathclair in my constituency. A few days ago, I put questions on the Order paper in reference to this gentleman's dismissal, asking if he had been dismissed, and if so, on what ground, who is his successor, and upon whose recommendation was he appointed. The answers of the Postmaster General were to the effect that he had been dismissed for active political partisanship, that it was unnecessary to hold an investigation, and that his successor was a Mr. Reid, appointed upon the recommendation of the Minister of the Interior. Now, I wish to say, in the first place, that a rule was laid down in this House by the Prime Minister himself in the session of 1896, that no employee of the government would be dismissed without having first a fair trial and investigation. How far that rule has been departed from, of course we on this side of the House are very well aware. Another rule laid down by another minister was to the effect that if any member representing a riding at that time was to get up in his place in the House and declare that of his own personal knowledge he knew of certain partisan acts on the part of any official of the government, the minister would consider it sufficient evidence to call for that man's dismissal. Well, if any gentleman can get up on the other side of the House and declare that Mr. Craig, who was the former postmaster at Strathclair, was guilty of partisanship, I will admit that the Postmaster General would be justified in dismissing him. But, I venture to say, that no hon. gentleman will make such a declaration in this House. On the contrary, I can truthfully say of my own personal knowledge that Mr. Craig has not been a partisan in any sense of the term whatever, further than silently casting his vote. Now a petition has been sent in to the Postmaster General signed, as he says, by ninety-five men asking for this gentleman's reinstatement. I had a copy of that petition sent to me, and I find it contained, instead of ninety-five names, one hundred and twenty-nine, a great proportion of them being gentlemen of the Liberal persuasion. The reeve of the municipality himself an ardent Liberal, signed that petition, and as the municipality is largely peopled by members of the Liberal party, this petition received the almost unanimous support of Grit and Tory alike in that municipality. Mr. Craig has been known for many years as a most estimable gentleman, largely dependent upon the revenue he derived from that office. Even if that were not the case, there has been no reason for his dismissal. I therefore state that the gentleman who recommended the dismissal of Mr. Craig took upon himself a great responsibility. I feel confident myself that the gentleman who recommended it in the first place was the defeated candidate in that constituency, a most active partisan who held the office of homestead inspector under the Minister of the Interior, who resigned the office in order to run in the constituency, and who has been reappointed since his defeat. I may say further that I am in receipt of many letters from Liberals as well as Conservatives asking for Mr. Craig's reinstatement. Copies of some of these letters have been sent to the Postmaster General, so I am informed, and the writers state positively of their own knowledge that Mr. Craig has not been a partisan in any sense of the term. He would not allow cartoons to be hung up in his office of either political party, in any election campaign; he simply allowed notices of the meetings to be hung up on behalf of both parties. Having drawn these facts to the attention of the Postmaster General, I feel confident that he will make an investigation and that he will see that justice is done to Mr. Craig.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This item may afford me an occasion for asking a question of the Postmaster General on a subject that I have seen noticed in the papers, I refer to a statement that he is making negotiations for the purchase of the Great North-western Telegraph Company. Is there any intention on the part of the government of acquiring possession of the telegraph lines throughout the country and attaching them to the post office system ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not aware of any negotiations being on foot for the purpose of acquiring the telegraph lines.

Mr. MONK. The Postmaster General, in answer to some observations made a moment ago by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) suggesting that the salaries of city postmasters be reduced, thought that the proposition would be opposed by the city members. I have no objection to voting the salary to the postmaster in the city of Montreal, some $4,000, because I do not consider it excessive. I would like to ask, however, in this connection, the hon. Postmaster General if he has considered particularly the state of the letter carriers in that city. Every one knows that living in the city of Montreal is probably the most expensive living for men of that

class to be found in any part of the Dominion. I have made representations on several occasions to the hon. Postmaster General, and I would like to know if he intends to maintain the salary of the postmaster in that city while giving no increase whatever to the letter carriers. I don't see any hon. member representing the city of Montreal here who would corroborate what I have just said in regard to the wants of that class of people, except the hon. member for St. Lawrence division (Mr. Bickerdike), and I have no doubt he will bear me out in what I say that there is urgent need in the case of these employees. I am very sorry that I cannot have corroboration from other members from that city.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no doubt that if other hon. members were in the Committee at the present time they would be able to express their views. I would say that none of them has ever asked me to reduce the salary of the postmasters or the letter carriers of that city. The maximum salaries of all these officials are where they were for many a year. I would, however, remind my hon. friend of the position of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), in reference to the reduction of the salaries of city postmen. The hon. member for Lisgar suggested that the reduction of salaries of city postmasters might lead to giving better salaries to other classes in the service, and I said that probably if he were to seek the views of certain hon. gentlemen in the House, for example the hon. members for West Toronto and Centre Toronto, he would probably find that they would not be in harmony with him in that view, therefore, I could not get unanimous support from that side of the House if I were to propose such a reduction of the salaries of postmasters.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General why I should seek the views of other members here or consult with them with reference to any policy. What business have I to seek the views of any hon. gentleman in this House ? I act within my rights as a member of this House, when I get up and state what my views are in regard to this subject. I do not know what he means or what he wants. I want to ask the hon. gentleman right here what he means ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When my hon. friend suggested that we should reduce the salary of the postmasters of Toronto and Winnipeg, I simply sought to point out to him that he would encounter the hostility of the members representing Toronto.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). It has nothing to do with me what other hon. members may do or say.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) refers to the point of increasing the salaries of letter carriers. Probably my hon. friend was absent from the Committee when I answered the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) on that point.

Mr. MONK. No, I was not ; I was speaking for the people of Montreal.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then I can only give my hon. friend the same answer that I gave to the hon. member for West Toronto.

Mr. CLARKE. So far as I know there has been no application made to the department, nor has there been any demand made on the part of anybody to reduce the salaries of the chief officials in the post office at Toronto. I think these officials receive very small salaries, considering the importance of the positions they hold and the importance of the work they perform. If any hon. gentleman will take the result of the transactions of the post office in Toronto he will find that it is enormous in its magnitude. What we are appealing to the hon. Postmaster General for to-night is not to reduce the salaries of the postmasters, but rather to increase the salaries of the worst paid and the hardest worked officials in the service, the letter carriers. I have not taken up more than a few minutes' time of the Committee, and I must confess that the hon. Postmaster General has not given me a very satisfactory answer to the questions I propounded to him. The answer he made was that the question of making an increase in the salary of the letter carriers was receiving his consideration. I hope that consideration will be favourable, because, from the terms of the petition which has been sent in by the letter carriers, he must see that their plight is a very serious one. They point to the fact, that, notwithstanding the determination of the hon. gentleman to make this a cheap country to live in, their experience has been, since these hon. gentlemen came into power, that the cost of living has increased substantially and that the difficulty of eking out an existence on the salaries they receive in cities and large centres of population has been very much accentuated. The hon. Postmaster General is aware that in violation of the precedent set by his predecessors in the past, in violation of what was originally laid down in the administration of the department, these letter carriers who went in at a minimum salary of $30 a month, or $360 a year, have been deprived of the statutory increase of $30 a year. Some were deprived of it for three years in succession, and these men, by the act of the hon. Postmaster General, were unwillingly compelled to contribute in that time a sum equivalent to $180, to assist the hon. Postmaster General in making both sides of the post office ledger balance. I appeal to the hon. Postmaster General to take the situation that these men find themselves in

to-day into his most serious consideration, and I ask the hon. gentleman if, in the item under discussion, he has made provision sufficient to give each letter carrier who is not receiving the maximum provided for under the Act an increase of $30 a year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. I am very glad to have that information from the hon. gentleman. I hope, in view of the urgency of the petition that has been sent in to him, and in view of the very strong case which these men have been able to make out, the hon. Postmaster General will make provision in the supplementary estimates to give them the whole or the major part of the increase they have asked for.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General if he proposes to increase the pay of the Montreal letter carriers as well.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Before the item passes, I would like the hon. Postmaster General to give a reply to my question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was going to. I remember answering my hon. friend's question the other day, and I stated that the action of the department was based upon sufficient ground. If such grounds had not existed the action taken would not have been taken. I do not know that I can say anything more than that.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Has the hon. gentleman any objection to telling me what grounds there were for the action, or what evidence there was of partisanship ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Speaking from memory, I am merely giving an elaboration of that answer.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The only answer I received in the House was that this gentleman had been guilty of active political partisanship. Who were the parties who made the charges ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot say whether all the details are set forth in the department, but it is very well known that some years ago the department laid it down as a rule that postmasters and other officials might choose between their positions or taking an active part in politics. because it is incompatible with the public service that officials should become active political partisans. That has special force in connection with the postal service. Postmasters occupy a delicate position in the community, and if they keep aloof from party politics, all the better for the public service.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I am afraid that is not a very clear answer to my question. We are just about as far ahead as we were before. Most assuredly when an hon. member gets up and states that to his own personal knowledge no such charge can be truthfully proven, some attention should be paid to his statement. If an hon. gentleman like the Minister of the Interior states that to his own knowledge this gentleman has been guilty of partisanship, then the hon. Postmaster General will be right, but I state that I have received petitions and letters, more particularly from Liberals than Conservatives, who have pooh-poohed the idea of that man being a political partisan. In no way whatever has the gentleman done one single thing in the nature of political partisanship except to go and cast a silent vote. Surely the Postmaster General will not drive him out of his office for that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot from memory say upon whose testimony the change took place, but I will look into the file of papers and ascertain. I do not know any reason why, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) presses for it, the name should not be given, but upon that point I would like to reserve a final answer until I look into the case. I will do so, and the hon. gentleman can bring it up upon another occasion if he desires.

Mr. CARGILL. I would like to know just upon what principle the government proceeds upon this question of dismissing officials for offensive partisanship. I presume that the rule would apply to one offensive partisan as well as to another. I bring to the attention of the Postmaster General a case in my constituency in which a prominent postmaster, a brother-in-law of my opponent, took a very prominent part in the last election. If I can establish that this prominent postmaster acted as a political partisan, I would like to know from the hon. Postmaster General, if he will dispense with the services of that gentleman. I have felt for some time that I have had a grievance against this man, and as this particular subject is now being discussed very thoroughly, I would like to know, in view of the principle laid down by the government in the early part of their regime in 1896, if the principle is applicable to partisan Reformers as well as to partisan Conservatives.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, in public life it is not considered necessary to decide more than the particular case calls for, and it is very unwise for public men to lay down propositions that appear to have no practical applicability.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh ! Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If my hon. friend (Mr. Cargill) will state a case, and if we think that a crime has been committed we will doubtless make the punishment fit the crime. But the hon. gentleman would not ask to have a case adjudi-

cated hypothetically in advance. Let him make the case and it will be dealt with. I do not know that my hon. friend in fairness could ask for anything more than that.

Mr. CARGILL. Would you appoint a commission to have the matter investigated ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps the accused might confess and save all that trouble. The procedure would depend altogether upon the charge and the issue which grows up around that charge. Let my hon. friend (Mr. Cargill) present his case and justice will be done in the premises——

Mr. CARGILL. Do you wish me to give you the name, and upon receiving the name do you promise to make thorough investigation and diligent inquiry and ascertain the facts and adjudicate upon them yourself ; or in what way do you propose to proceed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are many ways in which to do complete justice. If my hon. friend (Mr. Cargill) presents his case it will be dealt with in that spirit.

Mr. CARGILL. I thought I had presented my case. I am complaining that in the election which took place on the 7th November last a very prominent man occupying the position of postmaster in the east riding of Bruce, a very wealthy merchant there, a close relative of my opponent was very anxious to secure the election of his brother-in-law, and upon that occasion he resorted to devious ways and means that I think were very questionable. If I could in any way persuade the Postmaster General to give me his aid and influence in getting at the bottom of this matter, I am quite satisfied that on hearing the evidence he would consider this postmaster an extreme political partisan, and, having ascertained that fact, the Postmaster General —consistent with the policy laid down by himself and his colleagues—would consider it his duty to dispense with the services of that postmaster.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The invariable practice has been for some person to send a communication to the department signed by himself and furnishing particulars of the acts which he charges against the postmaster. To merely say in a general way that the postmaster was anxious to have his brother-in-law elected, and that he resorted to methods to bring that about, is too vague for investigation. Let my hon. friend (Mr. Cargill) follow the general rule : send his statement that he knows these things of his own knowledge, or give his source of information and then we will take up his case and deal with it in some way.

Mr. CARGILL. I do not know why my verbal statement should be any more vague than what my written statement would be. I assert here as a matter of fact that the postmaster to whom I refer had hundreds of dollars put up on the result in a particular polling division. He made it his business to get these bets. He went around that polling division night and day. The amount of money which he had bet on the result of the election in that polling division would when won have enabled him to have paid $5 to $10 for every vote in that polling division and then be money in pocket. The result was that in that particular polling division which had been in the habit of giving me a majority of from 80 to 120, it gave a majority of 10 against me. These are not vague statements. I could not make them any more explicit if I wrote them, and I am prepared to prove them.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to bring a case to the attention of the Postmaster General, and I think that when he knows of it he will certainly take action. I refer to the postmaster at Athens, whose name I think is McNaughton. Mr. Thomas Birney was dismissed from that post office on the ground that he was an offensive partisan, but the only thing against him was that he had voted for myself and for the late Mr. Wood in Brockville. This Mr. McNaughton came to Gananoque the day of nomination and was on the platform and was very offensive in his language. I had a meeting appointed to take place in Athens a few days after nomination and a letter was addressed to me at the post office at Athens. The postmaster, evidently thinking it contained some political matter, gave it to another person living in the same village by the name of Taylor, had it opened and handed back to him open, so that he could read the contents and did read them. He sealed it up and handed it back to me. At the meeting at night I made some reference to the dismissal of Mr. Birney, the previous postmaster. After the meeting McNaughton came to the hotel and abused me for referring to him on the platform. We had some words. The next day he met me on the street and challenged me to go into a yard to fight him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Did you accept ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, I did accept.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What was the result ?

Mr. TAYLOR. He slunk away. If anything could be more offensive than the conduct of that postmaster, I ask hon. members to name it. I demand of the Postmaster General that he hold an inquiry into the conduct of Mr. McNaughton, and I would name as witnesses, Mr. Ross, the late postmaster, Thos. Birney, Samuel Bodie, and others I could name, who heard the offensive remarks made both in the hotel and on the public street, in the village of Athens.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has made one serious charge against the postmaster—a charge that deserves investigation ; that is, that he delivered to another person, a letter addressed to and intended for the hon. gentleman. That, of course, is an unpardonable offence, whether committed by this postmaster or by any other. I would say to the hon. gentleman, and to others, that it would be formally inadvisable to conduct investigations as the result of speeches made here, though, of course, they are entitled to weight ; but as a matter of procedure, it would be much more convenient to have a written statement in the department, which would be a record in the department, of the matter complained of. I do not make that suggestion because I take exception to what my hon. friend has said, or because I belittle his statement in any way ; but rather that we should not depart from a methodical, businesslike way of dealing with such matters. If my hon. friend will make a statement of these matters in writing over his signature, and send it to the department, they will be investigated under oath. With regard to tampering with letters, or delivering letters to the wrong parties, whether accidentally or otherwise, if he says that a letter intended for him was delivered to some one else, that demands an investigation, and the onus will be upon the postmaster to explain his act. As to whether it is an offence for an officer to use improper language towards a candidate, that would depend upon circumstances.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps there was provocation ; perhaps it was not in the discharge of his duties in any way that this dispute arose ; my hon. friend may have provoked it on the street ; and so on. But, at the same time, if he desires that charge investigated, and will include it in his list, it will also receive investigation.

Mr. TAYLOR. In place of writing what I have said, I will clip it out of 'Hansard' and sign my name to it, and send it to the hon. gentleman ; and I will make the further charge that he drove all through the riding with the candidate and canvassed votes.

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. Postmaster General contend that the most serious way of making a charge is not by a man on the floor of this House ? Is that not sufficient ? Must an hon. member who makes a charge on the floor of the House, afterwards go to the office of the Postmaster General, and make it in writing, over his signature ? I think the most clear and explicit way of making a charge is to make it here ; and when that is done, we have a right to expect it to be investigated, without any further proceeding.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Would the hon. Postmaster General mind saying whether he regards going on a public platform and making a speech in favour of a party candidate, an evidence of political partisanship, sufficient to warrant the dismissal of a postmaster ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not wish to discuss hypothetical cases. If the hon. gentleman has a case of that nature, it will be investigated and dealt with according to the general rule. I am not going to lay down any rule as to what will be the conclusion in any alleged state of affairs. Political partisanship of an officer is contrary to our views.

Mr. CLANCY. Political partisanship, according to the hon. gentleman's views, is confined to his political opponents. The hon. gentleman knows that there could not be a greater farce entered into than to ask hon. members of this House to make charges and file them in his department. He knows perfectly well that charges of the most indifferent kind are constantly trumped up, and statements made which amount almost to perjury ; and the hon. gentleman, without sufficient investigation, satisfies himself with telling the incumbent of the office that his services are no longer required. That is followed up by a question in this House, and what is the invariable answer of the hon. gentleman ? Sometimes the charge of political partisanship has been made by a member or by a defeated candidate ; but when that answer is not given, the hon. gentleman states that he takes the responsibility himself. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if it has not been the rule that when charges of political partisanship have been made against Conservative office-holders, ninety per cent of them have been dismissed without any inquiry. I challenge him to say whether that is not invariably the case. I believe the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is reputed to be somewhat more fair in that respect. I remember hearing the hon. gentleman state a case of what he called political partisanship ; I believe it commenced during the former parliament. It was a case of an official speaking on a public platform in a harsh and ungentlemanly manner of himself and his leader. I believe that is the kind of case that ought to be punished. It is precisely such a case as the one mentioned to-night by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) ; and yet, the hon. Postmaster General is so hazy over it, that he cannot tell what should be done. He says : 'Perhaps you provoked him ; tell us all the circumstances.' I say that is not a fair way of dealing with both sides of the House. If the hon. gentleman wants to show even the gloss of fairness, he will lay down the same rule for both sides. I believe political partisanship is a great evil ; and if a person holding an office under the Crown, whether he be a Liberal or a Conservative, should make himself offensive politically, he should receive such punish-

ment as may be meted out to him by those in authority. I do not think the Postmaster General has reflected credit upon himself by the way he has answered the question.

Mr. MONK. I think the question of my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) is worthy of an answer. The question has arisen more than once in the province of Quebec, whether a postmaster who follows a candidate, who attends a political meeting, and there delivers a speech in favour of the candidate, is guilty of offensive partisanship. We ask the head of the department employing a number of postmasters, and he will not tell us. I think the right hon. Prime Minister might be appealed to to give us his opinion on that subject.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I may tell the Postmaster General that the case I had in view was not a hypothetical one. I had not made up my mind whether I would make any charge or not. I wanted to know what the position would likely be before I moved.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought it was somewhat refreshing to hear the statement of the hon. Postmaster General to-night, especially in view of the fact that in previous sessions he frequently told us that if any hon. gentleman in this House stated upon his word and honour that a party holding such an office had been a political partisan, he would deem it his duty to dismiss him. That was the rule he applied to his opponents, it is a poor rule which will not work both ways, but he is not willing to apply that rule now with regard to his own friends.

Mr. McEWEN. Judging by the charges our friends opposite are making against the Postmaster General, he certainly must have meted out very different treatment where they live to what he has done in our district. In our district, when the mail contracts were renewed in 1896, after the present government came into power, one of the contracts was re-let to a Conservative. I believe he was the lowest tenderer and entitled to it, but none the less he was a Conservative and got it. That was not all. There was another mail contract to be let a little later on, which an old gentleman, a Reformer, had had for many years, and would you believe it that contract was let to a Conservative, and the poor old Reformer was left out in the cold. That is the way the Postmaster General has treated our people, and it does seem to me very curious that he should have acted so differently elsewhere.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me the debate has drifted from the subject which gave rise to this discussion in the first place, that is the deficit. If we are going to settle that question, we had better drop minor matters, as the hour is getting late, and get back to the main subject, so that hon. members may understand for once and all whether there was a deficit at the end of 1896, or not. I would suggest to the hon. the Postmaster General that the time has now arrived when a change should be made in the system of keeping accounts in his department. I fail to see what there is to be gained by continuing from year to year two separate accounts, one for the Yukon district and another for the Dominion of Canada. I think that four or five years of keeping the two separate accounts is quite sufficient, and that from the beginning of next year all the accounts should be kept under the one head, and the question as to what is the exact deficit would no longer be disputed, but be very readily understood.

It may be said that that would not be fair for the purposes of comparison, but the hon. gentleman must remember that some of his colleagues have changed their methods of book-keeping, notably the Minister of Railways and Canals. We find now that many items are charged by that hon. gentleman to capital account which were not so charged by the previous government, and consequently his report is of very little use for the purpose of comparison. I might take also the Trade and Navigation Returns, in which the imports and exports are entered on a different basis, and it is difficult indeed to make comparisons unless we eliminate those items concerning which the system has been changed.

I think the hon. the Postmaster General would increase the value of his report very much, and make it much clearer if he would just make one account of the whole matter and not have two separate accounts. With reference to the deficit, which he claims existed at the end of 1896, I fail to see, after having looked into this matter very carefully, and after having listened carefully to everything said, why the Postmaster General should persist in claiming there was a deficit. What took place is simply this. At the end of 1895-6, on the 30th June, 1896, payment of a large number of contracts matured. The time for paying these contracts arrived on the night of the 30th June, 1896, but they could not possibly be paid at one o'clock in the morning of the 1st July, 1897. Consequently there was a large sum of money unpaid by the Post Office Department on the morning of the 1st July. That practice had been carried on for years, and I believe dates as far back as the time when Sir Oliver Mowat was Postmaster General of Canada. These contracts were paid after the 1st July, out of the appropriation for the following year. They were not a deficit, but simply items which had matured and were unpaid, but were no evidence that the revenue of the Post Office Department was not equal to the expenditure. It seems to me that the Postmaster General has simply been playing with the House and

the country for the last three or four years, treating us as so many novices or children, and expecting us to believe that an account which only matured on the night of the 30th June, and was not settled at one o'clock in the morning of the 1st July, was a deficit. To my mind that is so plain that it would be foolish to waste my further time discussing it.

Mail service $2,227,000

Mr. SPROULE. What is the explanation of this increase of $20,000 compared with last year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is merely an approximate estimate. As the country grows, the service is constantly increasing, and doubtless this estimate will not be sufficient. We have had hon. gentlemen to-night pressing the government to increase the mail service. This is an increase of $20,000. Probably $10,000 will be set apart for land service, stages, &c., and $10,000 for railway service. There are railways approaching completion, and applications are coming in for mail service. With a growing service, an increased vote is necessary.

Post Office—Outside Service—Miscellaneous expenditure $235,000

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. Postmaster General give us some detailed information on this item ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The increases include commission to postmasters for savings bank business, $2,000; manufacture of postage stamps, postal cards, envelopes, &c., $8,000; a total of $10,000. From this must be deducted $809.33, because the vote for 1900-1 for certain miscellaneous post office charges and equipment was more than was required. This leaves a net estimated increase of $9,190.67.

Services in the Yukon Territory—Post office $125,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The following figures will give the state of the Yukon service last year :

Mail services—		
Water service	$ 7,610 59	
Railway service	1,654 30	
Ordinary land service.....	71,168 17	
		$80,433 06
Salaries—		
Mr. James, special agent of Skagway	$ 2,000 00	
Dawson post office	20,411 25	
Atlin post office	3,342 30	
Lake Bennett post office....	1,974 42	
Other post offices	1,157 83	
		28,885 80
Miscellaneous—		
Atlin post office	$ 205 97	
Dawson post office.....	690 36	
Lake Bennett post office ...	2,153 38	
		3,049 71
		$112,368 57

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman be increasing the service there this year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We expect to increase it.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 27, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Parmelee.)

MARKING AND INSPECTION OF FRUIT PACKAGES.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 32) to provide for the marking and inspection of packages containing fruit for sale.

Mr. HENDERSON. In view of the importance of this Bill, I think we should have some explanations of its nature at this stage.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that this Bill, to a large extent, follows the lines of the Bill which was introduced into this House last session. It is introduced on the present occasion in consequence of the complaints that have been made in regard to the contents of closed packages of fruit put upon the markets of Canada and of Great Britain by Canadian fruit dealers. Difficulties have arisen to such an extent as in some measure to have discredited Canadian fruit in the markets of the world, as well as in our home market. Serious complaints have been made by the purchasers of Canadian fruits. The Bill which was introduced last session aimed at establishing grades of fruit, and at placing marks upon the packages that would indicate the quality of the fruit contained therein. This Bill provides a machinery by which packages so marked would be subject to inspection, and for penalties which would be a deterrent to those who are engaged in the fruit packing business in case they wished to pack fruit in a way contrary to the marks placed upon the package. The Bill has been somewhat modified since last session, inasmuch as it is proposed to apply it to the domestic as well as the export trade. It also provides in one section to apply to all packages of fruit which are closed, in this respect not being limited to apples and

pears, as was the Bill of last session. These changes have been introduced because of representations made from various sources in the country, especially from the fruit shippers and fruit growers' associations of the various provinces, the Bill being modelled to a large extent upon suggestions made by these interests. An attempt is made in the Bill to harmonize the somewhat divergent views of the different interests, while at the same time interfering as little as possible with the trade so far as consistent with safeguarding the public interests. I do not care to go into the details of the Bill just now, that I think could be better done in committee; therefore, I leave it with this short explanation, which I think will be sufficient to justify the introduction of a measure of this kind.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is the inspection to be made?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no provision stating where the inspection is to be made. The Bill provides for the appointment of inspectors when that is thought necessary, and any fruit which is marked under the provisions of this Bill will be subject to inspection wherever it may be exposed for sale, or in the warehouses of people who are engaged in the trade.

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose there will be no difficulty in getting an extra number of copies of this Bill to distribute among those interested?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly, just as soon as the Bill is printed, copies will be available for everybody.

Mr. HENDERSON. Could the hon. minister say whether this inspection is to be compulsory?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The inspection is not compulsory, but it is permissible; that is to say, that every closed package of fruit marked under the provisions of this Act, will be subject to this inspection.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

VICTORIA DAY.

Mr. EDWARD H. HORSEY (North Grey) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 33) respecting Victoria Day.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). Explain.

Mr. HORSEY. I may say that the purport and object of this Bill is to make the 24th day of May a permanent public holiday in Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask in connection with this Bill, whether the King's birthday will be a public holiday.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is carried.

Mr. MACLEAN. I will get another chance.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The statute provides for that.

QUESTIONS.

I.C.R.—APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked:

Is it the intention of the hon. Minister of Railways to appoint, this year, one or more French Canadian commissioners to inquire into cases of injury or damage to property of residents on the line of the Intercolonial Railway between Montreal and Campbellton?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The department has not found it necessary, up to the present time, to make the appointment of commissioners of the character mentioned.

I.C.R.—STATION AT TROIS PISTOLES.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked:

1. Is the government aware that the station house and the old restaurant at Trois Pistoles, on the Intercolonial Railway, were recently destroyed by a fire, which caused the loss of two lives, that of Madame Morin and that of the agent, M. Hudon?

2. Is it the intention of the Department of Railways to build a new station so planned that the dwelling of the agent and his family may be apart from the station proper, instead of being located in the upper story, so as to avoid the possibility of the recurrence of any such deplorable catastrophe as that which has occurred at Trois Pistoles?

3. If so, when will the work begin?

4. Is the work to be done under contract or by day labour?

5. What amount of money does the minister intend to spend for the erection of a station house and dependencies worthy of Trois Pistoles as a watering place and of the travelling public using it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair):

1. Yes.

2. The whole matter is under consideration.

3. The answer to this question will be involved in the answer to No. 2.

4. When the buildings are to be erected they will be erected by tender and under contract.

5. I cannot answer the fifth question.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—PAY OF THE MEN OF 'C' BATTERY.

Mr. CLARKE asked:

1. Did any officer or officers of the Canadian Artillery serving in South Africa, who did not take part with Colonel Plummer's column in the operations in Rhodesia, make application to the Rhodesian government, or to any person or authority, for a portion or share of the sum of money given by the Rhodesian government to the men of 'C' Battery, Canadian Artillery?

2. If so, was such application refused, and on what ground or for what reason?
3. What officer or officers, if any, made such application?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden):
1. No.
2. No.
3. None.

EXHAUST FANS ON ATLANTIC STEAMERS.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth) asked:

1. What are the names of the Atlantic steamers on which exhaust fans were placed, and for the placing of which the government paid $100 each?
2. Was any effort made last autumn to ascertain if these fans or any of them were continuously in operation during the voyage across the Atlantic?
3. Will the government endeavour to procure the installation of exhaust fans in all steamers carrying apples across the Atlantic from Canadian ports?
4. What steamers plying between Canadian ports and the West Indies are fitted with cold storage chambers, the owners of which receive subventions from the government?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher):
1. The government has not yet paid any bonus for the placing of exhaust fans on steamships, although the offer of a bonus of one hundred dollars towards the initial expense of fitting up each approved steamship was made in July, 1900. Exhaust fans were placed on the following steamships:
Allan Line: Pomeranian, Brazilian, Buenos Ayrean, Ontarian, Sarmatian.
Thomson Line: Devona, Kildona, Fremona, Hurona, Iona, Escalona, Jacona, Bellona.
Donaldson Line: Alcides, Amarynthia, Concordia, Kastalia, Lakonia, Marina, Salacia, Tritonia.
2. The owners of the steamships reported that the fans were used during the voyages across the Atlantic.
3. The government has been in communication with the owners of steamships, and it is expected that exhaust fans will be provided in all of the steamships for carrying apples across the Atlantic from Canadian ports, during the season of 1901.
4. The owners of the steamship Beta, Messrs. Pickford, Black & Co., Halifax, have received a subvention from the government for providing cold storage between a Canadian port and the West Indies.

ARMOURY AT ST. THOMAS.

Mr. INGRAM asked:

1. How many tendered for the contract to build the St. Thomas Armoury?
2. What was the name of each tenderer and the amount of his tender?
3. At what price was the contract let and to whom?
4. Did the department give the contract to the lowest tenderer? If not, why?
5. What is to be the total cost of the armoury?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte):
1. Five.
2. J. M. Green & Co., St. Thomas $29,793.00
Wm. Griffiths, Woodstock 31,359.00
Wm. Reath, St. Thomas 31,910.91
H. Lindop, St. Thomas 33.470.00
John Prudom, London 34,225.00
3. To J. M. Green & Co., for.... 29,793.00
4. Yes.
5. About $37,000, including heating and furniture.

RENT OF 25TH BATTALION CLUB ROOMS.

Mr. INGRAM asked:

1. How much rent did the government pay each year since 30th June, 1896, for the use of the 25th Battalion club rooms in St. Thomas?
2. What amount of rent was due and unpaid by the previous government up to the 30th June, 1896, for the use of said club rooms?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden):
1. The government has paid each year, since 1896, $20 per month for use of a building for 25th Regiment, this building containing store room, band room and officers' quarters.
2. Nine months' rent was due to 30th June, 1896, when present government came into power.

PORT STANLEY HARBOUR.

Mr. INGRAM asked:

1. What was the total expenditure by this government on the harbour at Port Stanley since 30th June, 1896, up to 31st December, 1901?
2. What is the amount expended yearly since 30th June, 1896?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte):
1. $37,565.32.
2. 1896-7..... $ 842.82
1897-8..... 20,046.31
1898-9..... 13,007.43
1899-1900..... 3,668.76
$37,565.32

PORT BURWELL HARBOUR.

Mr. INGRAM asked:

1. What was the total expenditure by this government on the harbour of Port Burwell since 30th June, 1896, up to 31st December, 1901?
2. What is the amount expended yearly since 30th June, 1896?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte):
1. $98,664.65.
2. 1896-7.....
1897-8.....
1898-9..... $24,864.88
1899-1900 ..... 44,577.97
Half year, ended 31st December, 1900 ..... 29,221.80
$98,664.65

PORT BRUCE HARBOUR.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. Were any applications made to the Department of Public Works since 30th June, 1900, for the improvement of the harbour at Port Bruce? If so, by whom?

2. Is it the intention of the government to improve the harbour at Port Bruce?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte) :

1. No.

2. When application is made, the question will receive due consideration.

ENFORCEMENT OF LAW RESPECTING BINDER TWINE.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin) asked :

Is it the intention of the government to instruct the inspector of weights and measures, or some other competent person, to enforce the law relating to binder twine, which reads as follows :—Section 3, chapter 37, 63-64 Victoria. 'Upon or attached to every ball of binder twine offered for sale there shall be a stamp with the name of the manufacturer or importer, stating the number of feet of twine per pound in each ball.'

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier) :

A copy of the Act, Chap. 37, of 63-64 Victoria, was sent to every inspector of weights and measures. A circular directing their attention to its provisions will be sent before the season for distribution of binder twine arrives.

I.C.R. ROUND-HOUSE AT CAMPBELLTON.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. What was the cost of repairing or rebuilding the roundhouse on the Intercolonial Railway at Campbellton, N.B.?

2. What is the present condition of the building?

3. After it was repaired or rebuilt, did it leak, and if so, what was the cause of the leaking, has the defect been repaired, and at what cost?

4. Who was the contractor that did the repairing or rebuilding, and was the contract let by tender?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The cost of re-modelling and enlarging the engine house at Campbellton, was $21,975.

2. The work has been carried on continuously since the contract was signed, and is now nearing completion.

3. There has been no leak in the building. The plans and specification and contract call for a new roof on the portion of the building to be extended, the existing roof was considered by the Railway Department in good condition. The contract plans and specification call for the repairing and making good of any portion of the existing roof damaged by the carrying on of the new work. The contractor guarantees the new roof for ten years after completion.

4. Contract was let by tender to Messrs. Rhodes, Curry & Co., Amherst, whose tender was the lowest, and afterwards transferred by them to Geo. McArthur, St. John, at the same price.

QUANTITY OF FREIGHT THROUGH CANALS.

Mr. CLANCY asked :

What was the total quantity of freight passed through the several divisions of the canals in Canada during the season of 1900?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

The total quantity of freight passed through the several divisions of the canals in Canada during the season of 1900, is as follows :

1900.

	Tons.
Welland	719,360
St. Lawrence	1,017,990
Chambly	348,561
Ottawa	366,782
Murray	18,916
Trent Valley	43,065
Sault Ste. Marie	2,035,677
	4,550,351

Information with reference to the Rideau and St. Peters canal, not yet ready.

TARIFF ACT—BRITISH PREFERENTIAL CLAUSE.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

Is it the intention of the government to so amend the Tariff Act as to debar from the advantage of the British preferential clause articles partly manufactured in Germany, or manufactured from raw material grown or produced in Germany?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In answer to the question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) I beg to say: No. Such provision would practically destroy the British perference inasmuch as British manufactures are largely produced from foreign raw materials, but if it can be shown that the intention of the British preferential tariff is evaded, we shall be glad to consider the facts when presented to us.

DISMISSAL OF MR. H. D. HENDERSON.

Mr. BROCK asked :

1. Has Mr. H. D. Henderson, who for twenty-five years was postmaster of Whitechurch, been dismissed?

2. Were charges made against him? If so, by whom?

3. At whose request was he dismissed, and on what grounds?

4. Was any inquiry made as to the wishes of those using the office, and what was the result?

5. Has a successor been appointed? If so, on whose recommendation was he appointed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

Mr. H. D. Henderson, postmaster at Whitechurch, was removed from office because, during the last Dominion election, he took

an active political part in the elections of West Bruce, West Huron and East Huron. During the campaign, one of the Liberal candidates, the present member for West Bruce, warned him of the consequences of such conduct, and notwithstanding which he still persisted in it, taking the view that he had as much right to appear on the public platform, as had the candidate himself. The truth of the charges appeared fully established, and no further investigation was necessary; accordingly, the postmaster was removed from his position. Mr. Alexander Beaton, was appointed in his place on the recommendation of Mr. Tolmie, M.P.

CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR ADDINGTON.

Mr. BELL (Addington) asked :

Has a census commissioner been appointed for the electoral district of Addington? If so, who has been appointed and upon whose recommendation?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). No census commissioner has yet been appointed for the electoral district of Addington. Perhaps, it is as well for me to add, that none of the electoral division census commissioners have yet been appointed.

PAYMENT TO MR. RALPH JONES.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

Referring to item No. 30 in the supplementary estimates for the year ending 30th June, 1900, for payment to Mr. Ralph Jones of $847.50—

1. Has this item been paid? If so, when?

2. Has a cheque been given to Mr. Jones or his attorney or agent?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair):

1. Yes, item No. 30, in supplementary estimates for year ending 30th June, 1900, for payment to Mr. Ralph Jones, of $847.50, has been paid. It was paid on the 29th of January, 1901.

2. The check was given to his attorney, Mr. Sinclair.

VISIT OF THE DUKE OF CORNWALL AND YORK.

Mr. NORTHRUP—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

Has the government any information of the proposed visit of His Royal Highness the Duke of Cornwall and York and the date thereof ? If so, have any arrangements been made for his reception?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have stated to the House on previous occasions, that there is correspondence on the subject now going on between the government and the Imperial authorities. It is still confidential, and the contents of it cannot be given to the House. No definite arrangements have yet been made for the visit of Their Royal Highnesses.

REPORT PRESENTED.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I beg to place on the Table of the House, the report of the North-west Mounted Police. This is the report only so far as the territories are concerned, and the Yukon is not included.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—NEW GOVERNMENT VESSELS.

Hon. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) moved for :

Copies of all specifications and plans issued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries when calling for tenders for the construction of two government vessels in British Columbia. Also copies of all tenders received for construction of same, together with a statement showing the amount of the deposits made by the several tenderers, &c., names of the successful tenderers, and all correspondence and papers connected with the same.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). There can be no objection to these papers being brought down at the proper time, but, I want to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the order cannot pass now. The contract has not yet been entered into; not yet signed. The department notified the tenderer that his tender had been accepted, and the contract is being prepared, but it is not yet signed. One of the tenderers withdrew.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Which was that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In Victoria. Not a week ago I received notice that they had withdrawn from their tender.

Mr. WALLACE. Is that the lowest tenderer ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. It would not be advisable, nor in the public interest, that I should bring down either the tender or the contract until the parties have signed the contract. There is no possible objection to these papers being brought down at the proper time, but just now I cannot do it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) can move later on.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. The two tenders were accepted by the department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The lowest tenders were accepted.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. And, I suppose the deposits were put up by the tenderers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There were no deposits.

Mr. SPEAKER. Shall this motion pass ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hon. gentlemen see that I cannot allow the motion to be carried now.

Mr. MONK. The minister says the tender was accepted, and the contract is only a matter of detail.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not by any means a matter of detail. So far from being a matter of detail, one of the parties whose tender had been accepted has already withdrawn. If I bring down the papers, and the whole world is informed who the tenderers were, and the amounts before the contracts are signed, possibly some of them might withdraw. This information is never given to the public, until the contract is signed.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. It is not the intention of the minister to call for fresh tenders.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know what will be my intention if they all withdraw. Unless the House compels me to, I am not going to make public the tenders, and amounts until the parties have accepted and signed the contract. I am quite sure that has been the practice heretofore.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the tenderers know all about these matters. I have no doubt that after they put their tenders in, they have communicated to each other, as I am told they usually do, what their tenders are. Now, Sir, a job may be on foot, and if the people know the facts of the case a job can be prevented from being carried out. I am not speaking of a job implicating the minister, but a job in which the tenderers drop out one after another in order to get a higher price for the building of the ship. There is too much secrecy. My opinion with regard to public tenders is that the whole public should know all about them right from the start. What is the object of secrecy ? The government will not tell us what binder twine costs ; they will not tell us anything. What is the object of hiding the facts ? The true way is to give the utmost publicity to all these matters. Let everything be done in the open, and then everybody will know exactly how the matter stands, and we shall have lower tenders, less jobbery, and no deals. The minister tells us that he will not give the information now, because if he does he is afraid it will assist in the carrying out of these deals against the government. But the fact that the people have full information in regard to these matters will prevent deals, if anything can be done in that direction. Therefore, we are entitled to have this motion passed, and to have the minister give full information to parliament. The plan that has been pursued in the past must stop—that of the government, on their own sweet will, without giving sufficient reasons, saying, We cannot bring down the papers about this or that. Parliament is entitled to receive full information on all these matters, and should not be satisfied without having the fullest information in the papers asked for by the hon. member for Victoria, B.C.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As I understand it, the only thing that, in the opinion of the hon. minister, should be kept secret is the prices of the various competitors, in the event of his asking for further tenders. I would not wish to urge the government to divulge a matter of business which it would be in the public interest to keep private. Still, when that feature is considered, what is there in it ? These tenderers, whoever they may be, have that information. Each one can give the amount of his tender to another ; they can impart that information to any one they please ; the minister cannot prevent them. That is the only reason advanced for withholding the papers. It seems to me, in listening to the discussion, that the interests of the department would be served by the amounts of these tenders being known, should the department have to resort to fresh tenders. There has been no argument at all to support the hon. minister in his determination to keep these papers back. As I understand it, he has these gentlemen in his hands, if they are responsible parties. One safeguard, however, seems to have been overlooked altogether in order to secure bona fide tenderers ; that is, the usual deposit has not been required. A very large amount of money is involved in the construction of these boats, and the ordinary course followed in all the departments is to require a deposit with each tender. That is done for the very purpose of preventing the withdrawing of tenders. The hon. gentleman says that one of the tenders which has been accepted has been withdrawn. But the tenderer cannot withdraw under the law, and, if he is responsible, it seems to me that it would be the duty of the department to hold him to his contract. The House being in session, and there being now an actual contract, it seems to me, unless some other reason is given, that the minister is unduly cautious in withholding the information asked for.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman knows that there has never been a case in the history of the government when tenders have been communicated to the House before the contract has been entered into. There are six or eight of these tenderers, and if I published the names the lower one would withdraw altogether. In this case the lowest tender has been accepted, the contract has been made out, it will be executed in a short time, and the moment it is executed the information will be given to my hon. friend. There is no disposition to withhold the information ; but I could not undertake to advise the House to make a new departure and publish the tenders which have been received before the contract is entered into. It is only a

question of time, and if the hon. gentleman renews his motion at the proper time, I will tell him when the contract is entered into, and bring down the information.

Mr. COCHRANE. Has the hon. gentleman not introduced a new departure by calling for tenders without a deposit ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will explain that when the papers are brought down.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I feel disposed to support the position taken by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). I think the only papers to be withheld from parliament are papers which are withheld by ministers of the Crown for grave reasons of state. Papers relating to anything done by the departments when parliament is sitting, the House has a right to see.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, no.

Mr. MONK. I differ from the hon. gentleman. What difference does it make that certain contractors have sent in tenders, and have failed to comply with those tenders ? The House of Commons has a right to see these papers—in fact, all documents having reference to public business except documents which the Crown sees fit to withhold for grave reasons of state. No doubt the minister will have to call for new tenders even if the names of the tenderers are divulged ; but the tenderers who will tender afterwards will all do so under the same conditions, and it is possible that they will tender at lower figures than before. But I lay my claim on the broad principle that except documents which are withheld by the Crown for grave reasons of state we have a right to see all documents.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The question involved is one of principle, applying not to this particular department alone, but to all departments which invite public tenders. I have to dissent entirely from the principle laid down by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) as to the right of parliament to control these documents in that broad and unqualified way that he states. He admits that ministers may withhold documents for reasons of state. If we accept that definition, the minister of this department says that for reasons of state he does not deem it proper to bring these papers down. No one disputes the authority of parliament; but the public business could not be carried on in the departments if the principle which the hon. gentleman has laid down were adopted. Take the Department of Railways, the Department of Public Works, or the Post Office Department, which make many contracts ; if, the moment a number of tenders were received, the list were produced in the House of Commons, there would be an end to all competition. It is said that in this particular case the tenderers themselves have probably a knowledge of one another's tenders. That is only a matter of guess work ; they may or may not. But it is positive that if we bring the papers down, every one of them will have that information, and they will have an invitation to put their heads together and make a combination against the public interest. Those who are in the habit of inviting tenders know perfectly well that when you have a list of tenders before you, it is absolutely necessary, in the public interest, to treat that list as confidential until the contract has been signed, sealed and delivered. The adoption of any policy at variance with that would not be in the public interest, and no self-respecting government should allow such a policy to be adopted.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). If I remember rightly, in nearly every state of the union one of the conditions in the letting of contracts for public works is that the tenders shall be opened in public, and this condition is insisted on in the cities and municipalities in nearly every part of America. It is looked upon as one of the guarantees also of proper administration to the public. It is true that a different principle is adopted by the present government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And the previous government and all governments in Canada.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, but that does not make the principle laid down by the Minister of Finance the correct one. The time must arrive when, in order to assure the parties tendering that they shall have fair-play and to protect the interests of the public, a day will be fixed in every case for the reception and opening of tenders, and all tenders will be opened in public. That is the proper practice, and the sooner we adopt it the better.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How long has the hon. gentleman been of that opinion ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I never opened a tender in my life.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is not the question. We do not open them.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The tenders in my department were always opened by the officers and a report given to me by them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. So they are now.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I never opened a tender, and I defy the hon. gentleman to state that I have done so. No tender for anything in my department was ever opened by me nor was I present at the opening.

Everything done was done in public and above board.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me ? I did not ask him whether he had ever opened the tenders, but I did ask him to tell this House how long he has entertained the opinion he has now expressed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am coming to that particular question. I freely admit that the principle I advocate now, I did not practise when I was administering the affairs of the country, and I admit that the present government is simply following up the practice followed by us. But there is this difference to be taken into account. There is a stranger at present ruling on the throne of the Stuart, and therefore it is perhaps time now that a system, which might not have been used when we were in power, should now be changed and a different principle adopted. But I was simply answering the statement of the Minister of Finance, that all governments would have to follow the policy adopted by this one and that to adopt any other would put an end almost to constitutional government. I wanted simply to point out that in nearly every country in the world—I do not know about Great Britain, but in all the states of the union—the contractor, before he tenders, insists that the day of opening of tenders should be published and that he should be given the opportunity of being present when the tenders are opened. I think perhaps that a principle which might have been worked honestly in our time, when there was a fair and honest administration in office, would be opened to suspicion at present and another should be adopted.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). I hope that the doctrine is not being laid down now by the Liberal party that a new and progressive principle should not be adopted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A pernicious principle.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is a pernicious principle which the hon. gentleman is advocating, because it leads to log rolling. It is when the tenders are not made public that the people get the worst of it.

The principle of publishing the tenders is adopted, the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) says, in all municipal corporations. That system prevents log rolling, but if you keep the tenders dark, log rolling is bound to continue.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It seems to me that a deposit should have been insisted on as a guarantee that the party tendering is prepared to go on with the work, if his tender be accepted. Had that been done in this case, the successful tenderer would have been bound to carry out the contract. The hon. minister said that the lowest tenderers had dropped out.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There were two distinct tenders one for a small ship and the other for a large one. The lowest tenderer for the small ship dropped out. I cannot tell you why he dropped out, but the lowest tenderer for the large ship accepted the contract and it is about to be signed. When it is signed I will bring it down.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not make any difference whether the tender was for a small ship or a large one. Had the party tendering been compelled to put up a deposit, he would not now back out. There is a strong suspicion that he may have consulted with others and have dropped out for reasons.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The question is not, as suggested by my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) whether the system is right or wrong or susceptible of improvement. The question is whether or not those papers should be laid on the Table at this moment. No doubt all transactions of the government have to be communicated to parliament to whom the government is responsible, but my hon. friend knows very well, and so does my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), that it is against all rules of constitutional government to bring down any papers before the transaction they relate to is completed. The reasons are obvious. There are private interests which might be placed in jeopardy if communicated to the public before hand, and the position taken by my hon. friend on my right is a proper one, namely, that as soon as the transaction is completed the papers will be brought down. But it stands to reason that, at this moment, when the government is engaged in a private transaction with private parties, the interest of those parties may be put in jeopardy if communicated to the public. The public interest is not the only thing to be considered ; the private interest involved must be considered also. Private parties having transactions with the government may fairly say : We do not want our business to go to the country at large ; we do not want the nation to be taken into our confidence. But, when the business is settled, the matter will be ready for the public. This is the rule which has been invariably followed in this House. I could cite instances without number in which that rule has been strictly adhered to.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. The reason I put this motion on the paper is that there is a very strong suspicion in British Columbia that the letting of these contracts has not been straight and square. This feeling exists, not only amongst the men in the firms that tendered, but amongst others who have been watching what has been going on. I was told by two, aye, by three, of the tenderers that the specifications for these two ships were the most extraordinary they had ever

had put into their hands. For one thing, I believe, though tenders were called for the steamers, yet no specification for engines was included. Then, again, no deposit was asked on any of the tenders, and that, in itself, was a very suspicious circumstance, according to our idea. These contracts must have involved about $100,000 for the two vessels——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Very nearly. One was for about $75,000, and the other about $15,000. Anyhow, we know how these things go. There would be extras probably, if a friend of the government got the contract.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It happened that the successful tenderer was a very strong Conservative.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. And what do we find now? That the successful tenderer has been let out scot free—there was no deposit, and he has been allowed to resign; and, no doubt, we shall see a friend of the government get the contract——

Mr. SPROULE. At a higher price.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Yes, at a higher price. That is the worst feature of it—that the lowest tenderer, owing to the neglect of the department in not asking for a deposit, is allowed to throw up the contract, and the country will have to pay more for the steamer than if the business had been properly carried out. The hon. minister said he was willing to bring down the papers as soon as the contract was signed. He will have to call for new tenders, or give the contract to another, and two contracts will have to be signed—and we do not know how long it will be before this is done. As for the argument that, in former times, papers were not brought down under the circumstance now existing, I will read what Bourinot says :

> Whilst members have every facility afforded them to obtain all the information they require on matters of public concern, occasions may arise when the government will feel constrained to refuse certain papers on the ground that their production would be inconvenient or injurious to the public interest. A high authority writes on this point : 'Considerations of public policy, and a due regard to the interests of the state, occasionally demand that information sought for by members of the legislature should be withheld, at the discretion and upon the general responsibility of the ministers. This principle is systematically recognized in all parliamentary transactions ; were it otherwise it would be impossible to carry on the government with safety and honour.' Consequently, there are frequent cases in which the ministers refuse information, especially at some delicate stage of an investigation or negotiation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. It seems to amuse hon. gentlemen opposite, that I should have a little assistance from a legal friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). Bourinot says further :

> Mr. Mackenzie expressed his opinion that everything that referred to the giving out of contracts of a technical and public nature, everything except the moral and personal reasons why any persons had been passed over, should be laid before the House.

Now, I contend that there is no delicate situation in this case. There is no reason that I can see why the papers should not be brought down.

Mr. WILSON. I think the hon. minister should give a reason why they asked for tenders without making a deposit necessary. That has been the principle heretofore, and it ought to be the principle now.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have stated that I would explain when the papers were brought down.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. minister please state how he knows that the successful tenderer was a Conservative ?

Motion negatived.

CANADA AND ITALY—IMPROVEMENT OF TRADE RELATIONS.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for :

> Copies of all correspondence between the Italian consul for Canada and the Prime Minister or the Minister of Trade and Commerce, respecting proposed improvement of the trade relations between Canada and Italy, and of all correspondence leading up to the placing of Canadian goods by Italy upon its general tariff.

He said: I believe that this correspondence, when it is brought down, will go a great way to show what is the attitude taken by the different countries of Europe with regard to ourselves since the preferential tariff has been put in force. On a previous occasion I urged in this House that the adoption of that tariff would place the countries of Europe in a situation of hostility and offence toward Canada, and would contribute greatly to the diminution of our commercial relations with those countries ; while, on the other hand, the adoption of a preferential tariff without any negotiations tending to give us a really preferred position upon the British market, would not give us that advantageous position in that market which we have a fair right, I think, to look forward to. Speaking particularly in regard to Italy, I may say, for the information of hon. members, that a movement has been on foot, in the province of Quebec at any rate, and in the city of Montreal, more particularly, for many years, to improve our commercial relations with that great country. The object of those who, in years past, have

laboured in that direction, has been to give us such commercial relations with Italy as would lead to a favoured interchange of goods between Italy and Canada. There are many products of ours which would find a market in Italy, and many of their products which we require. There is a great demand in Italy, and has been for years, for lumber. Though I find it impossible to get absolutely reliable statistics, because most of our business with Italy has been through French channels, and most of our shipping with Italy, been done through French ports, still there is no doubt, and statistics will show it, that we have in the past, through the ports of Bordeaux and Marseilles, carried on a commerce in lumber with Italy. We would find also in that country a very profitable market for much of the mineral wealth of this country. There is also a demand in Italy that would afford a profitable market for our Canadian pork. On the other hand, we take from Italy at the present moment, olives, olive oil, wines of different kinds, most of them coming through France, or many of them, Italian pastes, canned fish and other products of that country.

As I stated a moment ago, earnest efforts were made in the city of Montreal by men interested in that trade to establish favourable commercial relations with Italy. I might mention Mr. C. H. Cattelier, a well-known manufacturer of Montreal, an Italian, who laboured for a long time in that direction, and Mr. Cressy, advocate, and others. But we were under the disadvantage up to within a few years of having in Montreal no regular consular agent from Italy. There was a consul resident in Montreal, but he was an unpaid consul, and his situation was such that he took no part in that movement beyond a certain general interest, because it was impossible for him to deal with the government with that authority which belongs to a regular consular agent sent from a foreign government, and being to a certain extent in the diplomatic commercial service of that country. For four or five years back we have had in Canada a consul general from Italy, a gentleman thoroughly conversant with the commercial wants of that coutnry, and who, upon his arrival here, gave the subject his particular consideration, and applied himself in a special manner to the negotiation of commercial arrangements between Canada and that country, under the sanction, of course, of the British authorities. Now, Sir, I hold information, though not obtained from that gentleman, that in the prosecution of that object he had several interviews with the members of this government, and I believe correspondence with the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and with the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as well. I am under the impression, though I do not feel justified in formulating any judgment until that correspondence is before us, that the correspondence will reveal the fact that the government of this country, instead of seizing this opportunity of improving our commercial relations with Italy, were deplorably remiss in giving the subject that attention which it is claimed by many it deserves. At any rate, there have been no successful negotiations, so far as I have been able to ascertain, to secure a conclusion of some arrangements which would increase our commerce with Italy, nothing whatever has been concluded, no arrangement has been arrived at. So far as I have been able to ascertain, our position in regard to that matter has been altered. We occupy now the same position that we did before under the commercial treaties that country had made with Great Britain. We were not upon what is called there the general tariff, we were upon a special tariff, according to which the duty upon such articles as we sent to Italy was far less than it is according to the general tariff. There are two tariffs in Italy; there is the special tariff which is favourable to some countries, and there is the general tariff which is far higher, and which applies to all other countries. As I understand it, we are now upon the general tariff of that country, and consequently in a more unfavourable position than we were before.

As I said a moment ago, it is impossible to have accurate data as to what our commerce with Italy is at the present time. But I have ascertained that during last year, in spite of these unfavourable circumstances, our exports to Italy amounted in value to $260,458, and our imports from that country during the past year were only $144,573 ; that is to say, there was a decrease, so far as these statistics are reliable, in our imports of $250,000. As I stated, the object of this motion is to procure this correspondence. Of course I will suspend judgment myself and ask the House to suspend judgment until we see it ; but I think it is in the interest of the House and of the country that we should know whether these negotiations are going on, and what has been the result so far.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that his motion not only calls for correspondence exchanged between the Italian consul and the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but it also calls for correspondence regarding the placing of Canada by Italy upon its general tariff. On that phase of the question there might be some correspondence of a diplomatic nature, and to procure it the hon. gentleman ought to move for an address instead of simply moving for an order of the House. I would call his attention to Bourinot upon the subject, who says that correspondence between the Dominion, British and foreign

governments is moved for by an address. I do not know whether there is any correspondence with foreign governments in relation to this question, but as the motion calls for such correspondence, I think it is better to call for it by an address.

Mr. MONK. I will change the terms of the motion in the sense indicated by Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). There can be no objection, of course, to the hon. gentleman's motion for an address passing, and such correspondence as we have in our possession which is not of a confidential character, we will certainly bring down. But, I desire to mention to him that at the express request of the gentleman to whom he referred, the Italian consul, a very large portion of this correspondence was regarded as informal and strictly confidential. That, we will not be able to bring down, as the hon. gentleman will no doubt understand. With respect to the question of trade with Italy, he is right in stating that it is probable that a considerable portion of that does not come from Italian ports, but through French ports, and possibly, to some extent from those of one or two other countries, and it may be, therefore, that our trade returns do not very accurately show the actual amount of our trade with that country. That, he will notice, would apply rather more particularly to the question of importations. There has been a great drop in the importations, and I think it is not unlikely that it will be found that a considerable part of that drop arose from the very circumstances to which he has alluded. On the other hand, the hon. gentleman is, perhaps, aware that while the importations diminished our exports to Italy considerably increased. Our exports rose, I think in very nearly the same proportion, certainly as large a proportion, though perhaps not to the same amount, that our imports appear to have diminished. However, I can just say to the hon. gentleman, that we are very desirous of extending our trade and commerce with the Mediterranean nations as well as with any other countries with which we are likely to be able to open trade relations. As I had the opportunity of pointing out last session, one of the really important objects that we hoped to attain by the display of Canadian products at Paris, was the calling of the attention of the Latin nations more particularly to the resources of Canada, and explaining to them how they might be utilized for profitable exchange. The hon. gentleman, I believe, is right, in stating, as regards a considerable number of articles, although, if my memory serves me, not as regards all, the Italian government did accord us some more favourable terms. Personally, I should be very glad indeed to discuss the question with the hon. gentleman when the correspondence is brought down, but he will see that it is hardly expedient at this present moment, pending the production of such correspondence as we can lay on the Table, to proceed further with the discussion.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, of course, I would not ask for any confidential communications. I may say, to put myself right, and also in justification of the Italian consul, that I am in no way in communication with him. In fact, I have only met him once or twice, and upon inquiry in Montreal, before I made this motion I found that he had left for Italy. It is merely upon the rumours on the street that I have made this demand for this correspondence. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce will understand that we would like to see anything that is not confidential.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Certainly.

Mr. MONK. I would also take this occasion to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, if it is true or not, that the government has been notified of this change to which I alluded; that is to say, of the change resulting in Canada being removed from the former list or special tariff of Italy, and being placed now upon the general or less favourable tariff.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think the hon. gentleman is correct, but I will make a special inquiry.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, this debate, short as it is, has brought up one of the most important issues in this country, and the sooner the government of this country come to a new idea in regard to our tariff, the better will they be able to deal with questions of this kind. There is a new doctrine in Europe, and this is the doctrine of tariff for tariff, reciprocity for reciprocity. Every nation there is adopting that principle, and introducing it in the shape of having a maximum and a minimum tariff. By that they are enabled to maintain friendly relations with countries friendly to them, and by it they are in a position to retaliate on a nation that treats them unfavourably in regard to trade. Italy has such a tariff to-day; Russia has such a tariff to-day, and Russia is using it with great effect upon the United States. The sooner we in Canada come to recognize that principle, and have in our tariff maximum and minimum figures the better we will be able to deal with other nations. I go further. I was taxed on the floor of this House the other day by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as to what my opinion might be in regard to preferential trade. I do not believe in one-sided trade, even if it is with the mother land. The preference we have to-day is a preference not given to Great Britain, but

given to the manufacturers and workingmen of Great Britain at the expense of the manufacturers and workingmen here in Canada. I am against that out and out. I believe that the Conservative party, as a party, is against it out and out, and I believe the Canadian people are against it. The sooner we adopt this plan of a maximum and a minimum tariff, or, as I prefer to put it, of preference for preference, tariff for tariff, the sooner will we be able to extend our trade in different directions and upbuild this country. In connection with the old land, I believe that if proper representations were made to them, they will give a preference to us in consideration of the preference given by us to them, and the government made a great mistake the day they gave to the British manufacturers and the British workmen a preference in this market without getting one for ourselves. The opportunity is now coming in connection with the new Commonwealth of Australia, where they are adopting, as I believe they will adopt, the principle of protection, and a tariff for the encouragement of their own trade—the opportunity will present itself if the government is alive and up to date, to make some kind of a preferential arrangement with the Australian Commonwealth. The idea was brought out at the Toronto Board of Trade by a prominent merchant of that city, Mr. Hees, it was supported by the merchants of Toronto, and I believe, it will be supported by the people of this country. It is in line with what I have laid down already in my few remarks, tariff for tariff, preference for preference, and unless we frame our tariff in that way, and unless large powers are given to the Governor in Council to administer that tariff, we will not be able to hold our own with other countries. To-day the nations of Europe are being organized on that principle as against the United States, and they will be organized on that principle as against us. That is the coming principle, that is the rule that is demanded by the commerce of the different nations, and we must come to that in this country. I have believed in that principle ever since I have been taking any interest in our affairs, and the people of Canada are coming to that. The Conservative party has long ago come to that.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Why don't you abolish the preferential tariff ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I am ready to abolish a preferential tariff to-day that is unfair to the Canadian manufacturer and the Canadian workman.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Why don't you do it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Why don't you vote against it in this parliament ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I declare myself against it now. We will vote against it, and we will have it up in this House, and if the people are consulted, we will be sustained in it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hon. gentlemen claim great credit for what they have done in adopting that tariff, but they have done something not for the benefit of the empire. The way to do something for the benefit of the empire is to do something for the empire as a whole. If we wish to support the empire as we did by sending our soldiers to South Africa, present the empire with a great warship as Cape Colony is doing to-day, and as Australia is proposing to do, but do not do something at the expense of the Canadian manufacturer and the Canadian workmen. Now, I would like to have an expression of opinion from the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), or rather the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) on this particular question, and let him tell us, to-day, if he wishes to build up our trade, whether he is prepared to adopt this new principle, a principle that is being recognized all over the world which will enable Canada to make headway, the principle of the maximum and minimum tariff, administering it on a line that will produce trade between two countries with benefit to both.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Mr. Speaker, I think that we may congratulate ourselves upon the fact, that, before a great while, we shall be able to ascertain what the opinion of the Conservative party upon the preferential tariff is. We on this side declared that we believed that was sound policy, and we asked the support of the people upon that ground, and were successful. We asked the Conservative party to say what their policy was upon the question. The hon. gentleman who at that time acted as the financial leader of the Conservative party, Mr. Geo. E. Foster—a gentleman who is not apparently dictating the financial policy of the Conservative party at the present time, but who was the recognized mouthpiece of the party upon financial questions at that time—Mr. Foster very carefully refrained from taking any such position as that taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) just now, and for which he received the plaudits of his friends on that side of the House. These gentlemen opposite were very careful when they went before the country a few months ago, not to declare themselves as opposed to the principle of the preferential tariff. And, Sir, the success which the hon. gentlemen attained in only one province of this Dominion would not have been attained if they had declared the sentiment which they have declared in the House this afternoon. They succeeded in convincing perhaps the

majority of the people of Ontario that they were the truly loyal people, but my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) says to-day that that is not true, and that he is opposed to any preferences whatever being given to the manufacturer or the workingmen of Great Britain.

Mr. MACLEAN. As against ourselves.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. At the expense of the Canadian manufacturer or workingman.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain at whose expense he would give a preference. Are we going to take the tariff off the goods coming in to some other country ? We do not regulate the tariffs which protect manufacturers and workmen in other countries, and when we give a preference if it is to be at any one's expense, it is at the expense of the manufacturer and workingman of Canada. We go a little further and we say, that it is the policy of the Liberal party of Canada to reduce the duties and to remove to some extent the burdens of the excessive tariff which was imposed upon imported goods by the late Conservative government.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Is that the opinion you expressed during the last election with regard to the tariff on agricultural implements in Manitoba ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The question of agricultural implements was discussed very fully in the elections in the province of Manitoba, and we took our stand upon the duty on agricultural implements as it is to-day, and if my hon. friend will count the number of members who were returned from the western portion of Canada he will see that a considerable majority of the different constituencies recorded themselves in favour of the policy of the government. I have not risen for the purpose of making a speech upon the general fiscal policy of the government, but for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has made a clear and distinct declaration of the attitude of the Conservative party upon the question of the preferential tariff ; that he apparently received the unanimous applause of his friends on that side of the House when he made that declaration, and that the people of Canada now know, what they perhaps never had any official statement of before, namely : that the Conservative party is opposed as a party to the preferential clause in our tariff.

Mr. MACLEAN. A one-sided preference.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). The Minister of the Interior (Hon. Clifford Sifton) would have been wiser if he had refrained from making such remarks in this House. He says he is glad to know that the Conservatives have now declared their policy. He knows that we have never been afraid to declare our policy, and that we have adhered to the policy of protection which he and his friends opposed for twenty years, and which, when they came into power, they dare not remove from the statute-book of Canada although they were hostile to it. These gentlemen opposite have adopted a two-faced policy, professing on one hand to be free traders, while on the other hand they continue the protective policy of the Conservative party. I call that a dishonest political proceeding on the part of the members of the government.

Mr. DAVIS. What about Hugh John in Manitoba ?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, what about Hugh John. What about the Minister of Interior who came out for free agricultural implements and declared to the people of Manitoba that he would never rest until the duty on agricultural implements was totally abolished.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) is wholly incorrect.

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. WALLACE. Take what back ; I do not take orders from over there. I read the minister's speeches when he bitterly attacked the duty on agricultural implements, and when he pledged himself to do what he could to remove the duty. I would like to ask him if he justifies the duty on agricultural implements as it is to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I went before my constituents and I justified the tariff as it stands to-day upon agricultural implements, and Mr. Hugh John Macdonald——

Mr. WALLACE. Never mind about Hugh John Macdonald. I am not asking you about him. I did not ask you to make a speech.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Hugh John Macdonald, the candidate of these gentlemen that are for protection, declared that he was for free inmplements.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister of the Interior says he justified the 20 per cent duty that the Conservatives imposed upon agricultural implements. He pledged himself that he would oppose it in parliament, but now he turns around without any justification and defends the 20 per cent duty that he previously attacked when it was the policy of the Conservatives. That is the miserable position that the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) places himself in to-day. He tells us also that his party has removed the burdens of the people. How

much have they removed the burdens of the people by their present tariff? Not more than one-quarter of 1 per cent on the dollar, which makes it in round figures precisely the same duty so far as the burden of the people for each dollar is concerned, but it makes an increase of more than $1.30 per head on the population of Ontario, or largely more than $6,000,000 of burdens placed upon the people of all Canada. That is the policy the Minister of the Interior defends to-day. The Liberals for twenty years proclaimed themselves free traders, but the moment they came into power they increased the burdens of the people—if custom taxation is a burden on the people, and it is—very largely. They increased it last year by $7,000,000 over previous years, and I suppose that the Minister of Finance will at an early day get up and glorify the great Liberal party because they have placed this further burden upon our people. The Minister of the Interior speaks about the members from western Canada. Well, I do not think he had very much to do with the members from western Canada outside his own province of Manitoba, and I would like to ask him what was the result in Manitoba? The Minister of the Interior was elected by a large majority, but pretty nearly all his colleagues in the province of Manitoba were defeated. The whole resources of the empire were evidently centred upon the Minister of the Interior and he let his colleagues from that province go to the dogs. He did not care anything about them so long as he himself was elected. So far as his sneer at the province of Ontario is concerned, that we were only successful in one province, that is not true, because we were more successful than he was in his own province. We are proud of the record made by the Conservative party in the province of Ontario. We are proud of the members——

Mr. BOURASSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. I think we are very far from the question of trade relations with the Kingdom of Italy.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the specific question before the House is for correspondence respecting trade relations between Canada and Italy; but the discussion has become more general, and I think the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is quite in order.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is a very wide subject, and I am not surprised at the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) squealing out; because every time his party's indiscretions and want of fealty to their former professions are shown up, so much the worse for that party. I was saying, when interrupted, that we were proud of the representation from the province of Ontario, and it does not very well become the Minister of the Interior to throw out his sneers at the great province of Ontario, which, we have often been told from that side of the House, pays three-fifths of the taxes and contributes three-fifths of the wealth of the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say a few words with regard to the Minister of the Interior. He said: We stood by our policy in Manitoba, and look at the result. Now, I remember very distinctly reading a report of his speech in Manitoba, and it was to the following effect: It is true, I was against the duty on agricultural implements; I was a free trader in that respect; but you must remember that I am only one of the members of the cabinet, and the rule there is that the will of the majority must prevail, and the minority fall in with it; I still hold the same view, but since the majority of the cabinet decided that the other was the better policy, I had to fall in with it. And now the hon. gentleman takes credit to himself for having stood by that policy in Manitoba, when the reverse was the case. The whole tenor of his speech was that he could not get his own view to prevail and had to accept the view that was not acceptable to the people of Manitoba.

Motion agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—FREE TRANSPORTATION.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin) moved:

That inasmuch as almost every mile of railway in Canada has been aided, to a greater or lesser extent, by the Dominion government, the local legislatures and the numerous municipalities through which they run; and large sums of money have been given, as well as charters, conferring upon these railways a valuable franchise.

That inasmuch as the railways of the country are continuously seeking legislation for the advancement of some particular interest, or for securing some specific object; which legislation occupies the time of this House at a considerable cost to the country.

That inasmuch as such legislation, in order to be effective for the purposes intended, should be well considered, both by evidence and personal inspection of the location affected, by the members of this House, to the end that the best interests of all parties concerned may be safeguarded.

That, in order that these ends may be satisfactorily attained, the different railway companies for many years past, have given free transportation to all the members of parliament;

And inasmuch as such free transportation, coming, as it does, from railway corporations, no doubt with a view of affording every facility to the members for obtaining the fullest information as to the needs and requirements, both of the railway corporations and the country, and, notwithstanding such free transportation is uniform to all the members of this House, the object and intention is largely misunderstood by the people, and construed into corrupt intentions on the part of the railway corporations, thereby subjecting both the rail-

way corporations and the members of this House to an unjust and unfair criticism, which they are not always in a position to defend.

Therefore, in the opinion of this House, the present system of free transportation is unwise and undesirable, and should be discontinued, and a system substituted which would be free from the charges of corrupt intention or from adverse criticism.

That inasmuch as the railway corporations receive more than adequate compensation for that service as now rendered, this House is of the opinion that an Act should be placed on the statute-book making it incumbent on all railway corporations receiving a franchise or government aid, either in money or lands, to furnish free transportation to all members of this House, upon the certificate of the Clerk of the House; and that no mileage indemnity be hereafter paid by the government to the members while in attendance upon their parliamentary duties.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the 'Hansard' of this House for May 2, 1895, and I find that on that day a number of the prominent members of this House who are present to-day expressed themselves upon the subject with which I am dealing, although not exactly on the same lines. My hon. friend from North York (Hon. Mr. Mulock) who is now Postmaster General, introduced a bill on the subject. On the same occasion the Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright also expressed himself upon it; the hon. gentleman who is now Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, also expressed himself on the question, as well as a number of other prominent members of the House. These gentlemen all admitted the correctness of the principle of the resolution which I have moved. All they required was to have it put into shape, and I have arrived here to put it into shape. I have no desire to prolong discussion, but simply wish to say that the railway companies have no reason to complain should this resolution pass. The people of this country have established a portfolio almost entirely in the interests of these companies. That department costs us, taking into account the minister's salary and the salaries of deputies and those of the clerks, about $20,000 per annum, expended in the interests of these railway companies, and we have a perfect right to ask that they should in return give us something towards the expenses of the members of this House coming to attend their public duty.

I could refer to the debate on the 2nd May, 1895, for arguments in support of this resolution, advanced by gentlemen now holding office under the Crown. I believe that in that debate the Minister of Marine (then Mr. Davies), said that the Canadian Pacific Railway had received some $62,000,000 from this country, and the Grand Trunk Railway $25,000,000, and neither had paid one cent back. If we obliged these companies to carry members to and from this House once a year, that would not begin to pay the interest. It is about time that the railway companies should pay something to this country for the benefits they have received. The city of Toronto has an electric system which contributes to the corporation some $80,000 per annum.

Mr. CLARKE. Nearly double that.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Well, I always like to keep within the mark. It is high time that the railway companies should be asked to do this small measure of justice, and thus relieve members from the criticism and the charge, that having railway passes in their pockets, they are bound to vote just as the railway companies ask them. I want to relieve hon. members from the suspicion of becoming tools of the railway companies by the acceptance of railway passes. I am satisfied that such a suspicion is absolutely without foundation, but none the less it rankles in the public mind, and ought to be removed. I was told here a few days ago by a gentleman who occupies a seat in the Senate, at one time a member of this House was refused a pass owing to the stand he took, that for several years the railway companies had refused to grant him a pass, simply because he opposed some legislation they desired, and there are members of this House who pay their railway fares simply because their constituents are somewhat jealous on this matter. It would be much better that we should come here with passes rightly given to us, and not receive any mileage indemnity. There are hon. gentlemen who come here on passes, and then are paid $200 or $300 mileage because they happen to live a long distance from the capital. That is not properly understood throughout this country, or these gentlemen would not be elected to the position of being able to receive that favour during more than one parliament.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). I heartily concur, Mr. Speaker, in the object of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson), in moving this resolution. I have noticed with some curiosity the different positions taken by some hon. members in the debate in this House in 1895, when a Bill was introduced dealing with this question, and that taken by them in 1898 when a Bill dealing with the same question was introduced by the former member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock). I was somewhat surprised to find that many gentlemen, who spoke heartily on the first occasion in favour of the Bill, found reason on the second occasion to recant their former position, or else were absent from their seats. I must say, in my opinion, it hardly becomes the dignity of a member of this House to travel on favours granted by a railway company, especially when we consider that these companies must necessarily apply to parliament frequently for legislation in their interests. Undoubtedly a well-defined suspicion exists in the public mind that the complimentary tickets which these

companies bestow, are no small factor in putting through legislation in their favour; and that to this cause is attributable the very easy manner in which such legislation is frequently put through. I do not for one moment question the sincerity of any hon. gentleman when he tells me that the acceptance of a pass makes no difference whatever in his attitude towards the railway companies in this House, but I do think that there is cause for the suspicion that, taking it in the aggregate, this House is rather more lenient and less circumspect in dealing with railway legislation than it would otherwise be.

It is hardly fair that we should draw mileage from the government and at the same time accept railway passes from the companies. I do not pretend to be supersensitive in the matter, but I must say that the two seem incompatible. I think it only right, in fact I think it imperative, that members elected to this House should have the opportunity of travelling free over all the railway lines in the country if they see fit. They should have every opportunity and facility to visit various parts of the country and the public works there constructed; and should the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution not have taken the proper method of reaching and attaining the object he has in view, I hope we will have a promise from the government that hereafter, in all Bills coming before us for the granting of favours to railway companies, a clause will be introduced compelling these companies to give members of the House of Commons the privilege of travelling free over their lines. That would meet the case exactly, but in the meantime, I propose to support the motion as it stands.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). While I have seconded the motion in the absence of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith), I wish to say that I do not quite agree with the resolution in its entirety.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). If these hon. gentlemen who interrupt will have a little patience, I will explain my position. My view as regards the mileage allowance is that it is given, not only for the purpose of covering the cost of railway tickets, but the pullman fares and board while travelling, and also as an allowance for the time occupied in travel. I would have preferred had the resolution of the hon. gentleman simply been that the cost of the ticket be deducted from the mileage allowance, but inasmuch as he has not seen fit to make that provision, I am quite willing to second the resolution, and vote for it as it stands. Will those hon. gentlemen who laughed a while ago, smile now?

An hon. MEMBER. Where is the joke?

Mr. PUTTEE.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). If the hon. gentleman is too obtuse to see it, I am afraid it would be useless for me to try and make it clear to him. You will recollect, Sir, that the former member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock) introduced a Bill some two sessions ago for the purpose of regulating this very matter, and if my memory serves me correctly, a number of hon. members supported that Bill. I myself was in accord with its provisions, but I do not think I was present when the vote was taken, and because I was not present, I was accused in a western paper which supports the government of not being in favour of it. I may say that I myself have been frequently vilified because I accepted a pass from a railway company, and I feel strongly that this matter ought not to be left in its present position. The opportunity should not be allowed any one of accusing any hon. member of being favourable to a railway company because he accepts a pass from it, and for that reason, if no other, I would support this motion. But I believe further, that it is in the interests of the country that all members of parliament should be free to travel throughout the country and visit the various public works, if they so desire, without having to pay their railway fares. They would then be able to inspect the public works themselves, and satisfy themselves as to the utility of these works, and the desirability of carrying them on. I am not one of those who think that hon. members are influenced in their conduct by the acceptance of a pass, and I do not think it should be left in the mouth of any one to question the motive of any hon. member who accepts a railway pass. For these reasons I propose to vote for the resolution of my hon. friend from West Elgin.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). I recollect very well the discussion referred to by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) this afternoon. In that discussion the present Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock), and, I believe, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies), all pledged themselves on the floor of this House to this extent, namely, that the practice of taking passes and mileage indemnity was an improper one, and one which put hon. members in a bad light before the public. And they all agreed that something should be done to remedy the evil. If these hon. gentlemen will look up the record, they will find that they pledged themselves to do something in this sense. It is a public scandal that members of parliament should accept passes from the railway companies, travel free, and then go into our accountant's office and draw mileage for expenses they never paid.

There is an agitation in this House to-day for an increase in the indemnity of mem-

bers of parliament, and one justification given for the taking of mileage by members who travel on railway passes, is that the sessional indemnity is not sufficient. I hope that a reform will take place, and declare myself in favour of an increased indemnity. But I am opposed to the taking of mileage, as we take it now, and the use of passes. These gentlemen who are responsible for the conduct of this House, and who have pledged themselves to effect a reform in this matter—the Prime Minister, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and the Postmaster General—are bound to express their opinion on this resolution, and are bound by the promise they gave, to wipe out this scandal. The people do not like it, the public press have spoken against it, and the proper thing to do is either to make the railways carry members free or increase the indemnity, and give a larger mileage allowance. The mileage allowance now given is not simply intended to cover the travelling expenses of a member on the one trip to Ottawa and return. I know of three or four members to whom it costs as much as $300 and $400 a session in railway fares to and from their homes during the session, and it is needless to add that these hon. gentlemen pay their own fares. The thing as it stands to-day, is all wrong. It lowers the dignity of this House in the eyes of the people and ought to be abolished. As regards the question of railway fares, the railway companies should be obliged to carry the people's representatives free. There are countries where that is the law. In France, Italy and some other European countries, and in a good many states of the Union, that is the law. It is high time this scandal should be abolished. I am quite willing to vote for the resolution of my hon. friend from Elgin, and I do so mainly as a protest against the present condition of things. I say it here now, and have said it before in my own constituency, that I am in favour of an increase in the sessional indemnity to hon. members.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). The question brought up by this resolution is not a new one. A couple of sessions ago it was brought before this House by the then member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock), and it provoked a discussion of several hours. On that occasion the former leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) took Mr. Bostock to task for having brought up his resolution, and twitted him with being a young member, and like many other young members, a faddist—anxious to bring up something in order to satisfy his constituents he was doing something. I do not say that the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson), is moved by any motive of that kind, because I have no doubt he could do something in his riding without having to come here and do it in the House. As no doubt the hon. gentleman belongs to the patrons or the grangers, I presume he does not accept railway passes. No doubt, then, he would be able to get a pass and use it. We all know the fable of the fox who lost his tail. After suffering that loss he went around among the other foxes trying to persuade them that it was the proper thing for them to do without their tails also. There may possibly be some resemblance in this to the case of my hon. friend. I suppose this is a subject that should be treated somewhat seriously, but the first thing we should consider is whether this government or this House are in position to compel the railways to issue free passes to members. That is not decided, and I think it should be decided before action is taken in the matter. The question was discussed here two years ago for three or four hours, and I believe that other discussions of a similar kind have taken place in years gone by. It never seems to have occurred to those who brought up the subject that the government may not have power to compel railway companies to grant passes to members of parliament. If members of the House wish to accept these passes. I do not think there is any member of this parliament that would be influenced by the granting of such a pass. It is simply given as a matter of courtesy. I do not think such an imputation should be cast upon members as to say that it would influence any of them, one way or the other, in dealing with proposed legislation coming before the House. Before wasting time in discussing this question, I would like to understand what power the government has over railway companies in this matter. If they have no power at all, there is no reason why we should spend time in discussing it. In the meantime, if any hon. member wishes to accept a pass, that is a matter between himself and the railway corporation, and something as I understand it, that no other person has anything to do with.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL (Glengarry). It has been often said that bad company will have a certain effect upon men. My association with members of the House has not been so very long that, when riding on a free pass given to me as a member of the House, I have felt quite as comfortable as I should have felt if I held that pass as a matter of right. I have ridden more or less on railway passes given in connection with business, but I have always felt that I had given value to the railway from which I had received the pass. I do not have the same feeling when I ride on a pass under present circumstances. If there was some way to compel the railways to give a pass that we could accept as a matter of right I should feel more at home. If the government should think it best to make it incumbent—as the resolution says—upon railway companies to grant passes to members, that would accomplish what is desired in one

way. But I believe there is a better plan. If this proposal is gone on with I shall ask for an amendment under which it will be the duty of the government to furnish passes to all the members. Put the responsibility upon the government, removing it from the individuals members. In that case, members who accept a pass will do so knowing that they have a right to it. There is a feeling in favour of an increased indemnity to members of this House. If that is granted, it should be made obligatory upon the members not to accept passes. Members who come here to attend to the business of the country have a right to feel that they are not under favour to a private corporation, and they also have a right to fair remuneration for their services as labourers here for the people. I do not vote for the resolution as it stands though I am in sympathy with the sentiment that dictates it. If the matter comes up, I shall, as I say, propose an amendment that the government shall furnish passes to members or that the members' indemnity shall be increased as recompense in lieu of the passes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it might be desirable to have a word or two from the government with regard to this question. So far as concerns the argument that members of parliament who receive these passes are influenced by them, I, for one, do not attach any importance to it. I do not think that argument is of more weight that would be the argument that as the government issues passes on the Intercolonial Railway, to members of parliament, therefore members of parliament are inclined to support the government. I do not think that has been the experience of hon. gentlemen on either side of the House. Still there has been more or less discussion throughout the country with regard to this question of railway passes. I am bound to say that I do not like the language of this resolution on the subject. I do not think that any member of parliament is influenced in the slightest degree by these passes, for I have seen members who, undoubtedly used passes given by railway companies, fight with the utmost possible persistence against legislation introduced by the railways that granted those passes. Nevertheless, we must have some regard for public opinion in matters of this kind. Now, the Intercolonial—we might as well begin with that—issues passes to members of parliament. I suppose it issues passes also to certain officials of the government. I am not quite clear, from looking at the Acts relating to the Intercolonial Railway, under what particular power the Minister of Railways has exercised that privilege. I am not speaking of the present Minister of Railways in that respect more than of his predecessors, for I believe that in this matter, he has only gone a step beyond the position of his predecessor. Formerly the Intercolonial granted half-rate tickets or something of that kind——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To whom ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). To members of parliament.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was under the impression that the hon. gentleman's predecessor had granted to members of parliament tickets entitling them to half-rates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think not. When I came into the department, the practice was to grant passes to members of parliament.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, I am in error, and accept the hon. minister's correction so far as concerns the time at which the change was made. But I know that at one time certificates were issued entitling members to half-fare on the Intercolonial and, at some subsequent time, which, I thought, was under the administration of the present Minister of Railways and Canals that was changed to the system of giving passes. I would like to suggest, in the first place, that it would be well to have the duties of the Minister of Railways and Canals with respect to that matter defined by an Act of parliament. I think it would be well to have the matter made certain, so that we should know, if we are to have these passes over the Intercolonial, just what our rights under the law are, and not have a matter of that kind dependent upon the practice of one administration or another. So far as passes on railway companies throughout the country are concerned, I think, perhaps, it would be a better thing if we did not have these passes, it would be better if some other system were provided. I have not considered the subject very much, but I suppose it could be accomplished by a prohibition to members of parliament against accepting these passes. I think, probably, it would be better to deal with it in that way than in the way suggested by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Robinson, Elgin) who brought the motion before the House. It seems to me that, perhaps, it would be more in the public interest that members of parliament, travelling on private railways, railways owned by corporations which have business before this House, should pay their fare in the ordinary way and that any saving of the cost of fares or anything of that kind should be dealt with openly and above board and in some other way than in the manner of receiving passes from the corporations. I do not know that I would have the sympathy of many gentlemen in the House with regard to that, I am giving my own individual opinion alone. I think it is possibly a matter which might well engage the attention of the right hon. leader of the govern-

ment and the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), as it certainly does engage the attention of the country, to some extent, from time to time. As I said before, I do not attach much importance to some of the reasons which have been urged against the present system yet it may be that the subject is one which could be better dealt with in the interest of the country by some other mode than by the system now prevailing.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry that I was not in the House when this subject was brought up by my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Robinson). I understand that he has cited some opinions of my own in favour of the resolution he has just submitted to the House. I have looked up my words, as they are reported in the Hansard of 1895, and I do not find that I said anything very favourable to his contention. This is what I am reported to have said on that occasion :

> This question has taken a wider range than I supposed at first sight it would, when the Bill was introduced by the hon. member for West York. For my part, I am bound to say that the Bill goes much further than I supposed, from a hasty glance at it. I had supposed the intention of my hon. friend was to prevent any member who travels on a pass from drawing mileage under the statute, which would seem natural enough. But the Bill goes much further than that, and forbids a practice which is now universal in this House, I may say. Well, this is a question of public interest, and may be discussed upon its merits, but if I may judge from the temper of the House at this moment, the Bill is not likely to be discussed in that spirit.

I expressed no opinion upon the question which is now before the House. The question, as now proposed, involves a somewhat drastic measure, that is to say, that we should impose upon the railways of the country a service for which they had not bargained, and a service for which they should receive no compensation. It is true, as my hon. friend states in his resolution, and no one denies it, that the railways have received from the government, from all governments, from the nation at large, substantial subsidies ever since the beginning of railway history. But I would call the attention of the House to the fact that he proposes a new principle in British legislation, an addition to British legislation, in that, no matter what we have been doing previously, we should compel any corporation or any body in this country to give a service without compensation whatever. I think this is altogether against the traditions of British legislation. If there is anything sacred in British legislation, it is that ownership of any kind, property of any kind, is sacred, and should not be invaded, even in the public interest, without adequate compensation. In virtue of what principle would you impose upon the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway, for instance, even though they had been heavily subsidized by the nation, the obligation of carrying persons or merchandise without compensating them therefor, saying to them : You shall carry certain members of the community free ? It seems to me unfair to impose such a burden upon any one, not only upon railways, but upon any individual in Canada. The argument that the railways have been heavily subsidized is of no force whatever. They have been subsidized for good and valid reasons at the time, they have been subsidized in order to enable them to carry on certain business, the business of conveying goods and passengers. It was not certainly contemplated at the time these subsidies were given to impose upon them any additional burden than those which were specified at the time. Therefore, for my part, I am not prepared to assent to the views contained in this motion. On the other hand, there is no doubt that there may be an evil in the system now prevailing of members of parliament accepting passes. I do not ask anybody to make a confession in this respect, but if a confession were required, I think there are very few members of this House who would not have to plead guilty to such a charge, if there be any guilt in it. Whether such a practice leads or could lead to the evils which are suggested, or asserted in the motion of my hon. friend, I am not prepared to say. I quite agree with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, that it is not possible to say that any member of parliament has ever been influenced by passes, or that legislation has been affected thereby.

Moreover, if the motion of the hon. gentleman were to be accepted, the Act regulating the indemnity of members of parliament would have to be recast. My hon. friend suggests this himself, but this is not the way to do it. If it is necessary to change the Act regulating the indemnity, it should be recast on other lines than those suggested. The whole subject would have to be discussed de novo, rather than dealt with in this way. For these reasons I think that, though the subject is one which requires consideration, before parliament comes to a final conclusion, it is better not to proceed hastily, but to adjourn the debate to some future occasion when the matter may receive more careful consideration than it can at this moment. I, therefore, move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). Before the motion is put I wish to make a few remarks, because this is a question which affects every member in the House of Commons. The First Minister tells us that the mover of this motion is proposing an unheard-of thing in proposing to put a burden upon the railways without any compensation. Sir, I contend that it

will impose no burden upon the railways. We ask them to carry freight and passengers. Carrying freight may be a burden and require labour on the part of the railway company ; carrying a passenger from one point to another on a train imposes no burden upon the railway company.

An hon. MEMBER. What about his baggage ?

Mr. WALLACE. I am only speaking of carrying a passenger, not of carrying his baggage. I say that it is no burden upon the railway company, because the passenger walks on the train, and when he reaches the end of his journey, he walks off it, so that he imposes no labour on any railway official. More than that, as has been stated here to-day, these railways provide every member with a pass of their own accord. They furnish that pass either from a proper or an improper motive. I propose that that pass be furnished from a proper motive, whatever may be the case to-day, and I am not going to inquire into that question. The First Minister tells us one of the things sacred in British legislation is to recognise vested rights. Well, I contend that we do not interfere, practically or theoretically, with any vested rights. Lawyers, especially, are apt to attach great importance to the question of vested rights, and to suppose that when they bring that up no further argument can be made. It is a question of vested rights, and therefore vested rights are as sacred as the British constitution. I do not place so much stress upon vested rights myself, when they interfere with the interests of the people. Vested rights in all cases have to disappear when the people's interests are paramount. You give a man the deed of 100 acres of land, he has the fee simple of it, his house is his castle, but, when you give a railway company a charter which will authorize it to go through his house, and deprive him of his vested rights in the house and the land, the house and the land have to disappear so far as that owner is concerned in the interest of the whole people. So, I say, that vested rights are not so sacred as these hon. gentlemen are apt to try to make us believe. Now, the right hon. First Minister says to-day, that we want more consideration, and that he would like to have this motion adjourned until some future occasion. This question was up in 1895, we have heard. No conclusion was reached then. I have a distinct recollection of the former hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock), last year getting up and proposing a resolution somewhat on the same lines providing for the abolition of passes and advocating it on the floor of the House. I remember another hon. member of this House, at that time, who is not a member to-day, getting up and leading the then hon. member for Yale and Cariboo, out by the ear, taking him out by a back entrance, because it was a troublesome and embarrassing question for the government, and they wanted time for further consideration. Here, we have the old story repeated again. The arduous duties of the Prime Minister and his cabinet have prevented them from giving consideration to a question upon which they had fully made up their minds in 1895, and if they did not they have had ample time since then to come to a conclusion upon this subject. Yet, to-day, the Prime Minister proposes that they should have further time to consider the question. I object to all these postponements of the question. We have seen it from year to year. When a question comes up, and when the government are not prepared to come to a decision upon it they say: We want more time for consideration, we will move the adjournment of the debate, and the debate is adjourned accordingly. I believe that parliament should be able to come to a conclusion upon those matters that have engaged its attention for years past, that have been discussed upon the public platforms of the country, and that have been before the people during all these years. For my part, although I do not like the wording of the resolution in its entirety, I intend to support it. Some of the clauses are all right, but some I object to, for instance, the one which says :

That inasmuch as the railways of the country are continuously seeking legislation for the advancement of some particular interest, or for securing some specific object; which legislation occupies the time of this House at a considerable cost to the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the point of order ?

Mr. FRASER. There are two hon. gentlemen standing up at the same time.

Mr. WALLACE. I say that while that clause is one that would not be an argument for the carrying out of the resolution, and that I object to the wording of it——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WALLACE. Railways come before the country for legislation, and they have to prove to the country——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WALLACE. I have to congratulate the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) in having the most rapid promotion of any hon. minister in this House.

An hon. MEMBER. The wrong man in the right place.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not approve of the wording of that clause, but, while I object to it I do approve of the principle of the resolution, and, therefore, I shall vote for the resolution, if the House is to divide

upon the question, and to adopt the principle which I think is a correct one that its provisions should apply to all railway companies in Canada receiving a charter from the Dominion. As to receiving any subsidy or bonus, I do not care for that so much as receiving their charter. The charter of a railway company confers enormous rights and privileges upon the recipient. It is the duty of members of parliament to be able to go over the country, to travel over this Dominion, and to see what an immense domain and heritage we have. There is no burden placed on the railway companies, and I repeat that this is not legislation, which, in my opinion, interferes with vested rights at all. The government railway, the Intercolonial Railway, sends passes to the members of parliament representing the people. That is the rule to-day. It is a very good rule, whether inaugurated by the present hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) or by his predecessor I do not care. It is a very good rule, and the other railway companies of the Dominion should provide members of parliament, while they are members, with passes. This would impose no onerous conditions. The granting of a pass is no burden to the railway company, it imposes no onerous conditions, it does not call for any more labour on their part for a member of parliament to step on a train and go from one point to another. It does not impose any additional obligation upon the railway company, and does not add to the cost of running trains one cent. I therefore am in favour of this proposal of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) and shall give it my support.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am in order; it is a motion to adjourn. I am sorry that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is not in his place here to-day. As a member of the opposition of this House he introduced a Bill to regulate this scandal, if it is a scandal, but the moment the proposition comes up he is out of his place, and not here to defend his former record. The Rt. Hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has delivered, here, to-day, something of a defence of vested rights, but he has not had one word to say for the honour and reputation of this House. He places the vested rights of railway companies before the honour, and standing of this House in the country, and in that connection I wish to contrast his conduct with the conduct of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), who is not afraid to tell the House that he thinks the time has come for the abolition of the pass scandal. Are passes given for a consideration or not, and if they are given to members of parliament, are they given for a consideration or not? I know what the rule is in the general manager's office. As soon as he finds a man antagonistic to the interests of his road who is in the enjoyment of a pass, he cuts off his head and calls in the pass.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MACLEAN. I know of a case where a black list is made for the general manager.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, I am not going to give the names of people outside of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. MACLEAN. Oh, yes; hon. gentlemen do not like to listen to the truth. The general manager, in the course of the year, keeps a black list of the men outside of this House who have been against the interests of the company, and when the time for the renewal of passes comes round he consults the black list, and a new pass does not go out. The newspaper men of this country get passes, and a consideration is always implied. When the newspaper becomes hostile, the newspapers are put on the black list, and no passes are issued. That is a fact, and the people of this country think to-day, that some how the legislation that they do not like, and which is supposed to be against the interests of the people, has a connection with the free passes. If the hon. gentleman is up against a dilemma, now it comes back to my panacea, and what would cure it? Government ownership of railways. That is the only thing that will let you out. The railway question will come up in this House every day; it will come up between the conscience of hon. gentlemen and their conduct in parliament. There is only one way to get around it; government ownership, and that will cure almost every evil we have in this country so far as railways are concerned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACLEAN. These hon. gentlemen may laugh, but watch how rapidly public opinion is growing in this country. I am sorry the member for North York (Hon. Mr. Mulock) is not here now. I am sorry the First Minister expressed himself as he did, and I am sorry nothing has been said in regard to the question of members drawing their mileage while using passes over the railways. It is not right, and the public are against it. Gentlemen may say that the custom has been condoned in the past, but it is wrong and it must be stopped. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), a man for whom I have the highest respect, is on record as saying some years ago, that this system is a scandal, and that something ought to be done to remove it. Nothing has been done yet, and as the member for West York (Mr.

Wallace) said, the question is being jollied along from session to session, and from parliament to parliament. Surely, the Prime Minister can to-day state that he will consider how to remove this scandal and cause it to disappear for ever. The right hon. gentleman told us that he would adjourn the debate, and that later on, when the House has had a chance to consider the case, there will be something done to abate the scandal. Well, I accept for the present the idea that the right hon. gentleman has thrown out.

Mr. ANDREW B. INGRAM (East Elgin). As the hon. the mover of the motion (Mr. Robinson), is one of the representatives of Elgin, and as I am the other representative of that constituency, I take this opportunity of differing from my hon. friend (Mr. Robinson). I do not view the granting of passes as a scandal, and in proof of that, I may state that in the county I represent, that question was to some extent an issue in the various elections I have fought. I told my electors that I accepted passes on the different lines of railway, and that if elected I would again accept them. I have the happy satisfaction of knowing, Mr. Speaker, that my majority was increased on every succeeding occasion, and therefore, as far as the granting of passes is concerned, I do not really think that it amounts to very much. I understand that the object of giving ten cents a mile to members, for travelling expenses was, when the indemnity was first fixed, for the purpose of granting some consideration to those who lived long distances from the capital, and depriving those who resided in the capital of receiving mileage. A member residing in the capital can attend here at three o'clock in the afternoon, and he sacrifices no personal interest in the management of his business down town, while a member from Halifax, or Winnipeg, or British Columbia, must come here at the opening of parliament, remain here the whole time and neglect his private business. That is particularly the case with the British Columbia members. In my judgment, while it may be wrong to accept passes to some extent, the object seems to be, at the time the indemnity was framed, for the purpose of giving some indemnity at least to those who sacrifice their business in coming long distances. On account of the agitation in the press of this country, as to whether the members shall have their indemnity increased or not, that has become a very public question, and before any change is made, it should be well thought out. I believe that those who live at certain distances from the capital should have their indemnity fixed at such a rate and no mileage added to it at all. A man residing in Ottawa should have his indemnity fixed at so and so, and the indemnity should be increased in proportion to the distance the member lives from the capital. By that means we would to some extent indemnify the members who live at long distances for their loss of time, in neglecting their business, and on the other hand, those who live near the capital would be fairly indemnified also. To my mind, that is the only proper method of granting indemnity to members of parliament. Since I have been a member of this House—and I am here now for twelve sessions—I have listened to charges made against the Conservative government, and I have listened to charges made against the Liberal government as to certain scandals in their administration. Whether these charges were correct or not, I have heard them made repeatedly, but I have yet to hear one hon. gentleman in any parliament I have had the honour of sitting in, make a charge against any member of parliament, that owing to his having accepted a pass he voted on any particular occasion for or against a Bill. And when some gentlemen come into this House for the purpose of making a little cheap capital to promote their personal interests, I demand of them to bring proof of anything in the shape of a scandal caused by the acceptance of these passes. Why, Sir, I look upon it as an insult to every member of this House, when the charge is made that we are tools in the hands of any corporation. I have never yet been asked by any railway corporation to sacrifice my principles to support any Bill I did not wish to support. I have had perfect freedom, as I am sure every member of this House has had. I have always found, so far as I know, that railway companies, in promoting legislation in this House, endeavour to promote the legislation on the merits of the legislation itself, and if the merits of the legislation did not commend itself to me, and other hon. members, we were at perfect liberty to oppose it. So far as I am concerned, I am opposed to any change in the arrangements as we have had them for years. Until the government sees their way clear to say that they are not in favour of an increased indemnity, or that they are in favour of an increased indemnity, and that the way they propose to increase it will be by the plan I have suggested, namely, to do away with the mileage entirely, and to have a sliding scale for the indemnity, paid to members of this House in proportion to the distance they have to come to attend their parliamentary duties at Ottawa.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

THE GOVERNMENT STEAMER STANLEY.

On the motion :

Mr. Lefurgey—Copies of all reports, letters or other correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the boards of trade of

Summerside and Charlottetown or with any other person or persons acting in regard to the subject-matter of the motion during the years 1899-1900 and 1901, regarding the placing of the government winter steamer Stanley on the route between Prince Edward Island and Cape Tormentine, N.B., for the conveyance of mails, passengers and freight.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (East Prince, P. E.I.). As there are only a few ministers left before six o'clock, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) is not in his seat, and as we require him present when the subject-matter of this motion is discussed, I would request that it be allowed to stand until to-morrow.

Motion allowed to stand.

THE MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST.

Mr. MONK (Jacques Cartier). (Translation) moved for :

Return showing the receipts and expenditure of the Montreal Turnpike Trust, and a copy of the annual statement furnished the bondholders of the said corporation by the Montreal Turnpike Trust for the past ten years.

Mr. Speaker, this motion gives rise to a question which interests the city of Montreal and in a more particular manner the population in the neighbourhood of that great centre. This question, if I may say so, is one of paramount importance to the farming community throughout the island of Montreal and the neighbouring counties. And I believe that if the government are willing to lend an attentive ear to the few suggestions which I intend to make in submitting this motion to the House, they will understand that it is in their power to remedy what I may call the deplorable state of things in connection with the roads on the island of Montreal.

I am happy to see that the right hon. prime minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is in his seat, and I may tell him that should he consent to use in solving this question the great influence he is enjoying now——

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). (Translation.) What is the remedy ?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) He will raise to his own memory a monument more lasting than brass in the hearts of the farmers of the island of Montreal.

The PRIME MINISTER. (Translation.) What remedy do you suggest ?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I shall come to that by and by. As all the members of this House who are acquainted with the section of the country referred to are no doubt aware of the early legislation affecting the roads in the vicinity of Montreal, dates from a pretty remote period. I even believe that prior to 1840, laws were passed with a view to the improvement and maintenance of the great thoroughfares running from the parishes in the neighbourhood of Montreal towards the city. At any rate, I find in a hand-bood which I have in my hands, a statute of 1840 to such effect.

Without wishing to enter, at any length, into the details of such legislation, it will answer my purpose to say that it aimed at facilitating to the rural population of the island of Montreal the access to that city, and enabling the people from the city to travel in carriages on roads kept in good repair.

But this legislation, which was never consolidated or improved as it should have been, did not participate of the character of more modern legislation. It lacks concision and clearness, and, what is more, it does not provide for state or municipal control, such as is to be found in more modern legislation.

Allow me, Sir, to say a few words as to the roads referred to here. There is the main road leading to Lachine, which runs along the St. Lawrence. There is another road connecting with the Lachine road and which crosses the hills, known under the names of Côte Ste. Catherine and Côte St. Luc.

There is the road to the westward of Montreal, running from St. Laurent to the River des Prairies.

There is also the Sault-au-Recollet road which runs from Montreal to the River des Prairies. We have also the Sault road by which the people from the counties of Laval, Terrebonne and the north reach Montreal.

There is another road leading in a northwesterly direction to the Victoria road, namely, Côte St. Michel road, connecting with that great thoroughfare which runs along the St. Lawrence river and leads to Pointe aux Trembles. Those roads are under the control of the Turnpike Trust, an organization which is devoid of any municipal character. The trustees have absolute control over these roads, and have the rights of levying and collecting tolls. Owing to the increased traffic, and to the fact that the resources at the disposal of the trustees entrusted with the management of those roads were quite inadequate, the roads were left in a bad state.

From the statutes passed as early as 1840 down to 1895, it appears that these trustees secured the power of issuing debentures and that they extensively used that power.

Without going into details, it is sufficient to my purpose to say that, up to 1890, the debt of the trust reached in the aggregate to over $200,000.

The trustees had kept paying interest on those debentures ; but in 1895 or about that time, realising that all hope of repaying those bonds and all hope of being able to raise an adequate sum to the redemption of those debentures was lost, they deemed it necessary to repudiate a portion of the debt

so as to be able to pay the interest on the rest and, if necessary, to pay off the principal. New debentures were issued in virtue of an Act passed by the provincial legislature to the amount of $195,000. Those debentures are now in the hands of the Dominion government. But at the time when this new arrangement was made it was deemed advisable and fair to the holders of debentures to provide that they should be given some control over the management of the Turnpike Trust. It was enacted by the provincial legislature that every year or every second year there should be held an election of trustees, as the representatives of the holders of the newly issued debentures. The Act provides that three representatives of the Montreal Turnpike Trust shall be elected to watch over the interests of their mandataries in the Turnpike Trust, so that to-day we have a kind of joint trust. It is composed of two trustees who directly represent the corporation entrusted with the management of the roads, and as the statutes passed from 1841 to 1867 by the Quebec legislature and by the old legislature of United Canada stand, these trustees are appointed by the provincial government.

On the other hand, in virtue of the above amendment and the readjustment of the debt of the Trust under statute 58 Vic., chap. 14, passed by the Quebec legislature in 1895, the bearers of debentures select, as their representatives, three shareholders whose duty it is to attend to the management of the roads and to watch over the interests of the holders of debentures.

Now, Sir, having explained how this administration operates, I may be allowed to call your attention to this fact: that, as the various statutes governing this trust stand, the trustees are not called upon, as is the case with any other municipal or administrative body, to transmit annual returns to the authorities from whom they hold their appointment. We find to-day in our municipal administration in the province of Quebec, that every municipality is bound to transmit to the provincial government annual statements showing their management of municipal affairs, as also the financial standing of such municipality as is thus placed under the control of the provincial government.

In another sphere, the banks are called upon to furnish statements to the Dominion government; and it is now-a-days the acknowledged policy of the law that corporations of every description should transmit such returns to the government, when they are invested with powers enabling them to manage a portion of the commonwealth.

Nothing of the kind exists in the case of the Turnpike Trust. There is nothing in the statutes which makes it binding upon them to furnish statements to the holders of debentures. It is quite true that a general provision under which the Turnpike Trust may be called upon to send returns to the provincial government.

Motion agreed to.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

MANUFACTURE OF BINDER TWINE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Blain:

That, in the opinion of this House it is expedient that all binder twine now held by the government, together with all twine that may hereafter be manufactured by them, shall be sold direct to the farmer at a price to cover the actual cost of raw material and manufacture only, with one cent per pound added, and that no twine manufactured or paid for out of the Dominion treasury shall be sold or disposed of in any other way.

Mr. EDWARD HACKETT (West Prince, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, this question of the binder twine industry is a matter of such importance that I feel that I would scarcely be doing my duty to my constituents were I not to offer a few remarks upon it on this occasion. In the province of Prince Edward Island the farmers use large numbers of self-binders, in order that they may gather in their harvests with despatch, and the cost of binder twine is a heavy tax upon them. Some years ago, when a duty was placed on binder twine, the farmers had a grievance, and when that duty was removed it was supposed that they would be benefited. The result, however, has been quite different. Instead of being benefited by a repeal of the duty the farmers of late years have been paying very much more for their binder twine than they were formerly called upon to pay. It may be said that the government is not responsible for this, that it was due to the war in the Philippine Islands, which caused an increase in the cost of the raw material. We know from the statement made by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) the other evening, that such a statemtnt is not warranted by the facts. Some small increase has taken place in the cost of the raw material; but as a matter of fact, there is no increase to warrant the high price which has been paid by the farmers for binder twine during the last four years.

This question was fully discussed during the last election in Prince Edward Island; it was a burning question with us. The opposition held that the increase in the price of binder twine was due to the way in which the government had managed the output of the penitentiary at Kingston, where the labour of the convicts was utilized in producing it—that the product was sold to favourites of the government at a slight advance on the cost of production, and then sold by these government favourites to

the farmers of the country at a very largely increased price. The hon. member for Peel the other afternoon entered so fully into this phase of the question that it is not necessary for me to discuss it now at great length. We find that in 1896 the government made a sale of 1,000,000 pounds or thereabouts of binder twine to friends of the government, Coll Bros., at $4.35 per 100 pounds. It had cost the people of Canada for its manufacture at the penitentiary $4.60, or a trifle over, or a loss on the transactions of that year of 41 cents per 100 pounds. In the same year binder twine was sold to the farmers of the country at 100 per cent advance on the price at which it was sold to these friends of the government. In 1897 the output of the penitentiary was sold to the Hobbs Hardware Co. for $4.64 per 100 pounds; and that product cost the people of the country $4.84 per 100 pounds. It may be said that it is impossible for the government to regulate the price of binder twine. There is one thing they can do—they can regulate the price of the article produced in the penitentiary; that is certainly under the control of the government; and if they supplied the farmers direct at cost, with one cent per pound added to pay expenses, as proposed in this resolution, they would give the farmers of this country binder twine for about eight cents per pound or thereabouts. Coming down to 1900, we find that the Hobbs Hardware Co. and John Connor purchased about $51,000 worth of binder twine at an average of 7½ cents a pound. Last year it was said that a great change had taken place and that the government were going to sell direct to the farmers and give them the full benefit of the manufacture of this article in the penitentiary. We were met by our opponents with that statement on every platform; yet we find that last year the farmers were supplied by the government with about $8,000 worth at 14 cents a pound, or double the price at which it was sold to friends of the government. I say that is an outrage. This statement was made here the other evening by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and it was not contradicted. The right hon. First Minister said that on a future occasion it would be contradicted, but I say that it cannot be contradicted. Although it is perhaps impossible for the government to produce sufficient binder twine to supply all the farmers of Canda, yet they should sell that material to the farmers at the same price at which they sell it to their friends.

The hon. member for Peel says this is a small question. It is, so far as the amount of money involved is concerned; but it is a matter of vital importance to the farmers of the country that they should get their binder twine at the cost of production. It was supposed when this government came into power that they would be benefactors of the farmers in every way. It was supposed that machinery would be placed on the free list, that has not been done. It was supposed that binder twine would be sold to the farmers at the cost of production, but that has not been done. The government are evidently standing in with the combines; they are supplying this material to the friends of the government, who are the agents of the combines, and as a result the farmers are paying 100 per cent more for their twine than they should pay under honest and fair administration.

My hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) made a proposition the other evening that an agent of the government should be appointed in each of the townships to sell the product of the penitentiary to the farmers at cost. It may be impossible to carry that out; but surely this business government can devise some scheme by which the product of the penitentiaries which is so vital to the interests of the farmers may be sold to them at cost and charges.

It is not my intention to take up any more time on this occasion; but I see that the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is in his place, and I would like him to contradict, if he can, the statement made the other day, that this product is supplied at 7½ cents a pound to the friends of the government, while the farmers of the country are compelled to pay 14 cents a pound for it.

Mr. ERNEST D. SMITH (South Wentworth). Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to discuss this question, and would not now, but that it seems to me the time has arrived when the government should take us into their confidence and say what position they intend to take on this question. I waited during the discussion the other evening to hear the government state their position, and I have waited to-night so far; but we have heard nothing from them. This is a question which, while not the most important before the country, is yet of such importance that the members of the government ought to give us a definite statement as to the stand they propose to take upon it in the future. The farmer and all those who think about the matter regarded this question as one of the most important that came before them in the last campaign. I know that on every platform throughout my county, where almost every question was thoroughly threshed out, this was the one question, above all others, that attracted the most attention, and the one question in relation to which the government received the greatest condemnation by those composing the audience we addressed. I had opposed to me, not only a very astute gentleman, who met me on every platform, but, along with him, the late Speaker of the House, who, as every one who was in the last parliament knows, can place any matter in which he takes an interest before an audience in the most plausible form. However, when this question came up—and it came up at every meeting—he could not defend the action of

the government sufficiently well to raise any cry of assent from his followers ; on the other hand the people by their expressions, made clear their opinion that the government had been guilty of great wrong in the way they had handled the binder twine made in the Kingston penitentiary in the last four years. A government that had come into power with great professions of being a business government, ought to have managed an institution which required only good business ability in a manner that would have carried out, to some extent at least, the pledges they made to the people during the years preceding the year 1896. We all know that if there was one thing for which the members of the government took credit, one ground upon which they appealed to the people, it was that, if returned to power, they would do all they could to crush the combine. We all know, that for twenty years, that was one of the principal cries of the hon. gentlemen when in opposition. I can well remember speeches made by leading Liberal members of this House, as well as speeches of their prominent supporters throughout the country, denouncing combines in the strongest terms. One would naturally expect that, when returned to power, they would take every opportunity to carry out their promises, not only on this point, but others as well. There were many of these promises made that everybody knew to be incapable of fulfilment. But this question of binder twine was one over which they had full control. Here was an opportunity to smash a combine, an opportunity to carry out at least one of the many pledges they had made. They had it in their power, in selling this binder twine, to regulate to a large extent the price at which this commodity was sold to the farmers. Some hon. gentlemen may say that the government control only one-tenth of the quantity used in Canada, and that by reducing the price of that small percentage, they could not keep down the price of the whole product. Any man who has been engaged in business will know very well that if one-tenth of a given product is placed upon the market in a judicious manner, it will have a tendency to bring down the price of the whole. If this five hundred tons that the government manufacture annually had been placed upon the market in a judicious manner, it would have influenced the price of all the twine sold to the farmers. But, instead of that, they sold it in such a manner—taking no precautions—that those who purchased it, were enabled to make a profit evidently of about one hundred per cent. We have the proof of that in the fact that the Brantford binder twine factory were enabled to pay a dividend of 100 per cent one year and of half that on an average for two other years, besides that the price at which the twine was sold each year was not more than half the average selling price throughout the country. The government knowing, as they ought to have known, that they had it in their power to implement, even in a small degree, the pledges they had made, they ought to receive—as they did receive in the province of Ontario—the condemnation of the people for their management of the binder twine factory in Kingston. But the past is gone ; the future is before us. What action do the government intend to take in the future ? The motion of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) is that the government should sell this twine to the farmers at an advance of one cent per pound on the cost. I am not one of those who believe in revolutionary measures or undue interference with trade. I think it is not the province of the government, under ordinary circumstances, to interfere to any great extent with trade. But, during the past four years, there has been an extraordinary occasion, an occasion when it was evident there was a strong combination amongst the twine manufacturers to raise the price of twine unduly. Here was the opportunity ; and it seems to me that it would have been proper for the government to have adopted what might be called even a revolutionary measure. I would not ask them to do that in the future, but I would ask them to place the twine on the market as any business corporation would, to sell it as the large manufacturers of twine would sell it, either direct to the farmers or to the retail merchants. And, in order to prevent the charging of extortinate prices to the farmers, let them make an agreement with the retail dealers that, if they sell it, it shall not be in excess of a certain price. The Brantford binder twine people claim that, though they have made these large profits, they have never sold the twine at more than 1 cent per pound advance on the cost. Whether that is true or not, I do not know. But, in any case, let the government sell the twine to the retail dealers or farmers at such an advance on the cost as will enable the government to have a small profit, say of 10 per cent. That would be a fair profit for any manufacturer, and I think that any manufacturer would be satisfied with it. I know that the government will say that they offered this twine to the farmers, and that the effort was not a success, that it cost the government a good deal to advertise, and that the farmers bought only a small quantity. Well, there are ways and there are ways. It is easy for a government or a corporation, if they wish to take a certain course, to put obstacles in the way of every course that might otherwise be adopted. The government ought to form its plans as a corporation would form theirs. Any corporation could find ways and means of placing this twine upon the market and getting it in the hands of farmers and retail merchants without this high percentage of expense.

I notice in the first year the government offered it to the farmers it cost 50 per cent of what was sold to them for advertising the offer and the next year, last year, it cost 10 per cent of the total sale for the same item. There are ways that the government can easily find if they wish to place this twine in the hands of the farmers without an extraordinary cost for selling. It is not my duty nor the duty of any gentleman of the opposition to dictate to the government the method that they should follow in disposing of the twine, any business corporation can do it, and any business government ought to be able to do it. It seems to me that this article so commonly in use by the farmers ought to be sold in such a way that they would not be pillaged, as I am bound to say they have been pillaged during the past four years through the binder twine combination in this country. I maintain that the electors were right in condemning the government for their course in this matter. The government had it in their power to prevent this combination, they had their hands on the lever, and could have used that lever to prevent this condition of things arising. They did not do it, and they received the condemnation of the electors in Ontario for their course upon this subject, and I am bound to say this question had more to do with their defeat in that province than any other question.

Now, it may be said, I know it will be said, that the government did all that any government could do when they took the duty off twine. It will be said, as it was said in the campaign preceding November 7, that the government took the duty off twine, and what more could they do ? Well, it is true they took the duty off twine, and I am obliged to condemn them for doing that, as I did all through the campaign. I maintain it was a great injury to the people of this country. Surely 10 per cent was not too high a protective duty on twine. Hon. gentlemen opposite believe in a revenue tariff, so I am told ; well, 10 per cent is surely not more than a revenue tariff. The farmers of the country never asked this duty to be taken off entirely ; the farmers of this country are not beggars and paupers that they desire to be placed in a different position from any others of their fellow citizens. They were quite willing and are always willing to bear their fair share of the taxation of this country. Ten per cent is not an excessive taxation, even if the farmers paid the whole of it, which I deny. But if the farmers paid a portion of that 10 per cent in 1898 and of the 12½ per cent in 1896, they were quite willing to do so, and to bear their fair share of taxation. But they did not ask for this duty to be taken off. Who did ask for it ? Why, the government simply took it off to catch their votes. It was not taken off because there was any demand for it, the duty was a small duty, and it was taken off to catch the farmers' votes. Now, what was the result ? While that duty was on, the twine we used was mostly manufactured in this country. We imported last year under the 10 per cent tariff, 3,364,000 pounds of twine. Even the ten per cent duty, small as it was, was sufficient to enable the manufacturers of twine in this country to live and to make most of the twine we used, giving employment to a large number of men and to a certain amount of capital. These manufacturers in turn afforded a market for a considerable portion of the perishable products of this country that cannot be conveniently exported. Now what was the result of taking off the duty ? The twine factories were closed up all but one or two of them, and in 1899, instead of importing 3,000,000 pounds, we imported over 10,000,000 pounds of twine, that is to say, a large portion of what was previously made in this country was thus made on the other side of the line, giving employment to men and capital there instead of to our own people and to our own capital. Now what was the result ? Was it to reduce the price of twine ? I presume the hon. gentlemen who proposed and carried out that measure believed it would have that result, but the result was quite the opposite, and naturally so. Similar results often flow from such legislation. The removal of the duty caused the downfall of certain factories that had been in operation in Canada, and the handling of the twine fell into the hands of the large combines that exist in almost every article on the other side of the line. As soon as they obtained control of the manufacture here, and our factories were mostly closed, they raised the price of twine, and have kept it up ever since. I am sorry to say that apparently this government has been acting in collusion with them in creating a condition of things under which they could pillage the farmers to the extent of 3, 4 and 5 cents a pound on their twine. This amounts to a considerable sum in the aggregate each year. We import 10,000,000 pounds of twine ; I do not know how much was made in this country by the Brantford people. There was a million pounds made in Kingston, and probably fifteen or sixteen million pounds of twine are used in this country altogether. Four cents per pound upon that quantity would be a matter of $600,000, and I am bound to say the farmers of this country during the past three years have lost at least two million dollars on the binder twine they have bought in consequence of the action of this government. I think it is the duty of the government at once to declare their intention with regard to what they propose to do in the manufacture and sale of binder twine the coming year. It is a matter which cannot long be delayed, and if they intend to take a certain course they should take it immediately. The agents of the Brantford factory and of the United States factories are al-

ready taking orders throughout the country, and if the government intend the coming season to offer this twine to the farmers in a way that will enable them to purchase it in quantities according to their needs, they should announce their policy at once. This is an important question to the farmers of this country, and they are anxious to know what the government proposes to do.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). No doubt, Mr. Speaker, you wish to collect the opinions of the members from various parts of the House. Those hon. gentlemen who speak from the front benches speak so frequently and debate so keenly the subjects which are brought to your attention that no doubt you are often puzzled to ascertain the true sense of the House and of the country. From the serener atmosphere which we occupy on the rear benches we can look down upon the troubled arena below us, and form our opinions in a more judicial and in a calmer manner. Indeed, those gentlemen before us, from the heat of their arguments, would almost appear to us as partisans. I was interested in the first discussion that took place on this subject to hear from gentlemen of the opposition the remark reiterated with a good deal of fervour that they did not wish in the slightest degree to embarrass the government. I propose to return the compliment, and to say that in the few remarks which I intend to offer to my brother farmers in the House, I do not desire in any way to embarrass the opposition. In the part of the country from which I come we have not the advantage of living near the penitentiary, which some hon. gentlemen opposite have. Nor am I like that periodical, fair weather farmer, who announced that he farmed two months in summer only, and went far from the 'maddening crowd' in that season only, to revel in the cool airs and quiet of the country. We and my brother farmers in Nova Scotia, have to farm summer and winter for a livelihood. I have said that I did not wish in the slightest degree to embarrass the opposition. We have, in our part of the country, Sir, one of those odious combines which manufactures cordage and incidentally also manufactures binder twine. I do not have any wish to embarrass the opposition in this, but I would say that the learned leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), out of his hundred odd majority, had a hundred of his majority from that institution which manufactures binder twine. We heard from him how the sentiment of this House operates upon the degree of profit which they hope to get from the country by the manufacture of this twine. I opine that the gentlemen who have advocated this measure have no doubt done so with the desire that their fellow-farmers in the country shall participate in the benefits derived from the decrease in the price of this article, to the amount that the government manufactures at its factory at Kingston. To the extent that they partake in that consumption, they reduce the sum which these combinesters and others can extract from the horny-handed sons of toil in the country. I have said that I think the farmers benefit, certainly to some extent, by the amount which the government factory reduces the price of the binder twine supplied to the farmers. Well, now, I believe it is a fact, and I believe it is the sentiment of the hon. gentleman who supported this measure, and who addressed us yesterday afternoon. Let us see how he has carried out that idea. In this resolution, he has said that this binder twine is to be sold in the manner prescribed in this resolution, and in no other manner. I think, without revealing state secrets, that I may declare that some of the binder twine factories obtained their dividends during the past year by borrowing money. We all know that the price of the raw commodity has increased twofold, if not fourfold. It is the intention of the combines and the operators of factories, as the prices of the raw commodity decrease, to place that upon the market, no matter what price it obtains. If the government have laid in a supply of raw material, either of the manila hemp, or sisal, to manufacture this article, they have it laid in at the high prices of the present time. Not only is the price of the raw material double, or fourfold what it was previously, but the rate of freight is about double that which obtains under ordinary circumstances. When the government factory supplies my brother farmers with that commodity, it is to be remembered that they have had the raw material laid in at a high rate, and that they have had to pay a higher rate of freight, and they are bound, in addition, to charge a specific sum, increasing the cost of the article to the consumers of the country. If the combinesters put their heads together, finding that this resolution has been passed, they will sell their commodity a little cheaper than the rate at which the government can manufacture it, they will hold the market and grind my fellow-farmers in the west and east by high prices, and the government cannot sell their commodity unless they lose money upon it. If they did lose money upon it, would not the Argus eyes of the opposition be turned upon them, and would not they inveigh against the loss of the public money? It would be like a thunderstorm among a flock of young turkeys, It would smell to high heaven just like that $1.50 barrel of onions that an hon. gentleman referred to the other evening. Then, the government factory would be bound to sell its own twine. Here is the House putting a specific sum upon that binder twine, the combinesters would reduce the price to secure control of the market, and my fellow-farmers would be ground between the upper and nether millstones, exposed to all the ex-

actions which this unprincipled combination could put upon them in the shape of raising the price of their binder twine. That is something that should be avoided. I do not believe the hon. gentlemen meant to ask the House to adopt what is contained in their resolution, and in order that we may come to their rescue, I propose this amendment. The combinsters will set the price of their article at 5 or 10 per cent profit, because they have 10 or 20 per cent profit upon the raw material, and they are prepared for twelve or twenty-four months to sell below cost, in order to obtain the market. They will have a sliding scale to go upon, and the government, being bound hand and foot, will not be able to aid the farmers by competition. I will move in amendment, if it is the desire of the farmers to have competition between the government factory and the private operator, to add these three words after the word 'with,' in the 5th line: 'not more than,' so that it will read: 'with not more than one cent per pound added.' That will give an opportunity to the government to act upon the good old rule of trade, to supply the article according to the demand, and regulate the price by the competition which will take place throughout the country. If this is to be the desire, honestly expressed, with no intention to embarrass the government, or to produce any political effect, with a sliding scale by which the government can compete with others, the price of binder twine, before twelve months have passed, will be reduced one-half to the farmers of the country, and they will reap all the benefit.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). Mr. Speaker, it would be hardly expected that I should remain quiet while a subject of so much magnitude was being discussed in this House. Representing, as I do, a constituency in which there are two binder twine factories, you would naturally suppose that I should know something about the subject of binder twine.

Mr. GANONG. Are you a shareholder also?

Mr. HEYD. I am sorry to say that the hon. gentlemen who have discussed this question, have discussed it without that intimate knowledge of the binder twine business that is absolutely necessary in order to have an intelligent comprehension of the subject that is now before us. In order to relieve the mind of my hon. friend (Mr. Ganong), who fancies that I may have a financial object in view, I may tell him that I have not a five-cent piece of interest in any binder twine establishment in this country, but, while I have no personal interest in binder twine, I have the interest in the binder twine industry that every Canadian citizen should have, and I am free to confess that the only words that appeal to my mind that were addressed by the speaker from the other side, were those in which he condemned the government for taking off the duty on binder twine. With those words I sincerely agree. I think it was a mistake. I believe that the binder twine industry, like every other industry in this country, should be protected from undue competition from outside, and that it, like every other industry, should have the right to live in this country of ours. I believe that this industry, like every other, should be made to pay a duty on every pound of twine that comes into this country. I agree with our friends on the other side in that. Now, then, I approach the subject not as a politician, not with a desire to embarrass the government, not with a desire to contradict a truthful word that may have been spoken by hon. gentlemen opposite, but I approach it as a business proposition. We are manufacturing twine at the Kingston penitentiary, and how are we going to handle that product in such a way as to result in the greatest benefit to the consumers of binder twine, and at the same time to produce it at the least cost to the taxpayers of this country. I propose to approach that business question as a business man, and I shall try to put myself in the position of a man who is going to invest his money in that concern with the expectation of realizing a reasonable dividend out of his investment. The speeches made by gentlemen on the other side of the House have been apparently made for the purpose of discrediting the government, and of appealing to the prejudices, and sometimes to the parsimony of our farming friends. The question arises here as to what consuming power we have in this country for binder twine. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that last year there was entered for consumption in Ontario 3,900,000 pounds of binder twine, at 12 cents a pound; in the province of Manitoba 3,400,000 pounds at 10 cents a pound, and in the whole Dominion there were 8,000,000 pounds of twine entered at 11 cents a pound. The prices given are from the invoices of the merchants, who swore to them when the twine was entered. Let us deal with a proposition which represents an importation of 8,000,000 pounds of binder twine, or 4,000 tons. Now, according to the calculations of those familiar with the subject that 4,000 tons is about five-tenths of the total quantity consumed in Canada, or in other words, we import about half the actual quantity used. Eight million pounds of binder twine are imported from the United States, and that comes into direct competition with the twine that is manufactured in this country, which amounts to another 4,000 tons, including the product of the Kingston and Toronto prisons. Let us realize that the government manufacture of twine would represent

about 5 per cent of the total consumption. Last year we produced 408 tons, not 500 tons—and in the discussion of this question there has been a looseness which shows that the gentlemen who spoke have not carefully considered the various phases of this problem. With a producing capacity of about 5 per cent of the quantity needed, it is proposed here that we should proceed to regulate the price of binder twine in Canada. I appeal to any business man in this House if it is feasible, in view of this fact, that we could obtain the results which we are asked to achieve. Are we likely to bring down the price of binder twine because we, the Dominion of Canada, inject into a consumption of 8,000 tons, about 5 per cent. I say that from the standpoint of a business man, who is going to invest his money in that business, that I would not put a dollar into an undertaking that could only control 5 per cent of the total consumption.

Then when we have solved this problem, the question presents itself: How are we going to sell this twine which we produce at Kingston. We have gone into the business for various reasons, but I shall not now deal with the history of our connection with it. The Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Mills) says that we went into the business for the purpose of giving these young prisoners who are not wicked by inheritance an opportunity to learn a trade whereby, in after life, they might make an honest livelihood. I can tell the Minister of Justice that the man who works on a twine machine in the Kingston penitentiary is no better qualified to earn a living when he gets out than he was the day he went into the penitentiary, because the clumsy fingers of the prisoner who has been accustomed to wheeling bricks and carrying mortar, will never be able to compete with the deft fingers of the Canadian girls, who can produce twine better in quality, and in twice the quantity, that these prisoners can. There is no justification in that argument of the Minister of Justice, because the convict can never earn his living by making twine when he gets out of the penitentiary. It would be a legitimate argument to say that we have gone into the business in order to provide occupation for the prisoners. It is the duty of the government to give these prisoners; these forsaken ones; these men who have inherited the evil tendencies of their progenitors, an opportunity in this world to employ the faculties with which God has endowed them. To that extent I sympathize with the attempt to provide employment for these prisoners in their leisure hours. It is, however, a great fallacy to expect that these men will be able to earn a living by making binder twine from the knowledge of the trade they acquire in the penitentiary.

I desire to say one or two words with reference to the remarks which have been made by gentlemen on the other side of the House, in order to show the unfairness of the motives that apparently animate these hon. gentlemen. If they were honest they would at least be truthful. In a question of this kind we want facts. We do not want imagination; we do not want talk about combines; we do not want the experience of these so-called farmers, who for only three months in the year vegetate upon the land. We want something you can rely upon when you begin to add up figures and declare a dividend on the business you have done in the past year. The hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution says we will overcome the whole difficulty by simply adopting his motion which says that we shall sell to the farmers the binder twine at the actual cost of production plus 1 cent a pound. That is a business proposition, but let us look into it and see if it is feasible. We can find that out by ascertaining what other people pay for the labour involved in distributing 400 tons of twine. What have we to compete with in the selling of this twine? Do not make the mistake of supposing that we are going to run against people who do not understand their business. Much has been said about the Farmers' Binder Twine Industry of Brantford, and the mere fect that they have been enabled to pay the large dividends that have been referred to here, indicates that the Brantford factory is in the hands of men who thoroughly understand their business. The Farmers' Binder Twine Company has 4,000 stockholders, and it has about 600 agents, the qualifications of every one being thoroughly known. These men are out in the field to-day competing with us. How are we going to compete with an organization managed by the keenest business men of this country? The product of these mills is sold by the most skilful salesmen in the country at one cent per pound. The Farmers' Binder Twine Company pay their agents who are stockholders a commission of one cent a pound; they prepay the freight, assume all risk of loss, and trust the men who buy from them for five or six months or even a year. How are you going to get hard cash, and sell your binder twine at one cent a pound? There is the proposition. I guarantee that my hon. friend from West Toronto, who is a farmer for three months in the year, would not take stock at 2 cents on the dollar in such an undertaking. Leaving that aside, you find that the Deerings, the McCormacks and the Plymouth concern in the United States, have factories equipped with appliances to which ours in Kingston are as a rush light to the sun. If our people were wise, they would take every machine that is at Kingston and destroy it, and put in its place something that would be able to compete with the developments which have taken place in the past ten years. At the present time we have free trade with the United States in

binder twine. We have not a little preserve within which we can say: Here is the Kingston twine; come, farmers, buy it. They are not going to buy it unless they can get it cheaper than they can get binder twine anywhere else; and we cannot produce it cheaper than these men do. Notwithstanding that they pay the full cost of the raw material and pay dividends to their shareholders, these companies can sell their twine to the consumer cheaper than the Kingston penitentiary under whatever devices we manage it. That is one of the peculiar features of this binder twine business. My hon. friend says that we are going to overcome that by simply selling the twine to the farmers at one cent above cost. When was that twine sold to the farmers at more than one cent above cost? We have heard a great deal about combines. There has been no combine in binder twine in Canada for years. We have heard gentlemen say that these companies have been able to divide 100 per cent dividends through the action of the government. What companies in Canada have done that? You would think there were fifty or sixty companies each dividing from 50 per cent in 100 per cent dividends among their shareholders. We have only two operating companies in Canada to-day: the Consumers' Company of Montreal, and the Farmers' Company of Brantford. These gentlemen talk about combines. What combine could you get up in Canada, which would be able to compete against the Deerings and the McCormacks and the Plymouth Companies? If it were not for the silliness of the proposition, and the serious consequences involved, and the attempt to make political capital out of it, it would be laughed out of court. There are not five business men on the other side of the House, who believe that the proposition now before us is practicable. It will not do what its friends propose to do. If they say, let the government make binder twine, and sell it to the farmers direct without the intervention of a middleman, I am with them. As a political move that would be the best thing the government could undertake. It would give us an opportunity to shout and say: See what the government are doing for the farmers; we are trying to kill out these great combinations, these great monopolies, and produce binder twine, and sell it to the farmers at cost. It would be a political move that anybody might adopt. But is it feasible? I say it is not. You cannot sell binder twine for one cent a pound, when the Brantford people are paying one and a half cents. I predict that if this resolution carries, and the attempt is made to sell the twine at one cent a pound, and only to farmers, it will have this result: in famine years, when binder twine is scarce, our agents will have at their side in distant parts of the country, men who are a good deal sharper than the farmers, and long before they know it, the twine will be bought up, and there will be an advance in the price. In years of plenty, when we have more twine than we know what to do with, it will not be sold, and we know how binder twine deteriorates in the process of keeping.

My opinion is that the government should consider this question seriously, and try to sell binder twine to the consumers at the least possible expense, doing away with the intervention of middlemen when possible. I hold as a business man that up to the present time the management of the sale of the product of the Kingston penitentiary has been a dead failure. It was worse under the old regime, because we lost money. Under the present regime, with all its imperfections, it has at least been able to declare a slight dividend. This is an important question, when you come to realize that the binder twine industry has had expended in its development a large sum of money. Those who are not familiar with what is going on do not realize that an attempt is being made to drive the Canadian companies out of the business. The Plymouth concern, which produces twenty times as much as the Brantford concern, the Deerings, the McCormacks, and the other great American binder twine producing concerns are trying to capture the Canadian market, and the one thing that has prevented the farmers of Canada during the last few years paying more for their binder twine has been this very company, the Brantford Binder Twine Company, and hon. gentlemen appear to be under the impression that they have made their money in an illegitimate way. I do not for a moment suppose that the conditions existing in the past two years are going to be permanent. There has been a condition of great fluctuation in prices, and business men, with business training and unlimited capital, have had opportunities to buy cheaply, have been able to make large sums of money. I said a year ago in this House that had the Brantford Binder Twine Co. sold their raw material and never made a pound of binder twine, they would have cleared $225,000. On an investment of that kind with a capital of only $65,000, it is easy to declare dividends of 90 per cent, 100 per cent and 60 per cent. When you come to realize that that company does a business of $300,000 a year on a capital of only $65,000, and with a dividend of only $6,500 a year, you see how easy it is to pile up and accumulate funds which at last must be divided. That accounts for these immense dividends, which are now inviting a competition in the binder twine industry that will end ultimately in the loss of every dollar invested, because I do not believe we can ever compete, in the circumstances in which we are placed, with the great manufacturers of the United States. My opinion is—and it is the opinion of a business man—that every dollar put into binder twine in Canada will ultimately be lost, no matter

what action this government may take, unless they restore the duty ; and ultimately the manufacturers of the United States will do the binder twine trade business of this country no matter what efforts we may put forth at Kingston and at Toronto.

I want to impress upon the minds of our farmer friends here that the influence which has regulated the price of binder twine in this country for the past four or five years has never been any combine. There has never been a combine in this country in binder twine for ten years, and all those statements made by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) to the effect that the government have been conspiring with the binder twine companies and thus enabling them to declare 100 per cent dividends, are purely imaginative. The hon. gentleman has the reputation of being a business man, whose opinions on financial subjects are worthy of consideration ; but with all deference to his gigantic ability as a business man, his statements with respect to the connection of the government with these various binder twine industries, I would describe, if I did not know him so well, as the imaginations of a mind diseased. The hon. gentleman went on to say that by means of the conspiracy between this government and these great manufacturing industries, this great combine had declared dividends of 100 per cent. But who is this great combine ? Where are the factories that make it up ? Why, there are only two firms in the whole country—the Farmers Binder Twine Company and the Consumers Cordage Company—and they are diametrically opposed to each other. They are as opposite as the poles. The object of the hon. gentleman in making that statement was evidently to try and show that this government has been derelict in its duty and had conspired to advance the interests of its political friends.

But how could the government advance the interests of its political friends ? Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the Plymouths and the Deerings and the McCormacks, and the other great manufacturing establishments on the other side, are all a party to this combine ? To show how absurd is the statement, all you have to do is to look at what it actually costs to produce twine in the prison and then see what it was sold at. The figures given by the hon. gentleman are purely imaginary. It costs a great deal more to produce the binder twine than he stated. One gentleman says it costs 6¼ cents. That statement is not true. By referring to the Auditor General's Report and taking last year's purchase of supplies and dividing it into the amount that they actually cost, you will find that the raw material costs 7 cents per pound. And if you will take the 400 tons that were produced and divide them into the entire cost, you will find that it costs 8¾ cents per pound, and yet the hon. gentlemen who supported this resolution for the purpose of injuring the government, tell us that binder twine, which it costs 6¼ cents to produce, was sold to the farmers at 14 cents. Why did these hon. gentlemen take the highest figure ? But when hon. gentlemen have a political object to serve, they are not deterred by any little obstacles of that kind.

Up to the present the only sensible utterance pronounced was that of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson), who said that it is the duty of the government to put selling agents in the various townships of this country and sell, at the lowest possible cost of distribution, the output of the Kingston penitentiary to the actual consumers and do away with the middleman. That is a sensible proposition, which I commend to the judgment of the government. I hope the time will come when the government will be able to sell its binder twine direct to the farmer, so that if we are only able to supply one farmer out of twenty, he will get his binder twine at the lowest cost price. But what are you going to do with the other nineteen farmers ? How will you sell this twine so that there will be an equal distribution ? It is easy to get up and make academic speeches, but the moment you begin to sift every proposition from a business standpoint and see how you can make this thing operative, difficulties stare you in the face on every hand, and it is evident that since the Kingston penitentiary makes only 5 per cent of the binder twine consumed in this country, we cannot hope to make any impression on the price, and all these promises made are bound to result in failure. I intend to oppose this resolution because one cent per pound will not sell our manufacture of binder twine, because we will be fighting competitors who pay twice as much for selling and who have at their disposal more skilled binder twine salesmen than we can hope to secure. We will be bound, if that resolution carries, to meet failure the very first time we come into competition with these men. At the same time, I hope that this discussion will induce the government to consider the question and devise some means of removing this binder twine matter from the realm of politics and thus give our hon. friends opposite no excuse for saying that we are using that industry for the benefit of our friends. If the government are bound to sell the twine to the wholesalers, let them advertise in the public markets and sell to the highest bidder, whether he be Grit or Tory and thus remove the stigma these men are attempting to fasten on us. I have not the slightest doubt that the government can overcome the difficulty. There have been fabulous jumps in the market in the last two or three years and great opportunities to make money, but I have not the slightest doubt that when the industry assumes its ordinary condition, the government will be able to devise a scheme

of disposing of the product of the Kingston penitentiary to the people who want it at the least possible expense to the country.

Mr. GEORGE STEPHENS (Kent, Ont.) I notice that the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) said that when the Liberal government came into office, in August, 1896, they found all the twine on hand that had been made the previous year. I would like the hon. gentleman to tell me why this twine had not been sold for the harvest of 1896? Was it because the previous government had entered into a combine with the Consumers' Cordage Company, in order to allow that company to sell their whole output at 7½ cents per pound, which they did. The raw material had fallen from about 6 cents per pound to a little less than 4 cents. The twine could surely have been sold to the farmers in 1896. But the government did not sell any twine whatever that year. They had in the neighbourhood of 500 tons on hand. Twine had gone down from 16½ cents to 7½ cents, and was still declining, but the government held the twine, though it was manufactured and ready to go into the market. When the Liberal government took office on the 6th August, 1896, it was too late to sell that twine for the harvest of 1896. The hon. gentleman complains that this binder twine was kept over and sold at too cheap a price. I want to show him that some merchants in his county bought twine in 1897. And what did they pay for it? Mr. S. A. McCartney, of Alton, bought twine at 5½ cents; Messrs. Peaker & Son, Brampton, at 5½ cents; Mr. R. Hewson, Malton, 5½ cents; Mr. J. E. Harris, Cheltenham, 5½ cents and 6½ cents; Geo. McClellan, Cooksville, 5⅝ cents, and Messrs. Kelley & Marshall, Orangeville, 5⅝ and 6 cents. Now, this twine, the hon. gentleman says, was sold to Coll Bros. at 4¼ cents a pound. That, I believe, is a fact. But hon. members should bear in mind that the twine was a year old, and not of as good quality as that which was bought at 5½ cents. Any one who has handled binder twine knows that when it is carried over a length of time the quality depreciates. Twine that was sold at 4¼ cents at the penitentiary, allowing for freight and interest on the money for one year, was a good sale, as compared with twine delivered at the merchant's storehouse at 5½ cents per pound. I would like the hon. member for Peel to answer the question why this twine was not sold and used in the harvest of 1896.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). It is not my intention to prolong this debate a great length, but I cannot allow some of the statements made by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) to pass without some notice. He seeks to convey the impression to the House, and through the House, to the country, that the twine made in the Kingston penitentiary last year cost 8¾ cents per pound, instead of about 6 cents or 6½ cents per pound, as stated by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain); and, by that means he seeks to justify the government in placing that twine upon the market and selling it to the farmers of this country in quantities of less than one ton, at 14 cents per pound. Now, there need not be any question as to the actual cost of this twine to the government. We do not require to examine the cordage journals or any other journals, or to ascertain the price of manila in New York or any other place, to find just what the government had to pay for their raw material. We can go to the Auditor General's Report or the report of the Minister of Justice, and take the items under the head of Kingston Penitentiary. There we find exactly the figure the government paid for the raw material from which the twine sold to the farmer during the summer of 1900 was made. I find that these figures were correctly stated by the hon. member for Peel, who, by the way, I must say, made not only a very excellent speech, but a very carefully prepared speech, showing that he desired not to mislead the House or to misstate the case in any way. The hon. member for Peel stated that the government bought in 1899-1900, or the year preceding the 30th June, 1900, 140,335 pounds of manila hemp, at 5½ cents per pound, 123,344 pounds of manila hemp at 5½ cents, and 8,320 pounds at 9 cents. These were the only purchases made by the government during the whole twelve months preceding the 30th June last, and this is the raw material out of which the twine was made that was offered to the farmers of this country at 14 cents per pound. The average price of these 272,000 pounds, or 136 tons, of raw material, was $5.60 per hundred pounds. We all know that there is not a pound of raw manila in a pound of twine; at the most, there would not be more than 85 per cent of fibre in a pound even of pure manila twine. At that rate, the price of the raw material in a pound of twine would be 4·76 cents. To this, we will add the price of the cordage oil, which would not be more than 15 cents per hundred pounds of twine. In all, the cost of the raw material for a hundred pounds of manila twine would be $4.91. We are credibly informed by the Minister of Justice that this raw material can be converted into twine in the Kingston penitentiary at the rate of 75 cents per hundred pounds, or ¾ cent per pound. This makes the total cost of binder twine in Kingston penitentiary $5.96 per 100 pounds, or, say 6 cents per pound. Yet, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd), without giving us any data upon which to make the calculation, makes the assertion that it costs 8¾ cents per pound. I need not, and do not intend to prolong the debate by giving the average prices of the sisal, because that has not been brought very prominently into question. But, I do say that if the gov-

ernment offered to the farmers of this country the output of the Kingston penitentiary last year in quantities of less than one ton at 14 cents per pound, they were seeking to get too large a profit from the farmers, seeing that the cost to them was 6 cents per pound, the profit thus being over 125 per cent. Now, the hon. member for South Brant tells us, by way of excuse for the Brantford company, making such an enormous profit on the output of their factory, that they made that profit from the sale of raw material. But he does not tell us that they sold the raw material. He says had they sold the raw material without making it up they might have made a profit of $225,000. But there is an 'if' in it, they probably could not find a purchaser. It may be that in the late part of the season, for a few days or a few weeks, the price of the raw material rose rapidly to a high figure, but we have no assurance that the Brantford people could have sold the large quantity of raw material which they had at that large price, and no assurance that they could have realized the $225,000 out of their raw material because they had no purchasers for it. His plan of making a sale of binder twine in the Kingston penitentiary is one, I am sure, which this House will condemn. He says it should be put up at auction and sold to the highest bidder. Now, that is just what we do not approve of. You can rest assured that if the Kingston penitentiary output of binder twine was put up at auction to be sold to the highest bidder, a very good price indeed would be realized for it. American buyers would come in, I have no doubt, and purchase the whole output at a high price, knowing by that means they would destroy all competition and be able to get a high price for every pound of twine required by the farmers of this country. What we want is to retain in our own hands the entire output of the Kingston penitentiary, to keep it as a lever for the purpose of maintaining a level of prices. The hon. gentleman from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) says that 5 per cent is all that the Kingston penitentiary can turn out of the total requirements of Canada, and that 5 per cent of the total quantity would never control the price. But I think he destroys the whole force of his argument when he shows that the twine imported into this country last year cost 11 cents per pound. It appears from his statement that this 5 per cent, produced in this country, when put on the market by the government at 14 cents per pound, had the effect of enabling the American manufacturers of twine to raise their price up to 11 cents. I think that is clearly the case, and if the government, by inflating the price and holding back the twine from the farmers of this country, unless a very high price was paid for it, had the effect of enabling the American manufacturers to sell the twine required by the people of this country at an enormously increased price over its actual cost, I think that fact destroys the whole force of his argument. To my mind if we could judiciously manage the sale of this small quantity of twine, sell it only in small quantities, it would be quite sufficient to maintain a level of prices, and I know that was all that was expected by the late Sir John Thompson when the plant was installed in the Kingston penitentiary. It never was intended that the government should make money out of that twine business, that idea was entirely foreign to those who began this industry there. The sole intention was to use it for the purpose of preventing an undue inflation of price, and so long as we carefully guard the sale of this twine I believe that it is quite sufficient to maintain a control over the price of the entire requirements of the country. I repeat again, if putting the price of that twine at 14 cents a pound is sufficient to enable the American manufacturers to increase their price far beyond its value, on the other hand, retaining the control of the twine in our own hands and keeping it at a low price, will in the same manner affect favourably to the farmers the price of the remaining quantity of that twine which we are unable to produce in this country. I need not say that I should support the resolution of the hon. member for Peel. I think it is a motion in the right direction, and I hope the government will accept the resolution and be guided by its terms. I pay no attention to what the hon. member for South Brant says when he contends that the increase of 1 cent to cover the cost of selling the twine is not at all sufficient. I fear the hon. gentleman is putting in a word for his own constituents who are large manufacturers of twine, and that, although he pretends to be a friend of the farmer, he is desirous of enabling his constituents to obtain as big a price for their output as they possibly can, notwithstanding that the farming community will suffer in consequence.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. Mr. Charles Fitzpatrick). I was unfortunately absent when this debate originated the other night, but I have read carefully the speeches that were made, and the conclusion to which I have come is that there is a great deal of inaccurate information in reference to the binder twine industry, either on the opposition benches or in the Department of Justice. The member for Grey made a specific statement which I think it necessary at the outset of my remarks to contradict; he made the statement that in 1900 the government sold binder twine to their own friends at 7¼ cents per pound, and that they sold it to the farmers at 14 cents a pound. The question as put to him directly by the Minister of Railways and Canals whether he intended to give to the House the information that they were selling the same twine at the

same time at these different figures. The answer he made was : 'Yes, at the same time and the same quality of twine.' Now that is a serious statement, an extremely serious statement to make, because it necessarily implies dishonesty on the part of the officers of the government charged with the administration of this industry. To that statement I wish to give an absolute, unqualified, positive denial. What the hon. gentleman no doubt meant to say, because I would be loath to insinuate for a moment that a gentleman occupying the position he does in this House would attempt deliberately to mislead the House and the country—what no doubt the hon. gentleman intended to say was that in the year 1899 the output of the Kingston penitentiary was sold to Hobbs Hardware Co. by public tender, and sold to them without competition for 7¼ cents a pound; and that that twine, so sold in 1899 by public tender was delivered to them in 1900, and the delivery took place in 1900 at the price stipulated and paid in 1899. Their basis of comparison fails absolutely. In one instance you have got the twine that was sold in 1899, as I said a moment ago, by public competition at 7¼ cents a pound, at a time when the raw material was sold at 5½ cents a pound ; and on the other hand you have the twine that was sold at 14 cents a pound in 1900 at a time when raw material had actually gone from 5½ cents a pound up to 16 cents a pound, at certain dates in that year. Now it seems to me that in discussing a matter of this sort, and especially in discussing it in the interest of that important element of the community which is called the farming class, the least that element has a right to expect is an honest and fair statement.

I will now proceed to deal with the motion, and in speaking of that motion, I would state immediately that we have no quarrel with a portion of it. With a portion of it we cannot have a quarrel, because, since August 1899, we have been doing what that motion says we ought to do. Since August 1899, it has been open to the farming class of this country, who apply to the Kingston penitentiary direct to get binder twine in lots to suit them from the penitentiary, and at what price ? At the price of the raw material to which is added the cost of manufacture, and when the purchase is for less than ten pound lots, one cent a pound is added for profit. That has been the system since August 1899. It was in existence from August 1899, for the balance of that season, it was in existence throughout the whole of the season 1900, and it is well known to hon. gentlemen opposite, those who were here during the course of last session, and those who took cognizance of it but who were not here, that the information was given publicly in this House that the twine was disposed of in this fashion. I therefore say that we have no quarrel with that portion of my hon. friend's motion which asks that the government should go that far, because it is merely giving effect to that which we have been doing since August 1899. But, when it goes farther than that, and asks us to pass a motion that we should dispose of binder twine to the farmer at a price to cover the actual cost of the raw material and manufacture with one cent per pound added, and goes on to say that—

> No twine manufactured or paid for out of the Dominion treasury shall be sold or disposed of in any other way.

It is asking us to do a thing which, when my hon. friend comes to consider it, he will see is almost, I was going to say, absurd. Let us not deal with generalities, but with concrete facts. I said a moment ago, that we disposed of our binder twine to the farmer. What happened last year ? At the end of the season, the 1st of August, 1900, we had not disposed of more than half of the whole output for the year. We had half of the output still on hand. What are we going to do with that—keep it over until next year, when it will become practically valueless, and then dispose of it to the farmer, because, if this motion is adopted, we are not free to dispose of it in any other way ? This motion goes too far, as my hon. friend must see at a glance. It is all very fine to ask that we should dispose of this to the farmer, but, why is it that we cannot get the farmer to deal with us ?

Mr. MACLEAN. You hay forked the farmer once ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He was hay forked once no doubt. Probably my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) knows when and under what circumstances. He has no doubt a knowledge of the transaction. How is it that we cannot get the farmer to deal with us ? We have offered this twine to him on the conditions specified by my hon. friend in his motion. Last year half of the output of the penitentiary was left on our hands. I think my hon. friend might go further; when he says that we shall be obliged to give all the twine to the farmer and no one else, he should adopt the other branch of the argument, and so be strictly logical, and say that so long as we have to dispose of the twine to the farmer, the farmer must deal with us, or that he shall find us a purchaser. I said that we disposed of this twine at the cost of the raw material, adding to it the cost of manufacture, and adding one cent a pound. Hon. gentlemen opposite undertook to tell us that the farming class were practically buncoed, to use an expression which I would borrow from the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), by the government in connection with the sale of binder twine; that is to say that they paid much more for their twine than should have been legitimately asked of them. My hon. friend ought to bear in

mind that binder twine is a marketable commodity like any other. When you put it on the market, the price has to be regulated by the law of supply and demand, and in order that the House may determine whether or not the farming community paid more for their twine than they ought to have paid, it is necessary to examine the prices at which others dealing in the same commodity in the same market disposed of their article. Let me point out how that applied. The government had no monopoly of this twine. They were competing in the market with others. What did we find? We found this circular was issued at the time we were disposing of our twine to the farmers, issued by a concern that sells what they call the Plymouth Binder Twine. These gentlemen are dealing with the Kingston output:

In the hope of moving the accumulated stock of twine at Kingston penitentiary, the warden has again reduced prices, but thus far there has been no visible increase in their orders. With few exceptions, the farmers of Ontario, remembering past experiences, are apparently not willing to take chances with convict-made twine, or they do not consider the penitentiary article as a bargain, no matter how low the price; otherwise, that twine should have been disposed of as rapidly as made, as the government's price has been, all season, from 1 to 2 cents per pound below the market quotations for twine of reputation.

That is what has taken place, and that is evidence of those who are competing with us in the same market. It is that we are selling this twine from one to two cents per pound less than our competitors, and yet we are told that we are endeavouring to impose on the farmers.

Mr. BLAIN. At what date was that?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The date marked on it here in writing is August, 1900. My hon. friends have referred to the origin of this industry at Kingston. They have told us that the intention was to start this industry for the purpose of regulating the price of binder twine in Canada. Bear in mind that the output of Kingston penitentiary is 500 tons a year, and that the amount of binder twine used in Canada, is about 8,000 tons. We import over ten million pounds free of duty. How far are you going to regulate the price of binder twine with the amount we have at our disposal, it is impossible for me to see. But, we are also told that the intention of the government, when this binder twine factory was started in 1894, was that it should be used exclusively for that purpose, that it was not to be looked upon as a business industry to be dealt with on business principles. Let me draw the attention of my hon. friend to what took place in July, 1894, when this question was under discussion. At that time Mr. Davin asked that the government should pay the freight on the binder twine up to the North-west, and Sir John Thompson, then Minister of Justice, said:

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I should very much like to be able to do so, but I am afraid I cannot make such a promise. Companies already engaged in the binding twine business are in the habit of paying the freight as far west as Owen Sound, but we would not be able, without involving loss and without calling on parliament to make good that loss, to pay the freight on binding twine sent to the North-west Territories.

There is no suggestion there that this is to be dealt with on any other principle but a business principle.

Mr. MULOCK. I should like to ask if binding twine is being sold under cost?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, it is not. I mentioned the rates the other day, and I forget them for a moment, but binding twine is not being manufactured under cost—the price covers the cost, and an allowance for the labour of the prisoners.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that calculated as free labour, or as convict labour?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As convict labour, 50 cents per day, because their hours are shorter and work lighter than free labour. The product is sold at a price covering the cost of the material, also interest on the expenditure for plant, allowance for deterioration, and everything that enters into the calculation of a private manufacturer.

Mr. MULOCK. Except the labour.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not excepting the labour, but excepting free labour prices. We charge for the labour, but less than free labour prices.

Mr. MULOCK. A question here arises with respect to goods manufactured by convict labour, and the prices at which they are put upon the market. The government are calculating the price at convict rates, and are placing convict labour in competition with free labour. There is a large question involved; and I do not wish to enter into it now, but I want to be sure as to what is the practice of the government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That question does not arise in this instance. The labour is computed at 50 cents per day, and it is w rth no more than that. Convict labour terminates in winter at four or five o'clock in the afternoon; the prisoners are also later in beginning work, and the work is lighter than with free labour. In addition, I may say that we are selling the product at the same prices as the Central Prison in Toronto, the firm at Brantford, and the Consumers' Cordage Company, although I have not made an agreement with any of them.

That does not look as if Sir John Thompson was regulating the price of the output. He was selling it at the same price that these competitors were seling their product at, and we forsooth are blamed because we are selling it at one or two cents a pound less than our competitors. Now, since 1886, how have we dealt with this output of binder twine? It has been not only suggested, but it has been made a matter of positive statement that in 1896 the output of the Kingston penitentiary was disposed of to friends of the government at a figure less

than it cost to produce it. That is charged against us. Let us look how this twine industry was dealt with previous to 1896. Let us see how those who charge us to-day with dereliction of duty acted themselves, and how many of these gentlemen protested against the action of the Conservative government.

This industry was started at Kingston in 1894. It first began by installing the plant and the people of this country were made to pay $40,000 for a plant that cost the contractor in the vicinity of $18,000.

Mr. FRASER. They were preparing for the elections of 1896 then.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, this was previous to the elections of 1896. Not only did the people of Canada pay the figure I have mentioned, but they paid it notwithstanding that the government had called for tenders and that they had a tender for a plant of the same sort for $20,000.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure that the hon. gentleman will do himself the justice to produce the evidence of the statement he has made. The Solicitor General made a similar statement last session and he expected the House to accept it without giving any proof beyond the mere statement itself.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Last session I made the statement and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) did not contradict me, but some one on the other side suggested that perhaps my statement was incorrect. What did I answer? I said the public accounts are there open to you.

Mr. CLANCY. No.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to be allowed to proceed. This system of interruption I am not going to stand just at the present time. Last session, when a similar objection was made, I suggested that this matter should be referred to the Public Accounts Committee, and I challenged the hon. gentleman to bring it before the committee. I then said that I would produce Mr. Mackey, the auditor, from Toronto, who was specially charged in connection with the suit—to which I shall have occasion to refer later on—with the examination of these accounts, and who would produce the invoices to prove the statement I made. The challenge I made then I repeat now. I say that this matter would be better dealt with before either the Public Accounts Committee or the Committee on Agriculture, where we would have an opportunity to bring witnesses and to prove the statements I have made. That is the place to deal with this question, and not here where we have all sorts of vague statements made by gentlemen on the other side of the House, arising from what I must at least call imperfect knowledge.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). It is very kind of you to call it that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The very same year that this twine industry was inaugurated in Kingston let us see what became of the output. Was it sold to the farmers of this country or was it sold to the combine? I charge that in 1894, when the industry was first started, the output of that year was sold to Mr. John Connor, who at that time was the moving spirit in the binder twine combine in Canada. Mr. Connor was the man who controlled the whole of the twine industry in Canada. It was sold to him, and he entered into possession of it. He sold it as he thought best throughout the country in the interest of the combine. And then, what occurred? At the end of the year after he had got possession of our twine he owed us for the output of 1894 something like $6,000.

Mr. CLANCY. You once said it was $20,000.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Oh, I am going to show you in a few minutes that it was $53,000. There is no use in confuting these facts with me to-night. That was in 1894, and 1895 what happened? The output of the penitentiary in 1895 was sold to the same Mr. John Connor, notwithstanding that in the previous year he was indebted in the sum I have mentioned. In the month of June, 1895, he had received on account of sales made of this twine which belonged to us and for which he had not paid us one farthing; he had received $28,000. In August he got another $5,000, making it $33,000, and when the month of December of that year came around he was indebted to the government for the twine he had actually received during that season in a sum amounting to something like $40,000. And how did the government settle with him? Notwithstanding that he had received the money and put it in his pocket in the interval, he was settled with by taking notes from him. All that in the interests of the farmers of course. But that is not all. That goes on until the month of March, 1896. In that month it is found that there is such a thing as a Public Accounts Committee in the House of Commons. It is discovered that perhaps a question can be put with reference to the industry, and what happens? Then Mr. Connor makes an assignment of certain claims which he has, in order to refund the government apparently the amount of money he had received during the year for the binder twine output of the Kingston penitentiary.

Then what happened? You see that up to that time we were dealing with Connor, who had sold the output of 1894, and that of 1895, and had paid something on the output of 1894, and for 1895 had paid out $174, on an output of $153,000. These gentlemen, who had the interest of the farmers so much at heart, could not deal with Connor any more; that would be too barefaced; and in 1896 what do they do? They

look around, and in place of Connor, they take Patrick Kelly, the chief clerk of the Brantford industry, and constitute him the agent for the sale of the binder twine output of that year. What does Kelly do ? He makes a bargain in March. Then March goes by ; April, May, June, and July go by. Up to the change of government in July, Mr. Kelly never thought proper to carry out his contract, and the binder twine of that year was all stored at Kingston. The season went by ; the combine had accomplished their purpose ; our twine was bound up ; and the market was free to them. And yet these gentlemen talk about combines.

But that is not all. They were not content with tying up the product of 1896 in the manner I have described, and keeping it out of the market for the benefit of their friends of the combine by storing it away in the storehouse of the Kingston penitentiary. They then deliberately rise up and tell us that that twine which they had arranged to dispose of in the fashion I have described, remained on our hands to become practically valueless. We sold it at less than it cost, and they make that a crime in us. Assurance has limits at times, but it does not appear to have many in the present instance. Do you realize what it means? You have this binder twine stored in the spring of 1896 ; we come in in July, 1896 ; we find a million pounds of this binder twine in the Kingston penitentiary, stored away ; the time had gone by to dispose of the output of the season. August was not the time to dispose of it. We then endeavoured to force upon Kelly the execution of his contract. He had promised to give security that he would faithfully perform his obligations under the contract, and so forth. The next thing we heard was that this clerk of the combines had disappeared and left the country. We were left in September or October with this binder twine ; and then what did we do ? Our opponents say that we sold it to friends of ours. We advertised publicly in the newspapers for tenders for the purchase of the output. We disposed of it by competition. Coll Bros. were the highest tenderers. There were three tenderers : Wood, Vallance & Co., the Hobbs Hardware Co., and Coll Bros., who were the highest, and who got the twine. And from that time up to the first of August, 1899, the output of each year was disposed of in the same fashion, that is to say, by public competition, tenders being called for.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him if the output of 1898 was disposed of in that way ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. MONK. There were public tenders invited, or was it sold to Bate & Co. without tender ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Tenders were called for.

Mr. MONK. By circular or by public advertisement ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. By circular.

Mr. NORTHRUP. By private circular ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. By private circular.

Mr. NORTHRUP. And that is the government's conception of public advertisement ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In 1898 circulars were issued, and the product was sold to Bate & Son. Competition took place between Bate & Son, the Hobbs Hardware Co., and Coll Bros. again. These were the only persons, besides Wood, Vallance & Co., who tendered in the previous year in answer to the public advertisement. But perhaps my hon. friend would be interested to know that when we came into power in 1896 about $50,000 was due us in connection with the output of two years previous, and it took us four years to collect the money. We had to sue for it and carry it through the courts for four years.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask another question ? I would like to know if the invoices in connection with the disposal of the output of 1898 were not made out to the Hobbs Hardware Co., and if the Hobbs Hardware Co. did not pay for the output ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not aware of that. I am not concerned with the private dealings of Bate & Son, or with how they disposed of the product.

Mr. MONK. That was not my question. I am speaking of the dealing with the department.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not know any further than I have stated.

Mr. MONK. The information we have is that it was so disposed of.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It may be. I do not say that the information the hon. gentleman has is not correct. The output was sold and the money paid. The output was not given to an agent to collect the money, and the money carried in his pocket for twelve months, a note taken for the amount, and the money never paid.

These are in general terms the condition of this binder twine industry. Hon. gentlemen opposite took it in hand, they burdened it at its inception by paying for the installation of the plant 100 per cent more than it ought to have cost. They added to that their mismanagement of the output of 1894, 1895 and 1896. Then, after we came in, we disposed of the output of each year by

public tender until August, 1899, when we made it a condition that the farmers should have the right to come in and make their purchases in lots to suit themselves. This has been continued during the present year, and it is now a question to determine what shall be done next year. Notwithstanding the facilities given to the farmers to make these purchases in the manner I have described, half the output or thereabouts remained on our hands on the 1st of August last. How shall that be disposed of at the end of the year ? Shall it be disposed of at a sacrifice ; and, if the farmers will not buy the twine themselves, are we to keep it there or force it upon them in spite of themselves ?

I have stated all the facts in connection with this matter, and I repeat that the place to investigate this question, as it is one of facts and figures, is either the Public Accounts Committee, the Committee on Agriculture or a special committee. Establish the facts once and for all, and settle the position of the government with respect to their dealings with this industry, and it will be found that the only object the government have had has been that for which the industry was originally created, that is to say, to give employment to the inmates of the Kingston penitentiary, and then to dispose of the product at an honest, fair price, so that the public of this country shall not be burdened with any portion of the cost.

It seems to me, and I am sure that the farming community agree with the others in this respect, that no one class can be burdened in order that another may be benefited. It is not the desire of the farming community that we should run this at a loss to the public generally in order that they may be benefited. What they ask is that they should have an opportunity to buy the product at the cost of the raw material, plus the cost of manufacture, and something in the way of an addition to cover a reasonable remuneration in return.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). I confess, Mr. Speaker, that I was a little surprised at the remarks which fell from the lips of my hon. and eloquent friend the Solicitor General, as although in one sense strictly professional, in another they were hardly such as I would expect to hear from a gentleman so quite up to date as he is. It is an old rule—so old that I thought it had become obsolete—that when the facts and the evidence are against you, be sure and oppose the attorney opposite. But, it seems to me that when a deliberative body such as this is asked to consider a simple proposition, which in no way reflects on the administration, but which simply suggests, in the interests of the people, a wiser way of conducting a certain industry, a gentleman occupying the position of the Solicitor General would have endeavoured to contribute something to assist the House in arriving at an intelligent conclusion as to whether the system proposed was better than that hitherto followed. I venture to say that at present we might just as well discuss the events of a hundred years ago, as those of five or six years ago, even when these touch the binder twine industry.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem amused, but, perhaps, they do not care to have the events of the last four or five years discussed. But even admitting their contention that the system now followed is that which they inherited from their predecessors, that is no answer to the argument that the plan now proposed is an improvement on that which has been in vogue in the past.

We owe the hon. the Solicitor General thanks for telling us that from the time the present administration came into power the whole output of the penitentiary was put up to public competition. But this public competition was invited, not by means of advertisements in the newspapers, but by private circulars, and this is the hon. gentleman's idea of public competition. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how many of these private circulars were sent out, and who were the parties that were favoured with them.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot give the exact number.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Would the number be two or three or four ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. About five or six.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Here again we have an interesting piece of information and it shows what a different meaning may be attached by the hon. gentleman to certain words, compared with that ordinarily given them. I should have thought that the word 'circular' was a word, the use of which would depend a good deal upon the number that had been sent out. Supposing only one had been sent out it would be perfectly clear, it would be more properly called a letter. If it was only two that were sent out it would still be clear that it was only a letter, and that the word 'circular' would be out of place as applied to it. And I venture to say that the great majority of people would think that if five or six letters were sent out privately to friends of the government, it would be hardly a fair description of the action of the government to say that this was advertising for public competition. But I rose mainly because a question was asked that I thought I could, in some part, answer. The Solicitor General asked why the farmers declined to deal with the government. A suggestion with regard to this was given by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). I venture to give

another. Last year—I cannot give the exact month, but it was several months before the general elections and, I think, in August or September—I was shown a letter received from the warden of the penitentiary by one of the farmers who had written to that official for the price of binder twine. The receiver of the letter brought it to me. It was somewhat similar in its general effect to the statement of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), giving different figures for different quantities of binder twine delivered on the train at Kingston. But the farmer, being dissatisfied with the figures quoted, had gone to a dealer in Belleville—a good Reformer—and had bought twine at a much lower cost than the price he was asked by the government for twine delivered on board the train at Kingston. The Solicitor General asked a perfectly fair question when he wished to know why the farmers would not deal with the government, and I think I have given a fair answer—the reason being that the government, while professing to be interested in the farmer's welfare actually proposed to charge him more for binder twine on board the cars at Kingston than the dealer would sell it for delivered at his door. A large number of people are interested in the binder twine industry and in what becomes of the product of the government factory at Kingston ; and the hon. gentleman who brought this question before the House felt, as I judge from the line of his remarks in which he referred to the disposal of the binder twine from 1896 down to this date, that the people who were interested were not fairly treated. Ascertaining from such facts as those brought before us by the hon. member for South Brant that in the sale of binder twine there were enormous profits, he naturally said that if private binder twine works are making large profits, and if the government, composed of men of great ability, carries on a similar industry, there must naturally be large profits for that industry ; and the question naturally arises where those profits go. No one can look at the prices paid by friends of the government—and no one can deny that those who were fortunate enough to obtain this binder twine were friends of the government—and see also the prices at which the material was sold to the people and fail to see that not only was a profit made but that it went in a direction in which it should not go. The simple issue before the House is, whether the profits that have been made will continue to go to those who have handled the binder twine for the last four or five years, or to the farmers. The hon. member for Peel objects to the present plan, and the appeals to the House to adopt a better way, one by which the profits will go to the farmer rather than to the friends of the government. I would have thought that the hon. member for South Brant would have given some arguments to show that the course adopted by the government was that best calculated to promote the interest of the majority of the people or else would have adopted the course suggested by the hon. member for Peel. But, if this debate has had no other advantages it has had two. It has had the advantage of teaching us the meaning attached to certain words by the Solicitor General, who, no doubt, speaks for the government ; and it has given us the pleasure of hearing a speech from the member for South Brant as thoroughly protectionist as any ever delivered on this side of the House. I wonder if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) also attached a different meaning to the words he used from those that we attach to them and is prepared to call himself, in certain quarters, a protectionist, meaning thereby, protection to that in which he is interested and free trade for the rest of the world. I hope that the government will consider the proposition made by the hon. member for Peel. It is possible it may not be the best means of dealing with the question. I am not certain that a better plan may not be suggested ; but I shall support it because it is incomparably superior to the course followed by the government for the last four years, and I consider it to be my duty on this floor to support the best measure proposed, even though it may not be in every respect perfect.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have received a memorandum which enables me to give the information with reference to tenders asked for by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Northrup). Tenders were advertised for in all the years except 1898, and in that year tenders were called for by circular. Then the leading wholesale dealers, without respect to politics, had circulars sent to them on the recommendation of the inspector, Mr. Stewart, who was instructed to send them to all such. At least one dozen were sent to various parts of the country in 1898.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). I am glad the hon. Solicitor General made that statement before I spoke, because the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) will now see that there is no need for a new dictionary. If for two years there was advertisement in the public press, and if, in the third year, knowing just the parties who took advantage of the opportunity offered, circulars were sent out to them under the direction of a well-known Conservative at the head of the business, a gentleman appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite, I think the government have done everything they ought to be called upon to do. There is one thing that the hon. member who has made this resolution should do. In fairness he should stand up now and offer to do it. He should offer that if the farmers do not take all the binder twine manufactured at Kingston he will purchase the bal-

ance. He wants the government to carry on this business. He should desire the government not to lose in doing so. If, in response to the government's advertisements all the parties who might have done so, did not send in tenders for the product of the factory at Kingston, it may have been for one of two reasons.

Mr. MONK. They did not get a chance.

Mr. FRASER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) think it fair, when advertisements were inserted in the newspapers for two successive years calling upon people to tender and only certain people did tender, to say, that, because in the third year, all the parties who did tender were asked to tender again, they did not have a chance ?

Mr. MONK. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) wishes me to answer his question, and I shall do so. I do not think it is fair to sell 1,429,635 pounds of binder twine at $66,883.27 to parties who can sell it again for $199,750.72, making a profit of $133,167.15.

Mr. FRASER. Is that from the Public Accounts ? Now, if the hon. gentleman thinks that that is smart, I venture to say this House does not think so. If he reads from an article got up specially in the interests of his own party, he will not find that a sufficient answer. What was the hon. gentleman reading from ?

Mr. MONK. Do you deny the figures ?

Mr. FRASER. I do deny them. I rather think that the Tycoon of the opposition leadership would have appeared to better advantage if he did not attempt to answer in that way. The dual capacity in which the party finds its leadership will not be strengthened by efforts of that kind. I was about to say that, for myself, I think the late government entered into this business on purpose to fool the farmers ; I have no more doubt of that than I have that I am talking. For the last ten or twelve years I have heard men in this parliament who wanted to get the farmers' vote, talking about binder twine It has been a continual subject of discussion.

Mr. CLANCY. On your side, too.

Mr. FRASER. I do not deny that. But with the exposure made by the Solicitor General, and the challenges made to hon. gentlemen opposite to call for a committee and examine witnesses under oath, I do not think we will have as much trouble in the future in relation to this question. For myself, I think the government should never have entered into the business. We have paid twice as much for the machinery as it ought to cost. I do not believe it is the business of the government to enter into the manufacture of binder twine at Kingston, any more than it would be to enter into any other manufacturing business. There is plenty of other work the convicts could do. I think, now that the duty is off binder twine, that the case is quite clear. What would any business man do to-day ? Let the government, now that the duty has been taken off, put up at competition the manufactured product, and every bit of raw material that they have on hand, together with this machinery that has cost twice as much as it should cost, and let them sell it all and go out of the business. At least, by that means we would avoid all the trouble of these discussions. Then, if binder twine is an absolute necessity to the existence of the farmers, they could get it without duty from the outside, in case it could not be manufactured within this country. Here is a way in which the whole problem could be clearly solved. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has a panacea for everything that comes up, namely, to take the railways over, and then all difficulties would be solved. But I think he will admit that this Kingston penitentiary difficulty would not be solved except by the government going out of the business altogether. I may say that this is a question that does not affect us so much in Nova Scotia as it appears to affect the people of Ontario. But if, as has been clearly shown, the government have sold an article at the lowest price, if these people who are in the same business are to be believed, and I would trust them to tell the facts more than I would that single individual farmer that the hon. member for Hastings has told us about, if the evidence of the Solicitor General is to be taken, the government have sold the twine at a less price than it was sold elsewhere ; and having taken the duty off binder twine, I think they have done all that they should do. Now, I would suggest to them that they should clear the decks of this question altogether, sell out everything ; and that would prevent a number of hon. gentlemen from talking for ever about this question of binder twine. It would give an opportunity to the manufacturers of the country to compete with each other in manufacturing a good article for the farmers, that they could get at the lowest price. I offer the suggestion in all modesty, and I trust it will be accepted ; and I have no doubt hon. gentlemen opposite will join with me in endeavouring to relieve this wicked government, as they consider it to be, from the necessity of dealing in binder twine to the disadvantage of the farmers.

Mr. JOHN SHERRITT (North Middlesex). I have listened with a good deal of interest to the discussion that has been in progress to-night. I may say that this is a question of considerable interest to the farmers in North Middlesex, the riding which I have the honour to represent. I may say also that I am a farmer, and I never was more proud of being so than I have been to-night, when I heard the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche), getting up and calling

himself a farmer, whom I am informed on good authority is one of those wealthy coal merchants down in Nova Scotia. This binder twine question is one of considerable importance to the agricultural community. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Fraser) proposes that the government should go out of the business altogether. That hon. gentleman, and some others who have spoken on that side of the House, have had a good deal to say, but they have all failed to suggest any way by which the business could be carried on on business lines. The hon. member for Guysborough started out to draw comparisons. I do not think that is the proper course to pursue on this question. It would be just about as fair to argue that, because a man has had his hat stolen at some time, another man would be justified in going and taking his boots. The hon. gentleman states that it costs 7¼ cents to produce this twine. I have not heard any argument put forth that would show this House that the government ever offered this twine at a time when it was possible for the farmers to obtain it, at any such figure, or at any figure that would be a fair price, as their advertised price to farmers was 11 cents to 14 cents per pound. Some wild suggestions have been made from the other side of the House, but there has been no proof that binder twine had ever been offered to the farmers, as I said before, at less than 14 cents for best quality.

Now, it seems to me this is a state of affairs which should not exist. The motion before the House, I approve of in the main, though I do not believe exactly in that one-cent proposition. I think it possible that some way could be devised by which this twine could be sold to the farmers at a less price than nearly double what it costs to produce. I was thinking, when listening to some hon. gentlemen opposite that if they had been in my riding previous to the 7th of November last, they would have had some difficulty, notwithstanding the talent they exhibited here to-night, in convincing the farmers that they have been properly dealt with in this matter. The result of the election in my riding shows that the policy of the government in reference to this binder twine question as well as other matters, had been distasteful to the farmers. Ontario has spoken out against the government on this matter, and I believe, amongst all the bad things that have been done by the government, no action that has been taken has promoted the interests of the opposition more in that province than the action of the government upon this very question. It was not on account of the unpopularity of our late member, or on account of my own popularity that the campaign in my constituency resulted as it did, but it was the action of the government on this and other questions that placed me in this House. I do not wish to detain the House or to enter upon a lengthy discussion of the matter, but my idea is that this binder twine was offered at a time when the farmers could not avail themselves of the offer. The offer was made so much in advance of the time that they actually needed it, the time that many farmers were not prepared to purchase it. I think if the government desired to assist the farmers they would leave the offer open until the 1st of July. That would give them ample time, and if they then found that orders were not coming in from the farmers they would have an opportunity of sending men out and in some way disposing of the twine throughout the country. I believe the matter has been very badly handled in the past. When the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) referred to the question the other day he stated that he was an independent man. We should show, on both sides of the House, that we are all independent men. It does seem to me that we should show our independence on these lines, notwithstanding the fact that we may be sitting on one side of the House or the other. I know what I am speaking about when I say that if any hon. gentlemen, sitting on the other side of the House, representing a farming community, who votes against this motion will be giving a vote contrary to his own opinion, and which, apart from political considerations, he would not give.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, this question of binder twine is a most important one to the agricultural constituencies of this country. I am very sorry that the motion and the mover of the motion have not been paid a greater compliment by the hon. members who have spoken, supposedly to the motion, but really not to it at all. I think there has seldom been a motion presented to this House which has been less discussed than this motion now before us. We have heard a rehash of certain pages of the Conservative literature of the last election, which most of us have all heard for hour after hour, given with the utmost gravity and good faith, as if it were something original and something that no one had ever heard before. I did not suppose, when I read that literature first, or when I heard it delivered from platform after platform during the election, that the men who used it believed it. I did not suppose that they were so lacking in ordinary knowledge and common sense, but now I am bound to believe that they talked it so long that they not only have come to believe it themselves, but they think they can make other people believe it by continuing to talk it. What is the purpose of all this talk about binder twine? What was the purpose of the literature that was circulated through the country, and what was the purpose of the campaign that was made in regard to binder twine in the late election? I am at

a loss to understand what the purpose is of the greater part of this debate, but the purpose of the attack upon the policy of the government in regard to binder twine during the election was to blind the eyes of the farming community if possible to the wise action of the government in abolishing the duty on binder twine, and making that product, at any rate, free to the farmers as far as the tariff was concerned. Whatever pledge in regard to the reduction of the tariff the government may have failed in, it did not fail on the article of binder twine. Therefore, as binder twine is an article of the highest importance to that part of the community which forms the largest part of the electorate, it was necessary to deceive, if possible, the farmers as to the value of the action of the government to them. It was for that reason and that alone that the campaign of misrepresentation, of slander and falsehood, which has seldom or never been equalled in any country, was carried on on the basis of binder twine during the late election, and the fact that in that part of the country where binder twine is more important than in any other, the government's policy was sustained by a vote of four to nothing, is a sufficient answer to it. The government abolished the duty upon binder twine ; they fulfilled to the utmost limit their pledge in regard to the tariff on that article, they benefited the farmers by doing so, and then the charge was made that they had used the output of the Kingston penitentiary to unduly increase the price of the article to the farmers. A case was built up in regard to the misuse of the binder twine of the penitentiary which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sherritt), who preceded me in this debate, declared was the cause of his return to this House and the defeat of his opponent. So successful were the opposition in that campaign of misrepresentation that they made a majority of the electors of North Middlesex believe that the government, by manipulating one-tenth of the binder twine used in this country, had increased the price by 100 per cent. I will admit that you can manipulate the output of the Kingston penitentiary so as to affect the price of binder twine to a proportionate degree, but that was not the contention that was put up. The contention was exactly what I say, that the government had so manipulated the output of the Kingston penitentiary, being one-tenth of the total consumption of the binder twine of this country, that they had doubled the price of twine to the farmers, an utterly preposterous proposition. The idea has been held out to the farmers that they depended on the output of the Kingston penitentiary for their binder twine. My opponent said to the farmers in one section of the country, where I had the pleasure of meeting him : You do not use American binder twine : 'It makes no difference to you that the duty has been taken off twine. As long as the government hold up the price of twine manufactured at the Kingston penitentiary, so long will you have to pay that price. That is what interests you.' I made inquiries and I found that there never had been a pound of Kingston penitentiary twine sold in that part of the country. The point I want to make is this : That the idea has been attempted to be implanted in the minds of the people of this country that something has been done, or attempted to be done with the twine output of the Kingston penitentiary that never was done or attempted to be done by this government or by the late government, and that never could be done by any government. However that is in regard to the last election and having fought through that campaign. Having heard the slanders that were hurled against the policy of the government; it is certainly a pleasure for me now to come to this House and find a member of the Conservative party coming forward with a resolution endorsing the policy of the government in regard to binder twine. That disposes effectually of all the slanders uttered during that campaign and puts them exactly where they belong. We need not consider them any more. As the Solicitor General said : The government did during the past year offer the twine direct to the farmers at a fixed price. The charge was that the government had sold the twine to a combine, whereas as a matter of fact they had offered the twine to the farmers and part of it they were unsuccessful in selling to any one. The motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) endorses the principle pursued by the government last year. I do not know that it is a principle of universal application. I do not know just how well it will work out in practice. It may be that sometime we shall attempt to sell twine direct to the farmers on the basis of the cost of the raw material. In the meantime the raw material may go down in price and the farmer can buy his twine cheaper from the other manufacturers. Another feature is that if the raw material maintains its price or if it increases in price, it is possible for the government to make a very considerable difference between the price of the penitentiary twine and the market price of twine, and then I am afraid we will have our friends opposite charging that the output of the Kingston penitentiary is being used as a bribe to the farmers of the country, by giving a preference to the friends of the government on this low priced twine. I am perfectly satisfied that so long as the present government is in power there is no danger of that taking place, but I am not at all satisfied that should the opposition come to power they will not carry out the traditions of their Conservative predecessors. These features

are worthy of consideration, but they are questions of the future. The question of the present is, that for some reason or other, whether on account of the combine or whether it is an accident of the market; the binder twine of this country has been sold at abnormally high prices during the past year or two. We do know that the government of Canada controls the output of the Kingston penitentiary, and I am entirely in accord with the hon. gentleman's motion —which I distinguish entirely from his remarks—that at the present time it is the duty of the government to use the output of the Kingston penitentiary to check, so far as that output can, any possible combine whereby the price of binder twine is increased to the farmers. That being the case I would have been very glad to accept the motion, but it contains a feature which is a very great weakness and which is not necessary to its principle. That is that in the case of the farmers not purchasing the total output (which occurred this year) no provision is made as to what is to be done with the residue. Is it to be carried over to another year when possibly the price of the raw material having gone down it will be unsaleable except at a loss. The suggestion made by the hon. member for North Middlesex (Mr. Sherritt) was that the twine should be offered to the farmers up to a certain date, and that after that date it should be offered for sale to the highest bidder. That is a fair proposition and I will take the liberty of moving an amendment along that line, I do not exactly agree however that the government should be entitled to a cent a pound over the cost of manufacture. The government having control of the penitentiary and having to find work for the convicts, it is right that they should sell that twine at its fair cost. But then comes the question of the cost of twine manufactured by prison labour, and I do not wish to conflict with our friends in the House who are here in the interests of labour, and who have a very natural deep rooted objection against the competition of prison labour. I would like to have their support for any motion I put before the House, because I believe that the true interests of the labouring men of Canada are exactly the same as the interests of the farmers. I propose to amend the motion by striking out the cent a pound extra over cost, and placing the cost as if the twine were produced by free labour. My amendment is this :

> That so long as the government continues to manufacture twine, the same shall be offered for sale directly to farmers up to July the 1st of each year at cost of material and manufacture, calculating wages on the basis of fair wages for free labour ; and that the twine unsold and on hand on July 1st of each year be sold by tender to the highest bidder, after advertisement.

That is entirely in line with the policy pursued by the government during the past year, except that it carries it a little further and makes it more definite. It is also in line with the motion of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). As the representative of an agricultural constituency, I would ask the members representing agricultural constituencies in this House to vote for that amendment without respect to politics or arguments in respect to past transactions either by one government or the other.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I am sure the tone of the hon. gentleman's speech was such that he might ask hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to vote for the proposal that he has made; for those who followed him somewhat closely could see that he spoke entirely from a non-partisan standpoint. The hon. gentleman was very moderate, I fancy he thought himself. He commenced his speech by declaring that the whole country were fools, that no man of ordinary intelligence could have believed a single word contained in certain campaign literatures which was circulated in the country. I desire to remind that hon. gentleman that he sat in this House, and his leader sat in this House when those statements were made here, and that up to this moment not an hon. gentleman has challenged one of those statements. I do not think the hon. gentleman intended to reflect upon his leaders, but he has not shown that knowledge of the question one would expect from a gentleman who assumed such a lofty tone as he assumed a few moments ago. If he will take his pencil, and go to his room, and spend a few hours there, he will never again make such an exhibition in this House as he has made this evening. I venture to repeat the statements which were made here on former occasions, and made in what the hon. gentleman rather opprobriously called campaign literature, and which have remained to this moment uncontradicted.

What is the position of the Solictor General to-night ? He set forth as a proper answer to the charges that the machinery at the Kingston penitentiary had been purchased at an exorbitant price; but he sat down without giving a single particle of evidence in support of that bald statement. He simply said that one Mr. Munro would be able to present the evidence at the Public Accounts Committee. Well, the Solicitor General made the statement, and it devolves upon him to bring the matter before the Public Accounts Committee and there present the evidence to prove it. It does not devolve upon this side of the House to do that. The first thing the hon. gentleman said was that in August, 1899, the twine had been sold to the farmers of this country on precisely the terms proposed by the motion of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). Now, I have here an advertisement that appeared during last session in the public press. It is dated the 26th of February,

and I believe this House met last year on the 1st of February. An advertisement appeared in the public press some time before that; but, public attention was called to it during the session, and the hon. gentleman saw fit to amend the notice with regard to the sale of twine; and what does it say ?

Orders from farmers in pursuance of the advertisement dated January 22nd will be received and filed until the 20th of March, instead of the 1st of March, as stipulated in the former advertisement.

Now, what were the stipulations sent out to the farmers ? Let it be remembered that this twine with one cent added for manufacture was sold at 7·51 cents a pound. What is the farmer asked to pay ? In lots of fifty tons and upwards—for manila 12½ cents, for mixed 9½ cents, and for New Zealand 8½ cents. No farmers are likely to buy twine in fifty ton lots, as the hon. gentleman knew perfectly well, and it was idle to put such a notice before them. The price to the farmers in carload lots, which is less than fifty tons, is for manila 13 cents, for mixed 10 cents, and for New Zealand 9 cents. In lots of one ton up to a carload, the price was—for manila 13½ cents, for mixed 10½ cents, and for New Zealand 9½ cents. For smaller quantities, such quantities as my hon. friend knows the farmers will purchase, what was the price to them ? Bearing in mind that the cost price of this twine, including manufacture, was an average of 7·51, what was the great inducement offered to the farmers ? Why, in lots of less than one ton, they were paying for manila 14 cents, mixed 11 cents, and New Zealand 10 cents. After that advertisement had appeared on the 25th February of last session, this is what the hon. gentleman gave out, and yet he does not hesitate to rise in his place and declare that the twine from 1899, up to the present was sold at a slight advance on the cost of producing. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is prepared to withdraw the statements made in this House last session, of which I gave him a sample a moment ago? I do not say that he intended to mislead the House, but he made statements by which the House was misled.

Another statement which the hon. gentleman made was that if the twine were held over it would be a loss. In other words, that if the twine were held over more than a year it would have to be sold at a loss.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. I shall not ask this House to rely entirely on any statement I make in this matter, but we had an investigation, and had witnesses examined. Mr. Hughes was examined, and the hon. gentleman tried to make it appear that twine would be deteriorated by being held over, but Mr. Hughes stated that being held over one year would not matter, but it would not do to hold it over two years, so that there is nothing in the hon. gentleman's plea that he was justified in forcing a sale because it would not do to hold over the twine.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am instructed by the warden of the penitentiary to that effect.

Mr. CLANCY. The warden is a man new to the office, and his opinion cannot be taken against that of Mr. Hughes, who has had many years experience in the business.

Then the hon. gentleman said : Well, the farmers will not deal with us. I think I gave the reasons a moment ago. The farmers were led to believe by the hon. gentleman's friends that they would get the twine at a price slightly above cost. But they had to pay very exorbitant prices. My hon. friend replied that some dealers in twine had said : You are selling twine much less than the price manufacturers ought to get. But naturally the very men who wished to put up the price could not be expected to say anything else.

The hon. gentleman made some statement with regard to Mr. Connor to which I desire to call particular attention. One was that Mr. Connor had sold twine in 1894 at excessive prices.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He bought it from the department and retailed it to the public. I never was aware of the prices at which he sold it, and it did not concern us.

Mr. CLANCY. Yet the hon. gentleman stated that Connor was in the combine, and was selling at combine prices.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes. In 1894 he purchased the output outright and disposed of it in the market himself. In 1895, he sold it as agent of the government, and received 10 per cent commission on the sales, but simply forgot to pay for it. That is all.

Mr. CLANCY. That is what Connor has to say on that subject when brought before the Public Accounts Committee.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not care what he says, I have the contract.

Mr. CLANCY. That is what he says with regard to the prices at which he sold it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The statement I made was that Mr. Connor was the chief factor in the combine that existed at that time, which combine had closed up all the factories in Canada except the ones at Brantford and at Montreal, and that, in that capacity, he secured the agency for the sale of the government twine at a commission of 10 per cent.

Mr. CLANCY. Connor swears that he was under special instructions in 1895. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) asked him : 'What did you sell the twine at in 1895?' And Connor replied : 'The average price for mixed was 5½ cents.' The member for Leeds then asked him : 'The government gave you a limit to sell at?' And Connor replied : 'Yes, from time to time I was to advise with the warden and be governed by him.' Now the hon. gentleman has made the charge, first, that Connor in 1894 secured the binder twine and fleeced the people.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman offered a tittle of evidence to prove that? He has utterly failed to do so. We come to 1895, and we have the fact that Connor, who sold the twine for the government, was under special instructions, and sold the twine at 5½ cents.

Then the hon. gentleman said that in 1896 Mr. Kelly had the contract, and the government tried to get him to give security. But if the hon. gentleman has told the whole story, he would have been more frank. What was it? It was that the late government exacted that Kelly should give security for the twine, and Kelly having failed to give security, they would not give him the twine. I ask my hon. friend if he did not find that state of things when he came into office. Mr. Kelly was unable to furnish the secruity, and the result was that the twine was held over and not sold that season. But, did the hon. gentleman wait till next season? No, he sold the twine in September of that year, after he had been only a few months in office to Coll Bros.

Mr. TAYLOR. Connor.

Mr. CLANCY. Connor was acting for Coll Bros. Are they twine dealers? No, they are soap manufacturers in St. John. Yet the hon. gentleman made the sale on the plea that the twine would deteriorate if left over, although we have the evidence of an expert that it was without a tittle of foundation. And who is this man Connor? Has not the hon. gentleman had dealings with him during last year? Did he not sell Mr. Connor a good deal of the twine of 1900? And why did he do that if Mr. Connor is not in favour with the government? I take it that he is the same man who went to the county of Victoria, N.B., and helped to buy out the opposition candidate. Mr. Connor is a friend of the hon. gentleman opposite, though the hon. gentleman assumes to blame him here tonight. Mr. Connor gave evidence in the presence of the hon. gentleman himself and swore that, from 1896 to 1898, three successive years there was collusion in regard to the binder twine, and that the ministers of the Crown were aware of it—they knew that there was a combine. The hon. gentleman asked how the price could be affected by the small quantity of twine produced in the Kingston penitentiary. The hon. gentleman has political friends in Toronto who were clamouring as lustily as hon. gentlemen opposite did for years to have factories started in the Kingston penitentiary and the Central prison for the purpose of compelling manufacturers to accept fair prices. I will call one of the most respectable witnesses on this point, the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), who is always moderate and thoughtful in his statements. If hon. gentlemen will turn to 'Hansard' of 1893, page 3433, they will find that, in the course of a discussion on the desirability of establishing a binder twine factory in Kingston, the hon. Minister of Customs says :

> The government is taking this action with a view to employ prison labour and at the same time keep the manufacturers at Halifax from obtaining too high a price for their product.

Then, we have Mr. Dryden, the Minister of Agriculture of Ontario. In a speech made on January 24, 1894, at Columbus, in his own riding, he said :

> Another reason why this industry was established was that the farmers laboured under the burden of a monopoly, and it was thought desirable that the product of the prisoners' labour would be used in the interest of the farmer. He showed how the farmers had paid monopolists for the ropes, wrappings, &c., at the twine price, but in future——

This is a pledge to the people——

> —they would have a guarantee that the prison twine would be all right in quality and weight. He intended to use his influence in future to supply the farmers with the twine at first cost. Business must of necessity be done on a cash basis. But as a good many farmers cannot pay cash, some means will have to be devised to give them the benefit of this industry.

He is not only to sell it at cost but he is going to trust the purchasers. And how did it turn out? Precisely as the professions of the hon. gentlemen opposite turned out who, for years, clamoured to have this industry established but who, the moment they came into power was shown by sworn evidence, while knowing there was collusion, allowed the combine to be formed. And how was it formed? By Mr. Connor and the Coll Bros. going up to Toronto, purchasing the twine there and getting the two years' output of the Kingston penitentiary—making a large quantity of twine—and then combining with the American Cordage Company. And who are the agents of that company? Why, Hobbs Bros. of London. So that all that was necessary was to call in Hobbs Bros. and the combine was formed. And the result was that the twine that was purchased from the government at 4 cents was sold to the farmers at 10, 12 and 14 cents. It is well enough for hon. gentlemen opposite to say that there was no combine ; but I would like any hon. gentleman who is disposed to

look at the question fairly to account for the great disparity between the prices at which the twine was sold by the government from year to year and the price at which it was sold to the consumer. No attempt has ever been made to do that. I will not pursue this subject any further. I have to say to the Solicitor General that he is bound, after the statement he has made this evening, to call his auditor, Mr. Munro, and to make his case good. As for Mr. Connor, that gentleman is a friend of his own, and we have no concern with him. As regards the motion in amendment, I do not think it is in order. It simply reaffirms what is affirmed in the original motion, it does not substantially contain new matter, as it must do in order to be an amendment. It simply repeats, by the variation of dates, the substance of the motion of my hon. friend. I consider it to be entirely harmless, but not in order. I wish to point out to hon. gentlemen that if they accept that motion they bind themselves by the dates; and I ask the First Minister if he is prepared to bind himself in the sense of that amendment as to the dates. I desire to say to the Solicitor General that I do not think he was quite fair in his mode of dealing with this question to-night. There was really no need for the heat he displayed in the discussion. In the first place he utterly failed in making a single statement good. His statement with regard to the cost of the machinery may be true, I do not offer any opinion upon it, I have no information on the subject; but if it be true, it does not affect the case in the slightest, it has nothing to do with the sale of twine. Now there is twine enough manufactured in the Central prison and in the Kingston penitentiary, if the hon. gentlemen can control their friends there, they too affect materially the price of binder twine in Canada. It has been stated here to-night that the consumption of twine is something like sixteen million pounds, and that a considerable share of it is manufactured in those two institutions, and the others will be governed to some extent by the price at which this is sold. I know there is always a difficulty in dealing with so many persons in a business of this kind, I grant it is not an easy thing for the government to sell twine in a satisfactory manner. But, I agree with the hon. gentleman's motion that if we are going to employ prison labour in Canada it ought to be employed for the benefit of the people of Canada. The object of the motion is to secure that the twine should be sold in the best possible way to the farmer, and in order to do that hon. gentlemen will hardly pursue the course of asking as high as 12 and 14 cents a pound for twine when it is sold to dealers at an average of $7.51 per hundred.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). I wish to say to the House that I see very little difference between the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and the resolution I submitted to the House a few days ago. I have to say that I am willing to accept the motion in amendment because I see very little difference between that and my own. Now, I wish to say a word as to the motive I had in introducing this resolution; and to show that I had no political motive, and had no desire to catch any special vote in this country, I want to read the words of the Prime Minister at the close of the debate the other day :

> The government certainly has no right to complain of the manner in which my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) has introduced this motion.

I think that is good proof from the leader of the government that what I said upon the question is not open to the criticism that has been made by some hon. gentlemen opposite. I want also to draw attention to the fact that no farmer, no gentleman engaed in agricultural pursuits speaking from the other side of the House, has said one word against my motion. The first gentleman who spoke upon the question was the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd), but he represents a constituency that contains a binder twine manufactory. Then the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) ventured to state that the leader of the opposition received a very large vote from the binder twine manufactory in the county of Halifax. I thought we had a secret vote in this country. How can any man say how people voted in that county on the 7th of November ? Then we have the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Stephens) speaking in defence of the twine industry in this country, but, I believe he is a large seller of binder twine himself, and, therefore, he wants a little protection upon that point, not having the interest of the farmer in view at all. Then we had the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who is a lawyer, I believe, and not a farmer, who spoke in defence of the government. Therefore, the House will see that no gentleman representing the agricultural interests of the country attempted to say anything against the motion that I had the honour to introduce. Then, I think I ought to get some credit from the House, because my motion has brought into the House, the hon. Solicitor General, who is not often in his place. I was only sorry that he was not in better temper after being away so long.

In my resolution I ask that two things should be done; first, that these middlemen should disappear. If the terms of the amendment of the member for Alberta be adopted by this House, then Coll Bros. will be no more in the transaction, because they are not farmers. They bought the twine in 1896. In 1897, the Hobbs Co. bought it, and they will be no more in the business because they are not farmers. The twine was sold to H. N. Bate & Sons in 1898, and as they are grocers they will not come in

under the new deal. Therefore, I willingly accept the terms of the amendment, because all these middlemen, who the farmers claim have been making large profits out of the binder twine industry, will disappear, and that is what I want. There is one other point, and that is as to what the profits should be. My motion says that the profits should be one cent; the amendment says that the profit should be based upon a calculation of paid labour in this country. I am not quite sure what difference there would be in the calculation, but I am sure there could not be much. Therefore, upon that point I am willing to accept the amendment of the member for Alberta. I am glad to know that hon. gentlemen opposite, including the Solicitor General, I presume, are willing that there should be a change. The member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) said that the transaction was altogether unsatisfactory to himself as a supporter of the government; so of course I should have his support. I am delighted to see that the government are willing to change their plan, and that they are now willing to adopt the terms of the resolution; therefore, I presume it will pass unanimously.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. Mr. Fielding). As we are about to vote upon these propositions we had better have it clearly understood what they are. When the hon. gentleman says the two propositions are the same, he is certainly labouring under a misapprehension. There are two radical differences between the two motions. First, in relation to the cost of producing the binder twine. So far as that is an element in the motion of the member for Peel (Mr. Blain), he proposes that no regard should be had to the distinction between prison labour and free labour. We propose, or the member for Alberta proposes——

Mr. MONK. Who are we ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am going to vote for it.

Mr. WALLACE. Then it is a put up job.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then it is a very good job, because it is common sense, and the hon. gentleman is going to vote for it too, and will set a very good example, because sometimes he votes for propositions which are not sensible. So far as the cost of labour is concerned, the hon. mover of this motion makes no distinction between free labour and prison labour.

Mr. MONK. A cent a pound.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend from Peel says that he has no conception whether that represents the cost of labour at all. He says that he has made no calculation upon that basis. Inasmuch as it is unavoidable from our operations at the Kingston penitentiary binder twine factory that we must enter into competition with the legitimate industries of the country, it is only fair and reasonable and right, under conditions of free trade, there being no duty, that we should not put prison labour in competition with free labour, and that while we are competing with outside factories, whether it is the combine in Halifax, which elects the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax)——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What is wrong ? I speak that which I know. I say that if it were not for the combine votes, I doubt if the hon. gentleman would have a seat in this House, and then we would only have three leaders on that side of the House instead of four, as at the present time. I say that when we have to compete with the legitimate industries of the country, even though you may call them combines, it is not fair in competing to place prison labour against free labour, and therefore the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) says that in any calculation that can be made in respect to labour, that calculation must be on the basis of free labour, and not prison labour.

Mr. BLAIN. We are willing to do so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am glad the hon. gentleman has come to that. I hope he will continue to accept useful suggestions from this side of the House.

Mr. INGRAM. How long is it since the hon. gentleman has come to these views ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What are the views that the hon. gentleman refers to ?

Mr. INGRAM. How long is it since the hon. gentleman has entertained the view that the labour employed in the Kingston penitentiary in the manufacture of binder twine should be equal to that of free labour ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend will find that has always been held. His complaint is that we have been charging too much, and that clearly shows that we have not been putting it on a basis of prison labour, which would make the price less. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) says that we have been charging too much for prison-made twine.

Mr. CLANCY. You entered into a combine.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hon. gentlemen talk of combines ; why, they flourished on combines for eighteen years.

Mr. COCHRANE. And you are following that up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I want to call the attention of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), having mentioned this

one important difference, to the other material difference between his proposition and that of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). The hon. member for Peel proposes that we shall sell this binder twine to the farmers at a certain price, regardless of whether the farmer is willing to buy it from us or not, and he then says distinctly that even if the farmer does not buy it you shall not be at liberty to sell it in any other way, and therefore you can keep it and let it rot if you like. That does not strike us as a very reasonable proposition. The hon. member for Alberta says that you shall offer this to the farmers at a fair price up to a certain date, and if the farmers take it at that price, well and good, but if the farmers do not take it at that price, then instead of allowing it to rot, as it would under the proposal of the hon. member for Peel, you shall advertise in the public press for tenders, and sell the balance of it in the open market at the best price.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. gentleman what they are going to do with the amount of binder twine now in the Kingston penitentiary ? Are they going to allow that to rot ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is one thing certain ; if it rots now it does not rot through any lack of effort on the part of the government to sell it, but the hon. member for Peel is proposing a scheme, which, no matter how many buyers we might find, would not permit us to sell the surplus at all.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). Mr. Speaker, when I asked the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) the question, how long it is since he entertained these views, I was surprised that the hon. gentleman did not answer. I have always found him courteous and all that sort of thing. Since hon. gentlemen have controlled the affairs of this country, I do not know any case where they have been prevented from selling binder twine at the actual cost, that is to say, charging what would be equal to free labour in the manufacture of twine in other factories. Therefore, the hon. gentleman had it right in his own hands if he entertained these views, ever since he came into power. In respect to the motion moved by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), it strikes me that the hon. gentleman must have had this motion placed in his hands, because he possesses the faculty of speaking one way and moving a resolution in an entirely different direction. The hon. gentleman's speech was not the speech of an independent man. I doubt very much, whether, in his election in Alberta, the issue was really on the question of binder twine. I had the opportunity of passing through that hon. gentleman's district, and it struck me that he represented a grazing country. I read the papers pretty closely during the last campaign, and it occurred to me that the question of scrip had more effect in his election than the question of binder twine. I remember crossing the river at Edmonton, in his constituency, and there was no bridge at the time of my crossing. It strikes me that this was another very important issue in his constituency. So, I say, that instead of charging the electors of other portions of the Dominion with being ignorant on this question and not capable of arriving at a proper conclusion as to whether binder twine was properly dealt with by his government or not, he should have been more frank in his statements, and they should have been more in keeping with the actions of an independent member. Therefore, for that reason, while I support the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman, I entirely differ from the remarks he made in moving his resolution.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIS. If hon. gentlemen will possess their souls in patience, I can assure them that I am not going to take up the time of the House. I may just say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) who moved the original motion, complained that there were no hon. gentlemen on this side of the House representing agricultural constituencies who had taken any exception to the motion he had moved.

Mr. WALLACE. That is not what he said.

Mr. DAVIS. That is how I understood the hon. gentleman. However, I am not going to take up very much time. I am sure the farmers of the North-west Territories will be very much pleased to learn that they have the sympathy of hon. gentlemen on the opposition side of the House who sympathize so much with the farmers of the North-west Territories and other parts of the Dominion. I was amused the other afternoon to see one of the hon. members from West Toronto get up in this House and sweat in every pore for the poor farmers of the North-west Territories. He wanted to get them cheap binder twine. If the same hon. gentleman and some other hon. gentleman associated with him would arrange to give the farmers of the North-west Territories cheap freight rates, it would be an advantage to the farmers in that part of the country. I am sure that the farmers must be laughing, if they have read the speech of the hon. member for West Toronto. I sympathize with the hon. gentlemen opposite because this was an important plank in the last election ; in fact, they only had two planks, one was binder twine and the other the Minister of Public Works. I do not know

on which they got the most votes, but I fancy it was on the Minister of Public Works. We had this question of binder twine discussed in the North-west Territories. The last hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) mentioned the question of scrip. As far as scrip was concerned, if there was any kudos to be got for hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House out of scrip they went us one better because they offered to give scrip to children born up to date if their parents would only vote for the Conservative candidates. They then came down to the question of binder twine and we heard about the sale to Bate & Co. and others from one end of the North-west to the other, until a gentleman in my constituency suggested that they should get it set to music and play it on a brass band. The farmers in the North-west Territories took little stock in that, for we all know that they returned four Liberals with very large majorities. The hon. gentleman for East Hastings, (Mr. Northrup) tried to make a point against the Solicitor General by saying that a farmer in his constituency told him that the government offered to sell twine for 14 cents when he could buy it in the village for 10 cents. Well, there is twine and twine. A man may buy a pair of boots for fifty cents and another man may pay $3.50 for a pair. There are different qualities of twine as well as of boots, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Northrup) took care not to say that the ten cent twine was as good quality as the fourteen cent twine. I know personally that the government did offer the twine to the farmers, because they offered to send a car-load to my district and sell it at a great deal less price than the farmers were paying to the implement dealers. I took a good deal of trouble to find what the farmers wanted, and I found that the farmers did not want the Kingston twine because they said it was not as good as the other, for which they preferred paying the higher price.

Som hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DAVIS. I see the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) shaking his head, but if the advice of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) were carried out and the government were to dispose of the Kingston plant it would be in the interest of the people of Canada. It ill-becomes gentlemen on the other side to talk about binder twine in view of their record in the past. We know they bolstered up a combine by their protective tariff which made the farmers pay thirteen cents a pound for twine when the raw material was worth only four and one-half cents. These gentlemen talk about binder twine all the time, but they never mention any other kind of twine, although they know very well that rope is three times the price it was three years ago on account of the increase in the price of the raw material. These hon. gentlemen opposite never mention that, because they want to leave the impression that the government by some manipulation has been robbing the farmers and not allowing them to get cheap binder twine. The farmers are too intelligent to take any stock in that. As a matter of fact the twine was sold in the proper way by tenders being called and were sold to the highest bidder. The purchaser sold at a small margin of profit and when the twine passed into the hands of gentlemen like the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), who, I understand, keeps a general store, they took advantage of the rise to sell it to the farmers at a good fat profit. I do not see why they should not do so, because we all know that a business man has to take advantage in the rise in the markets as he has to suffer by a decline in prices. I have known dealers to buy wheat at seventy-five cents and sell it for fifty cents, and have known them again to buy it at seventy-five cents and sell it at a dollar. These people got the twine in a legitimate way and they paid for it, whereas the late government never got paid for the twine at all. We know that in one case in the province of Manitoba a leading politician belonging to the Conservative party got a large amount of binder twine from the government and did not pay for it, although I understand that he has lately done so. Since he became Minister of Public Works in the province of Manitoba, he seems to have got rich all of a sudden, and he was able to pay his debts. I sympathize with the new members on the other side of the House, because they have studied the campaign literature of the Conservative party which is largely drawn from the imagination, and as they now feel it necessary to fire off their campaign speeches they might as well do so now as at any other time. I hope they have satisfied themselves on that score, and that we will be now able to proceed to business.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I listened with a great deal of interest to the statement made by the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), and I always notice that when he gets up that beautiful falsetto treble which distinguishes him, he is always very angry and he is always very incorrect in his statements, and this evening was no exception to the rule. He told us that we on this side had to adopt their amendment. Before that we did not know the government had an amendment, but now we see that they had not the courage to propose their own amendment and so they handed it back to the independent member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), to be seconded by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), who is always ready to do such work for the government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We never heard of anything of that kind before.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has not spent much of his time in the House for the last four years, or he would see it and hear of it every day. The Minister of Finance told us that our motion was based on the cost of prison labour, and did not provide for the cost of free labour. The contrary is the fact, because the motion of the member for Peel (Mr. Blain) proposed to add one cent per pound to the cost of labour and raw material, and that would have more than provided for the difference between free labour and prison labour, because the whole cost of manufacture is only about three-quarters of a cent per pound. But when did the government adopt this new policy ? Last year, and the year before, this twine was not sold to the farmers, but it was sold to the Hobbs and the Colls and the Connors and the Bates to speculate in it and double the price to the farmers. As has been pointed out, the American agent of the Hobbs Hardware Company is in the combine, and it was the easiest thing in the world when they got hold of the Canadian product, including that of the two prisons, for them to make a combine and sell at whatever price they pleased. The fact is and cannot be disputed, that binder twine that was bought for about 7 cents a pound by these people was sold to the farmers for 14 cents. There is the whole thing, and I think the country will realize that there are no thanks to be given to the government for the fact, that they will be forced to sell the product of the prison to the farmers of this country at a price that is pretty closely fixed, but that the gratitude for that will be given where it belongs to—His Majesty's loyal opposition. I think we may give our thanks to our worthy colleague from the county of Peel, who has brought this matter to the attention of the House, and has forced the government to their knees, and to follow out the lines of his resolution.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, it is really remarkable to observe the affection which our friends of the opposition have suddenly worked up for the amendment to the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). It must be pleasing to every member of this House who has the interest of the agriculturists at heart to see the unanimity that prevails at the present time on this very important question. That unanimity of feeling as to the proper method to pursue, renders it entirely unnecessary for any person to occupy the time of the House at any length on the question.

For my part, I have simply to say that while I was quite in sympathy with the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Peel, so far as it went, and while I am in more hearty sympathy with the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Alberta, still I should have been pleased —coming from the North-west Territories, hundreds of miles from Kingston, the place where this binder twine is manufactured—had the resolution or the amendment gone just a little further, and assured the farmers in all parts of the country that they would have been able to participate in whatever benefit will accrue from the sale of the output of the Kingston penitentiary; and I would be very glad to have from the government an expression of intention or a promise that they will see to it that the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west Territories are allowed to participate along with the farmers of Ontario in those benefits, be they small or great.

As I said, I do not propose to take up the time of the House discussing the question, because the matter is practically settled. But on behalf of the hon. member for Alberta, and the district he represents, I would make just one remark, which is called forth by a reference which was made by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram). I was very glad to hear that that hon. gentleman had been out through the North-west Territories ; but I regret that he did not remain there long enough to gain some appreciation of the extent of the district of Alberta. He seemed to have come away from that part of the country with the idea that grazing was its sole industry. I may state for his information, and for the information of any other gentlemen who are not familiar with the North-west Territories, that there are many industries and many interests in each of the constituencies of the territories. My hon. friend from Alberta does represent the grazing industry, but he also represents the agricultural industry ; and I will venture to say that there is as much agricultural country in the district of Alberta devoted entirely to that industry as would contain possibly half a dozen or ten constituencies like that represented by the hon. member for East Elgin. In the riding from which I come, the binder twine industry was a matter of interest in the election, and I have no doubt it was also in the district of Alberta. Possibly there was also some interest in the issue referred to by the hon. member for East Elgin—the scrip issue. But if he had remained in the district during the campaign he would have found that the gentleman running in the interest of the opposition was ready to go a greater length than the Liberal candidate, who is now the member for Alberta. That was the state of affairs, I know, in Western Assiniboia, Eastern Assiniboia, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. The Conservative candidates were ready to make and did make very much stronger promises to the people respecting the half-breed scrip than the candidates running in the interest of the government found it necessary to make. I have simply to say in conclusion that I was quite in sympathy with the resolution of the

hon. member for Peel so far as it went ; but I am certainly more in sympathy with the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Alberta.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Oliver :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lefurgey,
Angers,	Lemieux,
Ball,	Lennox,
Barker,	Logan,
Bennett,	Lovell,
Bickerdike,	Macdonald,
Blain,	Mackie,
Blair,	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Borden (King's, N.S.),	MacLaren (Perth),
Bourassa,	McCarthy,
Bourbonnais,	McCool,
Boyd,	McCormick,
Brock,	McCreary,
Broder,	McEwen,
Brown,	McGowan,
Bruce,	McIsaac,
Bruneau,	McLennan,
Bureau,	McLeod,
Calvert,	Madore,
Cargill,	Malouin,
Carscallen,	Marcil (Bagot),
Champagne,	Martineau,
Clancy,	Matheson,
Clare,	Meigs,
Clarke,	Mignault,
Cochrane,	Monk,
Copp,	Morin,
Costigan,	Mulock,
Culbert,	Murray,
Davies (Sir Louis).	Northrup,
Davis,	Oliver.
Delisle,	Osler,
Demers (Lévis),	Parmelee,
Demers (St. John),	Paterson,
Dugas,	Pope,
Dyment,	Préfontaine,
Emmerson,	Pringle,
Erb,	Prior,
Ethier,	Puttee,
Fisher,	Reid (Restigouche),
Flint,	Richardson (Grey),
Fortin,	Richardson (Lisgar),
Fowler,	Robinson (Elgin),
Fraser,	Roche (Halifax),
Gallery,	Roche (Marquette),
Ganong.	Rosamond,
Gauvreau,	Ross (Ontario),
Geoffrion,	Ross (Rimouski),
German,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.)
Gilmour,	Rousseau,
Girard,	Russell,
Godbout,	Schell,
Guthrie,	Scott,
Hackett,	Sherritt,
Hale,	Sifton,
Harwood,	Simmons,
Henderson,	Smith (Vancouver),
Heyd,	Smith (Wentworth),
Holmes,	Sproule,
Horsey,	Stephens,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Sutherland (Essex),
Hughes (Victoria),	Sutherland (Oxford),
Hyman,	Talbot,
Ingram,	Tarte,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Taylor,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Thompson,
Johnston (Lambton),	Tobin,
Kaulbach,	Tolmie,
Kemp,	Tolton,
Kendall,	Tucker,
Kendry,	Turgeon,
Kidd,	Vrooman,
Lancaster,	Wade,
Lang,	Wallace,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Wilmot,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Wilson,
Lavergne,	Wright.—155.
LeBlanc,	

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for East Durham has not voted.

Mr. WARD. I am paired with the hon. member for West Northumberland. If not, I would have voted for the amendment and joined the happy family.

House divided on main motion as amended :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lefurgey,
Angers,	Lemieux,
Ball,	Lennox,
Barker,	Logan,
Bennett,	Lovell,
Bickerdike,	Macdonald,
Blain,	Mackie,
Blair,	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Borden (King's, N.S.),	MacLaren (Perth),
Bourassa,	McCarthy,
Bourbonnais,	McCool,
Boyd,	McCormick,
Brock,	McCreary,
Broder,	McEwen,
Brown,	McGowan,
Bruce,	McIsaac,
Bruneau,	McLennan,
Bureau,	McLeod,
Calvert,	Madore,
Cargill,	Malouin,
Carscallen,	Marcil (Bagot),
Champagne,	Martineau,
Clancy,	Matheson,
Clare,	Meigs,
Clarke,	Mignault,
Cochrane,	Monk,
Copp,	Morin,
Costigan,	Mulock,
Culbert,	Murray,
Davies (Sir Louis).	Northrup,
Davis,	Oliver.
Delisle,	Osler,
Demers (Lévis),	Parmelee,
Demers (St. John),	Paterson,
Dugas,	Pope,
Dyment,	Préfontaine,
Emmerson,	Pringle,
Erb,	Prior,
Ethier,	Puttee,
Fisher,	Reid (Restigouche),
Flint,	Richardson (Grey),
Fortin,	Richardson (Lisgar),
Fowler,	Robinson (Elgin),
Fraser,	Roche (Halifax),
Gallery,	Roche (Marquette),
Ganong.	Rosamond,
Gauvreau,	Ross (Ontario),
Geoffrion,	Ross (Rimouski),
German,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.)
Gilmour,	Rousseau,

Girard,	Russell,
Godbout,	Schell,
Guthrie,	Scott,
Hackett,	Sherritt,
Hale,	Sifton,
Harwood,	Simmons,
Henderson,	Smith (Vancouver),
Heyd,	Smith (Wentworth),
Holmes,	Sproule,
Horsey,	Stephens,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Sutherland (Essex),
Hughes (Victoria),	Sutherland (Oxford),
Hyman,	Talbot,
Ingram,	Tarte,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Taylor,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Thompson,
Johnston (Lambton),	Tobin,
Kaulbach,	Tolmie,
Kemp,	Tolton,
Kendall,	Tucker,
Kendry,	Turcot,
Kidd,	Turgeon,
Lancaster,	Vrooman,
Lang,	Wade,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Wallace,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Wilmot,
Lavergne,	Wilson,
LeBlanc,	Wright.—156.

Motion as amended agreed to.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 12.40 a.m. Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 28, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Canadian Patriotic Fund Association.—Mr. Costigan.

QUESTIONS.

I.C.R.—LEASE OF MONTREAL HERALD PREMISES.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the Intercolonial Railway taken over the premises until lately occupied by the Montreal Herald newspaper, corner of St. James and François-Xavier streets, in Montreal?

2. Has the lease of the Herald newspaper of said premises been transferred to the Intercolonial Railway?

3. Has any sum or indemnity, or otherwise, been paid to the Montreal Herald newspaper for vacating said offices in favour of the Intercolonial Railway?

4. What sum has been so paid?

5. Why was the Intercolonial office removed to the office in question?

6. What rent did the Intercolonial Railway pay for its former office, and what rent does it pay now, and to whom ?

7. What was the rent paid for said offices by the Montreal Herald newspaper, and when does the Herald lease expire?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Yes.

2. No, the lease of the Herald newspaper of said premises has not been transferred. We are sub-tenants of the Herald Publishing Co.

3. Nothing whatever.

4. No sum has been paid.

5. The original freight office of the Intercolonial Railway was destroyed in the Board of Trade fire on January 23, 1901, and it was impossible for our officers to secure suitable premises with the necessary accommodation on the ground floor elsewhere.

6. The rent paid for the former office in the Board of Trade building was $1,500 a year. The rent payable to the Herald Publishing Company for offices, now occupied, is $2,750 a year.

7. The rent paid by the Montreal Herald Publishing Co. is $3,150 a year. Cannot say when the Herald lease will expire, but the Intercolonial Railway has a lease of its offices for three years from the 1st of May next.

POSTMASTERS IN PICTOU COUNTY.

Mr. BELL (Pictou) asked :

1. What postmasters in the county of Pictou have been dismissed since November 6th, 1900, and who have been appointed to fill vacancies so created?

2. What contracts for carriage of mails, to or from points in the county of Pictou, have been made since November 6th, 1900?

3. In how many cases and for what sums have these been made without advertising for tenders?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

1. Since the 6th of November, 1900, the postmasters of Barney's River, Sunnybrae, Burnside, Scotsburn Station, West Branch, River John and Greenvale, in Pictou county, have been removed and have been replaced, with the exception of the last mentioned, by the following persons respectively : Daniel Cameron, Thos. M. Chisholm, Wm. Matheson, Jno. G. Proudfoot, Daniel Campbell. No appointment has yet been made to the Greenvale office. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Bell, Pictou) to allow the balance of the question to stand. The answer is being prepared.

FREE ADMISSION OF BINDER TWINE MACHINERY.

Mr. CARGILL asked :

Was any machinery admitted free from duty for use in a binder twine factory during the

years 1898, 1899, 1900, or were there any refunds of duty in connection with binder twine machinery during said years?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). Machinery has been admitted free for use in binder twine factories, during the period mentioned, under item No. 620 of the free list of the tariff, which provides for the admission free of duty, after the 1st January, 1898, of all articles which enter into the cost of the manufacture of binder twine.

SURVEY BETWEEN RICE LAKE AND PORT HOPE.

Mr. WARD asked :

1. Has any survey been made by the Department of Railways and Canals between a point on Rice Lake and the town of Port Hope, with the view of connecting these two points as part of the Trent Valley system? If so, when?

2. What amounts have been expended by the government in repairing the superstructure of the Port Hope harbour works in each year since 1885?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Yes, a survey was made during the summer of 1900.

2. The information will be obtainable from the Department of Public Works.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee to the fact that there are no notices issued, as is usually the case, for Friday, to-morrow. There are several members who would be very glad if the committee were convened for to-morrow, and notice might be given to-day.

Mr. FRASER. There were so many papers asked for that I thought it would be well to put the meeting off until the first of the week so that they might all be down.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The chairman will remember that the time of the last meeting was taken up in moving for papers, and quite a number were ordered, but the committee rose rather abruptly before the organization of the committee was completed, and without authority to appoint stenographers to take down the evidence. Perhaps that is the only business that could be expedited, and that should be done as soon as possible.

Mr. FRASER. I will see that it is done as soon as we can call a meeting.

MONEY-LENDERS.

Mr. J. A. C. MADORE (Hochelaga). (Translation) moves the second reading of Bill (No. 3) respecting money-lenders. He said : Mr. Speaker, the evil of usury, which this Bill—the second reading of which I now move—purports to remedy, is by no means of recent date. In fact, it traces its origin back to the remotest antiquity, and so to say, to the very cradle of mankind, and writers who deal with the philosophy of history hold that Jacob himself, on the day when he bought his brother's birthright for a mess of pottage, became guilty of extortion and usury. From the very rise of Christianity and throughout the succeeding ages, it is on record that legislators, in the different countries of the world, have grappled with the evil of usury and have framed anti-usury laws. But such legislative reforms did always occur periodically so that, between the abolition of a former law and the promulgation of a new statute, intervals of more or less duration invariably elapsed. Whenever usury was received in a country, and whenever the shylocks of those times, having multiplied with impunity, were seen unblushingly parading in the broad daylight their nefarious monopoly and hovering, like so many vultures, over the victims of their rapacity, then it was that public opinion being stirred up and roused from its lethargy, statesmen and law-makers in all civilized countries framed numberless laws against usury. And when the usurer thus put under the ban of society and branded as an enemy of mankind and a vulgar criminal, no longer dared to show his face, and when hydra of usury, chained as it were, and kept within reasonable bounds by drastic laws and inexorable tribunals, was afraid to hold up its head, then it was that the advocates of commercial freedom stood up and demanded in their turn the repeal of those laws under the pretense that they interfered with the expansion of trade and the progress of the country. When the English parliament in its wisdom, deemed it its duty to enforce an anti-usury law, such legislation had, beyond doubt, became a necessity and was a long-felt want. Under the beneficient influence of such legislation, the ruins heaped up by usury and the disasters which ever follow in its wake, gradually decreased, and finally, in 1853, the British parliament, having come to the conclusion that it was more expedient to foster freedom of trade than to protect the few victims of usury, the statute regulating the rate of interest was repealed. So it was with our own country and it became free to money-lenders and all other persons to stipulate any rate of interest whatsoever.

Later on, the many-headed monster of usury began again to show signs of life and in our young country, forty years had scarcely elapsed when lo ! usury was rampant again and had become the great curse of our community.

In Great Britain usury has become at the present day as great an evil as it was formerly, and so disastrous did the results prove that in England, the very home of commercial freedom, they have not hesitated to brush away as irrelevant the objection taken

to the adoption of an anti-usury law as likely to interfere with freedom of trade. They did, in fact, pass and turn into law a Bill, which, in its main features at least, is similar to the measure which I now ask this House to put on our statute-book.

In order to show, Sir, that the need of an anti-usury law is seriously felt in this country, I do not deem it necessary to enter into any lengthy details ; but, were I not afraid to trespass upon the indulgence of the House, I could give quite a long list of young lawyers, young notaries, young clerks, young professional men, young bank clerks, who after having occupied positions of trust which enabled them to handle the money of others, and who, having had the misfortune of falling into the hands of usurers, were induced to use other people's money to satisfy the exigencies of those money-lenders, and are now within the walls of penitentiaries or fugitives from justice in the United States.

The usurers nowadays, I dare say, have emboldened to the point of stipulating rates of interest as high as from 5 to 10 per cent per month, which represents an interest of from 60 to 120 per cent a year. Nay, more, they are bold enough to go before the courts and in the sacred name of justice, ask the tribunals to sanction such exorbitant rates of interest.

I now call to mind the case of a money-lender having lent a small sum at the rate of 12 per cent a day, sued his debtor, and obtained judgment at the rate of the stipulated interest, and why ? Because, Sir, as the judge indignantly declared, the law left him no option, because he had no discretion in the matter, and his hands were tied ; but he did not hesitate to say that it was the duty of the legislature to grapple with the evil and remedy such a serious state of things.

It was after such judgments rendered by the courts and also in consequence of the remarks fallen from the Bench, that public opinion being stirred up, the press advocated drastic legislation against such abuses Then it was that the Bill, which I now bring forward, was introduced in the other House by Senator Dandurand. Last year, the Bill passed in the Senate, but came up for discussion in this House at too late a stage of the session to allow of its being passed into law. This year, I deemed it my duty to take charge of the Bill in this House, and it was in order to discharge such duty that I introduced this Bill.

From the reports published by various commissions organized in Great Britain, with a view to the passing of the Bill I have referred to, and also from the expression of opinion given by competent men in the matter, I gather that there are two means which may be adopted, if not for suppressing usury altogether, at least for remedying in some measure the evils attendant upon it. The first consists in giving the courts power to go back to the origin of the transaction, to inquire into all the circumstances surrounding the loan, and to determine, as it appears to the judge, what amount should be legitimately charged in each case. The second means consists in determining, by statute, a maximum rate of interest, debarring the money-lender from recovering in justice any amount in excess of that maximum rate, and enabling the debtor to recover the amount so paid in excess.

The Bill now before the House follows the lines of the latter proposition. To leave to the judge the power to determine, in his discretion what rate of interest should be charged in each case would tend to destroy uniformity in the enforcement of the law. In fact, I know judges who would look upon a rate of 20 per cent in certain cases as reasonable and fair, while others under similar circumstances, would look upon the same as outrageous.

So far as the province of Quebec in particular is concerned, I must confess that such a system, in my opinion, is apparently impracticable. I am not familiar with the procedure followed in the other provinces, but in the province of Quebec when a debtor is sued by the lender for the amount claimed to be due, even if he acknowledged his indebtedness as to a portion only of the amount claimed, he must, in order to throw the costs of the contestation on the shoulders of the opposite party, tender and deposit the amount which he owes.

Were it left to the court to determine the rate of interest to be charged, the debtor would never be able to make a tender to the plaintiff, because he could not know what rate of interest the judge looks upon as reasonable and fair that is the reason why it is necessary to determine the rate of interest which the lender may collect ; because it would be ridiculous to give such protection to the debtor, were he forced to pay additional costs instead of the interest. Under such circumstances, believing that the system of giving such powers to the courts would prove unworkable at least in our province, we deemed it preferable in framing the Bill, to fix a reasonable rate of interest as a maximum rate beyond which any amount exacted by the lender should be looked upon as usurious.

In the Bill now before this House the maximum rate is fixed at 20 per cent for loans below $500 ; and in the case of business transactions above that amount, the Bill does not apply. Those who are opposed to this Bill take objection to the fixing of a maximum rate of interest at 20 per cent on grounds which are diametrically opposed to each other. The first objection, and it is one which has been invariably taken to anti-usury laws in the past—goes to say that such legislation interferes with freedom of trade. The second objection is that, if you fix a rate of interest at 20 per

cent, you thereby encourage a rise in the rate of interest in general in all business transactions to that maximum, which would be too high a rate.

I quite agree that, nowadays more than ever before, money has become a commodity, the value of which fluctuates on the market just as much as any other commodity; but I may remark here that I have incorporated in the Bill two provisions which obviate this difficulty. Thus, to meet the objection of those who think that the Bill is encroaching upon freedom of trade, it is enacted that in the case of larger loans, above that amount, in which greater risks are incurred and from which greater benefits are expected, the Bill does not apply.

As to great financial transactions and enterprises, such as railway construction, deepening of canals, mining operations and other similar operations for which considerable loans are made, and where the money-lender incurs great risks, the law governing the rate of interest remains as it stands today. This Bill aims at protecting those who borrow small sums without incurring any great risks or expecting to reap any large benefits; in short, men who go to the money-lender, just to meet certain expenditures in the ordinary course of their business, or in the practice of their profession, and who would be exposed to fall into the clutches of a Shylock, without any hope of ever succeeding to recover their freedom. In short, by limiting to 20 per cent the maximum rate of interest that can be legally charged on small loans below $500, there is a sufficient margin left for all reasonable business transactions.

Besides, in this matter of freedom of trade, it should be borne in mind that, the objection taken to the Bill in that regard has already been solved. Parliament did not believe that it was an infringement upon the liberty of commerce to pass laws against the organization of compacts or combines, by which certain parties control the sale of some products or commodities or raise the price of those articles at their sweet will. It never occurred to parliament that, when called upon to pass such legislation against combines, that they were interfering with or laying a sacrilegious hand upon the sacred principle of commercial freedom. So again, should parliament pass an Act prohibiting usurers' rates of interest, I am of the opinion that far from being an encroachment upon that great principle, the limitation of the rate of interest would result in preventing money-lenders from giving money a fictitious and exhorbitant value.

Objection is taken to the fixing of a maximum rate of interest, say 20 per cent, as likely to bring about a rise in the rate of interest up to that figure in all business transactions; but such objection, to my mind, is groundless. As a matter of fact, the money-lenders who now charge 60 per

cent, 100 per cent and even 200 per cent, would undoubtedly exact the maximum of 20 per cent. But as to loans on which money-lenders, under the statute as it now stands, charge only 10, 12 or 15 per cent, it would not be fair to say that they would be induced to raise their rate of interest owing to a limitation having been fixed by the Bill, beyond which, the rate would be extortionate and usurious. They would very likely, under such circumstances, keep within reasonable bounds, and charge only a moderate interest.

Besides, we know from experience that the fixing of a rate of interest does not necessarily bring about such results. The Banking Act fixes a maximum rate, for the banks, of 7 per cent, for all current business transactions. But, as is well known, the banks, for loans of five thousand dollars and more, charge 5 per cent and even less, notwithstanding the fact that they are allowed under the statute to charge 7 per cent.

This Bill also provides that if a money-lender sues his creditor and obtains judgment against him, the rate of interest shall be reduced to the rate of 6 per cent per annum from the date of said judgment. In this connection, I may say that it was at the special request of the judicature of the province of Quebec and particularly of the district of Montreal that such provision was incorporated in this Bill. On two different occasions, I heard from the bench remarks to the effect that it was greatly to be deplored that the courts were not given the power, when rendering judgment, to reduce the rate of interest. Mr. Justice Gill, when rendering judgment in the case I referred to a little while ago, which condemned the defendant to pay 12 per cent interest per diem, complained bitterly and indignantly that the legislature had not yet grappled with this question and remedied the existing evil.

The Bill contains also a provision respecting existing contracts. From the time of the coming into force of this Bill, no rate of interest, stipulated in contracts or agreements entered into before such date and exceeding 20 per cent, shall bear a rate of interest greater than that maximum rate. Moreover, from the date of the coming into force of this Bill, no rate of interest greater than 6 per cent per annum shall be recovered upon any judgment rendered under the operation of the old Act, just as in the case of judgments rendered subsequent to the passage of this Bill. Of course, the Bill contains a provision for the protection of the rights of third parties, in the case of a money-lender having conveyed a note of hand drawn prior to the passage of this Act. Such third person may recover the amount thereof, but the party discharging such instrument may reclaim from the money-lender any amount paid thereon for interest or discount in excess of the amount allowed by this Act.

Then, we have incorporated in the Bill a penal clause which makes the money-lender who infringes this Act guilty of an indictable offence, and liable to imprisonment not exceeding one year, or to a penalty not exceeding one thousand dollars.

The intention, in providing imprisonment was not only to frame a drastic law, but to attach opprobium to the business of the usurer.

We do not claim absolute perfection for the Bill, and the draft which is now before the House may, no doubt, be recast and improved. For my part, I shall be happy to receive from members of experience in this House, any suggestion they may think proper. I am confident that, with the assistance of the hon. gentlemen, we can, if necessary, amend the Bill so as to render it more acceptable. There are portions of this Bill which can be discussed more practically in committee, when each clause is up for consideration, and when amendments may be suggested and considered. I believe that if it is remodelled in committee in that spirit, it may prove a very useful measure.

But irrespective of any amendment that may be made to this Bill, I appeal in a particular manner to the members of this House to spare no efforts in waging war against usury and removing the evils attendant upon it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Madore) proposes some very radical changes in this Bill, and it contains provisions which have never yet been investigated by a committee. I would ask him if he would state to the House briefly in English, the reasons he thinks would justify the House in adopting the measure.

Mr. MADORE. Mr. Speaker, as I have stated in French, it has become necessary periodically to introduce a measure against Shylocks in different civilized countries during the past centuries. We have had in Canada, as there was in England, a law against usury. This law worked fairly well in England, until about 1853, when it was thought it was not necessary to keep it in force, and for the sake of what was called commercial liberty, the law was repealed. So it was in Canada. Since then, however, it has been found that money-lenders have multiplied everywhere, and that usury has become as great an evil at the present day, as it was when the usury law of England was first passed. Last year, a law was passed in the British House of Commons, containing about the same provisions as the Bill which I now have the honour to submit to this House. In Canada, usury has been the ruin of many young men in the province of Quebec, and, I presume, in other provinces as well. I could mention many and many names of young lawyers, young notaries, young professional men, young bank clerks who handle the money of others, and who having put themselves into the hands of a money-lender without a soul, have been obliged to use other people's money to satisfy the demands of the usurer, and are now either in our penitentiaries or fugitives from justice in foreign countries. It is well, therefore, that we should pass a law to restrict the rate of interest that can legally be charged on a loan. In this Bill, I have limited to 20 per cent per annum, the amount of interest that can legally be charged on loans under the sum of $500. In the case of large loans in which greater risks are incurred, and from which greater benefits are expected, this Bill does not apply. It only applies to loans made to young men for short periods in the general course of their own business. I think that 20 per cent under these circumstances is quite a reasonable rate, and should not be considered as an infringement of the liberty of commerce. These are the principal reasons which I have urged in French in favour of the Bill. The Bill also provides that if a money-lender sues and obtains judgment, a higher rate of interest than 6 per cent should not be allowed from the date of judgment. There is another class which says that for all previous loans which are still undue, from the time of the coming into force of this law, the rate of interest would be reduced to 12 per cent, and on all judgments rendered previously to the effect that the defendant should pay a higher rate of interest than 6 per cent, the rate would be reduced to 6 per cent from the very moment that this law comes into force. Then there is a penal clause which makes the money-lender guilty of an indictable offence, and liable to imprisonment not exceeding one year, or to a penalty not exceeding $1,000, who lends money at a higher rate of interest than that authorized by the Act. It has been thought well to provide for imprisonment, with a view of casting a stigma on the business of the usurer.

Mr. THOMAS FORTIN (Laval). The question of regulating the rate of interest has in most civilized countries excited very much discussion and, at various times, provoked some legislation. From the very earliest period in the Roman state there were laws regulating the rate of interest. In the Middle Ages, as is well known, no interest whatever for the use of money was deemed to be legitimate; and the word 'usury' derives its etymology from that period. Coming down later, we find various statutes passed in England regulating the rate of interest. I believe the first English statute on the subject was 37 Henry VIII., chapter 9, which fixed the rate at 10 per cent per annum. This statute was subsequently repealed and again re-enacted; and finally, the last statute regulating the rate of interest, and declaring an excess of the

rate to be usury was passed in 12 Queen Anne, chap. 16. By that statute the rate of interest was fixed at 5 per cent, and any rate stipulated in excess of that amount was declared to be usury, to which offence a penalty was attached. This law was repealed by 17-18 Vic., c. 90. We have had similar legislation in our own country. The first was 17 George III., chap. 3, which fixed the rate of interest at 6 per cent per annum, and declared null and void all contracts and obligations wherein a rate in excess of 6 per cent was stipulated ; and in addition a penalty was attached to this offence. In 1853 the first step was taken to repeal that statute. By 16 Victoria, chapter 80, the nullity of an obligation or contract whereby a rate of interest in excess of 6 per cent was stipulated, was repealed. Finally, in 1858, by 22 Vict., chap. 85, the statute regulating the rate of interest was repealed, and it became free to money-lenders and all other persons, to stipulate any rate of interest whatsoever. That law has been embodied in our civil code in the province of Quebec, and it is the law to-day. The legal rate of interest, in the absence of any stipulation, is 6 per cent per annum. In France, in the early part of this century, the law merely regulated the legal rate of interest in the absence of any stipulation ; but subsequent to the Code Napoleon, I think in 1807, a law was passed by which a legal rate of interest was established. I think in France to-day the rate is 5 per cent for ordinary transactions and 6 per cent for commercial transactions.

If the Bill before the House were intended to restrict the practice of stipulating the rate of interest in ordinary transactions, I must tell you very candidly that I would be radically opposed to it. I am in favour of liberty in all its forms, particularly in ordinary business transactions. The time when money was regarded as something special, distinct from other commodities in life, has passed. Money is now recognized by all civilized countries as an ordinary commodity the value of which may vary according to time and circumstances. A contract which provides for a rate of interest amounting to 200 per cent or 300 per cent, or even 500 per cent per annum, may look very bad ; but it is well known that at times of commercial crisis such rates of interest are not looked upon as exorbitant, and moreover they are sometimes the only means of avoiding more complete disaster. It is well known that on such days as the Black Friday of Wall Street, interest was stipulated at 2 per cent or 3 per cent per day, and the rate was not looked upon as excessive. What would have happened if the banks had been restricted by law to a certain rate of interest ? The money would simply have been left in the vaults, and instead of one or two big firms going to the wall, perhaps hundreds or thousands would have been ruined. Though I am entirely opposed to any law restricting the ordinary liberty of trade and commerce on this subject, I am not very sure that something ought not to be done for a particular class of people. I am not at all sure that there are enough of those victims described by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Madore) to justify legislation of this character. Of course, the cases that come to light do not present a very agreeable appearance ; but I am happy to say that there are only very few cases, and the question to consider is whether there are a sufficient number of victims of usury to warrant parliament in passing a special measure on the subject. To my mind this is very doubtful. It is well known that paper, whether negotiable or otherwise, is sold to-day, in all centres where money is loaned, for what it is supposed to be worth. A man whose signature is worth something can go to almost any bank and obtain money at a fair rate of interest. How is it, then, that people have to stipulate 50, 60 or 100 per cent per annum ? Because the signature of the man to whom it is loaned is hardly worth anything. The money-lenders in many cases know that they will never recover the amount they lend. Their only hope of recovering anything and making any profit is in stipulating a high rate of interest, and when they have received the interest for twelve months or so, they have recovered their capital, and they run a chance of recovering the remainder. My hon. friend has cited cases that have come before the courts and have called forth remarks from the bench as to the necessity of such a law. But to have an accurate idea of the evil, we should have information as to how much is on the average recovered upon the judgments in such cases. It may be scandalous upon the face of it to find judgments giving 200 per cent or 300 per cent, on the original loan—giving sometimes $2,000 on a loan of $100 or $200. But in 99 out of 100 such cases, I venture to say, the plaintiffs get nothing but the judgments themselves. It may be embarrassing to a defendant to have a judgment registered against him, but as a rule nothing is recovered by the money-lender.

However, I would not take the responsibility of opposing a measure of this kind. I have already said I have very serious doubts whether there is a sufficient number of victims to call for this legislation, but the fact that the proposed statute is not what is called a usury law constitutes its redeeming feature. It is not a law against usury, but intended merely to apply to the transactions of those commonly known as Shylocks or shavers. But is this measure the proper way of dealing with these people ? Would it not be preferable to make a special section in the Criminal Code declaring that parties guilty of such prac-

tices shall be liable to criminal prosecution. I am inclined to believe that that would be the best course, but in default of any such course being adopted I think the present Bill should be at least very carefully considered. It is restricted to money-lenders, and I take it to be almost a copy of the Imperial statute which was passed last year, and it is a matter for regret that this Imperial statute was not passed before, as we then would have had the benefit of the experience of its working in England. But as it has only been in force since the 1st of November, 1900, we are not in a position to judge by experience of the working of that Act. Such an Act might be not only useful, but absolutely necessary in England and yet not necessary in this country, because in England large fortunes are transmitted by the mere effect of the law from one generation to another, and the young men, who are awaiting their inheritance, are liable to fall into the toils of those money-lenders who will discount their expectations. But in this country we have no such law, but are perfectly free to dispose of property by will, and consequently no such evils can arise here as are felt in England.

There is one fault I find and that is in section 3, limiting the rate of interest upon small loans to 20 per cent. I am of the opinion that the legal rate of interest on any amount should be kept within reasonable bounds. In all the laws previously in force in any country, limiting or regulating the rate of interest, such rate never exceeded 10 per cent, and in England that rate was only allowed in the case of maritime hazards. It is very much to be feared that by embodying 20 per cent in this Bill, people will be led to believe that 20 per cent is the legal rate of interest on amounts below $500, so that in avoiding one danger, we may fall into another. Perhaps the simplest way would be to limit the rate of interest after maturity. This, I believe, would do away in a very large measure with the evil existing to-day.

A note is a negotiable instrument and its value is decided by the responsibility of the persons whose names are affixed to it. When a note is negotiated before maturity, the party who takes that note gives for it what he thinks it is worth, and there can be no question of usury in that transaction. The trouble comes after maturity. Take, for instance, a note for $50 at 5 per cent per month. The maker anticipates only paying 5 per cent interest, but if not paid at maturity, then the interest accumulates, and he finds himself under an obligation to pay an amount much in excess of what he anticipated when he made the note.

I simply offer these few remarks as indicating my views on a first perusal of the Bill and not in any spirit of hostile criticism. I believe the measure well worthy of serious consideration, but I doubt whether there is a sufficient number of victims to warrant this parliament interfering with the law and passing this special legislation. However, this Bill is intended specially for the Shylocks, who lend at excessive rates of interest, and will not interfere with legitimate business; and if we cannot make any provision in the Criminal Code that will punish these men, legislation of the kind now submitted may have a beneficial effect.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I regret that I was unable to follow the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill (Mr. Madore), but I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman's object is to remedy what he considers a very great evil. I wish to point out that the hon. gentleman is endeavouring to protect those who come under the exception rather than under the rule that prevails throughout the country. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) very aptly asked the promoter to state in English what the main objects of his Bill were. And the objects as the hon. gentleman gave them resolved themselves into this, to protect young men who live rather extravagantly—though he did not say that, nor am I going to say it, but young men who live beyond their means, properly or improperly—and become indebted to money-lenders, and become discredited and disgraced, and many of whom he says are now fugitives from justice. There may be such cases, but I am sure the House is not prepared to disturb a business useful to the country for the purpose of meeting cases of that kind. I should be glad to see young men protected from the evils the hon. gentleman has referred to; but, we must not injure the great mass of the people for the benefit of the few. If the hon. gentleman has given the slightest attention to usury laws, he knows that, as a rule they have not done what was expected of them. I do not mean to say that we should not restrain money-lenders at all, but it should be done with great care. You cannot lay down an arbitrary rule on this subject without interfering with a perfectly legitimate business in this country. Under the present law, where there is no contract, the borrower is always protected against extortionate rates. But, we must take care not to injure the large class of legitimate borrowers in this country. Take, for instance, the farmers who borrow money at short dates. I will suppose that the hon. gentleman is in the position of a money-lender, carrying on a private bank. No one will pretend to say that private bankers do not perform an important function in the business of the country. Chartered banks do not care for small loans at short dates. The class of borrowers dealt with give a security also that the chartered banks do not care for. Suppose that the hon. gentleman were in the habit of making loans at 20 per cent,

which is the maximum allowed under this Bill. A farmer comes in, and desiring to borrow $50 for fifteen days. For that loan the hon. gentleman would be allowed to charge only about forty cents. He has to look after the money, and see to its collection; and when it comes back, it may remain for fifteen or twenty days before being loaned again. What appears, when stated as a percentage, to be a very high rate, is really not a high rate when the circumstances are all considered. My own experience and observation is that in attempting such regulations as is here proposed, you are very apt to strike a severe blow at the class of people who, though they borrow money in small sums pay it back, and are not disgraced or brought into court. Who is the dependent person in these transactions? The man with the money is not dependent, he can make his own terms—if he cannot make them one way he can in another. These small short date loans would not be made upon negotiable security, but the lender would insist upon a chattel mortgage. So, if a man wished to borrow twenty-five or thirty dollars, it would cost him two or three dollars for drawing and registration. Such a transaction would be a mere evasion of this law; but the man who most needs money will be driven to seek the loan even upon these onerous terms. Suppose a farmer wishes to hold his grain for twenty days, and goes to a private banker to borrow fifty or a hundred dollars. He does not object to paying twenty-five per cent. If, without it, he might be compelled to dispose of his grain at a time when the market was unfavourable, the loss would be far greater than the interest on the money. I would ask the hon. gentleman if there is any general demand for this Bill. Is there any general outery against the sharks and Shylocks whom we have heard of here. There are some, no doubt, but there are men of great respectability carrying on private banks, men who do not charge such exorbitant rates as has been spoken of. The cases against which the hon. gentleman desires to direct legislation, I fancy occur mainly in great centres, where young men are in need of more money than others require. But these cases are comparatively few, and to injure the many in order to protect that few would be a great mistake. I do not think this Bill should go to a committee; the House should have no difficulty in rejecting it at this stage, for it has not a single good feature in it.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I have not had the advantage of hearing the whole of the discussion on this Bill, but I am bound to say I am in favour of giving the measure a fair trial. I do agree with my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) as to there not being a general demand for such a law as this. I did not gather from the remarks of the promoter of the Bill, that the evil which is attempted to be cured is confined to a few young men who have led lives involving too much expense. It is well known in the city of Montreal that the evils of usury are not confined to this class of young men, but are general. The expense of living in Montreal is considerable, and the revenues of a great many people—not young men only, but of many others of a diversified class—are far below what they ought to be to meet these expenses. Many are obliged to have a resort to the money-lenders, and the evil pointed out by my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Madore) arises. Nor is this state of affairs, I believe, confined to the city of Montreal. I believe we shall hear from members of this House that in many other large centres the same thing exists. It exists in England, as is evidenced by the fact that last year a Bill such as this, in fact a Bill after which this seems to have been drafted was passed by the British parliament, and is now on the statute-book, and known as 63-64 Vic., cap. 51, 'The Money-lenders Act.' I have not given this British Act very careful study, but it seems to be exactly the same as the Bill now before us, allowing for some changes made necessary by the difference of circumstances. It is stated that this interferes with liberty. In the first place, let me point out that this Bill is aimed at the Shylocks only. Section 2, defines what a money-lender is. If a man chooses, under the circumstances pointed out by the hon. member for Bothwell, to come to the relief of a farmer, he does not come under the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes.

Mr. MONK. No, not as I understand it, because he is not a money-lender, a man who habitually lends money at a higher rate than 10 per cent; so I say the Bill is restricted to that class of people who make a habit of profiting by the misfortunes of others. As to the other clauses, I think that the limit fixed of 20 per cent is a very reasonable one. Even as in the case spoken of by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), I think the man who lends a sum only for a few days ought to be satisfied with 20 per cent interest. The great difficulty, I think, is that laws of this kind have been passed time and again and have failed to meet the evil. I question very much whether this law, carefully framed though it has been, and in view of the experience of a great number of years with the operations of these money-lenders, will attain the object aimed at. I would ask the hon. member for Hochelaga how he would solve, for instance, a case such as was submitted a moment ago by the hon. member for Lanark. Supposing the hon. member for Hochelaga gives me his note of hand for $100 for one month, and I go to you, Mr. Speaker, and sell it to you for $70; how will this Bill operate to relieve the

member for Hochelaga ? I do not think it is possible to meet a case such as that, although I find in section 4 that extraordinary power is given to the court to examine all the circumstances of the transaction, and the court can give relief if the circumstances appear to justify it. I think the fact that this remedy has been tried in England, where they have adopted an Act to give relief to a large class of people who suffer from the exactions of these money-lenders, would dispose me to give this law a fair trial. It was discussed thoroughly in the Senate last year, and adopted by that body, and I think we should give it a trial.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS St. John and Iberville.) (Translation). Mr. Speaker, the measure brought forward by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Madore) deals with one of the most important and the most intricate problems which can engross the attention of a deliberative body. The trouble is, how to observe the golden means in dealing with a problem with regard to which there has always been such a broad divergence of opinion among men. The old axiom that money is barren and unproductive, no longer holds good nowadays. I believe that my hon. friend, in introducing this Bill, had in his mind the axiom which says that 'virtue is removed from extremes' and that 'you will go with the greatest safety in a middle path'; for, he has chosen a middle path between the extremes of absolute commercial freedom, as it exists now, and absolute restriction as it existed of old.

It is next to impossible to draft a Bill which is not open to some objection or other. It is very seldom that you find a legislation, which does not admit of some exception unforeseen by those who framed it. I think this Bill is entitled to our most serious consideration.

Now, coming to the principle of this Bill, I say that in order to determine whether it should be accepted, we have only to inquire whether there exists such an evil as usury in this country. The Bill now before us is an anti-usury legislation. Usury is the taking of more for the use of money than the law allows, or the extortion of a sum beyond what is legal. Under this Bill the maximum rate of interest is fixed at 20 per cent, and it is an indictable offence to charge a higher rate than that.

That, in the great centres particularly usurers are found who charge extortionate rates of interest is beyond question. The leading newspapers in this country have been denouncing that crying evil for years and years.

Under the circumstances, parliament, I believe, should not hesitate to grapple with this problem, and to give its best consideration to the Bill, which was framed with a view to remedying this evil. The principle of this Bill is excellent, and the committee to which it is to be referred, will, no doubt, give it their best consideration.

They say that such legislation interferes with freedom of trade; but far from encroaching upon the liberty of commerce, it simply aims at checking the rapacity of usurers and protecting our brothers and our children, and all those who are exposed, to be victimized by those Shylocks. It must be borne in mind that liberty is not freedom to do wrong.

Although I agree in principle with this Bill, I reserve to myself the same rights as other hon. gentlemen have to discuss some of the details in committee, and assist the hon. gentleman (Mr. Madore) in making a workable measure out of the Bill he has brought forward. I believe that all usurious contracts and obligations should be declared null and void under common law, for, a contract which contains unlawful or immoral stipulations is *ipso facto* null and void. Such is the principle of contracts such as laid down in our Civil Code, and such is the legislation in force in all countries which have adopted the principles of roman law.

That usurious contracts should be set aside is beyond question. But, I may be told : Are you not afraid of giving the sanction of the law to another immorality, I mean, the risk which the lender would incur of not being paid back ? No, Sir, I entertain no such fear, because the lender may have his recourse by means of another action, that is to say, the lender may recover only to the extent of the amount by which the borrower has benefited.

We could well adopt section 11 of chap. 127 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, which deals with such cases.

I do not intend going at any greater length into the details of the Bill now before the House. I approve of the principle of the measure, and to my mind, the whole question may thus be summed up : Does there exist an evil which calls for such a remedy ?

We owe protection to the weak, and the argument put forward by those who say that the evil is not general enough to call for such drastic legislation, is unfounded. The evil exists, and it is the duty of parliament to grapple with it. In conclusion, I may say that the measure now under discussion is one which deserves our best consideration, and one which commends itself to the approbation of the House.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). While most of those who are supporting the Bill speak from an urban standpoint, I may say that in the western part of Canada and in the new provinces, we need such legislation as that more, perhaps, than it is needed in older provinces. In the new provinces we have men who have failed, to some extent, to succeed in their former places of residence, and have moved out west with the view of bettering their con-

dition. They are not always provided with the means to start an establishment, and are therefore compelled, in many instances, to borrow money, and unfortunately they have to borrow it of those Shylocks, as they have been well described by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin). We have too many of those money-lenders who take advantage of poor men who are trying to improve their condition, and are compelled to resort to men who make a business of lending money at a high rate of interest. Speaking from my own experience, I know many cases where farmers were improving their position, but were compelled to have recourse to these Shylocks, have been in consequence completely ruined; their properties for which they had paid have been in a short time taken from them, and they have been thrown upon the road and ruined through having been compelled to pay as high as, not 20 per cent, not 50 per cent, but 300 or 400 per cent. I say it is time this House should take this monstrous evil into consideration, and adopt some such measure as that presented by my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Madore). It is high time that we should put a stop to the doings of these money sharks, because there is absolute need of legislation such as this in the newer provinces of Canada at least, if not in the older provinces.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). The old battle over free trade in money and attempts to restrict rates of interest, is now being fought over again to a certain extent in the discussion on this Bill. No doubt a great deal can be said from a practical standpoint as to the advantages of free trade in money, that is, leaving men at perfect liberty to hire or lend money. Under many aspects legislative efforts to restrict the rate of interest in matters of business are necessarily very difficult to enforce; but that there have been such efforts made in the past is evident from a study of history. Principles against taking excessive interest have always prevailed in the mother legislature, as well as in the various legislatures of Canada. The only question that can arise upon that point is whether these restrictions can be made available for the purpose of preventing extortion, and as to the effect of these efforts to protect certain persons that the legislature desires to protect. Those who have perused the reports upon the subject of litigation where excessive interest has been exacted, and where judges have been compelled by law to render judgments for large amounts of interest, have been shocked and wounded in their sense of justice. We must admit that the parties who have fallen into these traps are to be pitied, but in the main it is very difficult to protect them, even with the passage of such a measure as this. There are, unfortunately, persons who have no appreciation whatever of the significance of the contract which they have signed. They are, of course, severely pressed for the use of money, like many others, but they are unfortunately unqualified by education or knowledge of financial transactions to know the real nature of the contract which they signed and the obligations under which they are placed, and that the legislature should step in and protect this class of people from extortion I think no one can dispute. As to whether the provisions of this Bill will remedy these evils may be open to question. There are, no doubt, portions of the Bill which can be discussed more practically in committee when each clause is up for consideration and when amendments may be suggested and considered. I notice that this Bill is divided into two parts, to one of which only shall I allude in the few remarks that I propose to make. Clause 9 proposes to add an offence to the Criminal Code and to make persons liable to indictment who charge excessive interest over the rates provided for in this Bill. I question whether the general sense of the committee and the feeling of indignation which people have against those charging excessive interest have gone sufficiently far to declare that a contract which is voluntarily entered into by the supposed victim, and as to which there is necessarily no fraud, should involve a criminal offence. I question whether it is not stretching the powers of this parliament in its jurisdiction over indictable offences too far to make a criminal offence of that which heretofore has not been deemed a criminal offence and which has been deemed a venial offence even from the criminal standpoint. I think there may be discussion as to the advisability of adopting such a course. As to the other questions arising out of the Bill, I think, when we observe that it applies only to contracts where the sum involved is under $500, it is easily perceived that large financial transactions are not affected and that it is only parties who are requiring the use of small sums of money that this Bill is designed to reach. Another question which may arise in committee is as to the definition of the term 'money-lender,' and as to whether the law, professedly operating for the benefit of practically the whole public, should not provide that one class of money-lenders should be placed entirely on the same basis as all other money-lenders. I think it would be found very difficult in practice, as a matter of litigation, to ascertain the real practical meaning of this term 'money-lender.' If the present practices operate so grievously against the poorer classes of the citizens as to require this drastic legislation, I think it would be only proper that it should apply to all persons who lend money, whether they are regular money-lenders or not. With these exceptions, I think the principle of the Bill, as it has commended itself to the British parliament and as it

has commended itself to a number of legislatures on this continent, might well be accepted by the parliament of Canada and the details worked out in committee in order to carry out the design of the hon. gentleman who has brought this measure forward. As far as I am personally acquainted with business transactions in the maritime provinces I am not aware that extortion or that the evils which have been so graphically and picturesquely described by the hon. gentleman have resulted. The evils seem to be rather particular to the city of Montreal and to some of the larger centres of population in the country, and as my hon. friend (Mr. LaRivière), who preceded me, remarked, perhaps in some of the districts of the great west where farmers might find themselves unfortunately involved owing to their ignorance of the contracts they were entering into and owing to their necessities at certain seasons of the year. In the maritime provinces the matter has not been pressed to any great extent on the attention of public men, but with the evidence we have had from the hon. gentlemen who represent these two extremes, I think parliament is honestly bound to endeavour to provide a remedy for that state of affairs which appears to have pressed so grievously upon large classes of the people. I, therefore, while approving of the principle of the Bill, reserve the same right as other hon. gentlemen have to discuss some of the details in committee and endeavour, if possible, to assist my hon. friend in making a workable measure out of the Bill he has brought forward.

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I deem it my duty to offer my congratulations to my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Madore) for having introduced his measure in such eloquent terms. I also congratulate the hon. Senator Dandurand who, upon two different occasions, has brought this Bill before the Senate and has succeeded in having it endorsed by his colleagues. This is a measure of public policy, and although an hon. member has expressed the opinion that the victims of usury were not very numerous after all in this country, I may tell him this : that it is not the consideration of the amount at stake or of the number of victims which should induce us to support the Bill introduced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Madore), but the serious character and the extent of the evil which we are called upon to grapple with.

Alongside with the freedom of doing good, there is also found the liberty of doing wrong, and it is the latter liberty which calls for a restrictive law. We are told that to pass this measure would constitute an infringement upon the freedom of trade. For my part, I confess that I harbour in my breast the highest respect for commercial freedom ; but is it not a matter of fact that every day this principle is being infringed upon, and that commercial liberty is being curtailed ? Are not the customs and excise duties as many limitations of commercial liberty ? And still, handicapped as trade and commerce are by these necessary restrictions, nobody dreams of complaining about it. Therefore I say that parliament is empowered and is in duty bound to restrict the freedom which money-lenders enjoy of charging extortionate rates of interest. To my mind, the rate of interest stipulated by the present Bill is quite reasonable.

We have drifted very far from the doctrine of Christ. We claim to be a Christian people. Both the Imperial parliament and the Dominion parliament are said to be actuated by the most sincere Christian feelings. Now, Sir, without going back very far in the past, I perfectly remember the words of the Divine Master to his disciples : *Mutuum date nihil inde sperantes*, ' Lend, hoping for nothing again.' But, I ask, can it be said that we are living up to this divine precept when we, in a civilized country, are tolerating the exaction of such exorbitant rates of interest by money-lenders ? It is a well-known fact that money-lenders, particularly in the city of Montreal, despoil their victims of everything and even of their honour. I speak with a full knowledge of the facts, and the hon. member for Hochelaga could give the names of money-lenders who charge as high as 200 per cent interest. During my professional career, I have been called upon to occupy in cases before the court of assize where it was shown that young men had been led to the penitentiary by those Shylocks whom my hon. friend has just denounced with so much vigour. Take for instance the case at the 'Banque Ville Marie,' when two young accountants were arrested, after having completely wrecked an institution which had so far been looked upon as perfectly solvent. One of them was sentenced to the penitentiary and the other discharged by reason of his youth. Those two young men had been brought before the court, in consequence of their relations with usurers.

All this goes to show that the existing evil calls for parliamentary interference, and the limitation of the rate of interest when, for instance, you prevent people from taking their money to the lotteries, do you not restrict their freedom ? And yet, parliament did not hesitate to pass legislation for doing away with these lotteries. Again, was it not, on the part of parliament an encroachment upon the liberty of commerce to incorporate in our criminal code clauses making it an indictable offence to form trade combines or trusts, having for their object the undue enhancement of prices. Now, if it is lawful to restrict freedom of trade, with a view to preventing the creation of trusts and combines, and the running of lotteries ; if it is lawful to impose customs and excise duties, I think it is still more lawful to adopt a legislation framed with

a view to protect weak or necessitous men from being overreached or oppressed by usurers.

On these several grounds, I intend to give my support to the Bill introduced by my hon. friend (Mr. Madore), and I hope it will be carried into law.

Mr. F. B. WADE (Annapolis). The question of interest is regulated by chap. 127 R.S.C. and amending Acts. The law is not uniform for all the provinces, certain provisions applying to certain provinces only, and do not have general application. Some of its provisions relate to the province of Nova Scotia only. I refer particularly to section 13, chap. 127 as amended, which provides that at the present time interest upon real estate securities cannot exceed 7 per cent per annum, and on all other contracts, if there is not a stipulation, the rate is 5 per cent and there cannot be an agreement for over 10 per cent. Now, the Bill which we are considering deals with transactions under $500, and legalizes the exacting of interest up to 20 per cent, and so would alter the law as it is in Nova Scotia by increasing the maximum rate of interest upon sums under $500 to 20 per cent. For that reason I object to the Bill. It does seem that the difficulty which is contemplated by the preamble of the Bill exists only in the province of Quebec and therefore it would be well to exempt the province of Nova Scotia from its provisions, or let the same apply only to the province of Ontario and Quebec. If it is desirable that the law should apply to the province of Quebec I am sure I have no objection. We are not troubled with very many money-lenders in the province of Nova Scotia. The great worry with us is to find somebody to lend money to us.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WADE. I was filled with envy when I learned that the young men of Quebec were able to borrow money even at 20 per cent. We in Nova Scotia never found anyone who would favour us thus. I would therefore suggest that the province of Nova Scotia should be omitted from the provisions of this Bill, or if it goes to a committee, I trust that these matters may be considered so that the law may not be affected as it is in our province at the present time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). There is evidently a broad divergence of opinion amongst hon. members with regard to this Bill, and I am glad to say that the cleavage of opinion is not upon political lines. I was not aware until it had been stated here that a similar Bill had been passed by the Senate last year. I knew it was introduced, but I was surprised to hear that it had received the sanction of the Senate. The policy of the government of Canada (not of the existing administration, but of the government of Canada) has always been to permit the utmost freedom of trade in the matter of lending and borrowing money. Many years ago the Usury laws so called, which prohibited the charging of more than a fixed rate of interest, were abolished, and the general opinion will be that since then money has become cheaper and cheaper year after year. I can remember very well when 10 per cent, or even 1 per cent per month was not considered a very inconsiderable charge to make for money on note of hand. That has all passed by now. In the maritime provinces on good security money can be freely borrowed at 5 per cent, and 6 per cent, 7 per cent, and 8 per cent is considered a good interest to pay on note of hand. My hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin) stated the case in a nutshell when he said that while the principle of free trade in regard to the rate of interest is a good one, that possibly there might be exceptional circumstances which would justify a deviation from that good rule. The hon. gentleman from Hochelaga (Mr. Madore) told us that this Bill is based largely upon the Act which passed the Imperial House of Commons last year. I have given some attention to that English legislation and I read the report of the committee upon it and the debate in the House. It must be remembered that the law as it ultimately passed the British House of Commons is not at all of the same nature as the Bill now before us. There are special circumstances existing in England, particularly in London, which do not exist in Canada. Every one knows of the great scandals which resulted from the publication of the transactions of the celebrated usurer Isaac Gordon who died last year.

An hon. MEMBER. Lewis.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No ; I refer to Isaac Gordon; Lewis was another. There is a class of money-lenders in England who carry on their business by means of circulars containing more or less misrepresentations, which class does not exist in this community at all. It was against that class alone that the English legislation was directed. But they did not pass that legislation hurriedly. The matter was brought before the British parliament some years ago, and a special committee, the members of which were selected for their peculiar qualification, was appointed to investigate. They heard a great many witnesses, including some of the most distinguished jurists of the High Court in England ; Mr. Justice Mathew, Mr. Justice Hawkins, and that celebrated solitor, Mr. George Lewis. And, after hearing the evidence of these witnesses as to the existence of the peculiar evil which required remedy, the government introduced the Bill. There was a report made by the committee to which I have referred and upon which the legislation was subsequently based, and that report contains the following :

After carefully considering the evidence which has been given in regard to particular transactions and the general expressions of opinion of persons so well qualified to form a judgment as Sir Henry Hawkins, Sir James Charles Mathew, Sir George Lewis, the inspector general in bankruptcy and the county court judges, your committee have unhesitatingly come to the conclusion that the system of money-lending by professional money-lenders at high rates of interest is productive of crime, bankruptcy, unfair advantage over the creditors of the borrower, extortion from the borrower's family and friends, and other serious injuries to the community.

And although your committee are satisfied that the system is sometimes honestly conducted, they are of the opinion that only in rare cases is a person benefited by loan obtained from a professional money-lender, and that the evil attendant upon the system far outweighs the good.

They therefore consider that there is urgent need for the interposition of the legislature with a view to removing the evil.

I take it that if any facts were given to this House to show a condition of affairs in Canada similar to those that exists in England there would be little hesitation in passing the necessary legislation. But, who has contended in this House that the present system of lending at higher than 6 per cent, or 10 per cent, or perhaps higher than 20 per cent in exceptional cases ; who in this House has pretended to cite facts showing that that system has been productive of 'crime, bankruptcy, unfair advantage over other creditors of the borrower and extortion from the borrower's family and others.' These things may exist in Canada, but we have not heard of them. Speaking for the part of the Dominion I have the honour to come from, I do not know that any such things exist. I have spoken with some of my maritime province friends and we are pretty well agreed that the evil does not exist to any great extent in these provinces. The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), who is a distinguished member of the legal profession living in Montreal, is not able to state that in his judgment a very serious state of affairs exists there, and I understand it is largely upon the conditions said to exist in Montreal that this Bill is introduced.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In the whole province.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. While I do not challenge the statement which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) makes——

Mr. LEMIEUX. And amongst the farmers too.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. So far as I can gather from statements of gentlemen on the other side of the House, there is no evil in the province of Ontario calling for this legislation. I know the evil does not exist in the maritime provinces, but on the statement of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) and the statement of the hon. gentleman from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), the evil may exist in the provinces of Manitoba and Quebec. If it does exist to any great extent, I have no doubt the House will be prepared to grapple with it.

Let us just see what the Bill is which my hon. friend proposes. He does not propose as a rule to remedy the extortion, which he states sometimes exists, of undue interest. His Bill is intended to apply only to a particular class of cases, that is, in the first place, to loans below $500. Under his Bill you could charge 40, 60 or 70 per cent on a loan of $501 or above that. There is no attempt to limit the rate of interest on such loans. Therefore, he has to show a special condition of circumstances existing which justifies us in adopting the arbitrary limit of $500, and making illegal a rate of interest on sums below $500 which we are willing should be legal on sums above that amount. But the hon. gentleman says also, and says properly, that we must confine the legislation also to a particular class, that is, money-lenders. In defining this class he has tried to give definiteness to that which otherwise would be entirely vague. He proposes that the Bill shall apply only to one who makes a practice of lending money at a higher rate than 10 per cent per annum. That in itself is not very definite. It would be difficut to prove, before the benefits of the law could be invoked, that any particular money-lender came within that category. The English law, of which this purports to be more or less a copy, provides that the money-lender shall be registered, both by name and by place of business, and that he shall only do business under the registered name, and at the registered place. He is thus made a special class set apart, and is registered under one of the departments of the state and receives a license. If he attempts to do business at any other place or under any other name than that registered, he is liable to a criminal prosecution and punishment.

My hon. friend will see further that it would be absolutely essential to do in this Act what is done in the English Act—exempt from its operation all friendly societies. The hon. gentleman in his definition exempts pawnbrokers, and very properly. But that would not be sufficient. There are companies, such as building societies, loan companies and friendly societies, authorized by parliament to carry on business, and they might very well under some circumstances come within the operation of this Act. I take it that they would have to be exempted, as also all banking and insurance companies, who also might come under the operation of this Act, if left as it is now.

But assuming that we got on that far and agreed as to the class of people who should come within the purview of the Act, and those who should be exempted,

what would be the next step ? My hon. friend undertakes in the third section to make the contract illegal, and then he goes on to give power, in case a suit is brought under the contract, to the judges to intervene in certain cases. I venture to suggest to him that if his Bill goes to a committee, it would be better to follow the English Act, and not declare that the transaction in itself shall be illegal at all, but confine our legislation to two things—to refusing to permit the machinery of the courts to be used to give effect to an improper transaction when we define what an improper transaction is, and, if necessary, giving power to the borrower to have the transaction opened up in court.

The hon. gentleman proposes to make, as a criterion of what would be a rascally and unconscionable transaction, a fixed rate of interest. Now, I agree thoroughly with what the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) said. The mere mention of a rate of interest is no test of the bona fides or mala fides of a transaction. I can well conceive that under certain circumstances 20 per cent would be a most rascally rate of interest, while under other circumstances it would be nothing but fair. Every hon. gentleman knows that if a man were borrowing $1,000 or $2,000 on the security of a good farm, 20 per cent would be rascally extortion ; but if a man wanted to borrow $1,000 when his credit would not enable him to get it at a bank at the bank rate, when he had no security to deposit, nothing except his own name, it may well be that his credit would be so bad and the circumstances surrounding the transaction such that 20 per cent would be charged, and would be no evidence of mala fides at all. He might perhaps want the loan only for a day or for a week. My hon. friend from Laval cited the case of the celebrated Black Friday in New York, when as much as this prohibited rate of interest was charged for a week, let alone for a year ; and there are circumstances that occur from time to time in the lives of commercial men, particularly in large cities, when it is absolutely essential that they must have large sums of money ; and they must pay large rates of interest for it, because they do not happen to have, at the moment, the necessary security.

Therefore, I would venture to suggest to my hon. friend that he should follow the principle adopted in the English Act. What is that principle ? It is one which may not commend itself to every member of the House. It does not accept the rate of interest as the test, but the whole transaction as it will appear to the court, and it is left entirely to the court to be determined on the evidence, whether the transaction is an unconscionable one which ought to be set aside, or whether it is not. Many men will say, that is a very poor test, because some judges would take an ethical view of the facts, and others a very different view. I agree to that. I know judges who would look upon more than 10 per cent as outrageous under any conceivable circumstances, while others would look on 20 per cent as quite reasonable and fair. Therefore, to leave the matter absolutely to the courts to determine the character of each transaction, is very much like the test of the length of a judge's foot, or how far he will stretch his conscience ; but I know of no other, and that was the one adopted in the English Act eventually. As the Act was introduced, it contained a schedule with a fixed rate of interest beyond which it was illegal for the lender to charge ; but before the Bill passed through parliament that was eliminated, and it simply provided :

1.—(1.) Where proceedings are taken in any court by a money-lender for the recovery of any money lent after this Act comes into operation, or the enforcement of any agreement or security made or taken after the commencement of this Act in respect of money lent either before or after the commencement of this Act, and there is evidence which satisfies the court that the interest charged in respect of the sum actually lent is excessive, or that the amounts charged for expenses, inquiries, fines, bonus premium, renewals, or any other charges, are excessive, and that, in either case, the transaction is harsh and unconscionable, the court may re-open the transaction, and take an account between the money-lender and the person sued, and may, notwithstanding any statement or settlement of account or any agreement purporting to close previous dealings and create a new obligation, reopen any account already taken between them, and relieve the person sued from payment of any sum in excess of the sum adjudged by the court to be fairly due in respect of such principal, interest and charges as the court, having regard to the risk and all the circumstances, may adjudge to be reasonable ; and if any such excess has been paid, or allowed in account, by the debtor, may order the creditor to repay it ; and may set aside, either wholly or in part, or revise, or alter, any security given or agreement made in respect of money lent by the money-lender, and if the money-lender has parted with the security may order him to indemnify the borrower or other person sued.

In the evidence taken before the House of Commons in England, it was shown that cases were brought before the courts of such an excessively cruel and harsh nature that the county court judges had either to evade the law or else be a party to a gross injustice. In England the courts have the power to make judgments payable by instalments, and in some cases they made the instalments so ridiculously low that the amount could never be recovered by the lender. In that way the courts evaded the law and protected the borrower against gross injustice. To put an end to this condition of affairs, the English Act provided that the judges dealing with such cases could inquire into all the circumstances, and give a judgment decreeing what they thought reasonable and fair. If a judge came to the conclusion that the transaction

was a harsh and unconscionable transaction, he had power to open it up again, but not otherwise. That provision I suggest to the hon. member for consideration, as one which he might incorporate in his Bill, but he has taken an entirely different line by establishing an arbitrary rate of interest, without taking into consideration the circumstances under which the loan may have been made or the person to whom it was given.

I would draw my hon. friend's attention to what may have been unintentional on his part, and that is, that he has made the section retroactive. The provisions of his Bill extend to transactions which are legal under the law as it stands. I do not suppose he intended to make his measure retroactive and apply it to transactions which were perfectly legal under the present law.

There is another feature of the English law which commends itself to my mind, and that is, that not only can the court reopen the whole case when the suit is brought by the lender, but the borrower himself has the right to initiate proceedings to have the transaction declared harsh and unconscionable. Suppose a money-lender chooses to lay upon his oars and say : This young man has prospects in the future, I will not sue him now, my note is bearing 2 per cent a month, and I can afford to put it by in the safe and let it lie there until I can collect it. Well, under the English law, the borrower would have the right to initiate proceedings himself in order to have the transaction set aside and a fair agreement come to.

Therefore, I submit to my hon. friend that the principle adopted in England is entirely different from that he asks us to adopt, and that instead of fixing the rate of interest he should leave that entirely to the judgment of the courts.

Then, provisions should be made to protect the bona fide assignee of a note.

Mr. MADORE. Section 5 does this.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think it goes far enough. This section provides :

> The bona fide holder, before maturity of a negotiable instrument discounted by a preceding holder at a rate of interest exceeding that authorized by this Act, may nevertheless recover the amount thereof?

From whom ?

Mr. MADORE. From the lender.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The English legislature very properly protected the bona fide holder for value without notice. It provides that nothing in the Act shall affect the rights of any bona fide assignee or holder for value without notice.

Then, there is a very objectionable principle in the Bill referred to by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), and that is, you are, in a partial way at least, giving legislative sanction to an exorbitant rate of interest. One part of the Bill provides for an interest of 20 per cent, and that rate would be accepted by the whole community as the legal rate of interest up to $500. I do not think we should give legislative sanction to a 20 per cent rate of interest, because we would be thereby re-enacting the usury law to that extent. We have hitherto let the lending and borrowing of money depend upon the contract the parties might make between them, and if you determine to interfere with that policy, you should only do so to a very limited extent, and only where you have evidence of very serious evils which call for interference.

Section 9, in my opinion, would have to be remodelled, because it is certainly retroactive and unfair. My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) seemed to doubt whether we had the power to pass legislation of this kind, but no doubt we have the power, whatever may be our view of the policy, of incorporating criminal and civil legislation in the one Bill. Our power to make the practice a criminal one is unquestionable.

In my opinion the frame of the Bill will have to be largely recast before it can be accepted by this House. We should drop the fixing of any special rate in the Bill as evidence that the transaction is bona fide or malâ fide; and, if we attempt to proceed at all, we must proceed on the lines of only prohibiting the forms and the powers of the court from being used to enforce an unrighteous contract ; let the judge determine on all the facts of the case, whether the transaction brought before him comes within that definition or not; and, if it is a harsh, and unconscionable, and unjust contract, give the judge the power to open it up, and let him determine on the facts of the case. I think, also, we shall have to agree upon defining what a money-lender is. We must exempt the societies and corporations to which I referred, otherwise they would be brought within the purview of the Act, and we would have to decide whether the money-lenders we are striking at ought not to be registered, and have their business governed by the law as under the English Act.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Speaking for Toronto, and from what I know of Ontario, I do not think there is any need for this Bill. I have heard very little complaint, certainly of late years, of any great hardship in connection with usury. When times are hard, it is quite natural that cases will happen of very high rates of interest being charged. But, I do not think many such cases prevail, at any rate, in the older communities. I dare say that in Manitoba things may be different, and that there, money being scarce, very high rates will be charged. I think it would be a mistake to enact such a law as this, for it is not required now, and it would have a very

bad effect as interfering with freedom of trade in this regard. If a man is desparately hard up, he will borrow money from a money-lender if he can, no matter what laws you make to prevent him doing so; and, often the more difficult you make the borrowing of money under these circumstances, the higher the rate the borrower has to pay, because of the greater risk the lender runs; and yet the lending and borrowing will go on where men are bound to have money, and other men will lend it at a very high rate taking risks. I fail to see how any good can come of this Bill, even if it is passed by the House.

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

(In Committee.)

Mr. BRITTON. There is a great deal of opposition to this Bill in the country. I express now no opinion on the merits of the measure; but those who are opposing it and making representations to this House with reference to it, expect that the Bill will go to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and that they can state their wishes there. It seems to me that putting the Bill through the different stages now, would only invite the opposition to it which, perhaps, will not tend to such calm and fair discussion of it as would result if the Bill were referred, and further time taken for the discussion of its provision.

Mr. TISDALE. I beg to move that the Committee rise.

Mr. FLINT. I think there is a great deal of force in the recommendation of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), if he desires further consideration. But the effect of that motion would be that the Bill would be practically destroyed.

Mr. TISDALE. That is what I moved for.

Mr. FLINT. If the motion were that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again——

Mr. TISDALE. No, we want to get a vote on the Bill.

Mr. FLINT. The effect of the motion I speak of would be to continue the Bill on the Order paper. As one favourable to the principle, but objecting to some of the details, I would not object to the Committee reporting, that we might have further time for discussion. The contention of my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) that this Bill should go before the Banking and Commerce Committee has much force in. Though this is a public Bill, and does not necessarily go to the Banking and Commerce Committee, the House has always recognized that in the case of any Bills of an exceptional character it is well to have them discussed either before a standing committee of the House or before a special committee. The Banking and Commerce Committee would have the advantage not only of the opinions of very able members representing the legal and commercial classes, but there would be a full hearing from gentlemen outside who could give valuable evidence as to some of the questions of fact that have come up in this discussion. The questions of fact raised are as to the necessity for the Bill in, say, the maritime provinces or the province of Ontario, or whether certain provinces might not well be exempt from its operations. My hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Wade) has raised the question whether, if this Bill should be adopted, there would not be a necessity for amending some of the laws relating to usury in the province of Nova Scotia. I have not looked into that question, but it is well worthy of consideration. If it is in accordance with the rules of the House, I would move in amendment that this Bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. SPEAKER. That would be irregular; it could not be done.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I want the gentleman who introduced the Bill, which certainly received some support from both sides of the House, to have something like fair-play in the matter. I stated my objections to the Bill very frankly and fully, and suggested lines on which I thought he might redraft it. For one, I am not prepared to kill the Bill right off without giving some time, at any rate, for him to consider the suggestions made on both sides of the House. I recognize that this Bill is not an ordinary Bill, it is a matter of grave importance, affecting the commercial transactions of our people from one end of Canada to the other, and, therefore, it is not to be treated hastily. I do not think it is a fair way to treat the Bill to move that the Committee rise, at any rate, until after my hon. friend tells me that he will not consider the suggestions. If he says he will not consider the suggestions made on the second reading at all, or consider the propriety of redrafting his Bill, why, that would be another thing. But I understand that he is prepared to consider the suggestions made, and, therefore, I thought that we ought not to rise, but that we ought to report progress.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I have no such desire, but I gathered from the expressions of opinion that were made that we were simply wasting the time of the House, because the feeling is against the Bill. I have no desire whatever to interfere with the Bill or be unfair to the Bill. If there is any such suggestion as that, I beg to withdraw my motion. I thought the members had sufficiently expressed themselves, and I wanted to go on with the Bill.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. MADORE. I need not say to the Committee that I am quite prepared to receive any suggestions that may be made from either side of the House, or from a committee to which that Bill may be referred later on. The draft I have just submitted contains the principle of the Bill, and provided that principle is admitted, I am quite willing to go either to a Committee of the whole House or to a special committee, there to consider any suggestions that may be made. For instance, the suggestions made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are certainly deserving of discussion and consideration. We did not follow the lines of the English Bill because we considered that the circumstances in this country are not the same as in England, especially those in the province of Quebec. We did not propose to give to the judge the power to reopen the case, to go back to the beginning of the transaction, in order to ascertain whether the rate of interest charged is too high or not, and to leave that question altogether to his discretion. We thought that according to our procedure in the province of Quebec such a provision would be almost impracticable. When the borrower was sued by the lender for the amount claimed to be due, capital and interest, if the rate of interest was too high, and if it was left entirely to the judge to decide what amount should be charged, the defendant, even if he admitted his indebtedness, could not know the exact amount he would have to pay, and he could not make a tender to the plaintiff because in order to do so he must tender the amount that he really owes. If he does not tender the full amount of his debt, even if he succeeded in having the rate of interest claimed from him reduced, the whole cost of the contestation would fall on his shoulders.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not necessarily ; a judge has discretion.

Mr. MADORE. A judge has discretion, no doubt, but this is the general principle followed in the province of Quebec, and it requires extraordinary circumstances before a judge can change that almost universal principle. Then the debtor would succeed in having the rate of interest reduced, and would have to pay the costs, perhaps more costs than if he had paid the whole amount demanded from him by the action. This is one of the objections we discussed when we framed the Bill, and this is one of the considerations that determined us to take other means, that is, fixing the maximum rate of interest, and that is why we have put it in the draft. Now, after discussion, we might come to the conclusion that the means adopted by the English parliament are better than those incorporated in the draft. But I think we should be given an opportunity of discussing the various provisions, and it is for that reason, now that the motion of my hon. friend has been withdrawn, that I move that this committee do now rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as any question of fairness in the motion of my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Tisdale) is concerned, I do not think that will arise at all, because if it is the opinion of the House that the Bill should not proceed further, it is perfectly proper for my hon. friend to make the motion that he did. So far as the object of the Bill is concerned, I have no doubt it is intended to redress what may have been an evil. It may be a question, however, whether it is an evil that can be redressed by legislation, because the complexity of business matters is such, and there are so many degrees of improvidence in the manner in which people conduct their business, that it is absolutely impossible to cover every case of the kind by legislation. If parliament is to deal with this matter at all, I would much prefer it should deal with it on the lines of the English legislation, for reasons which have been set forth by many hon. gentlemen in the House, and which I need not repeat. The idea of the English legislation seems to be this : There are contracts which the courts will set aside on account of the situation of the parties, for example, by reason of duress, or by reason of certain relations existing between the parties, such as those of solicitor and client, or guardian and ward. Now, what the English parliament has done is simply to add to the grounds upon which the courts can set aside contracts, the circumstances that an excessive rate of interest has been taken. One disadvantage attending that mode of dealing with it is, of course, that it may involve a long and protracted inquiry, and involve a large amount of costs with respect to a comparatively small sum. Still, on the whole, I should think, if we are to deal with this matter at all by legislation, that would be better than the way proposed in the Bill before the committee. I would think that a better course to take with regard to this Bill would be to refer it to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. We understand that last year, in the Senate, a Bill of a somewhat similar character was referred to a special committee, and that committee made a very exhaustive inquiry. For my part, I would think that if this Bill is to be proceeded with, it would be better to discharge the order and to move to have it committed to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and then that committee could make such amendments to it as might be suggested by the hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill or by any other hon. gentleman. Under such circumstances, we could deal with the Bill more effectively than we can at present.

Mr. MONK. I am favourable, as my hon. friend knows, to his Bill, but it occurs to me that the feeling of the House at the present time is against it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not at all.

Mr. MONK. In its present form. I think the best way to deal with the Bill would be to refer it, as was done in the Senate, to a special committee, upon which there would be representatives from each province, who could confer and also compare with it the English legislation which in many details differs from those of this Bill. When that has been done the House will be better able to appreciate the Bill than it is to-day.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The motion made by my hon. friend is that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. The only reason that I for one did not press the motion to go into Committee was that there had been a good deal of discussion on the second reading, half finished discussion, which really ought to have been a discussion in Committee, and I thought when we got here and commenced to discuss the details, we would proceed a certain distance, and if the feeling of the House was against the Bill, we could report progress, or dispose of it in Committee the way we pleased. It is quite evident that the Bill will either have to go to a select committee named for the purpose, or to one of the standing committees of the House, such as the Banking and Commerce Committee. My hon. friend in moving that the committee rise and report progress, is taking a step in that direction. He will consider afterwards which course he will take, refer the Bill to a special committee, or refer it to a standing committee.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the House ought to know now the course that the hon. gentleman proposes to adopt. This is a very important Bill, and a great many valuable suggestions have been thrown out on the assumption that the Bill shall be passed in some form or another. There are a very large number of hon. gentlemen in this House who think that the Bill should not pass in any form. The House ought to know what course the hon. gentleman proposes to take.

Mr. MADORE. Mr. Chairman, the course I intend to take is to ask that this Bill be referred either to the Banking and Commerce Committee or to a special committee, formed as suggested by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). As I have had no time to think over that last proposal, and as I would like the committee to be as equal and impartial as possible, between both sides of the House, and to be representative of the different provinces, I ask that the committee rise, so that between now and the next sitting, we will have an opportunity of agreeing together.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I have formed an opinion of this Bill, and before voting upon it, I think I have a right to demand the fullest information which can be given in regard to a measure of this character. It is very evident that the circumstances which have occasioned it, and the scope and application of the Bill, are largely confined to one province, and are not applicable to the other provinces of the Dominion. Therefore, I, an inhabitant of another portion of the country than that which is the subject of this Bill, ask for some better reasons than those which have been given by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Madore), who has brought this Bill forward and who is appealing to the judgment of those from other provinces in order to influence their opinions, and to induce them to give their sanction to a Bill of a very severe character. If I read correctly this Bill, and I do not profess to be a lawyer, the court has to come in and nullify, if necessary, an agreement entered upon in good faith. Further on in this Bill, if I understand it, there is a very severe penalty imposed upon any one who violates its provisions, and who, by one inducement or another, is prevailed upon to lend money at a rate of interest in excess of that stipulated in the Bill. I consider, although the object of the Bill may be a good one, although the hon. gentleman may aim, in the principle of his Bill, at putting down an improper practice which may prevail in his portion of the country, especially where this Bill will have application to one of the provinces in the country, and where the conditions complained of do not exist, that the measure is one of a very harmful character. I see in the 9th clause that every money-lender who lends money at a rate in excess of the rate set down in the Bill, is guilty of an indictable offence, and is liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year, or to a penalty not exceeding $1,000. I consider that provision one which should demand the fullest attention of hon. gentlemen in this House, and also that hon. gentlemen from other provinces in the Dominion should consider whether the situation of the country demands the passage of such a severe measure as this, imposing such restrictions and penalties. I know, Sir, that a money-lender is a very odious object in this country, I know that a man who has money is sometimes an object of opprobium, and I know a great many people are willing to inveigh against people who have money, to declare that they are an injury to the community, and that as speedily as possible, either by Act of parliament, or by act of the persons themselves, this money shall be got away from

those who have it and distributed amongst those who have none. I know that to stand up and defend money-lenders, or bankers, or any of that objectionable class, is sometimes a work of supererogation, and that the person who does so renders himself an object of suspicion to all sorts of people. Now, Sir, it may be that the person who lends money, under precisely the circumstances set out in this Bill, may do the individual who has accepted the loan a life-long benefit. I know that young men who, under certain distressing circumstances, would have given 100 per cent, afterwards to be paid, if they could have got a loan which would have saved them from disgrace and utter ruin when their prospects were such that a kindly loan of a little money would have relieved them perhaps from the severe strain through which they had to pass. If a person would come forward and make a loan under those circumstances, a borrower would look upon him as a life-long benefactor. There are other situations like that which I have disclosed, but there are also circumstances in which a man might become involved commercially. A man also may have a speculation in hand which may return him a large amount of profit, but, he is unable to embark upon it, simply from the fact that he has not the fulcrum upon which to place the lever. In my experience I have often helped people with small loans of money, and I will give a little suggestion to some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who, on some occasions, may be disposed to be benevolent. I find that in some cases it was not safe to charge any rate of interest at all, but to place the thing simply upon the honour of the individual, because, if you charged 10 per cent, or 25 per cent, or 50 per cent, the borrower would say : That man paid himself out of the money he extorted from me out of my necessities, and I will not pay him back again. If you stand upon a man's honour and give him a timely loan, he is very far down in the scale of manhood, if he has the money, if he does not come forward and pay you for the loan. There is another case ; there are a great many gentlemen who come to you for a small loan for a very short time, and it is always safe to lend such a one a small amount, because in a great many cases he will never come back to see you, and if he does come back, perhaps he will pay that loan and want to borrow more from you. Now, this Bill is to a great extent founded in reprobation of the practices of the Jews. We know the history of the Jews. Some hon. gentlemen opposite know the history of the Jews. Some do not.

I am not going to refer to the history of Jews as set down in the sacred books, because I know every gentleman opposite is familiar with that ; but, I am going to refer briefly to the history of the Jews in the Dark Ages. You will remember that from A.D. 600 to the time of the Reformation, the Jews were very prevalent in Spain and Portugal and Germany. They did not deal in real estate nor in tangible securities ; they usually looked to the good faith of the individual, and they were keen judges of character, but they had a uniform rate of 5 per cent per month interest. The interest for two years ate up the principal, and if there were any mortgage attached to the loan, the Jew got the property. That condition continued until the Jews had secured a very large portion of the real estate in those countries. It, therefore, became an object for all those who were debtors of the Jews, or those who hated the Jews, to unite in those frightful persecutions which took place in the Dark Ages so called. Now, Sir, I think there is something of the spirit of that persecution in this Bill. Perhaps the hon. gentleman himself or some of his friends have suffered from the exactions of the Jews in the province of Quebec. In that happy portion of the Dominion whence I come, and from which the hon. leader of the opposition comes, the great difficulty there is to obtain a reliable person to whom to lend any money. In fact, if one bank obtains a good loan all the directors and the manager and the clerks of the rival banks set out to say to the borrower : Oh, the bank over there has charged you 5½ per cent, and we have lots of money that we lend out to railway corporations—sometimes on pretty good security and sometimes on pretty bad security—come over to our bank and we will treat you well. And if the borrower has good responsibles and security, and if it be an undertaking which, in addition to its own inherent merit, has something of popular favour to commend it, why, all the directors of that bank unite to use their personal influence, and sometimes their political influence, to induce the corporation or individual to take the loan from them, which starts the undertaking on its way and which undertaking may ultimately prove a benefit to the individual as well as to the people of the country. In my portion of the country, not only were the banks content to lend to all customers who could bring forward good security, but they came up to the city of Montreal, this pest district that has been referred to. They entered into rivalry with the Bank of Montreal and the Bank of Toronto and the bank of everywhere else, and they loaned money to all good customers who had proper securities at lower rates than the Bank of Montreal or the Bank of Toronto, or any of those protected institutions could afford to. Why, these banks were driven to the state of New York to lend their money, and the Bank of Nova Scotia, and the other banks in my province have come up to Canada to stay. They have opened up there benevolent institutions in other provinces ; they have

gone to the extreme verge of civilization on the Pacific coast to open branches ; they have gone to the West Indies ; they have gone to Trinidad, and they have gone to all parts of the earth from that little city of Halifax to lend money to every one who needed it, and who could bring forward good security. The good security is the thing, gentlemen. These banking institutions from Nova Scotia have gone to other nationalities ; they have gone to Brazil, and they have loaned money there to build railways, and they have loaned money to build railways in Jamaica, and if any person came forward with a good and matured scheme for completing the Panama canal or building the Nicaragua canal, there is plenty of capital in this country which enterprising men would lend to construct these great public works which carry on the commerce of the world. That brings me home to the subject of this Bill, and I say that the Bill has running through it the negative to the main essential of every Bill of a sumptuary character, which is, that the loaning of money is dependent upon good security, and that the money will follow the good security. Without asking for proof or without any general corroboration of the statements made by hon. gentlemen, I will assume it to be a fact that there is usury in the city of Montreal. Those money-lenders always scrutinize carefully the quality of the security, and it is because there is a risk in the security, and the man is afraid that he will neither get his principal or his interest, that he charges a high rate. The money-lender ought to be paid for that risk, and he also ought to be paid for the opprobrium that a man in his business experiences. The fact that he first of all possesses the money, and secondly, that he has not yielded to the solicitation of the borrower sooner but has put him off from day to day, is also to be considered. Now, what remedy is suggested ? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Madore) has told us that his province is suffering under the exactions of these money-lenders, and he has disclosed a situation which is alarming. But I would like to know what would be the situation if the money-lenders were not there ? Has the hon. gentleman ever contemplated the condition of people in desperate circumstances where there is no money-lender to relieve them at 10 per cent or 20 per cent or 50 per cent ? Does he not know that there are extreme cases of poverty and want occurring from day to day where a man wishes only to obtain a temporary loan, where a little ready money would be a great relief to families, and when those men who have money to lend are hailed as benefactors ?

Now, Sir, I set out with these two essentials: the security, and the money that is to be loaned upon the security. But, I would say this, that if this money-lending is so profitable in that portion of the country, under the ordinary law of supply and demand would not capital flow in ? Would not there be many money-lenders ? Would they not preponderate in the community until they would outnumber the borrowers? Would not those men who are ready to embark in precarious enterprises, who are willing to risk a good deal with the object of making a good deal, go and open in Montreal their pawnbroking shops, and their money-lending shops, in order to lend money to needy people ? And would not they, among them, reduce the rate of interest to ordinary commercial limits ?

I have not at all referred to those risks which are specially precarious—those which are speculative, like the stock exchange, like lotteries, like other operations which may be termed gambling. I have not gone into anything of that kind—into cases where perhaps a young gentleman has contracted a debt of honour, or those cases where a person has assumed a personal obligation, under circumstances which demand of him the discharge of his obligation. But, I have used ordinary commercial transactions, and I have hinted at remedies which can be brought forward in the ordinary commercial way.

Now, if the hon. gentleman would be content to take one provision of his Bill, and make the forfeiture of the loan the penalty for charging an excessive rate of interest, perhaps there would be many in this House who would be disposed to give their support to his measure. His intentions are benevolent and right. I have no doubt he has been shocked to see how many persons in the community have perhaps been beggared, or deprived to a large extent of their means, by the excessive rates charged by these money-lenders. To me, the thing was quite a novelty. I did not know that it existed in the community. My poor wits have been exercised for a long time in money institutions in endeavouring to find profitable modes of investment for money—to procure good customers who would take loans, and who, the security being good, would be able to pay a fair rate of interest. In other provinces of the Dominion the rate of interest is speedily diminishing, and people who have capital to embark, and who obtain their livelihood from the interest derivable from their capital, are seeking for places of investment. I think the remedy for the evil aimed at by this Bill would be to strike out the clause which calls for fine and imprisonment, and make the loan unlawful when an excessive rate of interest is charged.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Hon. gentlemen opposite may think that I have been arguing merely to consume the time until six o'clock; but that is not the case, because I stood up immediately after the hon. gentleman proposed his Bill to ask from him information which would guide me as to the

proper course to pursue. I was a little startled by the clauses of this Bill when I read them, because of their severe punitive nature. We tried in Nova Scotia at one time such an Act as this, and it was ordained by the legislature that a loan contracted in that way would be forfeited if the rate of interest were above 6 per cent; and afterwards that law was repealed.

At six o'clock, the committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at 8 o'clock.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). When the House rose at six o'clock, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) was addressing the House on the Bill now before the committee, and I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not now present, as some of the remarks I intend to make have special reference to what he said. Many of the clauses of this Bill have my support because they are intended to relieve the habitants in the province of Quebec from the exactions of the money-lenders, and judging from the enthusiasm thrown into the debate by the hon. gentlemen who support this measure, the Quebec habitant must be suffering severely. My hon. friend from Halifax undertook to show us that the money-lenders ought to have the sympathy of this House, but for my part my sympathies are all drawn to the poor habitant of Lower Canada. We all know how difficult it is for men who have settled on the soil to make both ends meet, especially when blest with the large families which are one of the characteristics of our French Canadian compatriots. In old France I believe there is a premium offered for large families, and I think it would be a better policy on the part of this government to pay a premium for a similar purpose here rather than spend the money in bringing out immigrants from the old world.

The hon. member for Halifax, I am told, is a farmer, but he is also one of the wealthiest men in this House. In fact, I believe he is a millionaire. Let me say here that the hon. gentleman is a personal friend of mine, whom I hold in very high esteem, and I am sorry he is not now in the House. He is, I believe, a philosopher, a thoughtful man, and do yon know, Mr. Chairman, I have an invitation to visit him in Halifax. He is the first millionaire I ever had an invitation to visit, and I expect he will be the last.

I am satisfied that it would be impossible for the Lower Canadian habitant, if he lived in the province of Ontario, to pay 20 per cent interest on money, and I do not think that the soil in the province of Quebec is any better than it is in Ontario. And these Shylocks—I am not introducing the name—who are stripping the agriculturists of this country of everything they can earn, will no doubt have a great deal to answer for, if there is another world. Six per cent, in my opinion, is ample interest to charge for advances, and I do not believe that the men who ask that rate should go to jail. I do not believe in sending any man to jail, because then the country has to keep him, for he does not earn anything like enough to pay the cost of his living, even when he is employed making binder twine.

In my opinion, this Bill should be recast. It should be submitted to a special committee composed of some of the best men in this House, and in which the farming element will be represented, and then we may have a Bill which will protect the habitant in the province of Quebec from being imposed upon and robbed of his home, as we are told he is to-day. Just fancy a poor habitant, with ten or a dozen children, and only 100 acres of land. Of course the children may be of considerable help to him, but when they grow up, only one of the boys can have the farm and the others have to leave, and unfortunately many of them go to the southern republic. We are trying to provide homes for them in the North-west and many are going there, but in any case only one of the boys remains on the farm, and he has to work day and night until he has paid off their share to the others. Then when he marries and his family grows up the same process takes place again. Consequently each farmer has to go to the loan company and mortgage his little farm to pay off his brothers and sisters; and if he is a hard-working man, and is blest with a good and industrious wife, he may succeed in paying off the debt, but by that time there will be another family of ten to provide for. This is why the farmers have to go to the money-lenders and Shylocks and build up a class of millionaires in this country.

We do not want only two sets of men in this country, millionaires and paupers, but we are coming to that as fast as we can and it is time we should pass some legislation to give the poor habitant a chance.

Progress reported.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW AMENDMENT.

Mr. GEORGE A. CLARE (South Waterloo) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 5) to amend the 'Act to restrict the importation and employment of aliens.' He said: The object of this Bill is to provide a simple way to carry out the law now in force, which was passed in 1897. I do not believe that the mechanics and labourers of this country wish to have high-salaried officers to carry out the Act, if a more simple, efficient and economical way can be found to enforce that law. As it is at present, the Act is entirely in the hands of the government to enforce it, and I do not

believe that the government has enforced it in the interest of the labouring class and mechanics of this country. On the other hand, I believe that the officers who were appointed to enforce the law were engaged more for the purpose of keeping the government and the members of the government party out of trouble than of assisting the mechanics and labouring class. The Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding), the other evening, in discussing the question of the ownership of railways, stated that he believed that it was impossible for the government to manage the railways without political interference; and, I believe, he was correct so far as this government goes. And, I believe that, in the same way, they have enforced the Alien Labour law for their own interest and to assist themselves politically. To prove this, I wish to refer to what happened last year in this House. The Alien Labour law was passed in 1897; and three years later, in this House the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) asked the following question :

> Since the Alien Labour law was enacted in 1897 has one conviction been secured by any agent or officer of the government under the law?

And the Prime Minister replied :

> I am informed by the Department of Justice that no prosecutions have taken place under this Act.

This, as I say, was three years after the Act had been placed on the statute-book. A few years later the same gentleman asked the government what amount of money had been expended under the Act, and the reply by the Solicitor General was that up to that time $2,556 had been expended. Up to June 30th, 1900, some $600 or $700, more had been spent; and we have the statement by the premier that, since that, $1,066 have been spent. And we find in the estimates for next year an appropriation of $9,000. But of this money, $2,556 was spent, and not even a single prosecution had been carried out. I believe that if the Bill I am now discussing were enacted, the law would be more strictly carried out, and with not one cent of expense. My Bill provides that any person, for instance, any labouring man or mechanic who is interested, should have the power to lay information before two magistrates and so enforce the law. That would not cost the country one cent, for those who are most interested, the mechanics and labouring men, will see that the law is strictly enforced. I myself have quite a number of men in my employ. In my own business I am protected from foreign competition, and I see no reason why the labouring class and mechanics in my employ and in the employ of other manufacturers of this country should not be as well protected from foreign competition as I am, especially as the people to the south of us have a law to the same effect.

Mr. CLARE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will have to ask my hon. friend not to object if I ask him to agree to a suspension of the consideration of this Bill until another day. The reason is that there are one or two Bills—one at any rate—of a similar character on the Order paper, which will come up at the next sitting when this order of business is taken up. I have also to inform my hon. friend and the House that the government is contemplating the introduction of a measure to amend the existing law. I am not in a position to say whether a Bill will be introduced, but the subject is engaging the attention of the government at this moment. I shall, therefore, have to move that the debate be adjourned. It will be taken up again on Wednesday next, and then the government will be in a position to declare to my hon. friend what policy they intend to pursue with regard to this Bill.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I merely wished to lay before the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister this consideration—if I mistake not the other Bills on this subject if not textually the same as this one, seek to amend the law in the same direction. I have here Bill No. 11, introduced by the hon. member from Vancouver (Mr. Smith), and I find that there is practically no difference between it and the Bill now before the House, except in certain minor details. A further consideration I would lay before the House is this—the Bill before us seeks to remedy an evil which has been in existence for a very long time, and I think the non-enforcement of the law against the employment of aliens as it is now is largely due to the fact that we have not this machinery which my hon. friend (Mr. Clare) seeks to provide. As the right hon. premier knows, in the province of Quebec, we have, in respect of most laws of this nature, exactly this kind of machinery—that is to say, we allow the individual, in case of violation of the law, to intervene and recover the penalty. The consequence is a considerable economy for the provincial government, and also a closer observance of the law. To give an instance which is quite recent, I am informed, though I have not yet confirmation of the fact, that in the town of Lachine, within the last few days, eleven or twelve employees of the factory were dismissed summarily because they asked for what they thought a legitimate increase in their wages, and a like number of men were imported from the United States to take their places. There is no question whatever, knowing the feeling that exists in the town of Lachine, that if we had such machinery as this, some individuals in the town of Lachine would have seen to the application of a law, the principle of which has been admitted by parliament. Now, in the United States they have exactly such a machinery as is provided in this Bill. The House will find that disposition in the sup-

plement to the Revised Statutes of the United States, volume 1, page 479, second edition :

That for every violation of any of the provisions of section 1 of this Act the person, partnership, company or corporation violating the same, by knowingly assisting, encouraging or soliciting the migration or importation of any alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners, into the United States, its territories, or the district of Columbia, to perform labour or service of any kind under contract or agreement, express or implied, parol or special, with such alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners, previous to becoming residents or citizens of the United States, shall forfeit and pay for every such offence the sum of $1,000, which may be sued for and recovered by the United States or by any person who shall first bring his action therefor, including any such alien or foreigner who may be a party to any such contract or agreement, as debts of like amount are now recovered in the circuit courts of the United States; the proceeds to be paid into the treasury of the United States ; and separate suits may be brought for each alien or foreigner being a party to such contract or agreement aforesaid. And it shall be the duty of the district attorney of the proper district to prosecute every such suit at the expense of the United States.

Now, if these other Bills have the same object, and if the evil which has been so often mentioned in this House exists at the present moment, why should we not proceed with the examination of this Bill at once, and have it passed into law so that it may afford relief in such cases as I have just indicated ? There are, of course, certain points of detail which would have to be modified when the House goes into Committee on the Bill ; but I think the matter is so urgent that the leader of the House ought to let us go into Committee on this Bill without delay.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I have two Bills before me on the same subject. This question has engaged the attention of parliament year after year for many years past. With the law on the statutes to-day, chap. 11, 60 and 61 Victoria, we might reasonably ask why it is that we have so many of these Bills introduced at the present time. It is simply because, when the government took charge of the Bill before, after handling it very discreetly for their own purposes for a few years, when they found they could not shift it off any longer, they passed a Bill that was of very little use in preventing the importation of aliens. In that Bill, who is to act ? The Attorney General of Canada. Aliens are imported under contract of labour, the Attorney General has appointed no person to look after that. The Attorney General is communicated with, the Attorney General is slow to act, the Attorney General will appoint one of his own friends, and that friend will be an instrument in the hands of the government, and the parties cannot get redress. That is why we need another Bill, that is the reason why we have these two Bills before us at the present time. Now the government contemplates staving it off a little longer, and say that they are considering the question at the present time. They said that five years ago, they said it four years ago, they said it three years ago, they are still considering the question, and the trouble is going on as it has been in the past. Unless there is some specific measure put on the statute-book that will work automatically, under which any person can take action when aliens are imported, this evil will continue. Now, if the government prevent the hon. member from Waterloo from going on with his Bill until they bring down their own, and then make some other amendments in the law that will make it practically inoperative, they will be able to stave off the matter a year or two longer, and we will be standing a year hence, perhaps, very much in the position we are in to-day. It seems to me the premier ought to give this House some assurance that whatever Bill they may pass, it will be one that can be put into operation at any time by any private individual or any corporation, instead of leaving it in the hands of the government, or in the power of the government to act at their own discretion in setting the law in motion. I think the premier ought to give us some assurance to that effect.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not prepared to give such an assurance to the hon. gentleman, but I am prepared to say to the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Clare) that he will have every opportunity to discuss his Bill. The government are seriously contemplating whether it is advisable to amend the statute which is now on our books. We are not prepared to give any opinion to the House at this moment, but we will be prepared to do so when the Bill comes up again, and I can assure my hon. friend that he will have every opportunity to have his Bill discussed again.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I desire to take this opportunity of impressing upon the Prime Minister and upon the House that this is a matter that ought not to be delayed for one minute. I come from a border county and know what is happening in the neighbouring city of Buffalo and along the Niagara frontier, and know how badly the citizens of Canada are being treated under the alien labour laws of the United States, which have just been read by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). Knowing how the honest labourers and workingmen of this country are now being treated on the other side of the line, I cannot urge too strongly upon the hon. premier that he should take back what he has just said, and immediately comply with the request which has been made by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), and give us the assurance that private individuals will be allowed to put

this law in motion, as they are allowed to do with regard to any other law. I say to the hon. premier that we should stop trafficking in a sort of bureaucracy, we should stop dealing politically when we come to the enforcement of the criminal law. We heard from the Postmaster General the other night that the government still go on cutting off the heads of the postmasters for political purposes; do they propose also to stop the administration of justice in this country? It seems that they are only willing to enforce the criminal law when it suits their convenience. It is my duty to urge the government to consider the rights of the people of this country, the rights of our workingmen in regard to the importation of alien labour. Can they give any sound reason why a law that applies for the protection of the workingmen of this country should not be enforced in the same manner as any other law upon the statute-books? What good or sound reason can there be for not enforcing it, or for refusing to say that they are going to enforce it? Why should they not be willing to assure us at once that this law will be enforced in exactly the same way as any other, so that a person who is aggrieved can go to the nearest magistrate and lay his complaint, and secure redress in the same way as he can do with regard to any other law?

This matter, being one that affects my constituency as much, and perhaps more than other constituencies in this country, I think it is my duty to submit with all the force I can, to this House and the government, that this matter must be, in the interests of Canada, attended to, and attended to at once, so that we cannot have it said, as it is said, and I am sorry to say, said truly, that young men from St. Catharines or Merritton, who are skilled artisans, who have learned their trade well, cannot go over to Buffalo if they are thrown out of work without being turned back. We had an instance not long ago when one of our largest factories in St. Catharines by fire was shut down. Axe makers, saw makers and agricultural implement makers, 300 and odd of them, were thrown out of employment, who were as able to do good work as any men in the Dominion of Canada. Some of them went over to Buffalo seeking in every way they could for work. They were turned back at once, unless they would swear allegiance to the United States. They were turned back without going to Washington to find out whether they should be turned back or not. Canadians are sent back because they are considered to be aliens and must not be allowed to get employment until they have made themselves citizens of the United States. If we are going to have reciprocity in tariffs or anything else, let us have reciprocity also in protecting our workingmen the same as the United States protect their workingmen. Let us say, that, if our young men are to be turned back, we shall turn back theirs. If this law, now on the statute-book, is a good one, enforce it and enforce it the same as you would any other law. I do not think that I am called upon to argue in this case upon the question as to whether we should protect our workingmen or not. It seems to me that the law as it stands on the statute-book does protect them; at least it is supposed to do so, and the people will insist upon enforcing it in the amplest and fullest manner as soon as possible. I urge upon the House and upon the government that this is a matter which ought to be attended to, and we ought to have an assurance that it will be attended to as expeditiously as possible upon the lines proposed by the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill.

Mr. WILLIAM F. McCREARY (Selkirk). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to say anything in connection with this Bill, but a statement has been made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster), who has just sat down, that I think conflicts with what are the facts. He says that certain young men went over from St. Catharines to Buffalo and were returned to Canada under the provisions of the United States Alien Labour Laws. As I understand the meaning of the American law, it is that when they go under an agreement made in the United States, capable of being enforced in the United States by both parties, it is then the object and purpose of the law to keep aliens from securing employment in the United States, and to deport them. The American Act, up to 1897 could not be enforced in that country, and if my hon. friend will look up the records of the litigation that has taken place under the American Alien Labour Act up to and including 1897, he will not find one case in the American reports, including those of the state of New York, but will show that the Act was defeated when it went to court. I had something to do with the enforcement of this Act in 1897 in Winnipeg, and I ascertained this to be the fact. I have had considerable correspondence with Mr. Powderly, the Commissioner of Immigration at Washington and his subordinate officials, and I found, that, although they have been amending their Act from 1890 up to the present time, it is still inoperative. I saw a good deal of their Alien Labour officer at Winnipeg, and he made the statement that while they might stop one, nine hundred would go across, because they could not stop the balance. A more flagrant case of the violation of any Alien Labour law could not have happened than that which took place last year under my own eyes. An agent from California came to the North-west Territories to get labour to work in the mill. He went amongst the Doukhobors and took away from the North-west Territories 150 of them, under a contract

which I proved to have been made to perform work in the United States. I had detectives put on the case, and I got the actual contract in the Russian and English language. I produced that before the commissioner at Pembina. I proved that these men were going to the United States under contract, and I wished to stop them. I went with a Canadian Pacific official to the customs officer at Pembina, and he said that their Act was no good. If this Bill is referred to a committee I will have before this committee the various amendments made to the United States Alien Labour law and the correspondence and contracts for the removal of these Doukhobors, and I will convince this hon. gentleman that the United States Act was inoperative. I submit that if these young men came back it was because they were afraid of Mr. De Barry, and what he would do, but, had they remained there and appealed against his decision, they would have been in the United States yet. There is nothing in that Act that can prevent these people taking employment there. I submit that in enforcing the Act the greatest difficulty is experienced in procuring evidence. United States attorneys will tell you that when the Act is really tested in the court they have no means of procuring evidence, and, I think, before any amendments are made to the Canadian law, they will have to be thoroughly considered, and that every one of the cases in which the American Act has been tried in the American courts should be brought to the notice of a committee and of the legal gentlemen who are members of it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). The hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) forgets something. He forgets in his righteous indignation that the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has, as le grand jongleur, undertaken with his sunny ways to correct all the troubles that exist between Canada and the United States, and that with his sunny ways to prevail upon the Americans to agree to a treaty fixing the boundary between Canada and Alaska, to give us a reciprocity treaty, and to settle a number of other questions. He has been doing that for quite a number of years, he is doing that to-day, and he believes that ultimately he will succeed. I do not think he is going to succeed at all. I think he has found out that sunny ways will not succeed in regard to the United States. That comes down to what my hon. friend has said here to-night ; the only way to deal with the United States is to give them law for law, tariff for tariff, and reciprocity for reciprocity. The country is sick of this postponing everything for consideration, and saying : Oh, do not do anything ; just wait until we can negotiate with the Americans. Just wait until our sunny ways succeed. Sunny ways will not succeed. The country expects the government to quit talking sunny ways and to treat the United States as they do us. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) says that the American law is not enforced. It is enforced, and Canadians are deported every day, and sent back from Buffalo to Toronto. We have lots of cases. Young men who have been sent back to Toronto come into my office and tell me about it. The only way to maintain our position as a nation, is to hold our own, enforce the law, and give them law for law, tariff for tariff, every day in the week, and every day in the year.

The PRIME MINISTER. And own the railways ?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, we will not give them the railways ; we will keep the railways for our own country. I will take the right hon. gentleman at his word again to-night, as I took him at it last night, that he is going to do something but it will be a long time ahead, I think. I trust now that we have heard the last of what sunny ways will do with our friends to the south, and that instead of sunny ways we will have something that is substantial and something that will maintain the national dignity of the Canadian people. So long as we lie down and let them whale us with their laws so long will they continue to do so. If we followed the example of M. De Witte with regard to the counter-vailing duty on sugar, we would bring them to time in twenty-four hours. That is the only way to deal with them. I trust that when the right hon. gentleman takes the matter into consideration and submits his proposal to the House, it will be on the line of law for law, and not based on the idea he has advocated for so many years of treating the Americans by sunny ways.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I am sorry that the right hon. gentleman proposes to treat this Bill in a different manner from that in which he has treated other Bills on the Order paper, which he has consented to being read the second time without committing the government to the principles contained in them. The Bill of the hon. gentleman from Vancouver (Mr. Smith) deals also with the subject under consideration, and if the government intends to amend the Act now on the statute-book, they should deal with these two Bills, which are the only ones before us relating to the subject of alien law. To my mind the present law is too severe in some cases, and it is a step in the right direction for my hon. friend (Mr. Clare) to propose in his Bill to reduce the penalty of $1,000 to not more than $200 nor less than $50. Let me point out an objection to the present Act. Suppose a man comes from Buffalo to St. Catharines and the authorities know quite well that he is an American citizen coming to Canada

under contract, the Act introduced by my hon. friend (Mr. Clare) will make the law so simple that the justice of the peace in St. Catharines, or to whomsoever is delegated the power, would deal with it at once and if it were necessary to impose a penalty of $200, well and good. There is too much red tape and too much machinery about the present law. Why should it be necessary to first communicate with and obtain the consent of the Attorney General of Canada before proceeding with a case? Section 8 of the present Act says:

> No proceedings under this Act or prosecutions for violation thereof shall be instituted without the consent of the Attorney General of Canada, or some person duly authorized by him.

Section 3 of the Act already provides for that, and therefore the proposal of my hon. friend (Mr. Clare) to repeal section 8 is in the right direction. If a manufacturer in Canada imports a man to perform certain labour, and if that man is competing with any class of skilled or unskilled Canadian labour, then the sooner that case is dealt with the better it will be for Canadian labour. I have heard the Canadian Alien Labour law discussed for a good many sessions in this House, and I formerly took the ground, with other hon. gentlemen, that we should not be harsh with our American neighbours in passing legislation of this kind, even though the Americans had been harsh with us. For years that was the policy of a great many hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. In 1890 a special committee was appointed to investigate this question, and it was only in 1897 that an Alien Labour Act was passed; an Act which has never since been carried out, and an Act that has not given satisfaction to the people of this country. Perhaps I am going too far in saying that the Act has never been put in operation, but I am perfectly safe in saying that it has not been administered in a way which meets the approval of the workingmen of Canada. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) talks about the American law being inoperative, and he says it only deals with persons who only go to the United States under contract. I live in a city situated between Detroit and Buffalo where we have skilled labour and unskilled labour passing through from the state of Michigan to the state of New York. It is on the highway of what we term an American railway, and I can state that several cases have come under my own observation in which Canadians, who have gone into the state of Michigan and the state of New York, not under contract, but to visit their relatives, and if they came across a better position than they had in Canada intending to remain in the United States; but the very moment they cross the line they were met by Mr. DeBarry or some similar person and were at once told that they must return to Canada. These men did not complain to the Attorney General of Canada and furnish the information that they were sent back improperly, because that was too much trouble and bother, but they simply returned to this country and were disgusted because the Canadian government did not pass a similar law, so that American workmen coming to Canada could be dealt with in the same way as Canadian workmen going to the United States are dealt with. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary) says that a committee should be appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the United States law, but what have we got to do with the United States law. We cannot amend it; we cannot add one word to it or take one word from it, and that being so it is idle nonsense to talk of remaining any longer quietly submitting to the treatment we have received. I have no hard feeling towards the government or the people of the United States. If they think it is in their interests to have legislation of that kind well and good, but when that legislation interferes with Canadian subjects it is my duty and it is the duty of every hon. gentleman in this House to support legislation which will protect the workingmen of Canada.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) has proven the wisdom of the Canadian statute as it now stands. He will agree that those Canadians who went to visit their friends and were sent back were not properly treated under the United States law as it exists to-day.

Mr. INGRAM. But they were sent back.

Mr. FRASER. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) would want a Canadian law to make it possible for evil-disposed persons to treat Americans in the same harsh way when they did not come here under contract. Does he think that that kind of legislation would promote harmonious feeling between the two countries? If some official in the United States violates the law of his country because of over-zeal, or perhaps in a desire to become popular, is that any reason why we should follow the bad example?

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) know what was the answer of the Washington government when their attention was called to the manner in which Canadians were treated when they entered the United States?

Mr. FRASER. I do not know what answer was made.

Mr. INGRAM. Then ask your leader.

Mr. FRASER. I shall be glad to have the information, but at any rate I feel sure from the statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) himself, that it is a very wise provision of our law to have some one in authority to authorize a pro-

secution against those who come from the United States under contract. I do not think we should undertake to impose penalties when we have no law for it. I have not very much sympathy with legislation of this kind. I believe it was adopted in both countries to fool the workingmen and try to get their votes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FRASER. Hon. gentlemen opposite started it, and I am not going to exonerate those who keep it up.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What do you wish to continue that state of things for ?

Mr. FRASER. It is here because hon. gentlemen opposite started it, and I suppose that like many other things it takes a while to get it off the statute-books. But, I do not think it is becoming in two great peoples to act like that. I may be told that the Americans began it. No doubt they did. Fancy Great Britain passing such legislation as we do; and yet if any person from Great Britain went under a contract to the United States he would be treated exactly as Canadians are. The British nation is too big for a small thing like that; and I think that if we treated it wisely, and did not make it appear to be a tremendous thing, it would in the end die a natural death. I do not deny that it appeals to very much in a man's nature, and I do not blame the people of Canada very much for taking the position that when the people of the United States act like that, we should act in the same way. I can understand that feeling very well; but, after all, is it not just like the school boy who has been struck by another boy, and who says : Because you struck me, I will strike back. Is that wisdom ? The Act may have to be amended; but, I think the suggestion made is the correct one. A week's consideration by the gentlemen who introduced this Bill, and by the government, who say they are going to inquire into the subject, is after all the wisest way to deal with it. I think we are agreed that if it is necessary to have legislation of this kind, we should have the wisest and best, and it should be so framed as to be effective. I am only expressing my own view, when I say that I do not think very much wisdom underlay the action of the United States Congress when to suit certain parties they passed that legislation. It may be very natural for us to retaliate; but there may be a wiser and better way, by which we can understand each other; and I think the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), who, as a labouring man, I am bound to say speaks with a breadth which does him credit, when he comes to think of it, will understand and appreciate what I say, that it would not be well for us to put upon the statute-book a law that would enable Canadians to do the very thing that he says was done in the state of Michigan. I admit that our friends to the south are neither wise nor considerate very often; but such as they are they are there, and I think that by putting this question off for a week we are likely to arrive at a better conclusion.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds). The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) advises Canadians to continue to suffer the indignities which they have been suffering for a great many years past. I hope the Bill of my hon. friend from South Waterloo (Mr. Clare) will not, if referred to a special committee, meet with the same fate as the Bill which I had the honour to introduce into this House year after year. In 1896, the Prime Minister gave me the distinct promise that if I withdrew the Bill, and brought it in the following year, the Canadian parliament would pass an Act, letter for letter and word for word like the American law. The next year I did introduce that Bill, but previous to my doing so, the Prime Minister put up one of his own supporters to get a Bill on the paper ahead of mine. We then had the two Bills—the one presented by one of the members for Essex, and the Bill which I had introduced year after year. I may say that when I first introduced my Bill, the government granted a special committee to consider it. That committee called witnesses before it, and brought in a report stating that it had been proved that Canadians had year after year suffered indignities from the enforcement of the Alien Labour law by the United States. On the strength of that, I introduced my Bill in 1896. It was then that I received the promise of the Prime Minister that in the following year we would pass a law, word for word like the American law. In 1897, the Bill introduced by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) and my Bill were referred to a special committee. What did the special committee do ? Bring in a Bill, word for word and letter for letter like the American Bill ? No; they mutilated the Bill in such a way that it has been ineffective ever since. Last year I brought a case before the Prime Minister. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) said he had not heard of more than one case in which a Canadian has been deported.

Mr. McCREARY. Pardon me. That is not the statement I made. I said, of those cases contested in the courts in only one had the Act been held good. In all the others the parties succeeded.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to ask my hon. friend, who has had some experience of immigration, if a poor Canadian goes to the other side to work, and Mr. DeBarry tells him : If you don't go back, I will prosecute you, and says to his employer, if you do not send this man back I will sue you for $200 or $300, what happens ? The

man probably has not the money to contest the case, and he sends him back. I brought a case before the Prime Minister last year. I read the following letter :

Prescott, May 8, 1900.

Dear Sir,—I am mailing you under a separate cover a Prescott 'Messenger' of May 4, 1900, marked on last page where one of our citizens was ordered back to Canada. I am well acquainted with Mr. White. He is one of our best men, and I had an interview with him to-day relative to this matter. He says that while at work in the store in Ogdensburg he was served with papers to return to Canada at once or be imprisoned. He had moved his wife and family to Ogdensburg, N.Y., and was practically a citizen of New York. There are now, and have been, citizens of Ogdensburg working in our town in defiance of the Alien Labour law.

Here is the case of a gentleman who went from Prescott to work in a store in Ogdensburg. He worked a few days, and then moved his family over. Some person made a complaint, and he was served with papers calling upon him to go back to Canada. The storekeeper was also notified that if he kept this man, an action would be brought against him, and the man was sent back to Prescott. I brought that case to the attention of the Prime Minister last year, and he made this reply :

In answer to the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), I beg to say that the case he has brought to the attention of the House, judging from the letter he has read, is not a case of violation of the American Alien Labour law. Mr. White had not gone from Canada to the United States in violation of that law, and if he was deported, that was an abuse of the law. This is the second instance of the kind, however, which has been brought to my attention. My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, brought to my attention the case of another Canadian who appears to have been deported from the United States under the pretense of a violation of the American Labour law, when in fact there was none. This is a case which calls for diplomatic representation by this government to the American authorities that some of their officials, under colour of the Alien Labour law, were going outside that law.

He says this was a case to bring before the attention of the American authorities, and I ask the right hon. the Prime Minister if he has done so. But the case of Mr. White is not the only one. Here is a letter dated Gananoque, July 16, of which my hon. friend from Kingston will know something :

Gananoque, Ont., July 16, 1900.

Dear Sir,—The oarsmen of this neighbourhood consider that they have a substantial grievance against the authorities of the country in the non-enforcement of the Alien Labour law. Instances are occurring here of the bringing in of oarsmen from the American side to row fishing parties who are stopping here and fishing in Canadian waters, the result being that we who have to provide and maintain expensive outfits are left idle, and without the means of earning our livelihood. This is all the more unsatisfactory when we find the American authorities opposite us strictly enforcing the Alien Labour Act on the American side of the line, in the interests of their own citizens. Only last week a number of Queen's College students were sent from the American side, and were not permitted to act as waiters. We would bespeak on our behalf a similar enforcement of the Act, which you were largely instrumental in having introduced, but which, it is to be regretted, is not, at any rate in this locality, attempted to be enforced.

Faithfully yours,

BENJAMIN LONGUEUIL,
FRANK LATTIMORE,

On behalf of the Gananoque Oarsmen.

A lot of students went down from Kingston during the vacation and engaged to work as waiters in one of the hotels at a watering place in the United States, but the American officer entrusted with the enforcement of the Alien Labour law notified these young men and the hotelkeeper who was employing them, that he would bring an action, and these students had to pack up their kits and return. Yet the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) says that our young men must be content to suffer these indignities.

My hon. friend asked how much money was spent in enforcing this law since 1897. I find by the Auditor General's Report that this is what it cost the government for the whole year, from June 1, 1899, to June 1, 1900 :

E. P. Bremner, agent New Denver, B.C., salary from June 7th to June 30th, 1900, $100 ; travel, $65.55 ; to account for $34.45	$200 00
William Keys, Montreal, services as agent between July 3rd, 1899, and May 31, 1900, ninety-one days at $5	455 00
W. B. McMurrich, Toronto, legal services	23 02
	$678 02

This amount was spent for the enforcement of the Alien Labour law, and yet the government never deported anybody.

But I find another gentleman who, I presume, was enforcing the Alien Labour law, Mr. R. C. Clute, of Toronto, who is down for remuneration from November 10, 1899, to May 5, 1900, 116½ days, at $40 per day, or $4,660 paid to this Mr. Clute, who goes around stuffing ballot boxes and fighting the battles of the party in the country. That is not all. Besides that $40 per day, he was paid travelling expenses and sundry disbursements, amounting to $1,526.78.

That is the way these gentlemen are enforcing the Alien Labour law. I brought the two matters I have mentioned to the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister last year and expected there would have been correspondence between this government and the government at Washington, and that we would have obtained some reparation for the indignity to which Mr. White had been subjected, and the Queen's College students. But not a bit of it. These people were driven back, and the hon. mem-

ber for Guysborough says they have to put up with these indignities.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. From what page of the Auditor General's Report is the hon. gentleman quoting the payments to Mr. Clute ? Is he quoting under the heading of 'enforcement of the Alien Labour law ?'

Mr. TAYLOR. No ; 'inquiry into labour troubles.'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman knows that that has nothing to do with the Alien Labour law.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not know what the government paid Mr. Clute $40 per day for. My hon. friend beside me says he was out stumping in his county.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If I had not turned this up, the hon. gentleman would have left the Committee under the impression that Mr. Clute was paid for enforcing the Alien Labour law.

Mr. TAYLOR. I said that he was paid $40 a day with reference to labour troubles.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And he earned his money well by effecting a settlement of the labour disputes in British Columbia.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am quoting to prove that this government have broken their pledge to the workingman that they would pass a labour law, word for word, similar to that in force in the United States, and would enforce it. But when the Bill came before the committee, of which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was a member, I predicted that it would never pass, and it did not. It was so mutilated that it became a dead letter, although our workingmen have been driven back from the United States, all along the line from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Should my hon. friend allow his Bill to be sent to a subcommittee, it will be altered beyond recognition by government supporters, just as was the Bill I presented, although we had the distinct understanding from the right hon. the Prime Minister that he would give us a Bill, word for word, similar to the American law, which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier read here to-night.

The law we have is worthless, and the workingmen of this country know it, and this government must assume the responsibility of coming to the rescue and allowing the Bill of the hon. member for South Waterloo to pass, or so amend the present statute as to make it just as workable as is the American law.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I am sure the House is in accord with the view that this matter should be dealt with in a very temperate manner. But this is no new measure, it is one that has been before the House a long time, so that there is no excuse for delaying its consideration. We have had experience after experience of very harsh treatment from the American people, and have borne with it patiently for years. Year after year we hoped that the government might succeed in carrying out some of its promises. But not only have we failure on the part of the government to do this, but we have had the spectacle of a Canadian official going to the United States in order to have the American labour law enforced against people leaving Canada. We have had the hon. member for Selkirk stating that when he was immigration commissioner, he went to the United States and did this. That was a most extraordinary procedure. And what does the hon. gentleman say now ? He says that the law is entirely ineffective, because he was not able to succeed in his object. I do not wonder that these hon. gentlemen should fail to sympathize with any movement for the purpose of protecting our Canadian workingmen when they not only refuse to do anything, but send their own officials to assist the American officials in preventing people from leaving their homes.

Mr. CLARKE. The exodus had not stopped.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems that the exodus continued, and it was necessary to send an agent to the American border to get the Americans to stop it. And what does the hon. gentleman advise us to do ? He advises us to wait patiently and find out if the American labour law is effective against our Canadians going to that country. Is it not perfectly idle to enter upon a course of that kind ? It is plain that the American people have exhausted in every way the reasonable patience of the Canadian people. If this is not a harsh law for the Americans to enforce against us, it is certainly not harsh for us to have the same law against them. It is a question merely of putting brick for brick on the wall. We are not seeking to irritate the Americans. No one can reasonably say that we seek to irritate them if we take the same course toward them as they have taken towards us. No one can say that we have been the aggressors, or have committed any offence, if we simply follow the course they have laid out. But it may well be said that we have lost the sense of dignity that should characterize an independent people if we allow them to subject Canadians to such indignities as they do, and take no action on our own part. We are told that the American law is not effective. But case after case has been given here, so that it is idle to make such a pretense. It is even said that there is no such law. But we see all the effects of a law, for the officers tap

a man on the shoulder and order him back to Canada lest worse befall him. The officials threaten the employers, and the employers rather than go to court to test the validity of the law, find the easier way is to tell their Canadian employees to return to Canada. I think we have now come to the end of the string ; and there is but one course left for us consistant with national dignity, and that is to pass such legislation as will meet the Americans precisely on their own ground, and give them the same treatment that they are meting out to the Canadian people.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND (North Essex). In rising to address this House for the first time, for a few moments, I desire to express at the outset my entire dissent from the opinion expressed by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), when he said it was time that the sunny ways of the government were discontinued. If the sunny ways and the practical common sense applied to the business of the country for four years have caused an increase of the trade of the country, as it never increased before, have advertised the country as it never was advertised before, have removed from politics questions very dangerous as they were not removed before, I think the people of this country will say, as they did on the 7th of November last, that they have confidence in the government, and will continue it in power for many years to come. Among the practical pieces of legislation that this government placed on the statute-book was the Act that is under discussion to-night. For years, this question had been trifled with by their predecessors in office. The hon. member from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who spoke a moment ago with such assumed indignation, had been trifling with this matter for years prior to this government coming into power ; and it was only when the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) introduced this practical piece of legislation that the hon. member for South Leeds became anxious to press the matter to an issue, which he had never been before. It was only when a member of the Liberal party, supporting the new government, was proceeding to put a practical piece of legislation upon the statute-book, that he became anxious to do what he had been pretending to do for years before. This is not a matter to be dealt with in any rash or reckless way. I happen to come from a constituency where we are brought face to face with this question in a most practical way. In the city of Windsor, which is part of the constituency I represent, and in the towns of Walkerville and Sandwich, there are four or five hundred people who take the ferry and cross to the city of Detroit, where they are employed. Every time this question comes up for discussion, every time there is a rumour that there is to be hostile action between Canada and the United States, there is a threat held out by their employers in Detroit that in a few days they will be told they cannot continue to have employment in Detroit unless they remove to the American side. And every time it comes up, the citizens of Windsor are concerned lest the result be that, instead of Windsor increasing as few other cities have—as it has been doing in the past few years—its progress may be retarded. Therefore, hon. gentlemen should not treat this question in any hasty or flippant way. It is a matter to be dealt with most soberly and with a great deal of caution. In view of the facts I have stated, I think every hon. gentleman should accede to the reasonable request that this should be sent to the committee, and there discussed soberly and carefully. Hon. gentlemen will notice that in the amendment which is proposed it is suggested that the information may be laid by any person before two justices of the peace of the county. Is that not pretty radical and pretty far-reaching ? Any person, perhaps some man who has applied for a position, and not got it, or some man who has been discharged for cause and wishes to wreak his vengeance upon somebody else, some merely irresponsible person, may launch into motion that which will place difficulties in the way of these places in my own riding, and of the two countries at large. Is that a rational thing to put on the statute-book ? Until I have had time to consider the question further, I think not. I think the Bill now on the statute-book is a more reasonable one and ought to commend itself to the members of this House. The existing law says :

> For every violation of the provisions of section 1 of this Act the person, partnership, company or corporation violating it . . . shall forfeit and pay the sum of $1,000, which may be sued for and recovered by Her Majesty's Attorney General of Canada, or the person duly authorized thereto by him.

Now, is it not a matter of sufficient importance, before an action of this kind is set on foot, that some person of reputation and standing should have the facts laid before him, in order that he may determine whether it is a proper case, in dealing with these difficult questions, to set the law in motion ? I submit to this House, very respectfully, that it is, and that to say that any person, however irresponsible, for whatever cause or motive, can be able, by merely laying information before a couple of justices of the peace, to set the law in motion, is placing a power in his hands which we ought not to do without considering it fully. Therefore, while most anxious to protect the rights of the working man in every practical way, I would urge upon this House that, in a matter of this importance, there can not possibly be a more reasonable thing than the sugges-

tion of the Prime Minister that the matter shall be left over for a week, sent to the committee, and carefully considered before we place this amendment upon the statute-book.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I quite agree with a part of the careful and deliberate speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland, Essex), who has just taken his seat. I too think this is a matter which we should approach with due deliberation, and that the House should take sufficient time to consider the case in all its aspects, so as to enact such a measure as will redound to the benefit of the class mainly to be affected, and incidentally to the benefit of the whole Dominion. But, that being the case, is it not all the more incumbent upon this House to get to work now ? It is understood that this will probably be a short session. Should we not, without delay, and without regard to any political bias or any question except the best interest of the country, consider what we should do to assert ourselves fairly and squarely before the people we represent, and before the people of the United States, as to how we shall protect ourselves within the limits of the constitution ?

Now, we are not at the threshold of this matter. The principle has been affirmed, the Act has been passed, and we are now taking stock to see exactly where we stand. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has told us, if I understood him aright, that every time this matter has come up in the House difficulties arise over at the border. If that is the case the proper time to consider it was when the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) introduced his Bill. Now, I submit to the House this proposition, that the Act passed a few years ago was either right or wrong. If it is right, keep it and enforce it like men; if it is wrong, then repeal it and be done with it. But instead of that, we are met with a plea for delay, we are met with the persuasive words of some hon. gentlemen, some of them almost get down on their knees and beg of us to be very careful, to go very cautiously in this matter. We have been very considerate so far, and I must say that it is no credit to Canada that a law should be put upon our statute-book and allowed to remain a dead letter. Britons have always been able to hold their own. I do not say this in any aggressive spirit whatever, but I say it because, if it is right for the United States to have a law upon their statute-books to protect their labourers, it is right for us to have a law on our statute-books to protect our labourers. Our labourers are as good, are as honest, are as able man for man, as are the labourers of the United States, and we should be just as ready to protect them as the United States are ready to protect theirs.

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that there is a sturdy class of men in this country who deserve protection at our hands, who deserve that their interests should be conserved by their representatives in parliament. Last night, through the effort of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, we were able to protect the farmers of this Dominion, and I think we will be taking a wise step if to-night we improve this opportunity to pass another bit of legislation that would protect the labouring classes of this country as well. From what class do we draw some of our best soldiers—soldiers that we count upon to defend this country and to defend Britain ? Why, we draw them from the ranks of these same labouring men—it is to them we look to a large extent to protect us in the hour of need.

Now, I have great deference of course for any suggestions thrown out in such a nice way by the premier; and for the moment, inexperienced as I am, I was almost led away by his suggestions to leave the matter over for a little while longer. I have noticed, however, that he makes that request of us pretty often. In the matter of the sugar-beet discussion, I understood that he would have been very glad to have it left over indefinitely, or for another season. If I understood him and the members of the government aright yesterday, when we were discussing the binder twine question——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Order, the hon. gentleman is referring to a previous discussion.

Mr. LENNOX. Well, it seems to me, at all events, to be the general policy of the government, whenever measures are introduced from time to time, to delay their progress as much as possible. Therefore, when it is suggested to-night that this matter be held over, I want to know if there is any good and substantial reason for it ? One hon. gentleman said to-night that a week or so would make no difference. I do not understand that it is proposed to pass this Bill into law to-night, we are only discussing the second reading of the Bill, as we have done with several other Bills that have been introduced this session. I have not yet heard any valid reason given by hon. gentlemen opposite why this Bill should not receive its second reading.

We had a very eloquent speech from the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary). One of the arguments which he stated very strongly was that the American Act is inoperative, that it had not been framed in such a way as that it could be carried out by the courts of the country. I am not going to enter into a wordy argument with him or with any other hon. gentleman as to whether this is the case. I do feel, however, that in the parliament of this Dominion we are able to frame an Act that will be legal and that can be enforced. If the government have any doubt as to the

validity of their Act they have not taken the people into their confidence, they have not told us that they have a doubt as to its validity. If they have, they should let the country know it. I understand that they profess to have an Act upon the statute-book, and to have officials for the purpose of enforcing it to some extent, but that they have not been enforcing it. The object of this amendment is to put this Act in the same position as other statutes, so that it can be enforced by the ordinary machinery employed for the administration of justice, so that we may have in every county, in every riding, in every municipality, at our own doors, and in our own courts, machinery by which we can enforce this Act instead of being obliged to appeal to the government to secure our rights.

Now, the other argument the hon. member for Selkirk advanced was one which I confess is the most extraordinary argument I ever heard. Of course, I have not had much parliamentary experience yet, and perhaps, after I have heard some more speeches from hon. gentlemen opposite I shall not be surprised at anything. But, I was very much surprised to hear that hon. gentleman say that we would have to collect all the American cases, refer them to a committee or something of that kind, consider them, pass an opinion upon them, be governed by them, and after we have done all this, we, the representatives of the people of Canada, could then begin to act. That is a most extraordinary proposition. It may be right, it may be wrong ; but speaking for myself and the people whom I represent, I will never consent by my vote to such a course, never, never, never.

I just want to refer to the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). I understand he is out of the House, so I will hit him lightly, although I cannot perhaps hit him very hard in any case. He points out the great danger that we are in. It may be so, but I do not so understand the temper of the American people. I understand them as a kindred race with ourselves. I understand that they are fair-minded and that they will, instead of retaliating if we protect ourselves, begin to appreciate us and understand that we are a self-reliant people prepared to vindicate our rights. But, if there is danger, I am prepared to meet the danger. The hon. member for Guysborough gives us his illustration of children, and says that it seems something like a couple of school boys wanting to hit each other, that it is a case of blow for blow. I am unable to follow his argument. It is a 'childish' illustration, and association sometimes breeds things of that kind. I urge my view upon this House from no party feeling at all; I urge it because I believe hon. gentlemen on the government side ought to be as much interested as we are. I urge it because I understand, that, more than upon this side of the House, it is the province of the government to devise the best measures for meeting these questions as they arise. It is for them to be prepared to meet the varied wants of Canada or to give place to other men. If we pass this Bill we are just acting fairly and honestly by a large and deserving class of the community. We are doing what we pretended to do in 1897 when this Act was passed. We are no longer perpetrating a false pretense upon the country ; we no longer proclaim ourselves to the people of the United States as people who have not the courage of their convictions and are afraid to enforce that which they pretend to enact. I would do justice to our own people, and in doing justice we will never be visited with anything that will do us harm. I understand this to be a fair measure of protection ; and not because there are a great many of these men in my own riding, but, because it is fair to the whole Dominion of Canada, and for this reason I will support the measure introduced by my hon. friend.

Mr. JOHN D. REID (South Grenville). Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this matter to pass without entering my protest against the manner in which the Alien Labour law has been enforced since it was put upon the statute-book. My hon. friend the member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has mentioned the case of Mr. White. Mr. White resided in my constituency and kept a store there for a number of years. He gave up his business and moved his family to Ogdensburg, but he was sent back again, as my hon. friend has stated, after he had secured a position in Ogdensburg. He complained to me as well as to my hon. friend. I told him there was no use, that nothing could be done, because, while the Alien Labour law was on the statute-book, it was an impossibility to make it work. In the town of Prescott we have a number of Americans ; they are coming there day after day and securing employment in that town. Canadians cannot go into Ogdensburg. I think this is most unfair, and after this one example no Canadians have sought employment in the bordering town. I notice that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) was very indignant at my hon. friend the member for South Leeds when he stated that Mr. Clute had received $40 a day, and when he insinuated that it should be placed to the credit of the Alien Labour law. I suppose that was for legal services in the case of strikes or something of that kind, and that is the reason why the hon. minister objected to that item.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). I did not object to the item. I was quite aware of the item existing and of the money having been paid. What I objected to was that the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), having before him the Auditor General's Report showing the exact amounts paid for the enforcement of the law, and

having before him the Auditor General's Report showing, in so many words, that this money, paid to Mr. Clute, was not paid in connection with the Alien Labour law at all, but in connection, as the report said, and which he had right before his eyes, with the inquiry into the labour troubles in the British Columbia mines, should have suppressed that information and tried to mislead the younger members of this House who said that they desired to form an honest opinion upon the question.

Mr. REID (South Grenville). Well, I did not understand it in that way. The point I wish to make is, that I claim that every strike we have had in this Dominion has been on account of Americans coming over and taking the places of Canadians. I will give an instance. In Valleyfield the great strike was due to so many American spinners coming to that town, being employed and working up the strike that took place and caused so much trouble there. The same thing has taken place in British Columbia on account of the aliens there. Americans come in, cut down the price of labour and cause the strikes. I was very much amused at the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Sutherland) giving us an account of the state of affairs as it existed in the town of Windsor. I just looked up 'Hansard' to see what the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) said when he introduced his Bill in 1897. At that time, in his speech he said :

A short time ago I picked up the Windsor Record, and I found the following article :

'Another outrage was committed on a young Canadian this morning by Detroit customs officials.

'W. J. Sutherland, a young man of about twenty years, from Wallacetown, Elgin county, came through on the Michigan Central Railway this morning to visit his uncle, Mr. F. Offer, at Detroit.

'He was met on the other side by one of the immigration agents of the United States, and asked to explain himself. The young man said he was going to visit his uncle. This did not satisfy the officers, and they proceeded to overhaul his baggage and open his letters found in his valise. Among them was one received some time ago from a firm in Detroit to whom Mr. Sutherland had applied for a situation. The letter was a refusal. The officers then assumed that he was again looking for a situation, and, after the usual compliments to Canada and Canadians, the young man was fired back over the river.'

After reading that article, and being desirous of securing information on the subject, and the true circumstances of the case, I sought out the young man and took from him a declaration, which I will read to the House. It is as follows :—

Dominion of Canada,
County of Essex,
To wit :

In the matter of W. J. Sutherland and his return to Canada under order from American customs.

I, William J. Sutherland, of the hamlet of Wallacetown, in the county of Elgin, do solemnly declare that on the 11th day of January, A.D. 1897, I was on a M. C. R. train, travelling on a ticket purchased at Dutton station, where I took the train for Detroit. My baggage was examined, and the officer asked me my age, where my home was, and how much money I had. I gave him the information, and had about $8.50. He then asked me what I was going to Detroit for. I replied, to visit my uncle in Detroit, and gave him his address. I had some private letters in my valise. He opened them, and one was an answer to an application I had made for a situation several months before, stating they had no opening. And I was ordered back to Canada, and they refused to permit me to enter the United States. I had no contract with any person to enter into or engage in any employment in the United States, but was on my way to a friend's. I after crossed on another ferry and went to my friend's, and am to-day on my return to my home in Canada.

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

W. J. SUTHERLAND.

Declared before me at the city of Windsor, in the county of Essex, this 19th day of January, A.D. 1897.

M. K. COWAN,
A Commissioner.

Then, again, there is another long letter which the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Cowan) places on record with regard to the case of Mr. D. Llewellyn Irvine, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan), in the course of his speech, makes this statement :

Coming, as I do, from a frontier city and a border county, representing, as I do, a constituency whose shores are washed by the international waters that divide both countries, I know whereof I speak when I say that constituents of mine have had indignities heaped upon them, their private correspondence searched, their breeches pockets gone through, as in the case of young Sutherland, to see what money they possessed, as if they were moral lepers or Chinese highbinders. I say that the initiation, the inauguration, the enforcement and the perpetuation of that policy is an insult to the citizens of the country initiating and enforcing it.

That is from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) who resides in the same city of Windsor with the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Sutherland). It is hard for me to understand how the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) can make the statement he made to-night. It looks as if he does not know what is going on in his own city, and it is quite evident that he has nothing to do with the labouring classes, or that he does not take any interest in them. I feel, Sir, that I would not be doing my duty when a question of this kind comes before parliament if I did not strenuously urge upon the government to put the Canadian labour law in such shape that it may be workable, and that the labouring men can have a case tested before the ordinary tribunals of the country. Why, the gravest criminal case is first tried before a justice of the peace. Is there any good reason

against the infractions of this law being tried before a justice of the peace with the right of appeal ? I believe that the government should not hesitate about giving our working classes a chance of enforcing this law with the least possible trouble and expense to them, so as to protect their interests.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). The discussion has wandered a long way from the Bill before the House, and from the Alien Labour Act of 1897. The instances which have been cited to the House have no bearing upon the actual Act itself. If these occurrences are correctly stated, they simply show a highhanded proceeding on the part of the United States officials in reference to Canadians who have gone there, and no law which we could pass would in any way be applicable. The whole point of citing the case mentioned by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) ; the declaration of the man upon whom the indignity was cast, tends to prove the fact that he was not going over there in violation of the United States Act, but that, nevertheless, he was sent back. The grievance there is that instead of the United States officials enforcing their law, they went a long way outside of it. I am sure that the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) will not contend that the action of his constituent, Mr. White, of Prescott, who took some member of his family to Ogdensburg to work, was a violation of the Alien Labour Act of the United States.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The customs official made him return, family and all.

Mr. BRITTON. I am not disputing what the hon. gentleman says, but his own statement shows that Mr. White did not violate the American Alien Act, and if he did not, then the officials were wrong in interfering with him. The Bill introduced by the hon. member (Mr. Clare) does not profess to redress a grievance of that kind. Take the case of the students from Kingston who went to Alexandria Bay, with the very laudable and praiseworthy intention of earning money by acting as waiters at the summer hotel. It is not pretended that they were engaged in Kingston for that work, and the sending of them back was a highhanded act on the part of the United States official ; but this Bill does not touch that.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) what all that shows ?

Mr. BRITTON. Let me answer that question by asking another. If these people were not in violation of the United States Act, how are we to remedy that, either by the present Act or by the Bill now proposed ?

Mr. CLARKE. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) that these cases show the extreme vigilance exercised by the United States officials to enforce their Alien Labour law.

Mr. BRITTON. It does not show an extreme vigilance to enforce the law, but it shows an extreme vigilance to go outside of the law.

Mr. COCHRANE. And, therefore, we should do nothing ?

Mr. BRITTON. We should.

Mr. MACLEAN. We should lie down.

Mr. BRITTON. We should stand up.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, stand up.

Mr. BRITTON. I am standing up, but we should not attempt to do anything that is contrary to the law ourselves. We should be careful not to do what we have no authority in law to do.

Mr. COCHRANE. We are not doing what we have authority to do.

Mr. TALBOT. Stand up.

Mr. COCHRANE. Shut up.

Mr. BRITTON. I do not pay much attention to the hon. gentleman from East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane).

Mr. COCHRANE. I was not referring to you. I was talking to that coon behind you.

Mr. BRITTON. I hope I can proceed without interruption. The first section of the Act which the hon. gentleman from Waterloo (Mr. Clare) does not desire to repeal has reference simply to the employment in the United States of persons who come over here to work, and he does not seek in any way to change that provision in our Act of 1897. The amending Bill only deals with the enforcing of the Act. A penalty can be enforced in any way ; but before anything can be recovered for a violation of the law, we have to establish that there has been a violation of it. I do not say that there has not been a violation, or if there has, that we should not attempt to enforce it. We should enforce it if there has been a violation, because if there has been in the United States, as our hon. friends say, such extreme vigilance to enforce their law that they have gone beyond the law, then we, at least, ought to go the length of enforcing the law as we have it on the statute-book.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRITTON. But I venture to say that if hon. gentlemen opposite cannot find better cases than those they have given to-night, there has been no violation of it. The cases given have not been violations of the law, and any attempt to enforce such cases as if they were violations of the law, would bring us into contempt, because we would necessarily fail.

The hon. gentleman seeks to amend the Act, in the first place, by reducing the penalty. I dare say that is wise, because it would perhaps have the effect desired, of having the Act enforced for the recovery of the penalty, as it is easier to collect $200 than $1,000, and there is no doubt that in some cases a large penalty is a disadvantage in the enforcement of a law. But when we come to the hon. gentleman's mode of recovering the penalty, we come to the principal objection, and I think the acting leader of the opposition admitted that. I do not know what else he could refer to when he said that the Bill as introduced, was not workable, but would have to be amended in committee.

Mr. MONK. I said there were certain details.

Mr. BRITTON. It is the details I am talking about.

Mr. MONK. Every Bill is like that.

Mr. BRITTON. No, not every Bill. Some Bills are so nearly perfect at the beginning that everybody appreciates the fact. But this is so imperfect, that I do not see what objection any one could have to delaying it for further consideration. The hon. gentleman seeks to amend the method of enforcing the Act by providing that instead of the Attorney General or somebody under him having charge of its enforcement, as at present, any one may go before two justices of the peace of the county into which such alien or foreigner is imported and lay the information ; and he also provides that the penalty may be recovered in the same manner as debts of like amount are now recovered in any competent court in Canada. Now, I do not pretend to speak as a lawyer, but simply as any one would speak who would read this section. I do not know but that it might be held that the last part of the section killed the first part, so far as the recovery of the penalty is concerned, and that the only way to recover it would be to bring an action in those courts where debts of that amount would be recoverable. Perhaps, in addition to going before two justices of the peace, a person could sue in the division court for an infraction of the Act which may have occurred in the United States. Any lawyer will see the difficulty of a position of that kind, and will see that this is an ill-considered measure as it stands at present, and is therefore one that ought to have a good deal of consideration given to it before it or anything like it becomes law.

Then, another point. The complaint of hon. gentlemen to-night has been as to the enforcement of the American labour law by the deportation of our people who have gone over there, and they ask that retaliatory measures be adopted by us in reference to Americans who come over here. Now, what authority is there on the part of this government or any other individual in Canada to report an American who comes to Canada and does anything in violation of this Act ? That is provided for by another section of the Act, which the hon. gentleman does not propose to touch at all. Section 6 of the Act of 1897 provides for that, but he does not propose to repeal that. There is nothing in this Bill at all except that it reduces the penalty and provides another way of recovering it. The Bill does not touch the offence in any way.

Before I sit down I wish to say that I do not yield to any of the hon. gentlemen opposite, although they may parade so much every session their deep, devoted interest in the workingman, and their desire at all times and places to protect him who is so much oppressed by this government and those who support it. I do not use any such arguments as that ; but I do not yield to any hon. gentleman on either side of the House in my desire to do what is right by those men ; and where the law has been violated I think the law ought to be enforced. But I am satisfied that there has been, from the time this law was passed, an honest desire on the part of the government to enforce it, but in such a way that international relations might not be strained. There is no use of making a fuss where there is no evidence to show that an offence has been committed. You ought not to try to make international trouble by taking up cases such as those that have been talked about from time to time, like the case of Mr. White who went to Ogdensburg, and the case of those students. But where there has been a clear violation of the law it ought to be applied, and I believe that the persons whom this government have employed from time to time to enforce the Alien Labour Act, if they had found a case which they had evidence to support, would have prosecuted it and obtained justice.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (Hamilton). I do not rise, Mr. Speaker, to discuss the merits of an Alien Labour law. It is sufficient for me that I find such a law on the statute-book of this Dominion, and I assume, as I think every member of this House has a right to assume, that that law being there, was put there with a purpose and an object. It is of no use, I think, for the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) to tell us that the statute law of the United States is almost as bad as ours. If that means anything it means that our law wants improving, and I think the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Clare) is making an effort to improve it. If I had any doubt upon the merits of the Bill which we are discussing, I think that doubt would have been removed by the language which I find in 'Hansard,' uttered by the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, when addressing the House in regard to the

particular statute which the hon. member for South Waterloo now seeks to amend. At page 658 of 'Hansard' of 1897, the right hon. gentleman is reported as having used these words with reference to it :

> There cannot be any doubt as to the position of the government upon this Bill. In fact, I do not know that it is at all advisable to prolong the debate any longer, because, so far as I can interpret the sentiment of the House, there is a unanimous feeling at this moment, whatever may have been the opinions held by members in the past, that the persistence of the American Congress in keeping upon the statute-book these very obnoxious clauses, leaves no alternative to the Canadian people but to apply the same law themselves. The course adopted by our neighbours seems to leave no option to us but to apply to them the same measure of justice or injustice as they apply to us.

I would like to know if, in the last four years during which this statute has been upon our statute-books, any attempt has been made on the part of the Dominion to apply to the citizens of the United States, the same law that they apply to us.

Mr. BRITTON. Give an instance of any demand on our government to that effect.

Mr. BARKER. I will tell the hon. gentleman in a moment what I have to say upon this subject. I am not here to be cross-examined by him. I assume, when I find a statute upon the books of this Dominion, that it was put there for a particular purpose, and it seems to me that the only purpose for which this statute could have been enacted was the protection of Canadian workingmen. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) has argued that there is nothing to be done under this statute. Well, after what the right hon. the leader of the government said in 1897, as to the necessity for this law, I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything in reply to the hon. gentleman. But, I ask if there are no cases to which this statute can be applied, what harm can there be in our complying with the request of the hon. member for South Waterloo, by striking out of the statute the string that has prevented its enforcement during the last four years ? On the other hand, if there are cases to which this law may be applied, surely in common justice to the workingmen, in whom the hon. member for Kingston seems to take such particular interest, we should amend it in such a way as to enable it to be enforced. I do not want to take up time discussing the merits of a question that has been fully discussed and determined by a previous parliament. The statute is there, and it is the duty of the government either to see that it is enforced or else remove it from the statute-books altogether. Are these hon. gentlemen prepared to say that the law is not only inoperative and a nulity, but of no use ? If so, let them introduce a Bill to wipe it out. But, so long as it remains, it is evidence that necessity exists to protect our workingmen, and it should be made workable.

As to the particular section objected to, section No. 8, the insertion of such a clause in a law of this kind—a clause leaving the enforcement of the law completely in the hands of the Attorney General—seems to me an utter absurdity. Let us suppose an alien labourer infringes this Act when entering this Dominion at Halifax or Vancouver. Under the present statute no action can be taken against him at either of these places, but the complainant must come or write or telegraph to Ottawa and ask the Attorney General of the Dominion to investigate the case and for permission to prosecute the offender, and if the right hon. the leader of the government thinks as he did in 1897, he should favour the amending of the statute so as to make it really effective.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat quoted the remarks made by the right hon. the First Minister in 1897, and rather tried to leave the impression on the House that the First Minister had not carried out the promise he then made. Well, I happened to be on the committee to which was referred the Alien Labour Bill of that session, and which reported to the House. That committee acted on the promise made by the right hon. the First Minister in the remarks which my hon. friend has quoted. We took the Alien Labour law of the United States and copied it verbatim, and the Bill we reported to the House, and which passed is an exact copy of that law.

Mr. BARKER. Did the United States tie up their Acts as you did yours ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The clause to which the hon. gentleman refers was introduced by us because this was not a domestic measure alone, but an international measure, and it was deemed desirable and proper that the government should take the responsibility of enforcing the law in a matter that affected our international relations. I shall not discuss that point now as the First Minister has intimated that the matter will come up when the government policy is announced.

There has been a great deal of talking to the galleries to-night. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has sought to impress upon the new members of the House the idea that he is really in earnest, and is advocating the passage of such a law in the interest of the workingmen rather than of the party to which he belongs. That may deceive some of the new members, but not any one who has been here the last ten or twelve years. Why ? Because we know such is not the object of the hon. gentleman. I remember well his introducing a Bill of this kind every session for years when his own party was in power,

but never attempting to pass it into law. He made a great flourish about introducing an Alien Labour law, but when the leader of his party told him to subside he quietly withdrew the Bill. This farce he regularly went through every session for years.

When my right hon. friend came into office, he said that inasmuch as an Alien Labour law seemed to be desired by a portion of the community, because our cousins to the south had one in their statute-book, he would advocate our adopting one in identically the same terms. But the committee to which the matter was referred thought that, inasmuch as it affected our international relations with the United States, it was desirable that the responsibility of taking action should be upon the government, and that the government should initiate any prosecutions under the Act. I am not yet convinced that it is desirable to hand these prosecutions over to any man in the community who may choose to initiate proceedings. I think there is considerable force in the argument made use of by my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton), who pointed out that to allow, for instance, a dismissed employee to prosecute the company which dismissed him, without any responsibility whatever, would be going very far.

I merely rise to point out to my hon. friend this fact, that the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Waterloo is one which, I venture to say, not a legal gentleman on the other side will assert can be carried out in its present shape. I do not know what it means, and I would like to know if anybody can tell me what it means. I know the hon. gentleman's object, but it is not expressed in the Bill. But the law at present is clear and definite and capable of being enforced, and I have not heard it stated that the Attorney General has refused to prosecute in any case brought before him. I heard the hon. member for Grenville say that there were some breaches of the law in his constituency. Did he ever bring them before the Attorney General, and ask him to prosecute these Americans who had come to Prescott? Does he desire that they should be prosecuted and driven out of the town? I ask him, did he lay an information before the Attorney General, and ask him to prosecute?

Mr. REID (South Grenville). When this matter was brought before the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) as minister of the Crown was it not his duty, and the duty of the government, and the duty of the Attorney General of the Dominion to take action? It was brought up by the hon. member for Leeds, and the record given.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend (Mr. Reid, South Grenville) complained that there were some instances within his knowledge where the law was not enforced. I understood him to say that there were a number of Americans in Prescott in violation of this law.

Mr. REID (South Grenville). So there are.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Are they there against the wish of the hon. gentleman?

Mr. REID (South Grenville). Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Has the hon. gentleman reported the fact to the Attorney General of Canada, that prosecution may take place?

Mr. REID (South Grenville). No.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How is the Attorney General to know of the case then?

Mr. REID (South Grenville). I did not report the cases, because other cases have been brought before the Attorney General and no prosecution has followed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman name a case.

Mr. REID (South Grenville). I have read a case.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman, on his responsibility as a member of this House, name one case and let it go on record in 'Hansard'? So far as I know, the Attorney General has prosecuted all cases that were brought before him where there was sufficient evidence.

Mr. CLARKE. How many prosecutions have there been?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That has nothing to do with it. The law may not have been violated, the law is sufficient as it stands, and the Attorney General has not been neglectful of his duty. And I have merely been pointing out that the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Reid) who stated, in a casual way, that the law was being violated at Prescott admits that he has never brought the case to the notice of the Attorney General.

Mr. REID (South Grenville). Was a case ever brought before the Attorney General, to the knowledge of the hon. gentleman, since this became law?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know. I do not recall a case in the maritime provinces that has ever been reported.

Mr. REID (South Grenville). Then, the hon. minister is in the same position as I am. I would like to ask him if he could name a case where the government has taken action?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As I am informed, the Attorney General has taken action in every case where the facts have been represented to him. But it appears that those who make an outcry in this House do not desire to enforce the law. One hon. gentleman took half an hour inveighing against the government because certain people are in his constituency in violation of the law. But when I asked him : Did you give that information to the Attorney General to be made the basis of a prosecution ? he says : No, I never did. How is the law to be put in force if hon. gentlemen like this who know that it is being violated secrete that information ? There is no difficulty about the law. But it is like other laws, for instance, the Scott Act. It will not enforce itself. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not enforce it or lend themselves to the enforcement of it, but will play to the galleries and make out that the law is not being enforced. My hon. friend (Mr. Clare) who introduced the Bill, has been met in a very proper way by the leader of the House. And I am glad to say also that he met the leader in a frank and straightforward way and said : I accept fully and frankly the statement of the leader of the House and I am well satisfied. The government asked to lay the matter over for a week, when they will be ready to announce what course they will take, and the promoter of the Bill is perfectly satisfied. But the politicians, who have been playing with this question for political purposes for the last ten or twelve years—at the head of whom is the hon. member for Leeds—are not satisfied ; and they have wasted the whole night talking about the enforcement of this Bill which the promoter knows, cannot be passed in the way in which it is introduced—it is not English and not law, and no lawyer would seek to put it upon the statute-book until it was revised and corrected.

Mr. MACLEAN. Must not a man who is not a lawyer draft the Bill for this House ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not understand the relevancy of the question. It does not require a man to be a lawyer to draft a Bill. Sometimes laymen draft Bills better than lawyers do, and write better English. What I am saying is that if we do proceed with this Bill, let us make that Bill——

Mr. COCHRANE. Unworkable.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am willing to accept that as the official announcement by the party opposite. There is no man better qualified to speak for his party than my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) ; and on reading the Bill, it seems to me that it is drawn up just to carry out his idea.

Mr. REID (Grenville).

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. minister a question, if he has no objection.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. None whatever.

Mr. MONK. There is this Bill and a similar one standing in the name of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith). We have discussed this question since eight o'clock, that is for two hours and a half. In this measure is there anything contrary to the principle of these two Bills. Because, if there is nothing of that kind, then, after two hours and a half of discussion, should we not decide to either adopt or reject the principle of the Bill ? Because, at this stage, we are not dealing with the details but with the principle of the measure.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As it happened, the right hon. Prime Minister did not announce the introduction of a measure. He said that there were several Bills on the paper and that the government wished to consider the matter as one that had engaged their attention, and said that the conclusion reached would be announced on Wednesday next when the Bill came up again.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I think that hon. members on both sides will agree with me that it is deeply to be regretted that, when a question of such vital importance to the working people of this country is under consideration, we had not the presence of the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Mulock) to assist in our deliberations. I am glad, however, that before the discussion closes, we may have the advantage and pleasure of hearing what he has to say upon this important matter. I think hon. members will agree with me, too, when I say that the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Clare) has placed the working classes of the Dominion under lasting obligations to him. The workingmen in his own constituency are especially under obligation to him because of the frank, manly statement he made in moving the second reading of his Bill this evening. The hon. gentleman is a self-made man, he has grown up from the ranks, a man who, by his indomitable industry, by his integrity, by his great ability, has achieved the honourable position which he occupies as one of the largest, one of the most progressive manufacturers in Ontario west. And when a gentleman who knows the wants, the requirements, the wishes of the working classes of this country as well as he does, takes the trouble at the earliest opportunity to rectify an Act which has been found to be unworkable, which has been upon the statutes of this country for nearly four years, and which has been practically a dead letter, he is entitled to the sympathy and the support of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. It is

not fair to meet him with that carping criticism to which he has been subjected to-night. If there are some minor defects in the amendments which he proposes to make to the Alien Labour Act, those defects could have been remedied in committee. But until the hon. gentleman gave notice of his intention to introduce this Bill, no other hon. member of this House had given any intimation of an intention to amend the Alien Labour law and make it workable, and it is only this evening that we are informed for the first time by the premier that the government are considering this matter, and may possibly bring down a measure amending the present unworkable law. Why, Mr. Speaker, statements have been made across the floor of the House for the past four years that the government have been considering this matter ; but I think I am within the judgment of the House in saying that the consideration which the government has been giving to this matter has for its object how to avoid their plain duty in the matter of enforcing an Act which was intended to be of some benefit to the people in whose interests it was passed. The hon. member for Hamilton read a statement made by the premier some three or four years ago when the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) proposed to introduce his Bill. I need not repeat the statement made by the premier on that occasion, but taking those words at their plain meaning, there is no hon. member in this House but will confess that they lead to the conviction that the intention of the government at that time was to put a workable measure upon the statute-book and to enforce it up to the hilt, as the United States authorities have persistently enforced their measure up to the hilt from 1897 to the present time.

Sir, I was amused, if that is a parliamentary expression, to hear the statement in the House to-night that the American Alien Labour law is not a workable measure. What appropriations have Congress made year after year for the enforcement of that law ? What reports have been made by the Alien Labour law commissioner as to the success which has attended his efforts in the enforcement of that law ? What figures has he given as to the number of men who have been deported, sent back from the frontier ? This information can all be obtained in the library, or from the authorities at Washington, by any hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House, and if they take the trouble to look for that information they will find that every year a large appropriation has been made by the United States authorities for the enforcement of that law, and that every year that law has been vigorously enforced. It is only within the past two or three weeks that a statement has appeared in the press as to the action taken at Buffalo with regard to the deportation of Canadian workmen who were engaged in repairing one of the international bridges. So vigilant were the Alien Labour law officers of the United States that they actually deported these men who had been employed along with American workmen in repairing that bridge from the Canadian to the United States side of the river. Sir, the conduct and action of the United States Alien Labour law commissioner are in striking contrast with the conduct of the so-called labour commissioners that have been appointed from year to year to enforce the Alien Labour law here. American workmen were permitted to come over to the Canadian side of the river and assist in repairs on the Canadian side of that bridge, but when the repairs were completed on this side, and when it was necessary that Canadian workmen along with the Americans should go to the United States side of the bridge, they were deported, they were prohibited from going on with their work, they were sent back by the Alien Labour law commissioner ; and he proved by that act alone the Alien Labour law of the United States was capable of being enforced and was being enforced every day in the year. I have in my hand here a statement from the annual report of the secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and in speaking with regard to immigration and the number of people deported, he says :

> In addition to the foregoing, there were excluded at the Mexican and Canadian borders a total of 1,616 aliens.

We will be told by and by that the great majority of them were sent back from the Mexican border, we will not be given information as to how many were sent back from the Canadian border, prohibited from entering the United States. I find further on in the same report :

> Co-operation with organized labour in this country has been found useful in detecting violations of the contract labour law.

Instead of ridiculing the idea of invoking the aid and assurance of the workingmen to enable them to enforce the Alien Labour law, as was done by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and others to-night, the Alien Labour law commissioners of the United States solicited the assistance and co-operation of the officers of the organized unions on the other side to assist them in enforcing that law.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in imputing such a motive to me, I used no such language. I did not ridicule the aid of the workingmen ; on the contrary, I stated explicitly that whenever information had been given to the Attorney General of a breach of the law, he had given instructions to enforce it.

Mr. CLARKE. Why, Mr. Speaker, the echoes of the voice of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries have hardly died away in this Chamber, he said only a few minutes ago that to allow an employee to prosecute a company from which he had been dismissed, and to take action against it would have been outrageous, and still he challenges the accuracy of the statement that I have just made. The minister will find out that the statement he made a few minutes afterwards, that we had wasted the time of the House in discussing this matter, is not a statement that will be accepted by the workingmen of the country, who asked the hon. gentlemen opposite three or four years ago for fair-play, and have got but scant and cold justice from them up to the present time. We have another statement here from the annual report of the Treasurer of the United States. He says :

For the enforcement of the alien contract labour laws there was expended during the year——

That is during the year ending June 30, 1900.

—the sum of $99,598.51, leaving a balance of the annual appropriation of $401.49.

$100,000 had been appropriated by the Congress of the United States for the enforcement of the Alien Labour law, and the commissioners were so active and diligent that they expended every dollar of that amount, less $400.

Mr. McCREARY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to explain that that $100,000 voted by Congress is not only for the enforcement of the Alien Labour law, but also of the pauper immigration laws of the United States.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman will have to go to the library and get these books, they are as available for him as for myself, and lest he should not understand, I will read again the statement that I have just read :

For the enforcement of the alien contract labour laws there was expended during the year the sum of $99,598.51, leaving a balance of the annual appropriation of $401.49.

I am giving the House the information contained in the annual report of the secretary of the Treasury of the United States. If the hon. gentleman wants further information I would advise him to refer to that gentleman, or to the Alien Labour law commissioner of the United States. I am not an authority on this matter, I prefer to quote the gentleman who occupies the distinguished position of the secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

Sir, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries let some further light into the reasons, or gave some further information of the reasons which caused the government to insert clause 8 in the Bill passed in 1897. He says that this was an international matter, that they had to proceed very carefully, that therefore every safeguard had to be thrown about the Bill so that it would work no prejudice to the amicable international relations existing between the two countries. Now, Sir, I do not doubt but that may have been in the mind of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries at that time, and that was the reason why clause 8 was inserted in this Bill. But may I ask the permission of the House to give the reasons of one of his colleagues as to why this Bill was framed and passed in the shape in which we find it ? Am I within my rights in quoting from a statement made by the colleague of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Secretary of State, as to what his opinion of this measure was, and what he thought the prospects were of the enforcement of this Act after it was passed ? If so, I would like to read a few sentences from a statement which the hon. the Secretary of State made in another place :

I do not think the Act is likely to be enforced, and when it is not enforced it is a pity to place it on the statute-books, because it is not on a line with the views of the people of Canada. I should be sorry to see it on the statute-books because I know it would be an idle Act.

That is the opinion of the Secretary of State. He told another branch of the legislature of this country that it was not the intention to enforce the Act, that it would be an idle Act, and that it should not, for these reasons, be placed upon the statute-books. What does the hon. gentleman say to that explanation ? The hon. Secretary of State goes on further to deal with this very clause 8 that the hon. gentleman has discussed and explained at such great length. He says :

Under this Act persons can come in by thousands, and it is only when a report is sent to the Attorney General, and he makes inquiry that any action will be taken, and of course the party would by that time be absorbed in the community, and that would be an end of it. It is something we do not propose to carry out.

Now, I need not proceed any further to show he marked divergence of opinion that existed between the hon. gentlemen themselves in regard to this measure. Whether the intention of the government was as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has stated it, and I am bound to accept his explanation, or whether the hon. Secretary of State was speaking wide of the mark in the remarks which he made upon this measure, the hon. gentleman in the other Chamber was the better prophet of the two. The Act has been a dead letter, no honest attempt has been made to enforce it from the time it was put on the statute-book up to about six weeks before November 7 last, when the elections were held. Then, a little spurt was made, then a little flash in the

pan was seen, and hon. gentlemen opposite endeavoured to persuade the workingmen of Ontario that they were honest in their determination to enforce this Act. But, the workingmen of Ontario have had experience of these hon. gentlemen, and when the opportunity was afforded them in November of expressing their opinion upon the conduct of the government, they had not the slightest hesitation in expressing that opinion. But, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries asks : Has any case been brought before the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice, and has he refused to prosecute upon any occasion when the facts were laid before him ? If the hon. gentleman wants any information upon this subject let me quote to him the letter written by the hon. Minister of Justice in reply to an appeal made to that hon. gentleman by the mayor of the city of Hamilton, the mayor of the city of which my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) sitting behind me, is one of the worthy representatives. This is what the hon. gentleman's colleague said :

Ottawa, May 27, 1899.

J. V. Teetzel, Mayor, Hamilton, Ont.:

The Attorney General is not at liberty to give his assent to the prosecution for the infraction of the Alien Labour law to which you refer, an understanding having been reached last summer by the international commissioners that the Alien Labour law, until the negotiations were concluded, should remain in abeyance in Canada in respect to persons coming from the United States and in the United States in respect to persons going thither from Canada. Until it is shown that this understanding is not observed by the United States officers, no action can be taken here.

DAVID MILLS.

Is that sufficient answer to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to show that there is a case where the hon. Minister of Justice was invited to do justice to the operatives of the city of Hamilton, and that he refused to allow any action to be taken ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was perfectly right.

Mr. CLARKE. The right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), or no member of the government, has yet been frank enough to take the House into his confidence and tell us when the understanding so reached between the Canadian and American commissioners came to an end. We have a right to know, if such an agreement did exist, when it was abrogated, and what were the causes of its abrogation, and if the abrogation of that agreement is the cause of an appropriation of $9,000 being asked in the estimates for the enforcement of the Alien Labour law during the coming year. We have had no information of that kind vouchsafed to us, but we have had statements made again and again, and oft repeated by the alien labour commissioner at Buffalo and the collector of customs at Port Huron, that so far as they knew there was no arrangement or understanding made for the non-enforcement of the United States Alien Labour law, but that, on the contrary, at all times and under all circumstances, the law has been vigorously enforced. This is the answer made to the allegations which we have heard again and again, but is it a sufficient reason why the Canadian Alien Labour law was not enforced ? I do not think I shall take up any more of the time of the House discussing this matter, because it seems to me that the proposition of my hon. friend (Mr. Clare), coming from a gentleman of his experience, coming from a gentleman who is a large employer of labour, is such a reasonable proposition, is such a conservative proposition, is such a just proposition, that it should not have been treated as the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) proposes to treat it, of being shelved for a week or ten days. The hon. gentleman has given great attention to this matter, he has seen the disabilities under which his own and other workmen labour by the non-enforcement of this Alien Labour law, he has seen that strikes have been engendered, that bad feeling has been fostered because of the facilities which have been given through the non-enforcement of this law to employers of labour on this side of the line when they had a disagreement with their operatives to bring American operatives from the other side without let or hindrance to take their places. It has caused a great deal of bitterness between employers and their employees. If there had been an honest, straightforward enforcement of the law the disputes which take place from time to time between employers and employees would have been settled in a more amicable and satisfactory way, and the friction which has resulted would not have ensued. I hope that the proposition of my hon. friend, so fair and so reasonable, will be accepted by the majority in this House, and that at the earliest possible moment the Alien Labour law will be put into a workable condition and will be enforced fairly and reasonably from one end of this Dominion to the other. The workmen of this country have a right to that measure of justice and protection from the government. Sneers were made by an hon. gentleman opposite at my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) because he had not been successful from year to year in securing the passage of an alien labour law by the House of Commons. Sir, whatever credit is due for the passage of a measure of that kind cannot be wrested from the hon. member for South Leeds. Year in and year out he persisted, whether his friends were in office or whether his opponents were in office, in introducing this measure for the protection of Canadian workmen into the parliament of Canada. He drew public attention to the matter, he aroused and cultivated public opinion as to

the necessity of a measure of that kind, and if he was not succesful up to the year 1896, it was not his fault. The hon. gentleman opposite who has sneered at him to-night must share the responsibility of that failure, because neither that hon. gentleman nor any of his supporters, from the first time my hon. friend introduced his measure in 1890, or 1891, up to 1896, uttered one word in favour of a motion of that kind, or in favour of the adoption of the Bill which my hon. friend placed before the parliament of Canada.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) withdrew his Bill.

Mr. CLARKE. The man who insisted upon forcing that measure upon the attention of the people got little or no support from hon. gentlemen opposite. If they had been as anxious before 1896 as they were professedly since then, to do justice to the workingmen, they would have given the hon. member for South Leeds their assistance and co-operation in providing a law that would be workable, instead of one that is practically a dead letter. I hope that this measure will be passed to its second reading to-night, that the House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, that any imperfections that may be found will be struck out, and that it will be improved, with the assistance of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Mulock). We look to the hon. Minister of Labour, as a matter of course, to come to the assistance of the workingmen in perfecting this measure. With the assistance of these two ministers, and with the assistance of other hon. gentlemen, we will have a measure that will be of some advantage to the workingmen of the country, and they will appreciate the action of parliament if it completes that work to-night.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland). It is to me somewhat amusing to hear hon. gentlemen opposite prate so loudly and so long in the interests of the labouring men of this country, when for eighteen years they supported a government which absolutely and positively refused to pass an Alien Labour law in Canada. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) says that if the Liberal party, when in opposition, had supported the hon. gentleman for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) in his proposal yearly brought up in the House, that possibly the government of that day might have been forced to enact an Alien Labour law. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) desires to take his policy from the Liberal party. He is getting his policy from the Liberal party now; he will get it from the Liberal party for many years to come.

Mr. CLARKE. Oh, no.

Mr. GERMAN. Sir, there have been several statements made to the House to-night, as to whether or not the Attorney General of Canada has ever enforced the Alien Labour law since it was placed upon the statute-book. I am inclined to think that if hon. gentlemen opposite had more fully desired the actual enforcement of that law, rather than desiring to make political capital against the government, it would be found that the Alien Labour law would be enforced every time they sought to enforce it. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has never on one single occasion endeavoured to have the Alien Labour law enforced in this country. I ask him now, if he ever approached the Attorney General of Canada with the suggestion that the Alien Labour law should be enforced.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. gentleman desires an answer, I will give it to him. I have gone to the superior of the Minister of Justice; I have gone to the Prime Minister again and again from my place in this House, and I have appealed to him to have that Alien Labour law enforced.

Mr. GERMAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) cannot get out of it in that kind of way. The statute distinctly says that it shall be enforced on an application to the Attorney General of Canada, and not to the premier of Canada. I will venture to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) has never gone to the Attorney General, notwithstanding the redundancy of feeling which he tries to exhibit in the interest of the workingmen. He has a large number of them in West Toronto, and he endeavours to get their votes.

Mr. CLARKE. I am proud to say I get them.

Mr. GERMAN. Yes, he usually gets them. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that I have been more energetic in the interest of the constituency I have the honour to represent than has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke), because I have seen that the law was enforced, and enforced promptly and effectively. We had in the town of Welland in which I live, contractors bringing Italians from the United States to do work on our public streets. I wired the Attorney General of Canada that the Alien Labour law was being violated, and I at once received a wire in reply authorizing me to see that the law was enforced, and in twelve hours from that time these men were deported from Canada.

Mr. PUTTEE. Does the hon. gentleman wish us to understand that Italians were deported to the United States?

Mr. GERMAN. They certainly were. We have Italians in Canada who are Canadian subjects, and there are Italians in the United States who are American citizens, and these Italians who were American citizens and aliens had no right to come to

Canada and do work which Canadians could and would do, and they were deported immediately. The same thing happened along the shore of Lake Erie, where American citizens were building summer residences.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House the date of that deportation ?

Mr. GERMAN. It was about May of last year; it was early in the spring of last year. The contractors were building a granolithic sidewalk in the town of Welland.

Mr. WALLACE. About the time you got your nomination.

Mr. GERMAN. No, sir; it was very much earlier than the time I got my nomination, and whether I had got my nomination or not I would try and see that the Alien Labour law was enforced, because I take a greater interest in the workingmen than do the hon. gentlemen opposite. These men prate of their Canadian loyalty in this House, but outside of this House they are meek and mild as lambs. The hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) spoke about the work being done on the international bridge. I happen to know something about that. The International Bridge Company brought expert workmen from the United States; men that they could not get here, and there never was a complaint from any person in Canada. I challenge the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) to say that any Canadian expert workman who worked on that bridge on the American side of the Niagara river was ever deported. I defy him to mention the name of one.

Mr. LANCASTER. I say they were. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. German) that I know they were.

Mr. GERMAN. Give us the names, if you please.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have not the names here.

Mr. GERMAN. The hon. gentleman cannot mention the name of an expert workman from Canada working on the international bridge who was deported. Why, they have only begun to work on the American side of that bridge within the last month. This all shows that hon. gentlemen opposite in order to make a point if possible against the government, will endeavour to garble the facts. I happen to know that the international bridge has not been built to the international channel until the last month. It is not all completed yet. They have just begun at the drawbridge there lately. There has never been an expert Canadian who worked on the international bridge deported even by Mr. DeBarry, who has been the most effective officer in the United States service so far as deporting aliens is concerned. The Canadian Alien Labour law is, with slight exceptions, a verbatim copy of the United States Alien Labour law. The greatest difficulty that has arisen hitherto in regard to the enforcement of the Canadian Alien Labour law has been by reason of the very active operations of Mr. DeBarry, of Buffalo. We do not hear any complaint about it between Detroit and Windsor. We do not hear any complaint about it between the town of Niagara Falls on the Canadian side, and the city of Niagara Falls on the American side. I have heard something to-night about Prescott. I know nothing about the St. Lawrence district, but I venture to say that east of British Columbia, Mr. DeBarry the United States official has created more difficulty in regard to the operation of the Alien Labour law than any other one man either in the United States or Canada, by reason of his very great industry. He appears to be supported by the labour unions in the city of Buffalo, and he has continually and deliberately violated the Alien Labour law of the United States. He has exceeded the duty imposed upon him by the law of the United States. I know that he has taken Canadians who have gone to the United States and sent them back, just as illegally as he would take me or any other hon. member of this House by the shoulder and send us back. He has done it in violation of the Act, by reason of the pressure brought to bear upon him by the labour unions of the city of Buffalo. However, it has been done, in the county I have the honour to represent, it has created a good deal of friction. It was used as a political influence against me in the last election. It was said that I was not doing my duty to the labouring men, although I showed the people that I had been doing my duty. My opponent endeavoured to convince the public that the government had not been doing its duty—that it had put a law on the statute-book, and had not been endeavouring to enforce it. So far as I am concerned, I desire to see the Alien Labour law of this country enforced, and enforced properly in the interest of the public.

There are cases when it is in the interest of the Canadian people themselves that aliens should be employed in this country. There are occasions when you cannot get in this country the labouring men to do the work which you want done. There are occasions arising continually when you need employees whom you cannot get here, and it is necessary to get them in another country. Consequently, we have to be exceedingly careful in placing a law on the statute-book which will affect the rights of the public, as an Alien Labour law will affect those rights if improperly drawn and improperly carried out.

I am inclined to think the law as it at present stands will bear amendment. I had intended to propose an amendment myself,

and I am not certain that before this session is over I shall not do so, except that I hear from the government to-night that they desire that these matters shall stand over for a time, as they contemplate proposing a policy which they think may be satisfactory to the House. I am willing to bide my time and see what the proposition of the government is. If they bring down a Bill which is satisfactory, I shall be prepared to support it. If they bring down a Bill which is not satisfactory, I will rise in my place and to the best of my ability endeavour to make it satisfactory, at any rate, to me and the people whom I have the honour to represent. There is one respect in which, I think, the Alien Labour law can very properly be amended. The law at present is that you cannot contract outside the country ; that is, you cannot bring into this country aliens under contract made outside of the country. Men attempt to violate that law by telling employees to come to Canada and they will employ them here. If that objection can be got over, the law as it stands is as perfect as any Alien Labour law you can have. We have officers throughout the country with intelligence to enforce the law. I think possibly it might be made a little more elastic than it is ; it probably will be ; but I can say that the Alien Labour law as it stands to-day on the statute-book has been effective. It has been enforced wherever any gentleman has endeavoured to enforce it, and it has been a great benefit to the people of the country wherever they desired to take the benefit of it. It can be improved, but without improvement it is exceedingly better than anything hon. gentlemen opposite ever gave to the people of this country.

Mr. A. S. KENDALL (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, I will not yield to the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) in his zeal for the workingmen. I happened to have been, along with my hon. colleague, elected for the county of Cape Breton by a majority of the votes of the workingmen of that county ; and we were elected, Sir, because during the time we served in the local legislature of Nova Scotia, we put on the statute-book of that province a considerable amount of legislation for the benefit of the miners. We can, I think, claim it as some tribute to that legislation that when a few months ago 140,000 American miners went out on strike, they struck for the very same concessions from the capitalists which we in Nova Scotia had secured by statute, chiefly at the request of the workingmen themselves. So that I have some authority to speak for the workingmen in the constituency which I have the honour to represent.

Now, I cannot support this Bill, for two reasons. In the first place, it will prohibit the importation of skilled labour from another country into this country, no matter how much we may require it. If the great iron works in Cape Breton and the contemplated iron works at Sault Ste. Marie are not to be allowed to import alien labour, it will be impossible for us to get those great industries started in this country. Further, if the importation of such labour is prohibited, it will cut off the labour from the coal miners of this country and even the ordinary labourers, and diminish the market of the agriculturists. We have everything to lose by making an inflexible law on this question.

For one, I do not care to submit the interpretation of this law to the judgment of any two magistrates. I think we must recognize that only some man or body of men with a due sense of their responsibility can be properly entrusted with the enforcement of this Act. I know magistrates, numbers of them, who no doubt would put this Act into operation with prudence ; but we all know that there are scores of magistrates in almost every constituency who could not be trusted to adjudicate upon it with discretion and prudence.

I believe I am speaking in the interest of a great many thousands of workingmen in Cape Breton and the eastern part of Nova Scotia when I say that I oppose this Bill for the reasons I have given. At the same time, it may be possible before very long to introduce some machinery for the carrying out of this law without the difficulty of approaching the Minister of Labour or the Attorney General of Canada. But, for the reasons given, I cannot see my way clear to support the Bill.

Motion of the Prime Minister agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN. (Halifax). What estimates will be taken up to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Public Works.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask the Minster of Public Works whether before his estimates are reached to-morrow he will be able to lay on the Table the return promised over a year ago in regard to the telegraph service?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not promise it a year ago.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Prime Minister did. He promised to have it immediately prepared. I ask now whether the Minister of Public Works will be able to lay it on the Table before his estimates are taken up.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All I can say is that my deputy told me to-day that this return would be ready to-morrow.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. So we shall have it before the hon. gentleman's estimates are taken up ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 1, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

EAST QUEEN'S, P.E.I.—ELECTION PETITION.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) moved :

That the report of the judges on the petition and cross petition relating to the election held in the electoral district of East Queen's, P.E.I., together with the evidence taken before the said judges on the trial of such petition, and all other papers, documents and reports sent to Mr. Speaker by said judges be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved :

That Mr. Speaker be instructed to issue his writ to fill the vacancy now existing in said electoral district.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 35) respecting the Mather Bridge and Power Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Great North-western Railway Company.—Mr. LaRivière.

Bill (No. 37) to incorporate the Bishopric of Keewatin.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Hudson's Bay and North-west Railway Company, and to change its name to the Great Northern Transit Company.—Mr. Oliver.

CRIMINAL CODE—FORGERY OF COPYRIGHT.

Mr. LEIGHTON G. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 39) to amend the Criminal Code.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. McCARTHY. This Bill is to put the forgery of copyright on the same basis as the infringement of trade mark, which is punishable under the Criminal Code, while the forgery of copyright is not.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Militia and Defence for the year ending 30th June, 1900.—Hon. F. W. Borden.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. May I ask the Minister of Public Works as to what progress is being made with the return in reference to telegraph construction in the Yukon.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). I am as sure as one can be that it will be down this afternoon. I will telephone.

SUPPLY—THE CORONATION OATH.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Hon. JOHN COSTIGAN (Victoria, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, as I indicated a few days ago, I now rise to perform a duty which I feel incumbent upon me, and a duty which I have postponed the discharge of until the present occasion for the reasons which I stated to the House when I had the honour to give notice of the resolution. In rising to move this resolution, which I hold in my hand, and which I intend to place in your hands, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I am assuming some responsibility, but I feel at the same time that I am discharging a duty and a conscientious one, and that I can appeal to the good sense and the intelligence of the Canadian parliament to receive and consider this question in the spirit in which it is introduced. I am afraid that outside of parliament a misapprehension exists in the minds of a portion of the people with regard to the meaning of this movement and the complaint covered by the resolution which I hold in my hand. If such a misapprehension exists, I hope that every member of this parliament will feel it a duty, no matter what his views on this question may be, to assist in removing that misapprehension and in having the question fairly understood.

The motion which I am speaking to will explain itself. We are entering upon a new century ; we are beginning to discharge the duties of a new parliament. We have welcomed home from a foreign and distant

land our brave soldiers who went to defend the honour and the glory of the British Empire. There is no divergence of opinion in the hearty welcome we give to those soldiers. They fought upon the same battlefield in the same cause. There was no question as to what altar they worshipped before, or what their differences of creed might be. They were brothers in arms, discharging the same duty, maintaining the dignity of the British Crown, fighting the battles of the empire, and gaining fresh laurels for that empire, the greatest that exists in the civilized world. With that feeling evinced on so many occasions by the most intelligent and the best people in this country and in the empire, is it too much to expect that we should wish to give further force and meaning to the sentiment that we are all British subjects, and that there is no necessity for any cause to divide us, but that we may join together and shoulder to shoulder perform all the duties of citizenship notwithstanding any differences of race or creed that may exist among us.

In moving the resolution which I intend to move, for an address to His Most Gracious Majesty, I do so because I feel impelled, on behalf of those I represent, to ask this parliament to sympathize with the demand we make that we be relieved from certain expressions connected with the coronation ceremony—not with the coronation oath, as has been said outside of this House, and also, I understand, inside it. We do not complain of the coronation oath. I do not and would not propose to touch it to the extent of the crossing of a 't' or the dotting of an 'i'. The coronation oath remains intact. It provides for the succession of Protestant sovereigns in the British Empire. Every sovereign who ascends the Throne is bound to take and subscribe to that oath, by which he is sworn to maintain the Protestant religion as established by law. What I am dealing with is not the coronation oath at all ; it is a declaration beyond and beside the coronation oath. It is one as useless, so far as any practical purpose is concerned, as a fifth wheel to a coach. It is useless for all good purposes. If any hon. gentleman in this Chamber will show me that in asking for the removal of this declaration, which I consider perfectly useless, except for the purpose of wounding the susceptibilities of a portion of His Majesty's subjects—if any hon. gentleman will satisfy me that in the carrying out of this request any injury is done, or that we are impairing the strength of the Crown, or interfering with the permanence of the succession of the Crown as now arranged, I shall be willing to withdraw my resolution. But surely, when I appeal to the good sense of the House, and ask them to take the same view of the matter as prominent Protestant writers and public men, they will come to the conclusion that this declaration is entirely unnecessary, and might be done away with.

This is the object I have in view, and it it on these grounds that I ask the House to accept this resolution. I may give a few reasons why I think the House ought to accept it. I do not propose to make a lengthy speech or a lengthy appeal to the intelligence of the House on this question. I think that all it requires it to put the simple facts before the House, and leave the House calmly to use its own judgment upon them. But I must make one or two quotations and refer to one or two incidents to show how strongly the Protestant mind feels on this subject. When the question was discussed in 1867, I think in the British House of Commons, Earl Kimberley, who had formerly been Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and as such had been obliged by the law to make this declaration, just as His Majesty is obliged by the law to make it—because the King is obliged to obey the law as well as the subject—Earl Kimberley said—I give his own words :

> He had himself been called to make this declaration before the Irish Privy Council in the presence of a large number of persons of the Roman Catholic faith, and he must say that he had never in his life made a declaration with more pain than when he was required, before men holding high office, and for whom he had the greatest respect, to declare the tenets of their religion to be superstitious and idolatrous.

Now, I take the issue of a newspaper of a later day, the Guardian, which I am credibly informed is one of the most respectable Protestant organs published in England. It gives over a column to the question of the coronation oath, the declaration, and the attendant ceremonies ; but I will read the closing paragraph as bearing most directly on this question :

> However unreasonable and objectionable in its terms the declaration may be, it is satisfactory to know that it cannot, under any circumstances, with the long-established custom of deferring the coronation, be uttered in Westminster Abbey. But it will be highly unfortunate if the necessary legal steps cannot at once be taken to relieve Edward VII. from the necessity of uttering, even in Westminster Palace, words which cannot but be singularly offensive to millions of his subjects, not only in the United Kingdom, but throughout his great dominions across the sea. Christian charity has made great strides in two and a half centuries, and if this declaration of the time of Charles II. has long ago become too offensive to be used by any of His Majesty's subjects, why is the studied insult of calling all his Roman Catholic subjects idolaters to be maintained as a part of the King's accession duties ?
>
> A quiet and dignified declaration of personal loyalty to the Church of England is all that is necessary. If unhappily the law officers of the Crown see no way out of the difficulty in the

short interval before the King meets his first parliament, the deliberate use of such a string of offensive terms cannot fail to produce mischievous heartburnings and dangerous misunderstandings. International notice is nowadays far more keenly awake to royal declarations than it was in the early times of the Hanoverian dynasty. We shall be heartily sorry if Edward VII. is obliged to use words which will brand the King of Portugal, the King of the Belgians and many other royal mourners by the good Queen's grave as superstitious idolaters.

This is the opinion of one of the most prominent Protestant journals published in England. I might quote a good many other authorities, but do not think it necessary. I do not think it would be paying a compliment to the intelligence of the members of this House, with the opportunities they enjoy of making themselves acquainted with the subject, with the records in the library at their disposal, with all the information available to them, to undertake to argue a case to which, it seems to me, there cannot be two sides.

Therefore, I beg to move :

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

Most Gracious Majesty :

Your Majesty's most faithful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada in parliament assembled, beg leave most humbly to represent :

That as a token of the civil and religious liberties and of the equality of rights guaranteed to all British subjects in the Canadian confederation, as well as under the British constitution, the British sovereign should not be called to make any declaration offensive to the religious belief of any subject of the British Crown.

That by virtue of the Act of Settlement of 1689, the British sovereign, on the first day of the meeting of the first parliament, or at the coronation, is called upon to make the following declaration :—

'I, A. B., by the grace of God, King (or Queen) of Great Britain and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that I do believe that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever ; and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare, that I do make this declaration, and each and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope or any other authority or person whatsoever, and without any hope of such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope or any other person or persons or power whatsoever, should dispense with or annul the same or declare that it was null and void from the beginning.'

That such declaration is offensive to the convictions of all Roman Catholics.

That the staunch loyalty of Your Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Canada and throughout British possessions should exempt them from any offensive reference to the religion by their sovereign.

That, in the opinion of this House, the abovementioned Act of Settlement should be amended by abolishing the said declaration.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to quote from the Act of Settlement which requires such a declaration, so as to make it clear that it is required by law ?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I have quoted it in the resolution.

Mr. ARTHUR S. KENDALL (Cape Breton). On any occasion I would consider it an honour to have the opportunity of seconding this resolution, but I appreciate the distinction all the more since I have the honour of representing a constituency which formerly formed part of that which in 1820 secured, for the first time in the nineteenth century to a Roman Catholic a seat in a British legislature. It may be of some interest to the House that I should state the circumstances. In 1820, Mr. Richard John Uniacke, a Protestant, and Mr. Kavanagh, a Roman Catholic, were returned by the constituency of the county of Cape Breton to the legislature of Nova Scotia. Mr. Kavanagh was willing to take the oath of allegiance to the King, but he declined to violate his religious belief by subscribing to a declaration against the doctrine of transubstantiation, and he was consequently not permitted to take his seat. His colleague, Mr. Uniacke, took up the battle in his behalf, and by means of the great influence which he wielded, had a petition adopted by the legislature addressed to the King, with the result that on April 3, 1823, when the next session of the legislature took place, Mr. Kavanagh was allowed to take his seat without subscribing to the objectionable declaration.

But the legislature of Nova Scotia did not stop there. A few years later, this same Mr. Uniacke, with the assistance of Mr. Haliburton, caused the following resolution to be adopted by the House :

That a committee be appointed to prepare a humble address to His Majesty, requesting that His Majesty would be graciously pleased to dispense with the declaration and test oath against Popery which His Majesty's subjects in this colony are called upon to take.

And let me say, Sir, that in a House of forty representatives—only one of whom was a Roman Catholic, the remaining thirty-nine being Protestants—this resolution passed unanimously. And in accordance with this resolution, a petition was forwarded a

few days later. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall read a few paragraphs from the petition :

We have already, under the sanction of Your Majesty's government, removed every restrictive law upon Your Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects of this province, which has been followed by their gratitude; unwilling to pause, we would now solicit the gracious exercise of Your Majesty's prerogative for their additional benefit, and in compliance with the unanimous voice of your faithful Commons. We solicit that you would be graciously pleased to dispense with the 'declarations against Popery and transubstantiation,' as inapplicable to the present situation of this country, and tending to create invidious distinctions among Your Majesty's loyal subjects.

Devoted to our duties as the representatives of Your Majesty's faithful Commons, we feel confident Your Majesty will accept this address. And when Your Majesty considers that we appeal to heaven for the due fulfilment of our duties, and that we consecrate, by the sanctions of religion, our natural attachment to Your Majesty's person and government, Your Majesty will accept these our solemn pledges as adequate securities.

Confident of Your Majesty's favourable consideration of this address, your faithful Commons hope, eventually, that though at our several altars we may practice our several faiths, yet at that public altar where the spirit of our country presides, the only creed will be that of Christianity.

You will observe, Sir, that this petition sent some seventy-four years ago to the home government, was, in substance, the resolution now before the House. For my own part, I regret to say that my thoughts do not flow with sufficient ease, and I have not the resource in language to enable me adequately to express my conviction and sentiment on this matter—conviction and sentiments which, I believe, are shared by the overwhelming majority of the enlightened Protestants of this country. On the occasion to which I refer, Uniacke made the following exclamation :

When I look around, I think I scarce can discern the countenance of a bigot. Not one is there within these walls whose voice will not gladly concur in the prayer of this petition.

And, Sir, may we not hope that, in this boasted Canada of ours, three-quarters of a century after that resolution was passed in the legislature of Nova Scotia, the glorious nineteen century which has for its greatest boast that it has dissipated the ignorance of the dark places of the world with the lamp of knowledge and the teachings of the Prophet of Nazareth, a similar unanimity may be found to prevail ? May we not hope that in this Canadian parliament not one constituency in Canada has sent here a man who will not concur with the prayer of this petition. Sir, we do not ask for our Catholic citizens a favour, we only demand that a right which has been too long denied them shall be restored. For myself, I may say, I am a Protestant of the Protestants, and I know I can say to my Roman Catholic citizens, without fear of offence, that not under any conditions would I subscribe to many of the tenets of their faith. Yet, I would be unworthy of the position I occupy in this House, if I could not cheerfully stand up and demand for my fellow-citizens of another faith the right which, under similar circumstances, I should demand for myself. Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, the House may, not unnaturally perhaps, expect from me, since it has fallen to my lot to be the first adviser of the Crown in this country, and to be entrusted with leadership of the House in its deliberations, that I should at once express the view which, in my opinion, ought to prevail upon the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan). Let me say at once—and to this I am sure—there will be no dissenting voice—this is not a question as to which there can be any party feeling; it is altogether apart from and beyond the scope of party controversies. Let me say also that it is not the intention of the government to make it a ministerial question. This is one of those matters which had better be left altogether to the judgment of every individual member to be voted upon, to be acted upon, either one way or the other according to his conception of what is best for the country and for the empire of which we form a part. Personally, I may say, I favour the resolution of my hon. friend, though, if I had had the drafting of it, perhaps, I should have expressed the prayer of it in somewhat different language. But, even with this, such as it is, I favour the motion ; and I have no doubt—that if this motion were accepted unanimously by this House, it would have a most beneficial effect for the peace and harmony of all creeds and all races not in this country only but though the whole British Empire. But the question will be asked : Why should this resolution be introduced in this House ? It is not within our jurisdiction; it is not within our competence; we have no power to affect it one way or the other; at all events we have no power to affect it directly; and, whatever may be our judgment or even our action upon it, it cannot have any effect as to its abiding force, for this is altogether within the purview of the parliament of Great Britain. Such an objection, if it had been made some twenty years ago would have had, no doubt, great force, and, perhaps, it would have been found to be valid. But, I submit that, in this year 1901, when Canada has attained the development she now has, such an objection has very little force, if it has any force at all. We have, on more than one occasion, affirmed our authority, affirmed

our right and privilege to act beyond our legislative sphere, and to offer to the Imperial authorities our views, and to make our representations upon questions which were not within our immediate domain, but which affected British subjects in whole or in part. Thus, on one, two, and if I mistake not, three different occasions, this House passed resolutions in favour of home rule being granted to Ireland. Thus, at a later day, not yet twenty months ago, we passed a resolution of sympathy in favour of the Outlanders in the Transvaal. I am bound to say that, as a matter of history, at the outset, our representations were not accepted with any very great favour in England. I have a distinct recollection, which is shared, I am sure, by many of the members of this House that, we were told, in polite though frank language that we should confine our deliberations within our own sphere. That was years ago. Times have changed since then. Canada has progressed and developed since that time; and of late years, when we have chosen to offer to the Imperial authorities our views affecting, not Canadians, but British subjects in whole or in part, I am pleased to say that our representations have been met with favour and with courtesy. In order to make this point clear, let me recall what took place when we last offered our views to the Imperial authorities in 1899. The occasion was the unfortunate condition of things which then prevailed in the Transvaal, and on the 31st of July, in that year both Houses of this parliament passed the following resolution :

Resolved, that this House, representing a people which has largely succeeded by the adoption of the principle of conceding equal political rights to every portion of the population, in harmonizing estrangements and introducing general contempt with the existing system of government, desires to express its sympathy with the efforts of Her Majesty's Imperial authorities to obtain for the subjects of Her Majesty who have taken up their abode in the Transvaal such a measure of justice and political recognition as may be found necessary to secure them in the full possession of equal rights and liberties.

This resolution did not meet with the disfavour which similar resolutions had received in former years ; it was accepted, not only as an act within our scope, within the sphere of our legitimate aspirations, but it was accepted with great favour, and the following reply was sent :

London, Aug. 22, 1899.

To the Governor General of Canada,
Ottawa.

I have received from the Speaker of the Senate and the House of Commons, Canada, copies of resolutions unanimously adopted by those Houses on August 1 and July 31, respectively, with regard to the present situation in South Africa.

Her Majesty's government will be glad if you will convey, on their behalf, acknowledgments of those resolutions, together with an expression of their appreciation of the support thus afforded to them in their efforts to secure equal rights and liberties for all the white inhabitants of the Transvaal.

This came directly from Her Majesty and was transmitted through the instrumentality of the Colonial Secretary. Now, Sir, I would like, if possible, to approach this subject in a spirit wholly uncontroversial, and I put it in the sense of justice and of fairness on both sides of this House, that if our resolutions were thus appreciated in England, if we were not only permitted, but as it were, encouraged, to give an expression of our opinion and our sympathy in the efforts which were then being made by the Imperial authorities to secure justice and equal rights to a section of Her Majesty's subjects in a very distant land, why should not our efforts this day be accepted when they tend to relieve the conscience of at least twelve millions of His Majesty's most loyal subjects ? Only a few days ago Lord Salisbury had to speak upon the subject, and is reported by the Associated Press to have expressed himself in this way :

Lord Salisbury, in the House of Commons today, referring to the anti-Catholic declaration contained in the oath which King Edward took at the opening of parliament, said that though he deplored the language in which the declaration was couched, it must be remembered that the enactment represented the views and feelings of the period when it was adopted. The passions of the people now were not so strong, but there were undoubtedly parts of the country where the controversy which the declaration represented still flourished, and where the emotions which it produced had not died out.

I have no doubt whatever that these words of Lord Salisbury are true. I have have no doubt whatever that there are still portions of our fellow-countrymen in the old country and in parts of this country where these emotions of two centuries ago still exist. The best reforms are always slow to come. Nobody expects that prejudices will disappear in one day, or even in one generation ; but if such a resolution as is now before you were adopted by this House, even if it had no other effect than to do away with such prejudices in the mind only of one of His Majesty's subjects, still I think this resolution would not have been adopted in vain.

With regard to the legislation which is mentioned in the motion in our hands, Mr. Speaker, and which is now almost two centuries old, I have to say no more than has been said by Lord Salisbury, that to say the least, it is deplorable. Such legislation would not be adopted now. It is repugnant to the spirit of this age, it is a remnant of those intolerant ages which for many centuries desolated Europe. It is a sad commentary upon our Christianity that for three centuries two of the leading

denominations of Christians, Roman Catholics and Protestants, fought one another with a fury unparalleled. It is a sad commentary upon our Christianity that for three centuries Roman Catholics and Protestants assailed each other in the most enlightened countries of Europe, wherever Roman Catholics had a superiority over Protestants, or Protestants had a superiority over Roman Catholics. In 1685 the King of France, Louis XIV., revoked the edict of Nantes, which had been granted by his grandfather to the Protestants of France, and which gave them religious toleration and civil rights. By that act he expelled from his kingdom no less than half a million of the best artisans and mechanics of France, who carried over to England, to Hollond and to Germany, the arts and industries of their native country. Four years after that, in 1689, the legislation which we now have before us was adopted by the parliament of Great Britain. Let me recall the painful circumstances under which it was adopted. The year before had taken place the revolution of 1688, which was caused undoubtedly by the duplicity of King James II., whose tyrannous conduct alienated from himself the sympathies of his English subjects, and inspired them with deep distrust for himself and for the church to which he belonged. In 1689 the oath in question was passed.

But before I proceed any further, let me illustrate and make some comment upon the point which was made by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Costigan) in his opening speech. The object of this motion does not at all affect the Protestant succession, or the supremacy of the established Church in England, or of the Protestant religion. There are two oaths to be taken by the King. In 1688, after the accession of William and Mary, the following form of oath was prescribed by parliament, in a statute passed the very year of the revolution, in 1688. The sovereigns, William and Mary, took the following oath :

> The Bishop or Archbishop shall say :
>
> Will you solemnly promise and swear to govern the people of this Kingdom of England, and the dominions thereto belonging, according to the statutes in parliament agreed on and the laws and customs of the same.
>
> The King and Queen shall say :
>
> I solemnly promise so to do.
>
> Archbishop or Bishop,
>
> Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel and the Protestant Reformed religion, established by law ?

I need not go any further ; this is the test oath which has been taken, and the answer of the King and Queen to this is : ' All this I promise to do.' Now, the motion of my hon. friend does not in any way propose to do away with that oath. If the motion of my hon. friend were to carry in this House, and if it were to be accepted by the parliament of Great Britain, the sovereign would still be forced to take the oath which I have now read. But, in the following year, 1689, another statute was passed which extended to the King a statute which had been for some time on the statute-book, and which was to apply to the subjects of the King. In the reign of Charles II., in 1677, a statute had been passed which compelled all the members of the House of Lords, all the members of the House of Commons, and all the servants of the Crown, that is to say, all those who held commissions under the Crown, to take the following oath. I will recite it in order to make it clear, though it is familiar to all the members of this House, because it is the very oath that is embodied in the motion of my hon. friend from Victoria :

> I, A. B., do solemnly and sincerely in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that I do believe that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever : And that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other Saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare, that I do make this declaration and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope or any other authority or person whatsoever, or without any hope of any such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or persons, or power whatsoever, should dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null or void from the beginning.

This oath is contained in the statute entitled ' An Act for the more effectual preserving the King's person and government by disabling Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament.' In 1689, this statute was extended to the King in these words :

> And that every King and Queen of this Realm, who at any time hereafter shall come to and succeed in the Imperial Crown of this Kingdom, shall on the first day of the meeting of the first parliament, next after his or her coming to the Crown, sitting in his or her throne in the House of Peers, in the presence of the Lords and Commons therein assembled, or at his or her coronation, before such person or persons who shall administer the coronation oath to him or her——

Mark the distinction.

> —at the time of his or her taking the said oath (which shall first happen), make, subscribe, and audibly repeat the declaration men-

tioned in the Statute made in the Thirtieth Year of the Reign of King Charles the Second, intituled 'An Act for the more effectual preserving the King's Person and Government, by disabling Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament.'

You see there that this declaration, which was enjoined upon the subjects of the King who happened to sit in the House of Lords, who happened to sit in the House of Commons, and who happened to be servants of the Crown, was extended to the King, and had to be taken as well by his subjects. Now, it is a matter of history that this oath, in so far as it applies to subjects of the King, has been long ago abolished. No peer of the realm, no member of the House of Commons, no servant of the Crown, is bound to take the oath, but it is still enjoined upon the King, and it has been found quite consistent with the security of England to dispense the subjects of the King from taking that oath. It is still enjoined upon the King, and the object of my hon. friend from Victoria is to represent to the British Imperial authorities that this oath should be dispensed with by the King as well as it has been dispensed with by his subjects. Let this be acted upon, and there is nothing which guarantees the Protestant supremacy in England which will not still be in existence. I may be permitted to say, as a Roman Catholic subject, that this legislation in England is not altogether according to my views, but I know too well the temper of my fellow-countrymen, I know too well the necessity in which they are in England, to even offer the slightest objection, and for my part, I am quite content to be a subject of the Protestant King of England. All the disabilities which at one time affected Roman Catholics have been removed from the laws of England; they have been removed, and let me call the attention of the House of Commons to the severe struggle to achieve that result, and, against the objection, I am free to say, of many and many a man who thought that if Roman Catholics were admitted to civil and political rights, perhaps the liberties of England would be endangered. It is a well-known fact, for instance, that William Pitt long entertained the hope and wish to give Roman Catholics emancipation, but it is also a matter of history that George III. would not agree to it, and that Pitt died before he carried out this wish of his heart. In 1856, the ministry of Lord Granville, in which Charles Fox was, took the matter up and attempted to bring in legislation for the emancipation of the Catholics, but the King, who, as we know, and as history tells us, was a good man, a pious man and a moral man, thought that the dignity of his Crown, and the liberties of his subjects would be endangered thereby, and he promptly dismissed his ministers. The matter was taken up again later on, and in 1829, at last, an Act was consummated, Catholics were emancipated, they were given civil rights, they were given political rights, and they were placed on the same footing as their fellow-subjects, but, we know that George IV., who was then sovereign, hesitated a long time before he signed the Act. We know that he was not like his father, either a good man, or a pious man, or a moral man; still, he held the same views upon the subject, and it was only upon the strong remonstrances of the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel that he finally agreed. Now, I would ask: Is there, amongst our fellow-countrymen of the Protestant religion, let him be ever so strong in his convictions, a man who would not say to-day that it was a happy day for England when the Roman Catholics were granted emancipation? Is there a man who would go back to the condition of things that prevailed up to that time? Look at the services, which, in this country, and in this age, since 1829, have been rendered to the Crown and people of England by Roman Catholics, and you have the answer. Had not the Act of Catholic Emancipation been passed in 1829, England would not have had the services of the late Chief Justice of England, who was a Roman Catholic. And if there is one man to-day who has done more than, perhaps, any other during the last twenty years for the prestige of England in the Orient, that man is Lord Cromer, who, by his services in Egypt, has rendered imperishable services to his country, and Lord Cromer is a Roman Catholic.

Let us look at the cause of all this exceptional legislation against Catholics, apart from the prejudices which existed at the time; prejudices which were just as common then to Roman Catholics as to Protestants, and to Protestants as to Catholics. In the European civilization of that day these prejudices were common to both religions. Wherever Catholics had the power they persecuted Protestants; wherever Protestants had the power they persecuted Catholics, but if you go to the bottom of this legislation in England, there is one thing which the English people had in their mind in passing all these laws, and that was that they would not have the Pope to rule in England. We need not mince matters; it is just as well to go to the bottom of things. That was the thought in the minds of English Protestants. Time has dispelled many of the misconceptions as to the power of the Pope, and let me say here as a Roman Catholic of the twentieth century that the Pope has no authority or jurisdiction whatever in secular matters. His power and jurisdiction and authority are exclusively in spiritual matters, and we Catholics accept him as the power which has the final authority to pronounce upon all controversy in matters of faith and morals. Beyond that the Pope has no more authority than any

member of this House. He has no jurisdiction over secular matters in any shape or form, and Catholics do not claim that he has. Then, Sir, if these views are well understood and do prevail, it seems to me that there can be no reason whatever to maintain this legislation upon the statute-books of England.

I may be asked : Why should this declaration be removed from the law. It is simply because it is offensive. It is simply because it is painful to Roman Catholic subjects who honour their King, and are loyal to him; who are ready to fight and need be to die for his Crown ; it is painful to them that their King should take such an oath against dogmas which are dear and sacred to them. That is the reason ; the only reason. Sir, I do not desire to approach the subject in any controversial spirit. Whether this motion pass or does not pass ; whether if it is passed it is heeded or not heeded in England ; whether this oath is maintained or not maintained in the law ; the loyalty of Roman Catholics will not be affected thereby. They will continue to be as they are to-day, willing and cheerful subjects of His Majesty King Edward VII. and of his successors. But, Sir, it can be well admitted that the pride and devotion which we all take in this great empire which was the first refuge of liberty of conscience when liberty of conscience was still banished from the rest of the world ; would be enhanced and would be more enthusiastic if that legislation, the last remnant of persecuting ages, the last vestige of these ages of which I have spoken ; were to be blotted out for ever from the statute-books of free England.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussion which has taken place in the press of the United Kingdom, and in view of what has been said by men eminent in public life in the mother country, it seems to me highly probable that without any action on the part of this House the offensive portion of this declaration would probably be eliminated therefrom at a very early date. Therefore, I question very much the wisdom of the hon. gentlemen who have introduced this motion here, because the discussion of matters of this kind among men who have strong opinions either one way or the other is sometimes productive of more harm than good. As has been well said by the right hon. gentleman, this is a matter into which party consideration should not enter. This is a matter which should be above all party considerations and I, for one, as long as I have any voice in this House or in this country shall protest against any question of race or creed being introduced into the party politics of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what I am saying ; in what I am about to say I speak entirely for myself, and I recognize that every hon. member of this House, whether he be on the one side or the other, must vote on this matter, according to his judgment and to his conscience.

The declaration is one which at first was not applied to the Sovereign of England at all. It was applied in the first place to peers and members of parliament, and the object of it was to prevent persons professing the Roman Catholic religion from sitting or voting in either House of Parliament in England. In the first place by the statute which is known as the Bill of Rights which was passed in 1689, it was set forth that this declaration should be taken and subscribed to by the King or Queen of the realm ; and by a further statute which is known as the Act of Settlement which was passed in the year 1700, it was provided :

> That every King and Queen of this realm, who shall come to and succeed in the Imperial Crown of this kingdom by virtue of this Act shall have the coronation oath administered to him, her or them at their respective coronations according to the Act of parliament made in the first year of the reign of His Majesty and the said late Queen Mary, entitled an Act for Establishing the Coronation Oath ; and shall make, subscribe and repeat the declaration in the Act first above recited, mentioned or referred to in the manner and form thereby prescribed.

That brought into operation the words of this declaration as contained in the Act of 1662, passed the thirteenth year of Charles II.

As has been well said by the right hon. the Prime Minister, this is one of a series of statutes which two centuries ago imposed many disabilities upon Roman Catholics in Great Britain. These statutes have one after one been repealed, except in respect to one or two matters. In 1774, by an Act of the Irish parliament, Catholics were allowed to take a special oath of loyalty to the King. In 1778 an Act was passed for the relief of Catholic bishops and priests with respect to schools and with respect to the holding of property. In 1791 an Act was passed with respect to the necessity of taking the oath of supremacy and making a declaration against transubstantiation. In 1793 an Act was passed for the relief of Scotch Catholics with regard to the holding of property. In 1817 an Act was passed for the relief of officers of the army and navy, making it unnecessary for them to take oaths that were offensive to their religious belief ; and in 1829 was passed the Catholic Relief Act, which is well known to all the members of this House. The result is that this declaration remains as a declaration to be taken by the sovereign, that the sovereign of this country must under the law be a Protestant, and that two officers at least—the Lord Chancellor, who is supposed to be the keeper of the King's conscience, and I think the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—are still by vir-

tue of the constitution required to be Protestants.

Now, the question I first ask myself with regard to this declaration is, in case it should be amended or abolished, whether the constitution establishing the Protestant succession to the Crown is in any way in danger. Looking, in the first place, at the Bill of Rights, and in the next place at the Act of Settlement, which recites the Bill of Rights, it seems to me that all those securities which are dear to the convictions of a great many people of this country are sufficiently safeguarded without this declaration. The Protestant succession to the Crown is affirmed and declared throughout both these Acts. By section 2 of the Act of Settlement, which recites the Bill of Rights, containing somewhat similar provisions, it is provided that the succession to the Crown must devolve upon persons of the Protestant faith. Section 9 of the Bill of Rights deals with the possibility that a person otherwise entitled to succeed to the Crown might be in communion with or become reconciled to the Church of Rome, and in such case it provides that :

> The Crown and government shall from time to time descend to and be enjoyed by such person or persons, being Protestants, as should have inherited and enjoyed the same in case the said person or persons so reconciled, holding communion, or professing, or marrying as aforesaid, were naturally dead.

That is to say, if the Crown should descend to any person or persons to whom it should belong, and that person should enter into communion with the Roman Catholic church, or marry a Roman Catholic, the Crown should descend to the next in descent, who should be a Protestant. The same is affirmed in the Act of Settlement, which also provides :

> That whosoever shall hereafter come to the possession of this Crown shall join in communion with the Church of England as by law established.

It is therefore clear that without this declaration the succession to the Crown is by the two statutes I have quoted absolutely secured. Then it seems to me that it is a right thing and a proper thing, so far as this declaration contains matter which is offensive to the religious belief of any British subject, that it should be abolished or amended ; and I for one am prepared to state that in this House or before my constituents, or upon any public platform in this country.

The coronation oath which has been referred to by the right hon. leader of the government is another safeguard, and I also desire briefly to refer to that. The coronation oath, as adopted upon the accession of George II., and four successive sovereigns, and also, I believe, as used upon the accession of his present Gracious Majesty, is as follows :

> Will you solemnly promise and swear to govern the people of this Kingdom of Great Britain, and the dominions thereunto belonging, according to the statutes in parliament agreed on, and the respective laws and customs of the same ?
>
> I solemnly promise so to do.
>
> Will you to your power cause law, and justice, and mercy, to be executed in all your judgments ?
>
> I will.
>
> Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed religion established by law ?

And so forth, and the King answers : ' All this I promise to do.'

Now, it is desirable that those of us in this country who are Protestants should look at this declaration from the standpoint which would be presented to us if the Roman Catholic faith were the established faith of this country, and if the 12,000,000 people who are now in the minority were Protestants. Would we not feel a sense of injustice if a King whom we loyally served, whom we were ready on all occasions loyally to serve, should be obliged on his accession to the Crown to make a declaration with respect to the Protestant faith which contained matter so offensive as that which is found in this declaration ? I ask my hon. friends all over this House who are of the same religious belief as myself to take that into consideration, and to say whether they would not feel like making some effort to have an injustice of that kind redressed ? And the feelings which would animate us in the case which I have supposed are those which animate our Catholic friends throughout Canada. Therefore, although we may question the wisdom of introducing this matter into this House at this time, nevertheless we can well understand the feelings which animate hon. gentlemen in making this motion, and we can better appreciate the standpoint from which we should regard their action.

I do not desire to say very much further except with respect to the right of this House to pass any motion or tender any suggestion with regard to a subject of this kind which properly appertains to the Imperial parliament. The way that matter presents itself to me is that this parliament has, as has very truly been said, offered suggestions with regard to Imperial matters in the past. But, irrespective of all considerations of that kind, let us look at the question from another standpoint. No King, from William the Conqueror down, has ever become truly a King of England until he has taken the coronation oath, and made the declaration, if any, prescribed by law. He becomes King in the true sense of the word when he has done those two things. These are part of the compact between the Crown and the people. We are a portion of the British Empire. The compact which the

King makes with his people when he ascends the throne is a compact which he makes with us as well as with the people of the mother country ; and it seems to me that it might be competent for us in this House, without its being regarded as going beyond our legitimate sphere, to respectfully make a suggestion that that compact should not be expressed in terms which are offensive to a large body of the citizens of this country. It seems to me that in that way we might justify this resolution, although I do not disguise from myself the fact that it is a question upon which there may be a legitimate division of opinion in the House.

We all know how very slowly and painfully the world has learned the lesson of toleration in religious belief. We have seen how slowly even the institutions of our own country have permitted themselves to progress in that respect. I trust and believe that there is in Canada at present very little intolerance in respert of such matters, and that in the future there will be still less. We know that we have men in this House and country who hold strong opinions on one side or the other with regard to such matters. May I venture to express the hope that whatever views are advanced, whatever opinions are expressed on this question, they will be advanced and expressed in a generous and moderate spirit so as not to arouse any religious animosity which we all so much deprecate.

May I be allowed to make a suggestion to the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution, and the hon. gentleman who has seconded it. I venture to think that the conclusion is a little inconsequent, having regard to what proceeds. The resolution sets out, in the first place, that :

> As a token of the civil and religious liberties and of the equality of rights guaranteed to all British subjects in the Canadian confederation, as well as under the British constitution, a British sovereign should not be called upon to make any declaration offensive to the religious belief of any subject of the British Crown.

Then the resolution sets out the declaration referred to and proceeds as follows :

> That such declaration is offensive to the convictions of all Roman Catholics.

I am glad that the hon. the mover of the resolution has seen fit to alter his proposed motion with respect to the next paragraph, because he has amended the language of it at first presented. He proceeds to say :

> That the staunch loyalty of His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Canada and other British possessions should exempt them from any offensive reference to their religion by their sovereign.

It seems to me that we all might agree in the resolution so far, but what the motion proceeds to say is this :

> That in the opinion of this House the Act of Settlement should be amended by abolishing the said declaration.

Would it not be better for my hon. friends to consider whether that particular paragraph should not rather be amended in some way. If you logically follow the language that precedes this paragraph, all you would require to say would be this :

> That, in the opinion of this House, from this declaration should be eliminated anything offensive to the religious belief of any subject of Her Majesty.

In all sincerity, and with every desire to prevent this matter becoming the subject of controversy, I would suggest to my hon. friend that he might very well consider this change, and, I hope, adopt it. He will remember that he has introduced his motion in such a manner that it is impossible to offer any amendment, and he thus handicaps gentlemen in this House who are extremely anxious that this should not become a matter of controversy. He handicaps them by introducing his resolution in this particular way so that it cannot be amended. Therefore, it seems to me, that my hon. friends who moved and seconded the motion should be all the more ready to adopt some suggestion of this kind, which might express the views of hon. gentlemen who cannot bring their consciences to vote for the resolution exactly in the way in which it is framed. If my hon. friend should entertain that suggestion, and desires a little delay to consider it, I am sure there will be no objection in this House to concede him the delay he requires; but, I would trust and hope that he would not require much time to consider the suggestion I have made, and which I have made in the utmost possible good faith and sincerity.

I regret that I have trespassed so long on the attention of the House, and, as I have said before, I sincerely hope that this will not become a matter which will arouse any controversy in this House.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). I have listened with pleasure to the temperate and dispassionate address of the hon. the leader of the opposition, and I find in his remarks very little to criticise. The hon. gentleman has expressed a doubt—and I am free to confess that the same doubt has existed in my own mind—as to the propriety of introducing a resolution in a colonial legislature dealing with an Imperial question. We have, however, precedents for this course, and, I suppose that we have, as individuals, and in our collective legislative capacity, the right of competition.

The resolution offered by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) is simply a petition to the Throne asking for the redress of an alleged grievance; and even with the views I entertain on the propriety of

keeping strictly within our own sphere of action, I still do not realize that there is any particular incongruity or impropriety in the proposed action with regard to the declaration to be taken by the British sovereign that we are now considering.

The hon. the leader of the opposition informs us that this declaration dates back from the year 1689, and prior to that time was required from peers, and members of the House of Commons, and that upon the occasion of the inauguration of William and Mary, it was, for the first time, required of a British sovereign. The hon. gentleman went on to inform us that from time to time these declarations and laws and other requirements of a similar character have been modified, and various individuals and officials and collections of individuals in the United Kingdom relieved of the obligation of making such declaration. This of course is an argument leading directly in the line suggested by the hon. member for Victoria, that the change should go further, the modification be made greater, and that as peers and members of the House of Commons, and other officials have been relieved from the necessity of making this declaration, the time has properly come to relieve the sovereigns of the British Empire from the same necessity.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the conditions which existed when the obligation to take this declaration became law, if we consider them carefully and with a due degree of charity, will lead us to the conclusion that the step taken was, under the circumstances, a natural one. We must remember that when this declaration was taken by William and Mary, in 1689, it was at the end of eighty-six years of strife in England, eighty-six years of turmoil and internal dissension, eighty-six years of attempts on the part of rulers to break down and override constitutional government and to destroy the liberties of the people, eighty-six years of persecution and the violation of human rights in almost every sense and particular. We must recollect the occurrences in the reign of James I., of Charles I., of Charles II., and James II.—who was the mere pensioner of the King of France, who was the tool of the Papacy, who was determined to override the constitution and to destroy civil and religious liberty in the Kingdom of England. This condition of things led to the calling in of William and Mary and the passing of this drastic legislation that seems to us in this age so severe, so unnatural, so uncalled for and so unjustified. But, Sir, our forefathers who established these precedents in legislation are deserving a degree of consideration as to the circumstances under which they were led to take the action we are discussing to-day. The coming of William and Mary introduced a new order of things in England ; and in the 220 years since then, great changes have taken place. England at once assumed again under William and Mary the position she had occupied for a brief period under Cromwell, when she commanded the respect of the world and was a factor in human affairs. She became a great power and has continued to be a great power, disseminating the blessings of civilization, enlightenment and religion not only over the British Isles, but over vast territories of the earth. And the curse of things in these 220 years has brought us an evolution of conditions which leaves us hardly able to realize the state of public sentiment that existed at the time the legislation that we have under consideration was placed upon the statute-book. As evidence of this change in public sentiment among the English-speaking people we have the Treaty of Paris to secure to the inhabitants of French Canada their rights under the Napoleon code, their rights as Catholics, their rights as a French Canadian people. We have the erection of the great republic of the United States, where all recognition of religion is carefully avoided, and where it required a decision of the United States Supreme Court to establish the fact that it was a Christian nation. It is a nation where no oath with regard to religious belief, no conditions with regard to religious belief are possible ; where the Christian, the Jew, the agnostic, the Mohommedan, the Pagan, all stand on the same footing before the law and receive the same protection from the law. And we have this condition of things which has gone on from year to year, from generation to generation, so that it resulted, in 1829, in the Emancipation Act which removed the disabilities from Catholics. And the last relic of the condition of things that existed at that time is this very declaration that we now have under consideration. We can hardly realize the intense bitterness, the animosity that existed between various classes in the days to which I have referred. The Catholic persecuted the Protestant ; the Protestant persecuted the Catholic ; the Protestant persecuted the Protestant—Claverhouse, the envoy and agent of the papacy of England harried with fire and sword the covenanters of Scotland, the Puritans fled from the persecution that went on in the old land, and established their institutions in New England and they, in their turn, persecuted the Baptists and burned witches—all sects, all nationalities, all classes were imbued with the spirit of bitterness, of vindictiveness and animosity that could make no allowances for differences of opinion, but must make the world pronounce its own shibboleth and conform to its own views.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come, as I said a moment ago, for taking a step in Canada that will, at least, place upon record the views of the Canadian House of Commons as to the propriety of removing the last relic of the condition of things that existed at the time to which I refer. Of course, I wish to define my position

as a Protestant. In making this declaration I do not wish it to be understood that I subscribe to any doctrine that is denounced in this coronation declaration. I do not wish it to be understood that I believe in the doctrine of transubstantiation, for I hold to the old declaration of the Puritan Divine, who defined the Lord's Supper as being a sacrament established by Christ in which the use of the bread and wine set forth his death, and that these elements were partaken of not in a carnal manner, but by faith, and the use of these elements was made to represent the death of Christ. I believe that that beautiful simple ceremony that was established by our Master at the end of the last Passover Feast he celebrated, when he commanded his disciples to take the bread and wine and use them in remembrance of him, did not warrant the doctrine of transubstantiation, for he was there to dispense the elements. I do not subscribe to the doctrine of the worship of saints or the Virgin, for I remember the words of Christ, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only thou shalt serve.' And I remember Paul at Lystra who refused adoration from those upon whom he had exercised miraculous power. But these are matters of differences in doctrine. The belief in transubstantiation does not deny the divinity of Christ. The belief in the worship of the Virgin does not deny the sovereignty of Christ and the existence of an overruling Providence. But it is a far-fetched conclusion and unjustifiable to characterize those who believe in these doctrines as idolators. While, as a Protestant, I do not believe in them, I say that the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) has a right to believe in them—and he may as well be right as I, for neither of us is infallible. I have no right, nor has the government any right, to stamp him with the odious name of idolater because he happens to differ from me in matters of doctrinal belief. Therefore, I say, sweep these things away. As a Protestant, I do not say I believe these things are true, but I say that the hon. gentleman has as good a right to believe them as I have a right to believe the doctrines which I hold.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the existence of religious and civil liberty is the basis upon which our institutions rest. The existence of religious liberty is incompatible with stating any conditions, or denouncing any belief on the part of the law or on the part of the rulers of the country. If we are to have religious liberty, we shall find such a declaration as the one we have under consideration entirely incompatible with the exercise of that right. If we are to build up the institutions of this country upon a foundation of religious liberty, we must eliminate from our laws all conditions, all declarations, all statutes that are inconsistent with that principle; and it is proper, it is necessary, it is imperative, if we are to hold to the doctrines of religious liberty, that a declaration which requires the sovereign of Great Britain to declare that the man who believes in transubstantiation and in the worship of the Virgin Mary, is an idolater, should be swept away, or we have no claim to possess institutions which rest upon civil and religious liberty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is always a good idea to 'put yourself in his place,' if you are going to arrive at a conclusion as to whether your antagonist is right or wrong. I have asked myself the question: What would be my feelings if the conditions were reversed? What would be my feelings, if as a Presbyterian or as a Protestant, my co-religionists were in the minority and the Church of Rome was in the majority, and a clause was put into the coronation declaration of the sovereign of the realm which declared me, and those believing as I do, to be idolaters? Would it be relished by me? Would it be relished by those who believe as I do? Would it be just? Would it be warranted under the circumstances and under the institutions and laws of this country? It would not be warranted, it would be unjust, it would be trampling upon my rights, it would be a declaration that I would resent, it would be a declaration that I would fight to remove.

I do not look upon this question from my own standpoint alone. I turn to the hon. member for Victoria and I say, that while his belief is different from mine, while this odious designation of idolater does not rest upon me and does rest upon him, it would be equally unjust if the case were reversed, and he was placed in a position relieved from the odious declaration, and I was subjected to it. For this reason I believe in giving others that which we would claim for ourselves; I believe in giving to our Catholic fellow-citizens that justice which we ourselves would claim if we were placed in the position which they occupy. I do not believe in pressing a cup of bitterness to the lips of any of His Majesty's loyal subjects.

I believe, Sir, that the existence of this declaration has very much to do with the unrest that exists in Ireland, and that the removal of this declaration, the removal of the last remnant of those ages of hatred, of refusal to respect religious rights, of refusal to tolerate differences of opinion, of refusal to listen to anything but our own shibboleth—I say I believe the removal of this last relic of those old intolerant ages would have a most beneficial effect upon the pacification of Ireland, and would have a good effect upon our French Canadian fellow-citizens, who must feel themselves aggrieved in consequence of their sovereign being required to take the declaration under discussion. As a Protestant who would stand to the utmost and to the last for the vindication of his principles, I do not ask

for the retention of a condition with regard to others which I would spurn and resist with regard to myself. For this reason, I believe that the motion of my hon. friend amended in any way that he should choose to amend it, should pass.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by referring to the point which I spoke of at the opening of my remarks, and that is the only difficulty I feel in relation to this matter. I approve of the resolution per se; I have some doubts yet as to the propriety of this legislative body presuming to pronounce an opinion upon a matter pertaining to Imperial interest, Imperial legislation and Imperial affairs. As I said at the outset, I think we may be justified in doing this upon the ground that we have the right of petition, upon the ground that we are British subjects, subjects of a King whom we petition, that we are British subjects who are affected by this condition as much as if we were living in England; and the expression of our opinion on this matter surely will not be considered an impertinence, and surely will do no harm in the ultimate settlement of the matter which we have under our consideration to-day.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I have always regretted that questions of religion should be brought to the attention of this House of Commons. There is no reason, in my judgment, why it should be so. We have enormous questions to deal with. We have the business of building up a great nation in the British possessions on this North American continent, a work which taxes the resources of the ablest minds in the Dominion of Canada. But, from time to time, we have these religious or racial questions thrust upon the attention of the House of Comomns, calculated to provoke strife and discord and those feelings which we know by experience produce no good results.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the mover of the resolution (Mr. Costigan). He has, during my experience, never made a speech in this House of Commons calculated to promote the advancement and prosperity of this Dominion. Every speech, during the long period that I have been here, made by him has been on racial or religious lines, and calculated to provoke that very strife which we should seek to avoid, and to avoid which he tells us that he has in view in bringing up this question. Why, Sir, from the earliest days when the hon. member for Victoria was a member of this House of Commons, he brought in religious questions which disturbed the House of Commons, but which were relegated, as they should have been, to the province of New Brunswick, where they were settled amicably, because they belonged to the province of the New Brunswick legislature. At a later period, in 1882, I remember, the hon. member for Victoria brought in a resolution about Home Rule. In a few observations that I made upon that occasion, I ventured to say that the member for Victoria was trying to boom himself for position, and force himself into the government of the day. He got up and with the greatest vehemence denied the imputation; but the result was that within a very few weeks afterwards he was made a minister of the government of Canada. Is he afraid to-day that the mantle of oblivion is falling upon him again, and is it because he wants the people to know that he is still alive and a member of the House of Commons, that he has brought up another religious question for our consideration?

I listened with a good deal of interest, also, to the right hon. the First Minister, the supposed beneficiary, the intended beneficiary, if any beneficiary there be outside the member for Victoria himself, of the proposition made to-day. The right hon. First Minister had cuteness enough and power enough to prevent this question coming before the House of Commons in 1900, because an election was pending at that time, and the First Minister did not want this question brought up then.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the matter? He had, I say, sufficient influence and authority then to prevent that question coming up for consideration in the House of Commons, because an election was coming on at that period. To-day he is not satisfied with the power that he has, and the solidarity that he has acquired in the province of Quebec, and he feels that he requires something more to strengthen his position in that province. I think he should be satisfied, and more than satisfied, with his handy-work, and the handy-work of his colleagues in the province of Quebec. In reference to myself, I have always protested against questions of this kind coming up for consideration in the House of Commons. Even when my own political friends in recent years, thought it the proper thing, I protested against their course. I do so to-day. I believe that when we review all the circumstances we should carefully and cautiously proceed in a matter of this kind, and better still, I think we should take no position at all. If a wrong has been inflicted, the British government and the British parliament are strong enough, fair enough and generous enough, and have the instinct of doing right sufficiently to remove any wrong that may exist in that regard. They tell us that the language of this declaration is very strong. So it is, Mr. Speaker. It deals in very strong language with the question that is now before the House for discussion; it deals with it very straight-

ly. The language is strong in the declaration that the King of England has to make, and which he has to make, either on the first day of the first session of the parliament, after he comes to the Throne, or upon taking the coronation oath. He has, I presume, with the advice of his government, chosen to have that declaration made upon the first day, and not to wait for the coronation which will take place some time in the future. He has made that declaration. There is no question to-day as to how it will affect the present King of England. The only person it will affect will be his successor in office, and we all pray that another occasion for making this declaration may not arise for a long long time to come. I have said that the declaration to be made by the King of England is a very strong one. Well, Sir, it is not the only strong expression that obtains to-day. I listened to our good friend the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who in his vigorous language said that if you must call them idolaters, referring to our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, it is unfair, and that if he were one he would resent it, and fight to have it removed. He did not believe in pressing the cup of bitterness to his neighbour's lips. Our good friend tells us this afternoon that he is a member of the Presbyterian Church. We know that he is a distinguished dignitary of that church ; he not only performs the duties of the layman, but, I believe, he gets into the pulpit too, and preaches the gospel. We admire him for it, and we hope that he practices what he preaches. The church of which he is such a distinguished member have also views upon this question. The views held by the Presbyterian Church upon this question are in the Westminster Confession of Faith. In the Westminster Confession of Faith, page 109——

Mr. MACLEAN. Which edition ?

Mr. WALLACE. The edition that my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) does not know very much about. The distinguished gentleman who has just spoken in this House, and who is such an ornament of the church to which he belongs, will find on page 109 of the Westminster Confession of Faith, endorsed by two parliaments, one of the articles of the doctrine that he has to subscribe to before he gets into that pulpit. The hon. gentleman speaks of calling them idolaters ; I may be mistaken, I speak subject to correction, but I submit that the oath does not call any class idolaters, but it calls certain things idolatrous and superstitious. Here is what the hon. member for North Norfolk and that great and distinguished body of ministers of this country, belonging to the Presbyterian Church of Canada, say in regard to this question :

Mr. WALLACE.

There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ; nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that anti-Christ, that man of sin and son of perdition, that exhalted himself in the church against Christ and all that is called God.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WALLACE. I was waiting to hear the hon. member for North Norfolk get up and say that that was the doctrine of his church, and that he would stand by it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will get up, and I will inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) that the Westminster Confession of Faith is under discussion in the Presbyterian Church, that there is a very large proportion of members who are in favour of its modification, and that I belong to that wing.

Mr. WALLACE. The Westminster Confession of Faith, I presume, being a statement of the faith of intelligent men, of men of education and learning, has been under discussion and criticism from the first day it was adopted, 300 years ago, down to the present day, and when the hon. member tells us that it is under discussion to-day, he is not telling us anything we do not know. Why, of course it is. He is not giving us any information by telling us what we all knew before. That is one of the beliefs of the Presbyterian Church ; they have not amended it. Our good friend tells us that they have it under discussion ; it may be under discussion for 100 years, and it may be made still stronger, and still more positive than it is stated here. I do not know, and our good friend does not know either. Now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) what this has to do with a political question—the creed of a church or the tenets of the Presbyterian Church, on the Westminster Confession of Faith.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it is a very proper question to ask, and I say 'hear, hear,' too. To-day the King of England is head of the Presbyterian Established Church of Scotland, and he is head of that church which accepts the doctrine which I have just read. That is the reason why my statement has something to do with the question, because the King of England has to subscribe to that doctrine as well as the hon. member for North Norfolk. You will notice that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) is in quite distinguished company.

Mr. CHARLTON. He does that in his private capacity as an humble member of the church.

Mr. WALLACE. He does it in his public capacity as head of the Established Church of Scotland. Here again the Westminster Confession of Faith, says :

Private masses, or receiving the sacrament by a priest, or any other, alone, is likewise the denial of the cup to the people; worshipping the elements, the lifting them up, or carrying them about for adoration, and reserving them for any pretended religious use, are all contrary to the nature of the sacrament, and to the institution of Christ.

Further on article 6, page 119, says :

Transubstantiation or the changing of bread and wine into the substance of Christ's body and blood by consecration of the priest or by any other way, is repugnant, not to Scripture alone, but even to common sense and reason, overthroweth the nature of the sacrament ; and hath been and is the cause of manifold superstitions, yea, of gross idolatries.

Here we have things more offensive and more objectionable to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) in the Westminster Confession of Faith, than there is in the coronation oath, and the Westminster confession has to be made by the King of England. And this gentleman who is going to go over to England, and present his humble petition at the foot of the Throne, we never heard his eloquent voice from one end of the Dominion to the other raised—to say that these things should be changed in the Westminster Confession of Faith, until this afternoon, when he said that there was going to be a conference sometime in the future to consider the subject.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) evidently did not notice that I professed to some extent the same views in my speech.

Mr. WALLACE. What is that ?

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman evidently did not understand me in my speech, as endorsing to some extent these views, as my own views, as a private individual and member of the church. That has nothing to do with the question however. I stated that the views of the hon. gentleman from Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) were divergent from mine, but neither of us had the right to make these views the criterion by which the King shall be governed in his declaration of office as ruler of an empire which is composed of subjects of different religious views.

Mr. WALLACE. That does not answer the statement I have made. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), said :

To call them idolaters would be unfair, would be unjust, would be odious. He would resent it, and he would fight to the death to remove it.

That is what he has told us in a few minutes as his own confession of faith, and he said he did not believe in pressing the cup of bitterness to his neighbour's lips. But where is he now ? He tells us that he had stated that he shared the views which I have expressed. If he did say so, I must apologize to him, because I caught the very opposite meaning from his remarks. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is something else in regard to this matter. There is another church, the glorious old Church of England; that church which has done so much to evangelize the world, and to spread the belief of its own religion, without being open to the accusation of being partisan, or without being unjust to those other churches that have clustered around it in Great Britain and other countries as well. There are thirty-nine articles of faith. Mr Speaker, I shall not read you the thirty-nine articles.

Some hon. MEMBERS. 'Hear, hear.' 'Dispense.' 'Thank you.'

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) thanks me very much, but I think if I did refresh his memory with the thirty-nine articles, he ought to thank me very much more, because I do not know any gentleman of my acquaintance who seems to have so utterly forgotten the essence of so many of these articles as the Minister of Railways and Canals has. The twenty-second article is the one to which I would call his attention on page 492, and that article is subscribed to by King Edward VII., our glorious monarch, as the head of the Church of England. The English church is established by law in England, not in Canada, because we have no established church in Canada except the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec, and we read in the papers that they are trying down there to override the civil power in some cases.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. WALLACE. But this is one side of the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. I say that in Great Britain the King of England is the head of the Church of England. He has to subscribe to the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England; he has to take communion in the Church of England. Article 22, reads as follows :

The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration as well of images as of reliques, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.

That is the declaration the King has to make. I will not read article 28, because it is a long one, and it might tire out the Minister of Railways and Canals, but it is

something to the same effect. Article 19, page 444, reads as follows :

The visible church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments being duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

As the church of Jerusalem, Alexandria and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.

These are the articles that the King of England has to declare to even if you abolish the declaration which the member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Costigan) complains of. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have other questions with reference to the King's temporal power. I quote :

The Queen's Majesty [referring to Queen Elizabeth] hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other of her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction.

Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended; we give not to our princes the ministering either of God's word, or of the sacraments, the which thing the injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen, do most plainly testify; but that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scriptures by God himself ; that is that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evildoers.

The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England

The laws of this realm may punish Christian men with death, for heinous and grievous offences.

It is lawful for Christian men, at the command of the magistrates, to wear weapons and serve in the wars.

These are the articles of the Church of England. These are the articles which the King of England has to subscribe to as the head of that church ; and if you abolish that declaration, which troubles our friend the member for Victoria, you will have to abolish all the objectionable articles of the Church of England. Would it not be a nice spectacle, Mr. Speaker, to see the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England revised by the Hon. John Costigan ? As a humble member of that church myself, I shall protest——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should not refer to an hon. member by name.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not speaking of him as a member. I am speaking of him as the reviser of the Thirty-nine Articles.

Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. SPEAKER. By the rules of the House—and the hon. member knows them very well—it is not parliamentary to refer to an hon. member by name.

Mr. WALLACE. I know, Mr. Speaker, that a member is not to refer to another member by name in connection with the business of the House ; but I was referring to him in another capacity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order. Chair. Take it back.

Mr. WALLACE. I would not for a moment break any of the rules of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member knows very well that it is not parliamentary to refer to another member by name, either in his private capacity or otherwise.

Mr. WALLACE. Of course, I submit to your decision, Mr. Speaker. I say I will protest in the most vigorous way I can against the member for Victoria, N.B., revising the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, or the Westminster Confession ; and I am sure that in this way I shall secure the cordial assistance of the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton).

Now, Sir, I referred to these matters to show that even if the declaration which is complained of were abolished, the King of England would still have to make declarations which are stronger and more vigorous in language, both as the head of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland and the Established Church of England in England. So that the proposal made by the hon. member does not remove the difficulty he complains of.

You may say this language is too strong and too vigorous. Well, Sir, it may be ; that is a matter of opinion. But these churches are to be the judges in these matters themselves, and the House of Commons cannot interfere with the churches in this country—less even with the churches in England and Scotland—as to what their beliefs may be. What did the Pope of Rome say the other day in that celebrated interview with the Duke of Norfolk ? He said that under the British flag the Roman Catholic Church had rights and privileges and a freedom such as it had in no other country in the world. It is true, and, for my part, as a citizen of Canada I rejoice to know that that is the case. I am proud to live in a country where it may be said of any citizen, that so far as his religious beliefs are concerned, no man dare make him afraid, but he has the full, free privilege of worshipping his God in any manner he chooses. I have done my part throughout this country in preaching and promulgating that doctrine——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WALLACE. The jeers from the opposite side of the House come from those who know nothing about it, and I challenge them to point to a speech of mine in the House of Commons or out of the House of Commons—and I have spoken freely everywhere on these matters—where a contradiction has been given to the statement I am making to-day, or a line to justify a contradiction to it. They cannot do it, Mr. Speaker, and I challenge them to give us the proof before they use their sneers. A sneer is not a reply or a contradiction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the Church of Rome ? I have spoken of the Church of England. I have read its declarations, made in the strongest and most vigorous language, of the beliefs that it holds. I have read the declarations of the Presbyterian Church. And what I say of those two churches, I think I can safely say of all the other Protestant churches, that their beliefs are founded on the same lines as those of the Presbyterian Church and the Church of England in that regard ; so that the statement I make about those two churches in a general way applies to all Protestant churches. Now, about the Roman Catholic Church I do not wish to say anything, because I am not a Roman Catholic. I could read you a mass of evidence ; but I will just read the oath which is taken by the Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church when they are consecrated to the bishopric. In the Roman Pontifical, printed at Rome by authority in the year 1818, and on page 62 of that volume, will be found this form of oath to be taken by every Roman Catholic bishop at his consecration. In it he swears :

> To be faithful and obedient to his lord the Pope and his successors ; to assist them in maintaining the Roman Papacy and the royalties of St. Peter against all men; to preserve, defend, augment and promote its rights, honours and privileges; to persecute and impugn, with all his might, heretics and schismatics, and rebels against his said lord.

That has never been repealed ; that is the law to-day. Our good friend the First Minister said to us to-day that they would not tolerate the interference of ecclesiastical authorities in civil matters. I read in the London Times as follows :—

> What is going on in Austria at present ought to serve as a warning to those Englishmen who have failed to understand that the interference of the Vatican can have none but evil consequences. The spirit of even such a Catholic people as the Austrians has at last been aroused against the political priest.

And we know, Mr. Speaker, that in Spain and Portgual there are rebellions to-day against the interference of the clergy and the various religious societies of that church in civil affairs ; and we know that the same state of affairs is prevailing in Italy and France. In the face of these facts, we have the evidence, as I have read, of what the practice is in the Church of Rome. I am not going to refer to past history, because I do not think it is necessary, though it is provoked by the resolution which is proposed here to-day. But I can say this, that the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., would be much better employed in curing those evils in his own church than in coming here and proposing to revolutionize the Church of England and the Presbyterian Church or the other Protestant churches. He will find, as every one of us will find, I am sure, ample work to do in that regard in the churches to which we individually belong.

The British people have decided that their King shall be of the Protestant faith. They have endeavoured to surround that with all the safeguards and provisos that they think necessary. Those safeguards and provisos are mainly the declaration and the oath, and the fact that the King is the head of the Church of England and the head of the Church of Scotland—the Presbyterian Church as well—the fact that he is head of those two churches, and has to subscribe to their doctrines and make the declaration, is a guarantee that the will of the people will be carried out.

There is another point which, to my mind, is of great importance. We are told that the Roman Catholic conscience is outraged by the declaration. And the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall), who seconded the motion, has told us that in the old days in Nova Scotia there was a member of the legislature who refused to take the oath with regard to transubstantiation, which had to be taken at that time, and that shortly afterwards that oath was repealed. I am delighted that it was repealed, and that throughout the British Empire no man's religion is a bar to his attaining civil power, except in the case of the King of England and the keeper of his conscience, the Lord Chancellor, and the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. So far as the King of England is concerned, he has to make that declaration, but none of his subjects, save the exceptions I have mentioned, have. In the old days, members of parliament and judges and others had to make it, but that has been abolished, and there is no grievance in any domain under the British Crown to-day in that regard. British subjects may be Brahmins or Hindoos or Mohammedans, or belong to any of the Christian churches, or be Jews, there is no disability on that account attached to them. That, in my opinion, is right, but the people of England, who have the say in the matter, have declared—and they continue to declare, I assume, because otherwise they would change the law—that they will have a Protestant King on the Throne of England.

The history of the past they consider, and I consider, justifies them in taking that position. So that, if the King of England has to make that declaration, not one of his subjects, barring the two I have mentioned—the Lord Chancellor and the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—has to take it, no matter what position he may occupy. We have an illustration before us to-day. The right hon. gentleman who occupies the honourable position of First Minister of the great Dominion of Canada is, he tells us, of the Roman Catholic faith. That does not place him under any disability, and there was no disability against his predecessor, Sir John Thompson, who was also of the same faith, and whom I individually supported with all the vigour I possessed constantly, from the hour of his accession to the day of his lamented decease. Listening to the speeches this afternoon, one would come to the conclusion that hon. members of this House were under some personal grievance and were required to make some declaration which was opposed to their conscience and their judgment or both. But they are not required to do so.

Since the British people have not seen fit to change this declaration in all those years, we must assume that they hold as strongly to their beliefs in this regard as they did before. But we are living in this country side by side with men of all religious beliefs. We live together in amity, each one practicing his own religion any way he chooses, and each one being a good citizen. We are of different political party. Our neigbours on the one side are Grits and on the other Tories, and we do not refuse to live with our neighbours because of difference in politics, nor do we refuse to live with our neighbours who are Roman Catholics. In the county I represent, where we have a large Roman Catholic population, I never knew a place where Roman Catholics and Protestants live together in greater amity, but when we bring up those question with which we have nothing to do, we are likely to disturb that harmony.

The right hon. the First Minister said the justification for the course proposed was two-fold. First, we had interfered in the past when we offered our opinion, on two or three different occasions, on home rule. Well, Mr. Speaker, we did, and from Mr. Gladstone, the head of the government of that day, as the right hon. the Prime Minister has told us, we got a polite intimation to mind our own business and the British parliament would attend to theirs. And home rule has not been advanced, it has not become an accomplished fact, though Canada, on two or three occasions, appealed to the British parliament to pass a measure of home rule. They are better acquainted with the circumstances and conditions than we are. Those home rule petitions were intended for political effect, and I cannot get rid of the impression that the present movement is intended to give a little assistance to our good friend the First Minister, as well as to lift the non. member for Victoria, N.B., (Mr. Costigan) from that obscurity into which he has deservedly fallen. The right hon. the First Minister told us that last year we interfered in Imperial matters by passing a resolution proffering assistance to Great Britain in the case of difficulties in South Africa. He said we had passed a resolution of sympathy with the Uitlanders, and more than sympathy, because it could only be interpreted to mean active assistance. But the right hon. gentleman knows full well that in the middle of the summer we had passed that resolution, and when hostilities began, when the whole empire, Australia, New Zealand, and other portions of the empire had a call to arms and recognized their duty to show the hostile nations of Europe that if they should attack Great Britain they would have to deal with the whelps of the lion as well, where was the right hon. the First Minister of this great and loyal Dominion ? He was issuing a proclamation, on the 3rd or 4th of October, saying that we could not or would not render any substantial assistance to the empire in South Africa. I think his refernce to these things was unfortunate. However, these are the two reasons that the hon. minister gives us for the interference proposed to-day. I do not think they justify that interference ; I do not think we should be called upon to interfere. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has suggested changes ; and the chief beneficiary-expectant sitting opposite to me accepts the motion in amendment to going into Supply as a friendly motion which he believes, as I understand him, should pass, and he will give it his assistance, though he says that the wording of it does not suit him. If the hon. member for Victoria were as desirous as he says he is of having this resolution freely discussed and fairly disposed of, he would bring it up in the proper way and not as an amendment on going into Supply. For, the leader of the opposition has pointed out that amendments would make it much more acceptable to the people of this country, but he has no power to move these amendments thanks to the arrangement made between the hon. member for Victoria and the right hon. First Minister. In that regard an unfairness has been done to the House. This is one of those great questions upon which we should be permitted to express our views by word, or by vote, or by amendment. But that has not been permitted. And we have the spectacle to-day of the hon. member for Victoria by bringing in a motion in amendment to Supply—which is considered, in almost every case except in some cases of urgency, a motion of want of confidence—and that being accepted and helped along by the First Minister, thus preventing the presentation of those amendments which

hon. members should be at liberty to bring forward upon questions so important as this.

I have no more to say, except this—I think that in dealing with this matter as is proposed we open up a vista of difficulties for the future. As I have already pointed out you may abolish every line of that declaration, and yet the same words stand before the public, declared by the King of England, whoever he may be, as the head of the two great Protestant churches in Britain. The proposal of the hon. member for Victoria will not cure the difficulty. Great Britain has the matter in hand ; and Great Britain is not going to belie her record, to belie her past ; she will not be less liberal and generous to every citizen than she has been in years gone by. On the contrary, recent events, such as our men going out to fight side by side with British regular soldiers, the battles of the empire, will make the parliament and people of Great Britain, if they see any injustice or unfairness to any portion of His Majesty's citizens, more ready than ever before to remedy it, more ready than ever before to mete out justice to every citizen of the great British Empire.

Mr. HENRY R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). Mr. Speaker, I come from a constituency where there live side by side the French and the English, the Protestant and the Catholic, with a degree of harmony and with an amity that should be emulated throughout this country and in every country. For that reason I regret that the very first occasion when I raise my voice in this parliament should be one when the subject before us is one of a controversial character with respect to religion and race. I would have had it otherwise. But I cannot allow the occasion, now that it has arisen, to pass without making some references to the matter under discussion. At the very outset I wish to refer to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). I followed his remarks with care, with watchfulness, for I was anxious, owing to his place in his profession and his position in the House, to learn the opinions he held with respect to this matter. And I have to congratulate my hon. friend upon his utterance. I certainly can subscribe in every particular to the sentiments he expressed. But I had a certain amount of sympathy for him in the utterance of his sentiments. He seemed to stand alone, so far as any applause from those behind him was concerned. As he uttered sentiment after sentiment that was to be admired, as he announced principle after principle that could not be gainsaid, there was not a word of approval from those who surrounded him. Indeed, I thought that my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) who has just resumed his seat was in a more fortunate position in that respect. I noticed that my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who sits directly behind the leader, occasionally interrupted with a 'hear, hear' the remarks of the hon. gentleman from West York (Mr. Wallace). The hon. leader of the opposition states that he takes exception to the resolution in its phraseology and that he would be willing, if the hon. member from Victoria (Mr. Costigan) would consent to an amendment, to support the resolution with his whole heart. He felt that if these amendments suggested by him were made there would be left no matter of controversy in the resolution. I have read the declaration carefully, and I am of the opinion that if what has been suggested by the leader of the opposition were done, if, as I understood him to desire, all offensive portions of that declaration were eliminated, then does he think there would be anything left substantial and necessary in the interest of the constitution, or to the coronation oath ? I would ask my hon. friend if he thinks there would be anything left in the declaration if there were eliminated from it all the words which are alleged to be offensive ? Sir, I would invite hon. members carefully to read over that declaration. It has been suggested that the first portion of it contains words which are offensive, that portion ending with the words 'superstitious and idolatrous' ; and I understood my hon. friend from Halifax to say that after all that portion were eliminated the remainder would be quite satisfactory.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. I did not venture to state which portion of the declaration was offensive, and which was not offensive. My suggestion was made merely for the purpose of logically following out in the resolution what had been stated in the preamble, merely that. I did not attempt to deal with details in making the suggestion that I did.

Mr. EMMERSON. I accept my hon. friend's statement, but if his suggestion were carried out, there would be nothing left in the declaration, and there would be no necessity for any declaration at all in connection with the coronation oath. It has been said that this motion has been introduced in such a way as to prevent any amendment being moved, but it will be seen that there is no necessity, there cannot be any necessity, for any amendment, because the question is simply one as to whether this declaration should not stand as it is with respect to those features in it which are complained of, or whether we should say to His Majesty that it is quite proper that the declaration should remain as it has stood for upwards of 200 years.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 13) respecting the Canada National Railway and Transport Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 19) an Act respecting the Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company (Limited).—Mr. Borden (Halifax).

Bill (No. 20) an Act respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—Mr. Prior.

Bill (No. 21) an Act respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Prior.

Bill (No. 22) an Act respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 23) an Act respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 24) an Act respecting the South Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 25) an Act to incorporate the Ottawa and Hull Power and Manufacturing Company (Limited).—Mr. Champagne.

Bill (No. 26) an Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Fortin.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to call your attention to the fact that Bill No. 14, to incorporate the Century Life Insurance Company, is now printed and distributed.

Mr. SPEAKER. We have established the rule, and I will call the attention of hon. members to the fact that all the Bills which are not mentioned on the Order paper as being printed will not be called in future in order to avoid any misunderstandings. The reason for this is that there may be opposition to some Bills, and as they are not mentioned on the Order paper as having been printed, perhaps, an hon. member would be under the impression that it would not be necessary for him to be present, and to avoid any misunderstanding, after consultation with a certain number of persons, I have come to the conclusion that in future we will simply call Bills which are mentioned on the Order paper as having been printed.

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. TALBOT moved second reading of Bill (No. 27), respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.

Mr. FORTIN. I would ask that the second reading of this Bill be deferred as there may be some objection to the Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to obstruct this Bill in any way, but I think it would be well to explain to the House that this Bill, No. 27, is printed while Bill No. 14, to incorporate the Century Life Insurance Company, is not printed. I think these Bills should be printed consecutively.

Mr. SPEAKER. I could not give any explanation to the hon. member (Mr. Henderson), but I suppose it is due to the fact that, perhaps, one Bill is longer than the other. They are all sent at the same time, and I do not see any reason why they should not be printed.

Mr. HENDERSON. A Bill of this kind might be kept standing for an indefinite period simply for the purpose of keeping it back in the Bureau. I do not think the reason that a Bill is a long one is a good reason.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is always necessary, at all events, that a Bill shall be printed. I understand this one is printed. The rule I laid down a few minutes ago is for the purpose of avoiding any misunderstanding, because in the past I am informed that there have been misunderstandings about these Bills. A Bill will not be called unless it is marked printed on the Order paper.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not finding any fault with your rule, Mr. Speaker, but I cannot understand why Bill No. 14 should not be printed, when Bill No. 27 has been printed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SUPPLY—THE CORONATION OATH.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Speaker, before the House rose for recess, I was endeavouring to show what the object of this motion was, and that its amendment, if amendment were permissible, could in no sense change its terms, providing it is admitted as I understand it to be admitted, by at least the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), that all the objectionable and offensive features of the declaration which attends the coronation of the sovereign of the empire should be eliminated. It is not necessary to discuss the question of the amendment if it is merely a technical feature which does not in any way affect the merits involved in the resolution. And, Mr. Speaker, the very first thing we have to inquire is: What is the object of the resolution? As read, it proposes to ask His Majesty to amend the Test Act by eliminating the declaration which is attendant upon the ceremony of the coronation of the sovereign of the empire, and for the reason: that that declaration takes exception to the dogma of a particular church, and it becomes a question for us to consider as to what a dogma is.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh!

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman may say 'Oh,' but that consideration is

relevant in a discussion of this kind, because, as I understand it, a dogma is an opinion or theory derived from the gospels, and formulated as a doctrine by the church ; or, it is an opinion or theory of men founded on the words of Christ. Without going into a discussion of dogma, or without considering at all the religious opinions that may be held, it must be apparent that we, as citizens of the empire, interested in the sovereign, interested in all that appertains to his kingly office, should be anxious to see that there is nothing surrounding his high estate which could in any way transgress that liberty of conscience which is enjoyed by all those living in the British Empire. I for one am willing to subscribe to the proposition, that we as citizens of the empire should respectfully suggest and pray that there shall be eliminated from the coronation ceremony anything that could be considered as offensive to the religious convictions of any subject of His Majesty.

The hon. gentleman from West York (Mr. Wallace) referred to the fact that His Majesty, as King of England, was obliged to subscribe to the Westminster Confession of Faith, and also to the Thirty-nine Articles. While that may be so, it would seem to me that His Majesty does not do so as an individual, or as a King, but that he does it under the law as head of the church. If His Majesty subscribes to the Thirty-nine Articles, I hold that he does not in any sense subscribe to the Westminster Confession, for it stands to reason that he cannot subscribe to both, because for many reasons they are diametrically opposed to each other. Therefore, while the law recognizes him as head of the Established Church in Scotland, and also as head of the Established Church in England, yet the law does not require of him that he shall personally subscribe to any of the doctrines or dogmas contained either in the Thirty-nine Articles or in the Westminster Confession of Faith.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. At all events a discussion as to whether His Majesty does or does not do so is not relevant to the proposition involved in the resolution before the House. After listening to the utterances of the hon. gentleman from West York (Mr. Wallace), one is at a loss to know whether or not that gentleman is conversant with the occurrences which have transpired within the last twelve months. If there is one idea more than another which has grown and developed in Canada during this past year, it is the idea of empire. On every occasion, from every platform, among all classes and creeds we hear utterances in this Dominion as to the growth of the idea of empire. It is not germane to the subject that we should view the inception of this idea of empire from an historical standpoint. It is not even necessary for us to attempt to discover how the idea got lodgment in the minds of British subjects everywhere in all lands. We have only to recognize the fact that in Canada this idea has grown, and we have evidences of it on every hand. In all the public speeches of leading statesmen, in all the opinions ventilated by publicists and men of affairs, the idea is promulgated that we are beyond and above what we were a few years ago ; that we have developed from the mere citizenship of Canada, grand as that is, into the broader and grander citizenship of the British Empire. I do not think it is necessary for me to go into detail of the origin of those British institutions of which we are all so proud. That, I will leave to the historian, but I may recall the fact that in the early history of the United Kingdom originated those grand British institutions at a time when England was Catholic, at a time when there was no test oaths ; at a time when the religious convictions of Englishmen were far different from what they are to-day. Take the glorious Magna Charta ; take the right of trial by jury ; take the idea in our municipal affairs of magistrates and sheriffs and such officers, and you will find that their inception was at a time when England was wholly and solely and exclusively Catholic. Therefore, Sir, if we take pride to-day in the idea of empire, we must not forget what we are and whence we sprung ; we must not shut our eyes to the past. Bearing this in mind, I am sure that we will all be prepared to view this question dispassionately and calmly, recognizing the changed conditions, and recognizing too, that we in Canada are a different people to-day from what we were even a few years ago. I am sure that our neighbours to the south of us take pride in the idea and in the history of the Pilgrim Fathers. They take pride in the fact that they came from that ancestry—and there are many in Canada who had the same origin, and who came here by way of New England. If they take pride in that fact, it is because there was implanted upon the shores of New England, when their little bark arrived, the principles of religious liberty and freedom of conscience, and the right to worship God at whatever shrine their consciences dictated. This idea has been beautifully described by Mrs. Hemans in her poem on the Pilgrim Fathers :

What sought they thus afar ?
Bright jewels of the mine ?
The wealth of seas, the spoils of war ?—
They sought a faith's pure shrine !

Ay, call it holy ground,
The soil where first they trod !
They have left unstain'd what there they found—
Freedom to worship God !

And while our neighbours to the south rejoice in that freedom and claim it as a proud heritage, I am sure there is no portion of this American continent where the people can take greater pride in the same freedom than we in Canada. If our neighbours have that freedom, I am sure that we have it in its very essence, and enjoy it to the fullest extent. That being the case, we surely must recognize that under the law this privilege belongs to every man living in Canada and having the rights of Canadian citizenship. If, then, it is acknowledged as a right which the citizens of the empire may enjoy to the fullest extent, it must surely be acknowledged as a right that should be enjoyed without offence, and without anything that would in any way reflect upon or mar the enjoyment of that right. If that is the case, surely there can be no objection on the part of Canadians to approach the Throne and ask that there shall be eliminated from that test oath the objectionable features that have been referred to, as embodied in the declaration which has been under discussion this afternoon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not refer to myself with any idea of wishing to invite personal attention; but I do think that it is permissible to me to refer to the position which I hold with respect to these matters. I am not in any sense in sympathy with the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. My origin and my ancestry were such that I came from one of the Protestant denominations, and I owe allegiance and give adherence to one of the Protestant denominations of this Dominion. I recognize that at one time in the history of this empire that denomination suffered under legal and civil disabilities. I recognize that there was a time, even in Canada, at least in the province from which I come, when those who enjoyed the same ideas of religion that I do were under the ban—under disabilities with respect to public offices—when they were not in the enjoyment of the fullest civil and religious freedom which they enjoy to-day.

If this were a question involving the adoption of some particular dogma or creed, if it were a question which in a way involved the acceptance of doctrines which I as a Protestant do not hold, I could not in any sense approve of or support the motion of my hon. friend from Victoria. But I do not understand the question to be that at all. I understand the motion in no sense diminishes or restricts the religious freedom which every man in Canada enjoys to the fullest extent. It in no sense modifies the religious opinions of any one supporting it. It simply says that there shall be no reflections cast upon the religious convictions which any citizen of the British Empire may hold. With these ideas dominant in my mind, and with the idea that I would wish to enjoy my own religious convictions to the fullest extent without any reflection being cast upon them, I grant to those whose religious views differ from my own the same right; and I would not ask that there should be anything, either on the statute-books of this country or in any ceremonial connected with parliamentary proceedings, that would in any way reflect upon the conscience, the judgment or the religious conviction of any citizen of the empire, whoever he may be. I go farther, perhaps, than some hon. members of the Protestant faith; I believe in the entire severance of church and state; and I belong to a denomination which has that idea for its guiding principle, and which, through good report and ill report, has always stood up for that principle. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has stated that there are a number of Protestant denominations clustering around the Church of England. I want to say to him that I belong to a denomination that is in no sense clustering around the feet of the Church of England, or around it in any way. I belong to a church holding the faith which, in my judgment, had its origin long before the Church of England was ever thought of.

An hon. MEMBER. That is right.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend says that is right. It is right, because sacred history will prove it to be right. And, that being so, I would be untrue to the tenets of that faith if I were in any way to subscribe to a doctrine at variance with them. I have the deepest sympathy with those who are in any way brought under the ban from a religious standpoint. If my reading of history teaches me aright, there have been offences of a serious character committed by Protestants and Catholics alike in the history of the past. And if there is one blot upon the history of our young Canada, it is the expulsion of the French Acadians from the soil of Nova Scotia, in 1755. Was it because they were disloyal? If my memory be correct, from 1735, down to 1755, the French Canadians of the province of Nova Scotia suffered untold hardships, were deprived of privileges, and in every way placed in an unenviable position. This state of things finally culminated in their expulsion. I ask, were they expelled because they were not loyal or not willing to be loyal subjects of His Majesty? No, Mr. Speaker, they were willing to take the oath of allegiance, but refused to subscribe to the declaration involved in that test oath; and because they were not willing to become apostates to their faith, because they were true to the religious convictions which they learned at their mother's knee, they were sent out wanderers and outcasts over the continent of America. And their story, as you all know, has been beautifully told by Longfellow. If, 150 years ago those people were unwilling to subscribe to that declaration and suffered by reason of their refusal, surely hon. members must admit

that since then we have made advances in the direction of civil and religious liberty, which we should not ignore by voting against this resolution.

I cannot believe that our Christianity has been so ineffective, so futile during that period, that there have not been advances in mutual toleration and self-respect, and I cannot believe that the people of this country would be unwilling to subscribe, every one of them if it were brought to their notice, to the principle in the resolution before us.

My hon. friend who resumed his seat last belongs to an order which has given him great prominence, and I desire to say to my hon. friend, that I am an humble member of that order also. But when I profess allegiance to that order, I do so upon the well-recognized fact that the principles of that institution are based on equal rights for all, and while that order upholds the maintenance of the Protestant religion, at the same time it requires its members to give liberty of conscience to those who do not see eye to eye with them. And if it be true that the cardinal principle of that order, to which my hon. friend owes very much, be equal rights to all, then I ask those who are of the Protestant faith how would they like it, if some cherished tenet of their faith were denounced in any declaration by the sovereign of this empire, under the form of law. I think I need only appeal to the fair Canadian citizenship of this country for an answer to that question. Equal rights to all and the full freedom and enjoyment of all our religious convictions, but a condemnation under the law of none should be our guiding principle.

I shall, therefore, have much pleasure in voting, because of the faith to which I subscribe, and the allegiance I owe to that faith, in favour of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Victoria.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Before giving my vote on this question, I would like to offer a few remarks to the House. I listened with pleasure to the speech of the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., (Mr. Costigan) in introducing his resolution. He introduced it in a modest manner, and a style which was not in the slightest degree objectionable. I also listened with pleasure to the speech of the right hon. leader of the government, and to the sentiments he expressed, I could scarcely find any objection. I listened also with a good deal of interest to the remarks of my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace), and was particularly pleased to hear him read from the Confession of Faith. Perhaps it is a long time since I have read it, and it reminded me of my early days when, between my meals of oatmeal porridge, I was brought up principally on the shorter catechism and the confession of faith. I am not like my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who states that that faith is under the process of revision at present, and consequently is uncertain in his views. I stick to it in its entirety. And I must remind my hon. friend from West York, that there are no dignitaries in the Presbyterian Church, and when he asserts that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is a dignitary in that church, I must take objection to his statement. It is a church which sticks to its faith, and I hold to the confession of faith and the short catechism on which I was bred and educated. With reference to the question before the House and the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentleman who introduced it, although perfectly agreeing with him, I must draw his attention to the resolution, which is entirely a different thing. I must remind him that in all the debates in the House of Lords, and in the House of Commons, I never heard of any fault found with the declaration of the King.

The debate turned simply upon a criticism of the coronation oath, as to how it affected the legislative and executive action of the King himself ; because the declaration does not affect it in any way. There are two things required by the Settlement Act. The first of these is the coronation oath. If it were confined to that, any man, even a Roman Catholic could take that oath and be the sovereign of Great Britain. There is a pre-requisite declaration besides the oath. I agree with the right hon. the premier, that the declaration consists of two parts, one in reference to transubstantiation, the other in reference to the worship of the Virgin Mary, and the saints—two parts that are contrary to the belief, and objectionable to the feelings of every Roman Catholic. But he must remember that, in the clause of the petition he proposes to send to the old country, in seeking to eliminate these two objectionable parts, he does not substitute any declaration at all. And I venture to say that there is not any other person who does not believe and maintain that the sovereign of the British Empire should make a declaration that he belongs to the Protestant religion. That is a pre-requisite along with the coronation oath. You do away with that declaration.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is that declaration made in the abjuration oath ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The declaration belongs to the test oath, which was required by the Act of Mary. That Act was repealed by the Act of William and Mary, the only part that was retained being the declaration. The declaration was included in the test oath which was required, as the Prime Minister said, of every member of parliament, of every member of the House of Lords, and of every subject of the sovereign when he accepted office. But that test oath was abolished in regard to all the subjects of the sovereign and retained solely

in the case of the sovereign himself. That declaration is a pre-requisite under the Settlement Act, when the sovereign must declare that he is a believer in the Protestant religion——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would like to follow the hon. gentleman, but I am not sure that I understand him. Does he say that there are other declarations than the two to which he referred, about disbelief in the worship of the Virgin and of transubstantiation ? Does he say that there is a third declaration required ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not at all. The Settlement Act requires a declaration that the sovereign belongs to the Protestant religion. That declaration is embodied in the only declaration which the sovereign takes——

Mr. BOURASSA. That is in the Bill of Rights.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is required under Act of parliament that the sovereign should be a Protestant, and that he should take the coronation oath. You do away with that declaration about his being a Protestant under this petition of yours, about his declaration.

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is my opinion upon the subject, because it says in the resolution :

In the opinion of this House, the above-mentioned Act of Settlement should be amended by abolishing the said declaration.

You abolish the declaration altogether. There is no requirement in the coronation oath itself that the sovereign should declare himself a Protestant. Here is the coronation oath :

Archbishop.—Will you solemnly promise and swear to govern the people of the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the dominions thereunto belonging according to the statutes in parliament agreed on and the respective laws and customs of the same?

King.—I solemnly promise so to do.

Archbishop.—Will you, to the extent of your power, cause law and justice and mercy to be executed in all your judgments?

King.—I will.

Archbishop.—Will you, to the utmost of your power, maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel and the Protestant Reformed religion established by law——

It does not say that he shall be a believer in the Protestant religion—there is no requirement of that kind.

And will you maintain and preserve inviolable the settlement of the Church of England and the doctrine, discipline and government thereof——

And so on. There is nothing in the coronation oath making it necessary for the sovereign to declare he is a Protestant.

The PRIME MINISTER. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question ? Does he pretend that the test oath which is referred to in the declaration makes the King swear that he is a Protestant ? That oath which is impugned to-day—does it make the King swear that he is a Protestant ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. To the extent of the oath——

The PRIME MINISTER. Not at all. That oath could be taken by an infidel.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It could be taken by a Buddhist or a Mohammedan, or any other.

The PRIME MINISTER. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to point out where, in the declaration, the sovereign declares he is a Protestant ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The declaration, of course, to a certain extent, declares that he is a Protestant. But what I say is that the Settlement Act requires that the sovereign of Great Britain shall be a Protestant, and that besides the test oath it is a pre-requisite that there should be a declaration that he is a Protestant. According to this petition you would abolish all declaration whatever.

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You petition the Crown to abolish the declaration, unless I mistake the meaning of the words in this resolution.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I wish to be clear in my understanding of the hon. gentleman's argument. Is not the test oath, which is objected to by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., (Hon. Mr. Costigan) set out at length verbatim in the petition which it is proposed to send ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not a word of it is set out in the petition.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is set out in the motion given by the hon. member for Victoria.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then, he has made a mistake in the notice which he gave. He supposed that this declaration was the test oath.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In the oath of abjuration, or whatever you wish to call it——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is not an oath at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is not the objectionable declaration that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Costigan) is attacking not set out in the motion of the hon. gentleman ?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And is it necessary that the person that is taking that shall declare that he is a Protestant ? As I understand it, it only makes two declarations, one with reference to the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the other with reference to the worship of the Virgin.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It shows one thing, which must be clear to the hon. gentleman—that the person taking the declaration is not a Roman Catholic.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is, it shows that he does not believe in these two doctrines.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not read the amendment proposed here. He has taken the notice as given, covering the idea that this declaration was part of the oath. It does not belong to the oath at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I wish to be clear as to this point. When the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Costigan) put the notice on the paper he did not refer to this as part of the oath at all. He says :

> That by virtue of the Act of Settlement of 1689 the British sovereign, on the first day of the meeting of the first parliament, or at the coronation, is called upon to make the following declaration.

Then he sets out the declaration verbatim. He does not alter that in one syllable or letter, as I understand. Well, that is the declaration which he asks should be amended.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Where is the hon. gentleman reading from ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Page 432 of the 'Hansard.' That declaration makes no statement that he is a Protestant, it has no reference to that whatever. It simply says that he does not believe in the doctrine of transubstantiation and does not believe in the doctrine of the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary. Those are the only two declarations which are attacked and asked to be withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is no other declaration than that. The minister must remember that a prerequisite to the sovereign taking the Throne is an abjuration of the Catholic religion, if you do away with that declaration, there is none required of the sovereign. There is only the test oath which any Catholic can take, in which he does not abjure his religion, he does not say anything contrary to it. What I say is that the hon. gentleman in proposing his amendment ought to have been careful to see that the Settlement Act, and that the Bill of Rights are conformed with in every particular, for in them the sovereign has to abjure the Catholic religion. Now, I do not think there is any person in this House, be he Catholic or Protestant, who does not know the absurdity of proposing to the people of the British Empire that the sovereign of that mighty empire should be relieved of the necessity of declaring that he is a Protestant before he can ascend the Throne. I am perfectly in accord with my hon. friend in the objection he takes to those objectionable parts of the declaration which he has pointed out. But the declaration has been made and we cannot alter it at present. We cannot introduce an Act of parliament to relieve him from his declaration. The only power I know of which can do that, is the power which is vested in the Church of Rome. I do not know whether I am right or wrong in thinking that the Pope might relieve him from that necessity. But I know of no Protestant power that can relieve him from it. It is, after all, a question of sentiment that is before the House. It is a sentiment which the hon. gentleman, professing the religion that he does, and the right hon. gentleman also, have a perfect right to hold ; and we as Protestants in every portion of this empire are willing to agree to that change in the declaration which is required of the sovereign and which the hon. gentleman asks us to propose. But in his proposition he asks more.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What does he ask for ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. He asks us to abolish a declaration altogether.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The declaration referred to in the resolution, nothing more.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is no other declaration, if you abolish that declaration, there is none left for the sovereign to take.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What, then, is your objection to abolishing that declaration ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Change the wording of it so that the declaration required from the sovereign should not have any such sentiments as those expressed in the resolution. That would cover my view of the question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is there anything more in it ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Point it out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to read anything in the declaration which he would like to retain ? It is time to draw a distinction.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, I did not say anything of the kind ; that is not the question at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I thought it was.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. After all, there are but two propositions in the declaration, one of them in reference to transubstantiation, the other in reference to the worship of the Virgin Mary, or some of the saints.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Which of these do you want to keep ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I stated that these two statements are obnoxious to all Catholics. The declaration as a whole is objectionable to them. The proposition of the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution is perfectly logical. He says that the declaration as a whole is wrong, but he does not substitute anything which the Test Act requires. What we require is a declaration of the sovereign that he or she belongs to the Protestant religion, besides the test oath that is required of them. That is a simple doctrine.

Then, as to the expediency of introducing this resolution at the present time. There is no doubt that every subject and every parliament have a right to petition, there is only the question of expediency and opportuneness. Lord Salisbury has made a statement which, read between the lines, means that he thinks that the declaration required of the sovereign upon ascending the Throne is an objectionable one. Several members of the Imperial parliament, it appears, have followed in the same direction. That great organ of public opinion in England, the London Times, states further that it is the intention to change the declaration. In view of this fact, in view of the statement of Lord Salisbury, in view of the treatment which we received on a former occasion when we suggested legislation to the empire, is it advisable at the present moment to pass this resolution ? Had we not better wait a while and see whether Lord Salisbury's suggestion, as promised in the Times, is carried out ? The question of principle which comes up in the discussion of this motion of the hon. member for Victoria, is the real one after all. Perhaps we do not need to discuss the opportuneness of it. Certainly we have a right to petition if we like, and whether we do so now or at another time will be determined by a vote upon this question. But I would suggest to the mover, if he desires entire unanimity, to consider the several parts of his motion. The first clause is not objectionable ; the second clause is not objectionable ; the third clause, the one which I object to, could be modified in such a form that the declaration as now made by the King or Queen, as the case may be, would no longer be objectionable. Those objectionable parts should be omitted and a declaration should be framed in which those objectionable parts would not appear. The latter clause of it, I think, perhaps the hon. member who moved the resolution might agree to, as was suggested by the leader.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he were sitting down and proposing now to eliminate from this declaration what he considers the objectionable parts, what part would he eliminate and what part would he permit to remain ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not propose at the present to recast the declaration, but I say that any declaration required of the sovereign should not contain these objectionable parts.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then if you take those out you leave nothing.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You would have to substitute another. The Minister of Railways and Canals is not so quick and apt as he usually is. He does not seem to follow the requirements of the British constitution which requires of the sovereign an abjuration of the Roman Catholic religion as a prerequisite to his ascending the Throne. You do not make any proposition to attack that. I do not believe that Canada intends to do anything of the kind. They are perfectly willing that a declaration of some kind or other which would not be so offensive in its terms as the present one should be made, because it is a prerequisite, before the soveregin shall ascend the Throne, that not only shall a test oath be taken, but that this declaration shall be required. This resolution would be stronger without the last portion of it. We should simply state the facts and give the opinion of the House in reference to the matter leaving to the parliament of Great Britain to determine in what manner the Act should be amended. I have, perhaps, a few compliments to pay to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) who last adressed the House. His remarks were refreshing because we had not had for a long time, that florid style of oratory in this House. It is the child's first night, and we must deal gently with him. The first speech is always received graciously by the House, but I will remind the hon. gentleman that perhaps it is pardonable to get off a lecture upon one occasion in the House, or perhaps one stump speech, but do not repeat it again. In regard to the remark of the hon. gentleman that the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) received no applause when he sat down, I would state to the hon. gentleman that the hon. leader of the opposition voiced the sentiments of this side of the House, and when we consider the amount of applause that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson), coming with a reputation from his

province, received from his followers in this House, I would tell him that he must not be so bold in his criticisms as to our opinions in reference to our leader. Perhaps, I have spoken longer than I intended to on the subject, I would like to support the motion of the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan), but I would like to see it amended in the direction I have suggested. If it is amended in that direction, I think it will receive nearly unanimous support in this House.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to offer any lengthened remarks upon this subject; but the speech, well intentioned, I am sure, that we have listened to from the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) proves that this subject has not received from himself and from the members of this House, the attention as to the facts that it should have received after the notice that has been given of it by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan). In fact, I may safely say that up to the last few days, when it was known through the press that this subject was to be taken up by the parliament of Canada, most of the people who knew anything at all about the subject thought that the coronation oath and the declaration that we have objection to were one and the same thing. The hon. member for Lanark has based his argument on a point which, I think, from his point of view, from the point of view of the majority of the British people and from the point of view of a large majority of the citizens of the empire, is a right one. It is that the sovereign of England should be a Protestant. As far as that is concerned, there is no Roman Catholic sitting in this House who is urging any difference of opinion on the matter. Had the hon. gentleman had time to study the subject, he would see that there is nothing in the Bill of Rights and that there is less in the present declaration to force the British King to be a Protestant. No Roman Catholic or Greek schismatic could take that declaration; but outside of these, any man belonging to any faith or creed which does not believe in transubstantiation or in prayers to the saints and the Holy Virgin could take it ; and, therefore, the object that the hon. gentleman has in view, that of guaranteeing to the people of England that their King shall be a Protestant, is not at all covered by this declaration. A Pagan or a Buddhist could take it; in fact, any man but a Roman Catholic or a Greek schismatic could take it. It is not a declaration of Protestantism; it is simply an anti-Catholic declaration ; and if to-day we are asking the parliament of Canada to urge the British parliament to repeal that declaration, it is not because it is a Protestant declaration. No, Sir, we are not asking for anything to be taken from the rights or privileges that belong to our Protestant fellow-citizens; we are asking that a useless, obsolete, anti-Catholic declaration should not be imposed upon the British King at a moment when his accession to the Throne should be synonomous with peace, liberty, freedom and equal rights to all of his loyal subjects, who are ready to uphold him in keeping this empire up to the glorious state that it has attained. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the coronation oath which is not at all affected by this motion, and to which we have no objection at all. He has stated that a Roman Catholic could take the coronation oath. No, Sir, he could not; because the King of England, by that oath, is obliged to declare that he will uphold the Protestant faith. No Roman Catholic would make such a declaration. Therefore, I think the guarantee which every fair-minded Protestant wants to be given to him is completely covered by the coronation oath enacted by the Bill of Rights of 1688. The declaration to which we object was not added by the Act of Settlement of 1689, for the purpose, as every one who has studied English history knows, to give a guarantee to the Protestant people at large ; but simply as a result of dynastic feuds which had been agitating England at that time. The only object of this declaration was to prevent the Pretender, who was a Catholic, from conquering the Throne of England; or, if he had succeeded in conquering the Throne, from ascending it. If he had succeeded in conquering the Throne, he would have been prevented by this declaration from accepting the Crown and acceding to power.

From the very point of view taken by the hon. gentleman which, as a matter of principle, may be the right view for him to take, the objection he is making to this motion is completely unfounded. It is unfounded legally and constitutionally. If the hon. gentleman looks upon this question in the broad way that should be taken by this House, he will see that his opposition is still more futile. As long as the parliament of England is there, the people of Great Britain and the people of the empire cannot have imposed on them a king they would not like to have. We all respect the sovereign of the empire; but we know that the King is there only as the crowning of that magnificent edifice that we call the British constitution ; and that the safeguard of the British constitution is the free parliament of Great Britain where the people is represented by men who can look after its interests, and prevent the accession of a successor to the King who might not be in accordance with the views of the majority of the people of Great Britain. The intention of the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., as I understand it, and the intention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall) who seconded the motion, the intention of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and the intention of the

hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), are all the same after all; and we should all be united upon the matter. We come here as the representatives of a free British community, proud to be living under British institutions. We have fought even against British authority to acquire rights we thought we were entitled to. We are proud to live under these institutions, and we should be willing that the parliament of England should now sanction that magnificent work of freedom of thought, freedom of law, freedom of constitution which has been carried on in Great Britain from the beginning of this century. The first step in that direction was the abolition of the test oath for the free elected representatives of the people; then, it went on abolishing that same test oath for the civil servants of the Crown; and to-day, we ask that this test oath which is but an obsolete relic of days long past, should not be imposed upon the sovereign of that free people which is proud to call itself British.

The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has made an argument which I cannot accept. He said that my hon. friend from Victoria, N.B., (Mr. Costigan) was lacking in logic inasmuch as that the conclusion of the resolution was not relevant to the preamble. I believe the contrary. It is only a detail, of course, and I am glad to say that I can agree on the whole with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax). But, after all, this detail has its importance. The preamble of the resolution says :

> That as a token of the civil and religious liberties and of the equality of rights guaranteed to all British subjects in the Canadian confederation as well as under the British constitution, the British sovereign should not be called to make any declaration offensive to the religious belief of any subject of the British Crown.

Sir, the purpose of this resolution is not to ask for a special favour for Roman Catholics ; the principle of this resolution declares in favour of the very basis of our British institutions, namely, that there shall be perfect equality before the law for all nationalities and for all religions. Therefore, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) followed the advice of the leader of the opposition, he would simply ask that that part of the declaration which is offensive to Roman Catholics should be repealed. As a matter of fact, I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) who says that if you take out that which is offensive you take out nearly the whole of it. But this is not the main point. Should we follow the advice of the hon. leader of the opposition and ask to amend that declaration by merely taking out what is offensive to Catholics, we would not fulfil the principle of this preamble ; because this preamble asks on broad lines that the British King should be acknowledged by Catholics and Protestants, by non-believers and believers, as their King. The King of Great Britain should not be forced, in this new century, to make any declaration of the kind he is now obliged to make. I do not say that the King of England should not make any profession of his faith. The coronation oath is there for him to promise to uphold the faith of the majority of his subjects ; but he should not be bound to further take this declaration at the opening of the first parliament ; a declaration which I will not say is insulting only to his Roman Catholic subjects ; but offensive also to all the true Protestant British subjects who believe in the same equality and in the same acknowledgment of equal rights and freedom for all His Majesty's subjects.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall not devote any time to the speech of the hon. gentleman from West York (Mr. Wallace). I shall reply to that speech and to that gentleman in the words that Mr. Gladstone used toward a certain noisy member of the House who opposed him when he moved the second reading of the Disabilities Removal Bill in 1891. Mr. Gladstone, pointing at the man, said : I am not surprised, because I have always recognized that gentleman 'as the prop and pillar of everything that deserved to be overthrown and removed.' So I may designate the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). He has thought proper to give us a course on comparative religions, contradicting the very words of his opening remarks when he said that this is not the place to discuss religious matters. With these words, and with these words only uttered by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) do I agree. If this were only a question of religion ; if this were not a question affecting the rights of all British subjects ; if this were not a question based upon the very spirit of British institutions, we would have no business to bring it here.

I fully agree with the right hon. the Prime Minister and with the other hon. gentlemen who have spoken in favour of the resolution when they said that as British subjects we have a right to concern ourselves with everything that is in the interest of the empire at large. On a previous occasion, when I found myself obliged to differ from the almost unanimous opinion of this House on matters of Imperial concern, I clearly stated that every time when I believe that a large portion, or any portion of our fellow-citizens of the empire were affected in their rights, I was in favour of voting in this parliament for an expression of sentiment that might be favourable to that class of our fellow-citizens. But, I go further : I say that as Canadians, as representatives of the Canadian people, as members of the Canadian parliament, this is a matter of direct interest to us. What is the constitution of our country ? The constitution of our country is an Act of the British parliament. We cannot touch the slightest portion of the British North America Act without proceeding along the same lines as the mover of

this resolution has resorted to. Suppose we wanted to amend the constitution of our Senate, or the power of our executive, or the relations between the provinces and the federal government, the only procedure which we could follow would be to vote an address to the King of England asking the parliament of Great Britain to amend our constitution. Article 9 of the British North America Act says :

> The executive government and authority of and over Canada is hereby declared to be continued and vested in the Queen.

Sir, the King of England is for us not only the King of England, not only the head of the British Empire, but he is the sovereign of Canada. He forms part of our executive system ; he forms as much a part of our constitutional system as does this very House of Commons and the Senate. Therefore, in voting for this resolution I do not vote only on sentimental grounds, I do not vote only as a Roman Catholic ; but I vote as one of the representatives of the Canadian people in the Canadian parliament. And I am following the very procedure which the British North America Act obliges me to follow, if in that same capacity, I wished the Imperial parliament to amend our constitution in any other respect. Therefore, finding that the head of our government, that the chief of our Canadian executive is bound by a law which I am sure he detests himself ; by a law over which he has no power and over which we have no power—to make on the day of his coronation a declaration offensive to the dearest feelings of 40 per cent of the Canadian people, I say that it is our duty to ask, and to ask now, that the British parliament, which is the proper authority to do so, should amend the Act of Settlement and abolish that declaration. At the opening of this new century, in the first year of the reign of Edward VII., in this year when we have mourned together, Catholics as well as Protestants, French Canadians as well as English Canadians, the deplorable loss of that noble and kind-hearted woman who for sixty-four years reigned so gloriously over Canada as well as the empire at large ; I say that we are simply doing our duty to the people of Canada and to the King of England in asking that the parliament of Great Britain, which has the sole legislative control in the matter, should free for ever our future kings from making this declaration, and thus enable the sovereign to be considered not only as the king of a certain portion of his subjects, but as the king of all his subjects in this vast empire.

As the Prime Minister said this afternoon, if that declaration is not to be abolished, certainly the Roman Catholic subjects of His Majesty will not be more disloyal to him. But I ask all fair-minded men of this House : Do you think the loyalty of the Roman Catholic Canadians as well as the Roman Catholic British, that loyalty which has proved itself not only on the battlefield, but in every way in which a man can give to his nation and his sovereign the best of his efforts and abilities—do you think that loyalty which has been so staunch and so fully acknowledged by everybody, which cannot now be under the suspicion which dynastic feuds and rivalries of former times might cast upon it—do you think that loyalty should be rewarded by a declaration so offensive that, if it attacked any of the Protestant creeds of this Dominion, I myself would be proud to stand with those who would demand its repeal, and ask that the Protestant section of the people should be put upon the same footing as the rest. Sir, let us all be equal in Canada, let us all be equal in Great Britain ; and let us vote unanimously, if possible, for a resolution asking, not that the King of England should lose any of his privileges, not that the Protestant section of this country should lose any of its rights, but that the King of England should be more and more respected and loved by all his faithful subjects ; and it will be a great work which we shall have performed—a work which will be well received on the other side of the Atlantic by all the men who wish for the real welfare of the empire at large.

Hon. Wm. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Hon. gentlemen need not be alarmed, as I am not going to make a speech—I never do. I rise merely to throw out a suggestion. The First Minister remarked in a very gentle manner that he did not approve of the wording of the resolution, and the same idea has been conveyed to the House by the leader of the opposition—and I must do that hon. gentleman the justice of saying that his speech has been very acceptable to the supporters of the government. He has approached the subject with calmness, and with a judicial mind, and he has only suggested that the wording of the resolution should be changed. In that respect he and the leader of the government agree. Now, would it not be well for the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) to take both of these gentlemen into his confidence, and amend the wording of his resolution in such a manner as to make it acceptable to the House ? That is a suggestion which I throw out in a spirit of fairness, which I hope will commend it to the House.

I was going to say to the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) that I sympathize with him in having learned the Shorter Catechism in his younger days ; but I have the advantage of him in that respect—I had to learn it in two languages. Though my memory is not now as good as it was then, I can repeat considerable of it in those languages to-day. And let me say to the House, that no man will ever be

the worse for having read and studied the Shorter Catechism. The teaching of the Shorter Catechism and the Confession of Faith has made Scotland and Scotchmen what they are.

Mr. EDWARDS. And some oatmeal.

Hon. Mr. ROSS. Yes, and the oatmeal has now become so general that even Englishmen and Frenchmen use it. Now, a word about the Confession of Faith. Do not be alarmed, because I am not going to discuss religious subjects. But there is a general impression that the Confession of Faith was prepared by Scotchmen. It took seven years of the best minds and the most eminent religious men in England and Ireland and Scotland to prepare the Confession of Faith. They sat in Jerusalem Chambers for seven years, and they sat there by Act of parliament, and parliament paid them.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is why they sat so long.

Hon. Mr. ROSS. Of the 115 men who formed that body, only eight were from Scotland. But Scotland had the sense to adopt the Act of Uniformity, which was passed at that time, and to adhere to it, and it has adhered to it till this day.

Now, I think that the minds of both Protestants and Catholics have undergone quite a change, and that the feelings and sentiments we entertain towards each other have improved and are improving all the time. I used to read of the time when the idea amongst Catholics was that there was no salvation for Protestants ; but I hope there is not a Catholic in this House who is so narrow-minded, and I am sure there is not a Protestant in this House but believes that a large number of devout Catholics will find their way to heaven, though perhaps not in such an expeditious manner as the Presbyterians do. I do not think I have heard a story in this House since I came here. There was a certain Presbyterian in the county of Pictou to whom a priest of the district was expressing his sympathy on the occasion of the death of his sister. The good Presbyterian said, 'I have no doubt but she went to heaven, because she was a good woman.' Said the priest, 'When did she die ?' The answer was, 'On the 20th of May.' 'Well,' said the priest, 'if she gets there by Christmas, she will do very well.' As I said when I began, I am not going to make a speech ; I have never attempted to do so, because I do not know how. But I throw out the suggestion which I have made, because possibly a great deal of this debate might be dispensed with if the leader of the government, the leader of the opposition, and the mover of the resolution would meet together, and make a few gentle changes in the resolution. It is for the hon. member for Victoria to say whether this suggestion is accepted.

Mr. ROSS (Victoria).

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I have listened, Sir, with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, and I really believe that the suggestion he has made is one that might lead to any easy solution of the question which is now before the House. I do not wish to enter into any lengthy discussion of this question.

I was one of those who doubted the propriety of bringing such a delicate matter before this House, because, of course, this is essentially a political assembly, and although, since I have had a seat in this House, I have found evinced on all sides a most tolerant disposition, we know that questions of this kind, almost in spite of ourselves, drift into political acrimony, from which it is sometimes difficult to rescue them. I feel the less disposed to take up any of the time of the House, because the remarks made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition were of such a nature that, to me, whom this question interests in a particular manner, it seems impossible either to take one word from the remarks he has made or add anything to them. It is extremely satisfactory to me—and I think it must be to every member of this House—that a question of this kind should have been treated by the right hon. leader of the government, not as a Catholic, not as a Protestant, but as a man who understands and appreciates the liberties we enjoy, and it is doubly satisfactory to me that that question should have been so ably treated by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

Addressing myself, therefore, just to one point or two, I wish to call the attention of the House to the question of the form of this petition, because I have heard doubts expressed as to whether we could touch this question even in the manner in which it has been raised by the hon. member for Victoria. Upon that point let me remind this House that this resolution is in the form of a petition, and that it is one of the most inalienable rights of British subjects all over the world to petition the King upon all manner of subjects, without any restriction whatever. When we come to pass resolutions, when we come to advise the Crown and express our opinions on matters which are beyond the purview of this legislature, we may be infringing upon ground which is not ours. But the right to petition is absolutely unrestricted. Long before we obtained the great charter of our rights in 1215, it existed under the Saxon kings, it was reaffirmed, not only in Magna Charta, but in the thirty odd affirmations of that charter, it had been insisted upon since strenuously during the centuries of struggle of British subjects for the revendication of those rights they enjoy to-day, and it is to-day incontrovertible. We can petition the King of England upon any and every subject. That right is not restricted, except in

this respect that it is restricted to British subjects. So jealous are we of that right that no alien has the right to petition the King of England, except when he happens to be on British soil. Therefore, the objection that we are by this resolution touching a subject upon which we have no jurisdiction is, to my mind, well founded.

As to the question whether the subject is one which interests us or not, that has been answered by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. But let me remind the House, as a student of constitutional law, that there is a contract. We are petitioning in reality with regard to a contract, and that contract was formed by the oath of allegiance which every British subject is supposed to take. That oath is responded to by the oath of the sovereign, and from the oath of the sovereign, corresponding with the oath of allegiance which every British subject is supposed to take and may be obliged to take, arises the contract, which is one of service on the part of the subject and of protection on the part of the sovereign. Is it not just, under those circumstances, that the subject, who has become a party to that contract, should be allowed to make representations to the King upon the nature of the obligation which the King takes at the time of his coronation. It seems to me that this is essentially a subject upon which any subject may make a petition to the Crown. And that right is not only extended to British subjects, but belongs to every organization throughout the British Empire. Great legislative bodies, municipal corporations, in fact every corporation, as well as every British subject throughout the empire, has the inalienable right of petitioning the sovereign.

I shall not go at any length into the question of fact, as at present the only inhabitant of the British Empire who remains bound by the provisions of the test oath, passed in the reign of Charles II. is the sovereign himself. The great progress of liberty, the progress of enlightenment, of religious tolerance, has brought us to this stage fortunately—and it is by no means the last stage—at the opening of this great century, that all creeds are tolerated. We have had the Act of 1829 and the Act of 1858, and to-day, as a matter of fact, the only person bound by the provisions of the test oath of Charles II., enacted at a time when religious passions were excited to an inordinate degree, when the fury of religious strife was so great—the only person bound by that statute is the sovereign himself; and it seems to me only right and proper that he should be freed from the hard and harsh exactions of that statute.

In the remarks of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden), there was a suggestion to which I would invite the attention of all the members of this House who belong to the legal profession. The concluding part of the resolution of my hon. friend from Victoria, N.B., (Hon. Mr. Costigan), my hon. friend from Halifax suggested should be modified, and I think his suggestion is an important one for those who have at heart—as I think many members of this House, irrespective of creed, have—the success of the step which this House is now taking. That suggestion was that we should modify the concluding portion of the motion in this sense—that we should suggest to the Crown, to whom this petition is to be addressed, that the declaration should be modified.

Now, I speak in the hearing of the Solicitor General and of other members of this House who have given some attention to the study of constitutional law, and every one who has studied our constitution knows that there are two things absolutely required of a British sovereign before he can rule his people—he must take an oath, and he must make a declaration. The coronation ceremony as a matter of fact is an unnecesary ceremony; the sovereign can exercise kingly power without a coronation. A number of British sovereigns who have ascended the Throne during times of civil war, and even at other times, have exercised their kingly power without any coronation. The coronation is a mere relic of the old system, which obtained in England in Saxon times, and has been handed down through centuries, of presenting the King to the people and crowning him, so that there should be no doubt as to his title. But it is a different thing when you come to the power of ruling the subject. The King must take the oath provided by law, and he must make the declaration to the effect that he is in communion with the Established Church of England——

Mr. MACLEAN. And that he is not a Catholic.

Mr. MONK. No, it is not necesasry, according to the constitutional writers—and, if I mistake not, they are all unanimous on that point—that he should repudiate any particular doctrine. But I am speaking of the commentators; and it is necessary that he should not only take the oath, but declare himself in communion with the Established Church of England. And the reason for that is not far to seek; because the Bill of Rights of 1689, and the Act of Settlement of 1701, both, not only from specific portions of the Act, but from the whole text, require that the sovereign of England should belong to the Established Church of England.

Now, what my hon. friend from Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) has sought to obtain by his motion—and what I for one, as professing the Catholic faith desire—is that from that declaration should be eliminated these words which, to quote the language of the Prime Minister of England are 'so deplorable.' And I hope and believe it is

the desire of the great majority of the House. But we must not go too far, and that is why I think there is wisdom in the suggestion of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden). We must not go to the length of suggesting in our petition, which in other respects is so well founded, that the declaration should be suppressed altogether. We may not be met with that favour which, I need not say, we have a right to expect from the successor of a sovereign who, during such a long, and such a glorious reign manifested so continuously her disposition of good-will toward all those who professed the Roman Catholic faith. Therefore, I say, lest it should be noted on the other side when our petition reaches there that it has the defect of going beyond what is really required, we should adopt the suggestion that has been made. It is a suggestion which does not require, it seems to me, much negotiation among us to enable us to come to some agreement upon it. We should simply limit our petition to the object we desire to attain, that is to the elimination from the declaration of these expressions, for, Sir, we cannot reasonably ask, at the present moment, that the declaration should be suppressed altogether. Therefore, I suggest to my hon. friend from Victoria, that he should take the suggestion into consideration, because I think it is a very important one. It is possible—is it not?—that when this petition, in its present form, is received in England, the people may ask : Why is it that these petitioners do not ask for the elimination of the objectionable parts ; do not they know that, under the circumstances, it is necessary that the sovereign make a declaration of some kind ? I very earnestly suggest to the right hon. leader of the government to take the suggestion into consideration. It has been said by some that this is not the proper time to make this petition. I differ entirely from that view. Speaking as a member from the province of Quebec, and as one conversant with public opinion of that province, I know that during the long reign of the late Queen, and particularly during the last thirty years of that reign, nobody would have thought it proper or delicate to have moved in this direction. We in our province all knew what sentiments of friendliness and tolerance the late Queen entertained towards all those who professed the Catholic religion. And she was a woman ; and I venture to say, with absolute certainty that, among French Canadians there would have been a great reluctance to move in this question while that great and good woman lived. But it is different now ; and I think the time is opportune. We have now reigning a man whom we have learned to know as one of most tolerant disposition. He has just ascended the Throne, and has made the declaration. It is a declaration which, under the law, must be made either at the first sitting of parliament before the House of Lords or at the coronation. He made that declaration, as I think he was bound to do, at the opening of the first session of parliament in the presence of the Lords. It seems to me that now is the best time, for the question to be mooted at the moment when everybody hopes that the life of His Gracious Majesty may long be spared. It seems to me that the King having just made that declaration, and the question being agitated in England, and there having been, on the part of men known as most loyal subjects of the empire, a protest in regard to that declaration, it is a matter which we can treat as being ripe for consideration. It has been said by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), that some parties have endeavoured to make political capital out of this question. I am glad to say that so far as I have assisted in the debates in this House on this question, I do not find this disposition—unless indeed the hon. member for Westmoreland alluded to the remarks which may have fallen from my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace), which I had not the advantage of hearing. But, Sir, the physical resemblance between my hon. friend from Westmoreland and my hon. friend from West York is so great that my hon. friend from York may have deemed it necessary to accentuate the difference between them. In the same way I would say to the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), that he seems to have spoken with great heat on this subject, anticipating, no doubt, that it would give rise to very serious divergences of political opinion. I am glad beyond expression that his anticipations, if any such existed, have not been realized. I trust that in the few remarks that I have made, I have not expressed myself with too much heat. I cannot claim to be an extremely religious man.

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, no.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps I am as good as the right hon. gentleman.

The PRIME MINISTER. Far better, I hope.

Mr. MONK. Well, Sir, I believe there is a good place where members will go who have been obliged to hear some of the speeches made in this House, and I believe there is a bad place where members will go who speak too long. But I am, to this extent at any rate, religious, that I have preserved the principles of charity which were instilled into me in my youth ; and whatever may be the vote which members of this House may think it necessary to give upon this question, I can assure them that the feelings I entertain for them will continue to be in the future as they have always existed in the past.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). Mr. Speaker, I feel it incumbent upon me as a member coming from the central part of the province of Ontario to make a few remarks upon this important question. When I entered this House, among the first expressions I heard was a statement coming from the hon. member (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure), who seconded the address in this House, that he hoped this parliament would be a parliament of peacemakers. But when, the other day, I heard the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) state that he proposed to introduce into parliament a question which, in my opinion, ought never to have been introduced here, I could not but contrast his action with the words to which I have just referred. That hon. gentleman has had a long parliamentary experience, the people of Canada have been very kind to him in the past, he has had the honour of representing a constituency for a great many years in this House, and I should have expected better things from him than to introduce on the floor of this House a question of a class which will inevitably create discord among the people of Canada. I have listened with great interest to the remarks that have fallen from every hon. gentleman who has addressed the House, and especially those which were expressed by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). Just now I am reminded that it is not so long ago when that hon. gentleman rose in this House and resigned his seat because Canada was helping Great Britain to fight her battles. I was amazed that that gentleman should be selected to address the House upon this occasion, asking that an oath that does not interest the people of Canada should be complained of by the people of Canada. I thought such a proposition ought to have come from some hon. member who had proved himself in the past a defender of British interests.

Mr. BRITTON. What does the hon. gentleman mean by saying that the hon. member for Labelle has been selected ?

Mr. BLAIN. I say I listened with a great deal of interest to all the addresses that have been made upon this question today, I have listened with especial interest to the remarks so carefully prepared and well expressed by the hon. premier. I was anxious that, since it had been decided to introduce this question into parliament, there should come from the First Minister some expression of justification, that he should point out wherein some humble subject of His Majesty in Canada was suffering because the King of England had taken that oath. I am one of those who believe in British institutions. I am one of those who do not think it necessary, as some hon. gentlemen do, to tell just what religion and what church they belong to. I believe it is the duty of Canadian representatives to deal with questions that interest the Canadian people, and not go across the Atlantic to discover and discuss questions that do not interest us. When I was nominated for this parliament I made a promise that when questions came up here that had no right to be dealt with by the Canadian parliament, I should stand up in my place and speak against them and vote against them, and I shall do so on this occasion. If any representative of the Canadian people on coming to this parliament had been required to take an oath to which he felt he could not subscribe in his capacity as representative, then I would say that it was the duty of parliament to look into that question and come to his relief. But I find that there is nothing in the oath that any member of this parliament has not been willing to take when he took his seat in this House.

Then, I say, that so far as this parliament is concerned, we have no complaint to make. We ought not to cross the Atlantic to find trouble to bring into this country at the present stage in our history. Though I am not a very old man I have taken some interest in public questions, and the only questions that have caused trouble in our county of Peel, the only questions that have rent homes and set the people one against another have been questions introduced into this parliament with which we had nothing to do, and which ought never to have been introduced here. In speaking as I do, I represent more than the Liberal-Conservative party in the county of Peel, I am expressing the sentiments and feelings of a very large majority of the people who voted against me at the last election on November 7. The Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition have said that this is not a political question and ought not to be treated as such. If that is the case, then I think the Conservative party in this House should have been consulted upon this question before it was introduced. I have listened to the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) pointing out what was objectionable in the declaration. He said that political feeling would be aroused in this question and would extend until it was settled. In my opinion, it is a question that will take some time to die out, a question that ought not to have been introduced here, particularly in the commencement of the twentieth century. The hon. member for Westmoreland spoke about empire building. Have the people of Canada, have the people of the British Empire, suffered because Queen Victoria took the declaration which has been referred to ; no, they have not. The Liberal-Conservative party and the Reform party in Canada have been engaged during the past few months pointing to the growth and advancement of this Canada of ours and of the great British Empire ; but I have never heard it suggested before that any Canadian had been injured in either person or estate because

Queen Victoria, when she ascended the Throne, took the declaration that is now under discussion.

I have listened to the discussion of other troublesome questions, and in the history of parliament I have never heard of this question before. I was glad to hear the hon. member from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) say that the people of Canada did not know that there was any difference between the oath and the declaration. The declaration has not interfered with the people of Quebec, and that it has not interfered with the people of Canada, either in their homes, or the state, or the church, at any time in the history of the country. I have already said, and I repeat, that if there is anything that could be introduced into the parliament of this country that would interfere with empire building, it is just such a question as we are now discussing this evening. I say it is a time, in my humble opinion, commencing this new parliament, and commencing a new century when a question of this kind should not be introduced, and I am hoping that the young members of this House of parliament, whether they are Reform or Conservative, whether they support the government or the opposition, will be Canadian enough to say to the people of Canada that they will vote against this motion, and against every other question that ought not to be discussed in parliament. In respect to the introduction of the motion, I said a word, and I want to say something further upon the question. When it was allowed to be introduced into this parliament it was announced that it was not a political question. If so, there should have been some other form of introducing it rather than that it should have taken the form which by the rules of this House precludes any amendment being made by which the hon. members on this or the other side of the House are compelled to vote for or against it. I was amazed when the right hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) rose in his place, and when the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) rose in his place, and suggested that some changes should be made, when the Prime Minister said further that had he been preparing the motion he would have used some other words. Why did not the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., rise to his feet and say that he was willing to take the House into his confidence and make certain changes. I am sorry that I have spoken so long, but I want to put myself on record on this question as a Canadian representative, and I am here to say that I will vote against the motion. I am not going even to investigate the wording of the motion very closely. It is not my business as a representative of the people. It is my duty as a representative of the people to deal with questions that will help the Canadian people, and if the hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec, who, I suppose, will be most anxious that this resolution should pass, will come down with any Canadian resolution, if they can point out that the Roman Catholic people of the province of Quebec, or any class of the people, Presbyterians, members of the Church of England, or of any other class or sect in this country suffer by such oaths and declarations, that they interfere with their progress, whether they be Protestant or Roman Catholic, I will give that question my careful consideration, and if I find that Roman Catholics are being interfered with by any law that has been placed on the statute-book by the Canadian parliament, I will stand up in my place and vote that that should be taken away in order that every class should have their rights, and in order that we may develop the great country in which we live. These are my opinions upon the question. I am amazed, I repeat, that the hon. gentleman who introduced the motion would not stand up in his place and say: I am willing to consider a change if others differ from me. But, he says : 'No,' and he is defended on the other side of the House by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). They will accept no suggestion, but will maintain the resolution as it is. I feel it incumbent upon me as a man interested in all classes of the people, to stand up on the floor of this House and say that I will vote against this motion, because it should never have been introduced into the parliament of this country.

Mr. ROBERT A. PRINGLE (Cornwall and Stormont). Mr. Speaker, I desire on this occasion just to say a very few words. I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the remarks that fell from the right hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), from the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and other hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this question. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. I think it would have been better if the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) had framed his resolution in a little different language. I may say that I am in sympathy with the terms of the resolution, but I think the latter part of it is not couched in the language which will accomplish what is desired by the parties who are interested in the resolution. My reason for that is this ; in looking at the Act, 2 William and Mary, which requires the declaration to be taken, and in looking at the Act for establishing the coronation oath, I observe that they are two separate and distinct Acts. The Act for establishing the coronation oath is one thing, while the Act in regard to the Bill of Rights is another thing. It is an Act declaring the rights and liberties of the subjects and the succession of the Crown. In that Act it is imperative that our sovereign should take the declaration. My view

of that resolution is that the latter part of it should have been put in such a manner, I might say, as suggested by one of the leading English journalists, that it should be amended, but that there should still be a declaration taken by the sovereign as to the Protestant faith. In making that reference I quote from the paper which the hon. member for Victoria quoted from, the Guardian, which I believe is one of the leading Protestant papers in England. If I might be permitted, I will just read a short extract from this paper :

We are thankful indeed to know that this declaration does not, and never has, formed any part of the solemn and historic coronation service of our English sovereigns. It is a careless blunder, into which several of our contemporaries of the secular press have recently fallen, to assert the contrary. The facts are these. The declaration formed part of the Act of 1677, which the necessities of the times seemed then to justify, for 'the more effectual preserving the King's person and government, by disabling Papists from sitting in either House of parliament.' It had to be subscribed and audibly repeated by every member of each House before he could take his seat. The experience the country went through under James II. provoked further aggressive action, and in 1689 (1 Will. and Mary, sess. ii., c. 2) it was enacted in order to debar Papists from the Crown, that——

Then follows a citation from the statute, and the editorial continues :

However unreasonable and objectionable in its terms the declaration may be, it is satisfactory to know that it cannot, under any circumstances, with the long-established custom of deferring the coronation, be uttered in Westminster Abbey. But it will be highly unfortunate if the necessary legal steps cannot at once be taken to relieve Edward VII. from the necessity of uttering, even in Westminster Palace, words which cannot but be singularly offensive to millions of his subjects, not only in the United Kingdom, but throughout his great dominions across the sea. Christian charity has made great strides in two and a half centuries, and if this declaration of the time of Charles II. has long ago become too offensive to be used by any of His Majesty's subjects, why is the studied insult of calling all his Roman Catholic subjects idolaters to be maintained as a part of the King's accession duties? A quiet and dignified declaration of personal loyalty to the Church of England is all that is necessary. If unhappily the law officers of the Crown see no way out of the difficulty in the short interval before the King meets his first parliament, the deliberate use of such a string of offensive terms cannot fail to produce mischevious heartburnings and dangerous misunderstandings. International notice is nowadays far more keenly awake to a royal declaration than it was in the earlier times of the Hanoverian dynasty. We shall be heartily sorry if Edward VII. is obliged to use words which will brand the King of Portugal, the King of the Belgians and many others of the royal mourners by the good Queen's grave as superstitious idolaters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be better if the latter part of this resolution were in different form. I read in the resolution that the Act is to be amended. In what way ? By wiping out in its entirety this declaration ? It does seem to me, Sir, that the hon. the leader of the opposition, together with some hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, ought to be able to get together and so frame that resolution that it would accomplish the purpose which the mover (Hon. Mr. Costigan) has in view, and at the same time be more effective than in its present form.

I do not look upon this question, Mr. Speaker, as either a national question or as a religious question. It seems to me that it is a simple request for simple justice. Now that we are on the threshold of the twentieth century and looking back at the immense progress which has been made in the past century in religious liberty, I believe that we should do all in our power to obtain for that large population of Roman Catholics who are loyal subjects of His Majesty the King, relief from that declaration which certainly is offensive to them. I read in a recent article by Mr. Goldwin Smith, that very able and very distinguished gentleman, the following words :—

The coronation declaration and oath of the King of England, settled in 1688, is a curious historical fossil of the revolutionary period. The King is made solemnly to repudiate the doctrine of transubstantiation, and to declare that the invocation and adoration of the Virgin and saints are idolatrous and superstitious. There can be no doubt that this formulary is not only obsolete but extremely offensive and insulting to all the millions of Roman Catholics who are numbered among His Majesty's subjects. There can hardly be any doubt that it will be abolished by parliament with the hearty concurrence of all right-minded and sensible men. Its counterpart has already been abolished in the admission of officers of state.

We have only to look back to the legislation of the past to find a precedent for future legislation, which will remove the last vestige of offensive references to the religions of any class of His Majesty's subjects. Look at the Emancipation Act of 1829. Previous to that year every member of the British House of Commons had to subscribe to identically the same declaration as the sovereign now has to take, and by the Act of 1829, known as the Roman Catholic Relief Act, relief was given to our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects. That Act provided a single form of oath acceptable to Roman Catholics and available to them only ; and it abolished the declaration against transubstantiation. That legislation has been followed up by other relieving Acts. For instance, an Act was passed to relieve the Jews who were opposed to the form of oath required of them. I do not wish, Mr. Speaker, to take up any further time in the discussion of this subject, as it has been so ably and so thoroughly dealt with by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me. I feel satisfied of this : that even although I do not approve exactly of

the nature of the language of the motion, and while I should desire that the latter part of that motion should be amended yet as the resolution does not in any way effect the coronation oath, and does not in any way ask for the abolition of the oath by the sovereign to maintain the Protestant religion by law established, and as there is no attempt to interfere with the provision of the Bill of Rights which indicated that the sovereign must be a Protestant; it is evident to my mind that the repeal or the amendment of that declaration against transubstantiation can in no way prejudicially affect either the Protestant religion or the succession to the British Crown. When we look back in the history of our country to the many bitter fights which arose in settling principles which are now firmly established in this Dominion, every true Canadian must feel a degree of sorrow when he sees any question come before the people of Canada which is of such a controversial nature that it causes bitter discussion. I think we should approach a question of this sort in a calm, judicial manner, and discuss it apart from any religious feeling or bigotry. There is no room in Canada for a bigot. These matters should be discussed entirely on their merits, and it seems to me that the Roman Catholic population of Canada, who I understand constitute nearly 40 per cent of the total population, are perfectly justified in sending this petition to the mother land, and asking that any objectionable clauses in this declaration should be amended.

There has been a great deal said here on the question of church. Like the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), I may never have been accused of being over-religious. What I believe is that there is one church only, the church of God, and no body of men, be they called a church or a denomination, have an absolute possession or control of the narrow way, and no race has a monopoly of all the virtues, leaving to the others all the vices. We should take a broad view of questions of this sort; and feeling in that way, I intend to support this motion, although I would have much preferred that the latter part of it had been couched in different language. I picked up to-day one of our leading Canadian papers, a Tory paper, and I may be pardoned if I refer to an article in that paper dealing with this matter. After reciting the declaration, it says:

> The phraseology is the best evidence, perhaps, of the fears that caused the thing to be thought necessary, fears that now, happily, have little existence and less cause. There have been many changes since the Stuarts' time. Catholic countries are now not a menace to those of Protestant faith. The oath is one of the two remnants of much legislation, the most of which time and events have outworn. As the danger from Roman Catholic power outside declined, the restrictions against Roman Catholics in England were removed, till there is only one office, and that a semi-ecclesiastical one, in the service of the state, which a Roman Catholic has not the right to fill, or has not filled. The oath might well be subjected to the revision that has improved the laws in other respects. The Roman Catholic peers, and there are no more loyal men in the empire, have put on record their views in a dignified protest. Accepting the declaration of the Lord Chancellor, that the oath cannot be changed but by Act of parliament, they said:—
>
> 'We desire to impress upon your lordship that the expressions used in this declaration made it difficult and painful for Catholic peers to attend to-day in the House of Lords, in order to discharge their official or public duties, and that these expressions cannot but cause the deepest pain to millions of subjects of His Majesty in all parts of the empire, who are as loyal and devoted to the Crown and person as any other in his dominions.'
>
> It is a reasonable requirement of the law that the sovereign of Great Britain shall be a Protestant, like the great majority of his Christian subjects. It is equally reasonable, though, that in the obligations the sovereign is required to take on assuming his duties, there shall be nothing needlessly offensive to his other Christian, or non-Christian, people. There is reason to think that this is so fairly recognized that the common sense of parliament will bring about the change that the simple statement of the case suggests.

I believe the parliament of England will bring about that change, and I see no reason why the Dominion of Canada, the premier colony of Great Britain, has not the right to send forward this petition, although, as I have already stated, I would have preferred that the latter part of the motion had been couched in different language.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). I would like in the first place to appeal to the right hon. First Minister to adjourn this debate now. There ought certainly be a conference; it is in the interest of the country that there should be one; and it will prevent a great deal of discord if the suggestion thrown out by the hon. member from Victoria, N.S. (Mr. Ross) is accepted. Even if we have to adjourn this debate now and do not go into Supply, it will be worth the time we may lose to arrive at a right conclusion. There are serious constitutional objections to the line on which we are proceeding; and, while my sympathy is altogether with the object the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) has in view, I think it is in the interest of the country that this little conference should take place before we come to a conclusion, and I ask the First Minister if he cannot concede that point and adjourn the debate.

The PRIME MINISTER. There are several hon. members who wish and are ready to speak on this question, and I think we should give them the privilege of speaking.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will you allow the debate to go over to-night?

The PRIME MINISTER. We shall see what time it takes.

Mr. MACLEAN. While, as I said a few moments ago, I am in sympathy with the object of the hon. gentleman who proposed this resolution has in view, I substantially agree with what was said by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). If I read history aright, the meaning of that declaration is that the people of England in those days required the sovereign to abjure the Roman Catholic faith. That was the first requisite. Subsequently, they required of him an oath that he would maintain the Protestant religion. Now, if we ask the people of England to abandon that first declaration, namely, that the sovereign must abjure the Catholic religion, our petition will not be received, because it will ask the people of England to destroy something which they consider one of the bulwarks of the constitution. We must not disguise from ourselves that fact, that the people required the sovereign to abjure the Catholic faith by having him deny the two essential doctrines of that faith. If we wish to advocate what is laid down in the resolution, that a Catholic may be the sovereign of England, we can vote for the resolution as it stands ; but the constitutional objection is before us, and our petition will be dismissed unless we put it on right lines.

As I have said, I am in sympathy with the motion. Being one who has always favoured equal rights in this country, I think nothing should be said which would be unnecessarily offensive to the religious views of Catholics ; and I am ready to support some measure which will lead to the end we have in view. But if we think we can go to the King and parliament of England and ask them to change something which is an essential of the constitution, we shall make a mistake, and, in the common phrase of the day, we shall be turned down. Hon. gentlemen may argue that a Catholic ought to be qualified to be the sovereign of England. That may be maintained, and I am not going to deny it ; but the people of England will not be prepared to accept that proposition, and what we ought to ask is that the sovereign should be able to declare that he is not a believer in the Catholic faith, and declare it in a way that will not be offensive to Catholics. He ought to be able to swear that he will maintain the Protestant religion. But, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), you are striking out the essential thing that the people of those days intended to maintain, and which, I believe, the great bulk of Englishmen wish to maintain to-day. There is no use disguising the fact that what they had in view was that the sovereign himself should abjure the Catholic religion, and what we ought to ask to-day is that he should abjure it in some way not offensive to Roman Catholics. If that can be done, I am perfectly in sympathy with the object of the hon. gentleman, and I appeal to him to find some way of doing it. I appeal to him to confer with the right hon. the leader of the government and the leader on our side, and try and find out a way, a constitutional way, of accomplishing his object. That is all I have to say, but I think I am touching an essential question. There are lawyers on the other side who are members of the government, and I can see clearly, from the trend of the discussion, that they are disturbed as regards the constitutional aspect of the resolution we are asked to adopt. I would then suggest that we should adjourn the debate and see if we cannot devise a resolution that will commend itself to the House, and be likely to receive favourable consideration on the other side. By the present motion we are asking the British parliament or the King to change something that the English people, even at their present advanced stage, will not be willing to consent to.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). It is certainly a tribute to the judgment of my hon. friend from Victoria, N.B., (Mr. Costigan) that the resolution he has introduced has met with only two objections, and neither of these strikes at the base of the position taken by him. These objections are, first, that the time is inopportune, and, second, that the resolution is not happily worded, and might be improved in such a way as to be made acceptable to the authorities on the other side.

As to the wording of the resolution, I do not agree with my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Maclean), or the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart). The point taken by the hon. member for Lanark was, that it was absolutely necessary to carry out the settled idea and intention of the British people, both Catholic and Protestant, namely, that there should be always on the Throne of the empire, a Protestant or non-Catholic sovereign, and that, therefore, if the declaration at present in force were struck out, some other declaration should be substituted. I think that that opinion is erroneous. In the first place, it is a law of the land that the sovereign must be non-Catholic, and take certain oaths binding him to support the Protestant religion, and must be in communion with the Church of England, and the abolition of this declaration would not affect that law in the slightest degree. Supposing his declaration were absolutely struck out, we are left with these three fundamental planks in the constitution which are undisturbed. First, that the sovereign must take the oath to support the Protestant religion ; second, that he must be in communion with the Church of England ; and, third, that all these other laws requiring the sovereign to be a non-

papist remain in full force. The Act of Settlement provides all these constitutional requisites in the case of the sovereign, and it adds that, in addition to these constitutional requisites, which are sufficient for the purposes that Protestants cherish, he should make a certain declaration. Consequently, if this declaration were entirely abolished, the constitutional safeguards would still remain, and the feelings of our Roman Catholic compatriots would not be offended.

The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), whom everybody expected to take the strongest ground possible against this resolution, completely failed to make any serious argument against it. Instead of that, he brought the whole discussion down from the high level which it had attained to one of personal attack on the gentleman who supported the resolution. He had nothing but words of condemnation for my hon. friend the member for Victoria, and attacked the right hon. the First Minister on matters connected with South Africa, which had nothing at all to do with the subject before the House, and wound up by a fusilade on the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). But the point made by the hon. gentleman was, that inasmuch as the sovereign is ex-officio the head of the Church in England and Scotland, he is in that capacity obliged to make substantially the same declaration. But, as head of the empire at large, he should not be asked to make a declaration which is offensive to any section of his subjects ; and the King, as a matter of fact, is not expected to subscribe to the Westminster Confession. He is not bound to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who is acknowledged to be a very high constitutional authority, has made the statement that the sovereign is required to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles.

Mr. FLINT. I am not prepared to enter into an argument on that point; but I simply say that in my constitutional studies, which have not been more extensive than those of other hon. gentlemen, I have not seen the statement made before my hon. friend made it to-night. But let us suppose that the hon. gentleman's contention is right. The King is, ex-officio, the head of the army and the head of the navy; and it does not follow that he has to abide by all the rules of the army and navy which others follow in order to attain to various positions in those services. Where this devolves upon the sovereign ex-officio, the fact that he neglected to subscribe these articles would not destroy his sovereign power or position.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. But here is the distinction—the two matters that were mentioned are before he can become a King or exercise any of the powers of King, whereas, in becoming King, he has become the head of the army and the navy. The others are conditions precedent.

Mr. FLINT. There is no statute to that effect. Now, this resolution, if adopted, becomes a petition from parliament to the Crown. As to the point raised by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), of course, we all agree that parliament has the right to petition. The only question we have before us is as to the terms in which the petition should be couched. We should approach the question in the same attitude of mind and with the same sense of responsibility as if the vote on this resolution enacted a law, because it is an expression of the opinion of parliament on an important question. The point raised by my hon. friend from Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Pringle), and which was alluded to in one or two remarks of other hon. gentlemen, is a good one—that, apart from the relief to the feelings of an immense body of the loyal subjects of the Crown, it is proposed as a relief to the King himself, a measure of relief to the sovereigns of the future, that this amelioration should be attempted by the parliament of Canada. Why should we who admire and revere the person of our future sovereigns, as we trust we shall always be able to admire and revere them, inheriting, as they will, the character of their ancestors and the high traditions of the office they fill—why should not we endeavour to relieve them from what must be, to any high-minded and sensitive Briton, an invidious position ? Why should future sovereigns of the British Empire be called upon to utter in solemn form before the estates of the realm a series of statements of an entirely abstract character, a personal belief which does not, in the slightest degree, affect any practical interest of the state ? We boast, both here and in the mother country, and in the colonies of Great Britain, that we are, above all, a practical people, that we never legislate except for practical ends, and that sentimental grievances and difficulties must always give way to something practical—that we put up with grievances for a long time for the sake of performing other duties of practical utility. If it can be shown by any gentleman that calling on the sovereign to make a declaration of purely abstract sentiment upon a religious subject is of any practical utility in the government of the empire, then, although some person's feelings may be affected and injured, the majority, I think, would willingly see it stand, and even those who suffer from it, would allow it to stand for the other practical advantages derived from it. In this case, we have simply a declaration superadded to the law, an excrescence upon the law; and something superadded when it was appropriate to the feelings of

the people, when controversies on abstract questions of religion were carried on with a zeal and bitterness of which we can form no conception, when political life, literary life, philosophical life, were filled with controversies over questions of doctrine on ecclesiastical matters. We have passed into a new era, when we cheerfully allow differences of opinion on these subjects not at all affecting our conduct toward each other in business or political life. So, I say that if we adopt this resolution, we simply remove the bone of contention, an excrescence which is painful to many Protestants, and which must be painful to all adherents of the Roman Catholic Church, and which is of no practical utility whatever—a relic of a past age, bringing up subjects uncalled for at the present time, and certain to be a source of controversy—as long as this useless declaration remains as part of the statute law of Great Britain. Therefore, I have no hesitation in saying that I join heartily in support of this resolution, and I think, in the interest of harmony and peace, in the interest of the goodfellowship which happily exists between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants of this country, and all over the empire, this controversy should be removed as soon as possible. Unless this useless declaration is removed, the controversy must continue. We are at the beginning of a new parliament, of a new century, of a new reign. We are almost unanimously agreed that the phraseology of this declaration is unfortunate, to say the least of it, that it is painful, that it is of no practical utility, and that it should be swept away as soon as possible, and the controversy closed. Suppose that parliament having accepted the prayer of this suggestion, it is forwarded to the mother country, and, in the course of time it is acted upon, and that declaration is cancelled. Can we not see the prospect that is opened up of peace and harmony between all the various religions of the empire ? Cannot we see that our Catholic fellow-citizens, comprising, as they do, such an enormous number of the ablest sons of the empire, are placed upon a footing of absolute equality, in every regard, with other subjects in all portions of the empire ? If the King is compelled in this year of Grace 1901, or in some future year, to declare that the doctrines of the Catholic Church are idolatrous and abominable, why should he not declare that other religions with which Protestants disagree are also absurd and idolatrous ? Simply because in regard to Mohammedanism, and Brahmanism, and other religions with which the majority of Protestants disagree, there has been no historical struggle upon the soil of England, and no question regarding them which has affected political life in the mother country ; while the controversies over the Catholic religion did indirectly affect political life in England during the past several hundred years. Therefore, I join in the hope that this resolution will be accepted by this House, and that it may aid in inducing the parliament of the mother country to remove entirely this question from the arena of political agitation. Therefore, I cannot agree, either that this resolution is unfortunate in its terms, or that it has been introduced at an inopportune season. I think the hon. member for Victoria should receive the approval and thanks of parliament for giving us an opportunity to pronounce on so important a question at this time.

Mr. WM. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). As this debate has proceeded the conviction has been more and more strongly borne in upon my mind that among the members of this House there is a great divergence of opinion as to the facts under which this obnoxious declaration came into existence, as to the existing law, and as to the competency of this House in dealing with it. I was astounded when the hon. gentleman who brought in this resolution gave his reason for bringing it before the House. He said :

> I feel impelled to act on behalf of those whom I represent.

I was astounded that so old a parliamentarian as the hon. member for Victoria should stand up in the House and say that he was impelled to act on behalf of those whom he represents. Why, Sir, whom do we represent in this House ? If there is anything more clear than another under our constitutional system it is that every member in this House is elected, not to represent the particular body of the electors who exercised their franchise in sending him here, but he is elected by the people in that constituency to represent all the people of Canada ; and every man sitting on the floor of this House represents every elector in the Dominion of Canada just as truly, and should represent him to the best of his ability, just as effectually, as the particular representative who is sent to this House by the franchise of that elector. Yet we find an old parliamentarian beginning this important debate by stating that he was impelled to act on behalf of those whom he represents. That is the first point on which I would part with the hon. member for Victoria. I am impelled to speak here, not particularly for those who elected me, those whom I represent are the people of Canada. I was sent here to act to the best of my ability in the interest of the people of Canada. When the summons was received in the Gazette calling the representatives of the people of Canada to meet here, it was for the despatch of business connected with this Dominion of Canada, and when we are here for the despatch of business, when there is business to be done, I submit it is an imposition on the people of Canada whom I represent, that a whole day should be taken up in the discussion of a measure for relief

which the hon. gentleman, if he really wished to obtain some redress for his co-religionists, could have obtained hours and hours ago by accepting the suggestion which has been made again and again by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Now, Sir, I would like to say at the outset, that I thoroughly sympathize with every word that has fallen from several hon. gentlemen here regarding the language which is on the face of the declaration. I quite agree with the premier of Great Britain when he spoke of that language as deplorable, and I would be only too glad if I were standing on the floor of the Imperial parliament and a question came before that House on a motion that it should be considered and decided—I would be only too glad to raise my voice and give my vote in favour of expunging from this declaration every obnoxious term, every term that could even by a stretch of imagination be considered offensive to any one of His Majesty's subjects. If the day ever comes when we are engaged in recasting the political bonds that bind us to the mother land, and in devising any new political arrangement between that land and this, if at that time this declaration has not been modified or removed, and if I am then a member of this House, I will vote heartily for the passage of a resolution to remove any offensive expressions therefrom. But neither of those occasions is the one before us at the present time. We are here as representatives of the people of Canada and we are asked to consider a certain resolution. While I would not like to describe this resolution in terms that would be unparliamentary, if I were outside this House, if in my office a similar document to this were presented to me, I would not have the slightest hesitation in saying that it was as illogical as it was impudent. Why, since the debate commenced we have had many hon. gentlemen in discussing this question either wholly overlooking the terms of this resolution—and I hope that is the case—or misrepresenting the actual facts before the House. We have one hon. gentleman stating boldly that the coronation oath required the King to be a member of the Church of England, and on reference to the coronation oath it is found there is not a word to that effect. The last gentleman who spoke (Mr. Flint) said that the sovereign was compelled by law to be in communion with the Church of England. He nods his head in assent. Now, every hon. gentleman must be aware of the occasion when this declaration was put in force. A short time before that there was a sovereign of Great Britain who was in communion with the Church of England and continued in such communion until the day came for his reign to end, and then he took the last rites of that church to which he had always been attached and in which he had always believed. And it was at that time that the people of England, knowing that the mere declaration that a sovereign must be in communion with the Church of England, had not ensured a sovereign being a sincere member of the Church of England, knowing from actual experience that what the hon. gentleman asserted, had not been the fact, they at once put this declaration on the statute-book to attain the end that they had in view. It is all very well to refer to the coronation oath, but there is no conflict between the coronation oath and the declaration, and neither can take the place of the other.

Now, we are asked by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., to adopt this resolution. I have read the preamble and the resolution, and I venture to say that a more illogical document was never placed in the hands of a Speaker of this parliament. It is astonishing to me that an hon. gentleman of the legal acumen and the ability of the right hon. gentleman should for a moment have endorsed it, if he has glanced over this document, and seen how thoroughly illogical are the statements in it. Another who failed to perceive the character of this declaration is the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). When the leader of the opposition suggested that perhaps the objectionable phrases could be dropped from the declaration, this hon. gentleman from Westmoreland, a gentleman who has come to this House with a great flourish of trumpets, whose advent we looked for with anxiety, with apprehension on this side of the House, for we had heard that he was shortly to occupy one of the important benches behind the premier—when that gentleman arose he said that if you eliminated from this declaration all of the phrases that are objectionable and offensive to any people in this country you have nothing left. Now, that is a statement which is either correct or it is not. Let us see if we can find anything here that can be eliminated without destroying the declaration. If those who support the resolution really desired to obtain relief for a certain class of people, they would have presented it to the right hon. leader of the government and to the leader of the opposition, and an attempt would have been made to secure that support from both sides of the House that should be secured for such a resolution. But no such thing was done. The government alone has been taken into the hon. gentleman's counsels, and by a friendly member this resolution is brought before the House in such a way that 215 gentlemen are taken by the throat and are told : You must either swallow this, accept what I, the member for Victoria, say, or you must throw the whole thing overboard. I think that fact alone is sufficient to justify the description I gave of the resolution already. Let us see how the document proceeds. There is the usual preamble, it speaks about the Act of Settlement, gives the coronation oath, and then says :

> Such declaration is most offensive to the dearest convictions of all Roman Catholics.

I am in thorough accord with the hon. gen-

tleman on that point. The declaration is of necessity offensive to the feelings of all Roman Catholics. I am sorry it is so, and would be only too glad to do anything in my power to remove that offensive character. Then he goes on to speak of the staunch loyalty of His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Canada to whom it is very offensive to be branded as idolaters by their sovereign. I am thoroughly in accord with that too. I am sure there is not one gentleman on this side of the House but would raise his voice in endorsing that sentiment. These two premises being admitted, first that part of the declaration is offensive, second that the loyalty of His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects should not be rewarded by being so treated, let us see what is the conclusion. The conclusion from the premises is :

That in the opinion of this House the abovementioned Act of Settlement should be amended by abolishing the said declaration.

If there is nothing in the declaration that is not offensive, as the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) has said, then it is open to the objection that is raised, but let us see whether, if we do eliminate the offensive phrase, there is anything left. Bearing in mind the fact that the Crown had just been settled on William and Mary, who had no more right to the Throne of England by blood than any hon. gentleman in this House, that their title to it was wholly statutory, that, on the other side of the water, was the old sovereign King James who was encouraged and supported by Louis XIV. of France, who subsequently landed troops upon the shores of England; bearing in mind these facts, and the fact that his brother, Charles II., had taken the communion of the Church of England all his life, and had died in the rites of another church, we find that the House of Lords and House of Commons decided that this declaration must be taken by every sovereign who ascended the Throne. What was that declaration ?

I, A. B., do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that I do believe that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever.

Every Protestant in the world believes that, and there is nothing offensive in saying that any Protestant becoming King shall be called upon to declare that he does not believe in that particular doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. There is nothing offensive in its use here. There may be a statement of a theological belief to which a Roman Catholic as a theologian might object, but there is nothing offensive in that statement. The declaration goes on :

And that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous, etc.

All the rest of this declaration is open to the objection of the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., but, if we eliminated every other offensive phrase we would still have left in it the statement that the sovereign does not believe in the doctrine of transubstantiation. For 200 years, whether wisely or not, this has been part of the oath, and for 200 years it has been taken by every sovereign who has ascended the Throne. A new sovereign has just ascended the Throne, and it is our wish that he may long occupy that position. Throughout the mother land, objection has been taken to that oath by lawyers, by the press, by parliamentarians and by the people who regret this phrase and declare the necessity of removing it. Why, then, in the name of all that is sacred, should the time of parliament and the money of the people of this country be wasted here in discussing a question which we believe will be settled in the mother land in just the way we think it should be settled. I could not help suspecting, when the suggestion was first made by the leader of the opposition, that a conference should be held between the leader of the government, the leader of the opposition and the mover of the resolution to see if it would not be possible to agree upon terms, and when the leader of the opposition went so far as to intimate that he was willing to eliminate all the expressions that are offensive to the religious belief of a portion of the subjects of the British Crown, when I found the right hon. leader of the government and the mover of the resolution refused, although appealed to again and again to save the time of the House, to save the risk of having religious excitement stirred up in this country, when I found that the right hon. Prime Minister refused only a few moments ago to allow the debate to be adjourned, insisting that we should proceed to a decision to-night, and when I found that the leader of the opposition was willing that the resolution should take the ground of asking for the elimination from the declaration of the offensive expressions, it occurred to my mind that the elimination of the offensive expressions would not meet the desire of the mover of the resolution. What he desired was, although he has not told the House, but one or two members on the other side did blurt out what he really desired, was not the elimination of the offensive expressions, but to strike out the whole of the declaration so as to get rid of this particular declaration, which, rightly or wrongly, the people of Great Britain, for 200 years have considered one of the bulwarks of their religion. I would be glad to see the people of Great Britain do anything they can to bring about the removal of these expressions which cast a reflection upon a religious body, but I am not a member of the

parliament of Great Britain. I am here to represent the people of Canada, I am proud to be a Canadian, but I would be ashamed of my position if I were to do anything that would belittle Canada and make Canada seem small, mean, contemptible and foolish in the eyes of the nations. Look for a moment at our position; at the moment when the people of the mother land have told us that they desire to make a change we rush in with our petition asking them to do that which they in all probability are unwilling to do. Are we doing anything to increase the respect entertained by the mother land for us ? The right hon. gentleman told us this afternoon that a number of years ago we did send an humble address to the Throne, that it had not been received in a courteous manner, but that, perhaps, an address as this would be received. The Prime Minister said that a few years ago the Dominion of Canada was snubbed by the premier of Great Britain because we sent a resolution over, but that last year we sent a resolution to England which was gratefully accepted. I do not wish to say anything disparaging of the hon. gentleman's logical powers, but surely that was hardly worthy of the ability that we all credit him with. Last year, when the resolution was sent over to the mother land, what was the state of affairs ? We had the mother land engaged in a war in South Africa, we had the press of all the other civilized nations outside of the empire decrying the mother land and upholding the Boers as being in the right. We were told that Great Britain, standing in her splendid isolation, would soon be a thing of the past, and we sent in this resolution expressing perfect confidence in the purity and justice of Her Majesty's cause. It was unavoidable that a resolution sent in under such circumstances should be received with acceptance. Surely there is a distinction between that resolution of confidence and a resolution telling the people of the mother land that they have not known their own business for the last 200 years. It may be that the House of Commons will pass such a resolution. I would be glad to do anything in my humble power to remove these offensive expressions from the statute-book, but my first duty is to the people of this country, and I will be sorry to do anything which would reflect seriously upon the intelligence of this House by supporting such a resolution.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I wish, for a very short time, to ask the attention of the House to this resolution, and give some reason for the vote that I propose to record upon it. I have always viewed with disfavour any inclination or disposition to import into this House questions of this troublesome kind, questions relating to religion or to race. I have always regarded it as one of the things that parliamentarians should avoid as far as possible. I think that we may all trust implicitly to the trend of public opinion of the nineteenth century, and to the tolerance of the age to make us a more homogeneous people, to make us forget the distinctions of the past and to bring us closer together as members of the human family. We might trust to the disposition of the age to accomplish this, rather than to resort to resolutions of this kind. The toleration of the nineteenth centry is already historical. It is in the direction of broader charity of man towards man, of a more enduring philantrophy in the human race, and of a stronger inclination to live in unison with our fellowmen. The teaching of the social habits of the age all lie in that direction, and the inclinations of the people are to forget the controversies of the past and to make for harmony in the future. That happy result is, however, impeded in its course by the introduction of just such questions as these from time to time, which cause us to reflect on the history of the past, to remember the animosities of by-gone days, and to bring them before the world's notice so that they may do duty again in resurrecting what the best disposed people would gladly allow to remain dead and forgotten. The coronation oath, or declaration as it is called, was the crystallized wisdom of the time to provide against something that it was desirable to provide against. What was the object ? It was to do away with the possibility of a Roman Catholic king or queen being on the Throne of England. And, why was it necessary to provide this oath or declaration ? It was because of the troubles which had been engendered for generations previously, and the wars even which had been brought about by the intolerance displayed by the Roman Catholic sovereigns who had occupied the British Throne. It was to prevent these dangers to the state that the coronation oath and declaration was formulated. And what is the coronation declaration ? It is at best but a declaration or confession of faith. The oath is taken by the sovereign on his accession that he will support the Protestant faith. Then follows the confession of faith or declaration that the sovereign does not believe in the Roman Catholic religion, which had been found so troublesome up to that time; it is an acknowledgment that the sovereign adjures that faith if the sovereign ever believed in it. That is practically what the coronation declaration means, and why it should be offensive to Roman Catholics is the great mystery of my life. I do not believe in the faith that the Roman Catholic believes nor does the Roman Catholic believe in my faith. Is it offensive to me that he does not believe in my faith ? Not at all. Should it be offensive to him that I do not believe in his faith ? Not at all. These are matters which appertain individually to us and should not

be offensive to either. And when the law of the country demands that the Protestant religion shall be maintained and that the head of the state should be a Protestant, why should it be offensive to a Roman Catholic if the sovereign makes a confession of faith before the people of the world in taking his position at the head of the state. With equal propriety might you say that it is offensive to the Buddhist, offensive to the Jew, offensive to every other religious denomination. For my part, I can see no just ground why it should be offensive to the Roman Catholics of the country. Previous to the passing of this law it was found detrimental to the state that the king or queen should be a Catholic, and so the law was made that the sovereign, in ascending the Throne, should declare that he or she did not believe in that faith. Now, if this declaration did any injustice to the Roman Catholic ; if the Roman Catholic had the right to ascend the Throne of England, then I would regard it as an injustice. If it compelled any Roman Catholic in the land to take that oath, I would regard it as unjust. But it does not, because a Roman Catholic is not allowed to sit on the Throne of England so long as he is a Roman Catholic. In no position under the Crown, except that of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and the Lord Chancellor of England, is a Catholic debarred from occupying a position of emolument or honour by reason of the necessity of taking such an oath. Therefore, there is no injustice to the Roman Catholic. It debars him from no position he has a right to occupy under the law of the land. Were we charged with the duty to-day of providing a safeguard for the supremacy of the Protestant religion, I am bound to believe that we would be happier in our selection of words to accomplish that end. I believe that the spirit of the nineteenth century and the toleration of the nineteenth century would enable us to do so, but we are not charged with that duty, and, therefore, we cannot in any sense pretend to alter this declaration. Are we in this parliament within our rights in passing a resolution inviting the Imperial parliament to alter this declaration ? Some say we are and some say we are not. In my judgment we are within our rights, but the question that interests me is : Is it advisable or is it the part of wisdom to do so, and on that point I believe that it is not wise nor advisable to attempt it at the present time. The resolution which we passed last year in reference to the Uitlanders is not a parallel case, and on that point I beg to differ from the right hon. the Prime Minister. When we passed that resolution the mother country was engaged in a struggle to settle a most important question, and we wished to give her our moral support by declaring that we were in favour of the claims of the Uitlanders. In order to strengthen the hands of England we declared by a resolution in favour of the policy of England in regard to her subjects in South Africa. But, Sir, is England fighting to-day ? Is England now dealing with the question of the coronation oath, and is she asking to have it repealed ? Not at all. When the question was presented to the British nation what did Lord Salisbury say ? When the question was asked, how can this be amended ? he said : ' Only by an Act of the Imperial parliament ; but I am not disposed to introduce that Act, because I think I would be doing a very dangerous and unwise thing.' If that is the spirit of the Imperial government to-day, and the spirit of the British Empire, why should we attempt to disturb it, and do something that will invite or provoke a great deal of trouble, not only in the mother country, but in the various colonies of the empire ? Therefore, whether we have or have not the right to do it, I think it would be the part of wisdom to avoid provoking any unpleasant feelings by a controversy over this question.

If it was desired to pass this resolution, why was it brought in as an amendment to going into Committee of Supply ? We are always told that an amendment to Supply has but one meaning, that is, that it is a vote of want of confidence in the government. My opinion is that the object in bringing forward the motion at this time is in order that it cannot be amended in any way, but must be accepted in its entirety or rejected in its entirety ; for there is no amendment allowable to a motion made in amendment to the motion to go into Commitee of Supply. Therefore, it does suggest to my mind that the mover of this resolution desired to introduce it in such a way that it might be made a political machine in the hands of some parties rather than do justice to his co-religionists, who he thinks are suffering under something which he feels called upon to rectify.

These agitations do no good, but they often do a great deal of harm. We have had experience of them in the past in the Canadian parliament, we are having a similar experience to-day, and we may have it again in the future. What does this resolution ask ? It asks the abolition of the declaration altogether. If you abolish the declaration, you do more than Lord Salisbury himself says he has the power to do, except by an Act of parliament. If the resolution had been to eliminate the objectionable words in the declaration, and substitute something else in their place which might contain a sufficient safeguard for what was intended, that is, the perpetuation of the Protestant religion, as represented on the Throne of England, I could understand the wisdom of it. But this resolution aims at no such end. It aims at another end entirely, that is, the elimination of the declaration altogether.

Why is this resolution introduced at the present time ? As a general thing, we in-

troduce resolutions or Bills into this parliament because there is a demand for them from the people of the country. Have we had any petitions presented to this parliament asking for this resolution ? Have we had any great agitation in favour of it ? Not at all, so far as I know, and I have been constantly watching the press of the country. It is true, we have in the country a small sect, or society, that has been promoting this agitation from time to time, and, so far as I know, it is the originator of this question. But we have had no petitions nor demands for such a resolution from any part of the country, and therefore, in my judgment, there is no necessity for introducing it at the present time.

It is said that we declare that we are in favour of equal rights to all. So we are—equal rights to all under the Crown. We do not deny that ; we stand up for that ; but this resolution is going further than asking for equal rights to all. It is asking the elimination of that essential promise to the British Empire, that only a Protestant king or queen shall be seated on the Throne. It is going that much further, and therefore I am opposed to it. Is there any injustice done to any one by this declaration ? It is said that it is obnoxious to the feelings of Roman Catholics. I do not know why it should be any more obnoxious to their feelings than the declaration of the Roman Catholic faith is to my feelings when it says that I am a heretic and an outcast. Is it obnoxious to me that any Roman Catholic reads that to me ? Not at all. That is his own faith, and I have no quarrel with him because it is not mine.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question ? Does he acknowledge allegiance to any Pope or bishop of the Catholic Church ?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not talking about allegiance to them at all. Every British subject is bound to pay allegiance to the head of the state.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). My hon. friend was saying——

Mr. SPROULE. If my hon. friend wishes to interrupt me every little while with a question, I would like him to make his own argument. I am not talking about that at all.

In 1688, when the settlement was made between the state, the church and the people, this was part and parcel of the agreement ; and every member of the state from that time to the present, acknowledges allegiance to the Queen or King, with the understanding that he is obeying that part of the compact, and therefore, it cannot be insulting to his faith. The late Queen took that declaration sixty-four years ago. Has any Catholic suffered in consequence during the last sixty-four years ? Has the late Queen been any the less tolerant of the religious convictions, the religious rights, or even the prejudices of Catholics ? I do not think any one will successfully contend that she has been. Yet she took it, and they have lived under it all that time. The present King has taken it, and are they likely to enjoy any less freedom or any fewer advantages under him than they have done under the late Queen ? I do not think any one will contend that they are. That being the case, what ground is there for complaint ? In my judgment there is none.

I see great objections to the periodical introduction into this House of these disturbing questions, which have a tendency to divide the people and destroy that spirit of charity and tolerance which is the spirit of the nineteenth century, and rake up ancient history and the quarrels of the past, which many of us would gladly leave to be hidden in oblivion. It is because of these opinions and feelings that I am disposed to vote against this resolution. I never view with complacency the disposition to introduce these controversial questions. They are very troublesome questions, and those who introduce them must be held responsible. There are some who live and thrive on that class of work. I do not grudge them any little popularity they may obtain from it, but I think they are doing a great injustice, not only to the people of the country, but to the very class of people whose interests they profess to serve.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Gaspé). Mr. Speaker, I wish to relieve at once the mind of my hon. friend who has just spoken as to the feelings of Roman Catholics on this very important question. Speaking as one of the descendants of those Frenchmen who were ceded by a French and Catholic King to an English and Protestant sovereign. I have no hesitation in saying, as my leader very eloquently said this afternoon, that, Catholic and Frenchman as I am, I am prouder to have lived under a wise and constitutional sovereign like Queen Victoria, than under an arbitrary ruler like Louis XV.

I rise to give my humble but earnest support to the resolution presented by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan).

The question now submitted to you, Sir, is not raised with the object of creating any religious agitation. If it were, I would not speak in favour of the resolution. The Roman Catholics of Canada, united with their co-religionists of the British Empire, are anxious that a grievance should be removed, that an evil should be remedied and that a wrong should be righted. Without going any further, I wish to answer at once a preliminary objection which has been raised. It is stated that this is not the proper place to discuss the declaration of the King against transubstantiation—it being a subject-matter, coming within the purview of the Imperial parliament. This

opinion is presumably based upon the following reply sent to the Marquis of Lorne by the Earl of Kimberley, at the time the resolutions, adopted by this House in favour of home rule, were sent to the Imperial government :

> Her Majesty will always gladly receive the advice of the parliament of Canada on all matters relating to the Dominion and the administration of its affairs; but with respect to the question referred to in the address, Her Majesty will, in accordance with the constitution of this country, have regard to the advice of the Imperial parliament and ministers, to which all matters relating to the affairs of the United Kingdom exclusively appertain.

This same view is shared by a portion of the Canadian press. It is contended that the parliament which prescribed the declaration against transubstantiation, is the only parliament that can abolish or amend it.

Sir, I quite agree that this parliament cannot substitute itself for the Imperial parliament, but surely we have the right to express an opinion upon a question deeply affecting twelve millions of His Majesty's loyal subjects, and at the least 42 per cent of the total population of Canada. Granted, that we can not legislate for the British parliament, but who can deny to our parliament, but any of our legislatures—that expressive power or expressive function, without which, parliament would be nothing but a mere name ? True, we cannot interfere with the functions of the Imperial parliament, but, Sir, we would be unworthy of our British citizenship if we could not, in this House, ventilate a grievance, and even humbly petition the King himself.

After all, the declaration against transubstantiation, which is made the subject of this debate, is a relic of past ages. At the time it was framed, the English people thought it was absolutely necessary that such a declaration should be made by the King. It was, perhaps, considered more as a political move than as a sectarian one. But, Sir, the fear of the Stuarts exists no more, and the Protestant House of Hanover is now deeply rooted in the British Isles, nay in the whole British Empire. The Pope of Rome is, and has been, for years and years a firm advocate of peace ; the disabilities against British subjects belonging to the Catholic faith have also disappeared in the course of time, and today they form an important and numerous body of His Majesty's most loyal subjects. Why then, should the British sovereign be forced to make a declaration giving needless, wanton and studied offence to his Catholic subjects ? Why then should their dearest belief be officially declared idolatrous and superstitious ?

As Catholics, we hold as tenets of our faith: (1) the real presence of Our Saviour in the Blessed Eucharist ; (2) the invocation of the Blessed Virgin ; (3) the invocation of the saints ; (4) the sacrifice of mass.

Yet, Sir, these fundamental and essential articles of the Catholic creed are pilloried by Act of parliament. What are we asking ? We are asking that Catholic doctrines held sacred by twelve million British subjects should not be made the object of royal condemnation.

This vast British Empire is composed not only of Protestants, but of Catholics, Brahmins, Mahommedans, Budhists, Pagans as well. Strange to say, Catholics alone—twelve million of Catholics—are obliged to listen to a severe condemnation, to a rebuke, from the lips of their sovereign. This declaration, Sir, is, as I have already said, a relic of past ages. Let it disappear. Other relics have been done away with in conservative England. Not a century ago, according to public documents, the King was not only King of England, but also King of France. This title disappeared in the course of time, proud as the English were of this relic of past ages.

We also, in Lower Canada, were, after the cession, subject to the disabilities affecting the Catholics of England. An oath —a test oath—was required from our ancestors which practically debarred them from holding any public office. They protested, and Sir, Great Britain wiped out that vestige of past ages, and granted them civil and religious liberty.

We hope—we earnestly hope—that this resolution will be received in England, as the expression of the sincere and loyal wishes of the united Canadian people, and that the Imperial parliament will soon remove from the statute-book a declaration most offensive to Roman Catholics. This is not a national question ; this is not a religious question. It is a matter of public policy, a request for equal rights, for the exercise of that fair-play and broad toleration which characterize British institutions. In conclusion, I will say that I, as a Catholic, would not object to a Protestant declaration from the British sovereign, but I object to a purely anti-Catholic out-of-date declaration.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If I may be permitted to speak again in this debate, I desire to say, in view of the appeals that have been made to me from some quarters of the House to ascertain whether it would not be possible to amend the resolution, the principle of which seems to be generally acceptable, but the language of which seems to be the subject of some exception, after conference with my hon. friend the mover of this resolution, and with some other members on both sides of the House I have to propose, that my hon. friend would accept and agree to a change in the motion. The change I would suggest is in the last

paragraph of the motion, which is in these words :

That in the opinion of this House, the above mentioned Act of Settlement should be amended by abolishing the said declaration.

And substitute the following words :

That in the opinion of this House the declaration referred to in the above mentioned Act of Settlement should be amended by eliminating therefrom all those expressions which are especially offensive to the religious belief of any subjects of the British Empire.

Of course, it is a well known rule of the House that such an amendment could not be accepted except by consent of the House; but I imagine that, in a matter of this kind, no one would object and that these words could be substituted in the motion of my hon. friend.

Mr. SPEAKER. With the unanimous consent of the House, there will be no difficulty in the hon. gentleman withdrawing his motion and substituting the other.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, if, in offering a few words with regard to the suggestion just thrown out by the leader of the House, I should preclude myself from speaking should the debate continue ?

Mr. SPEAKER. If it is a personal explanation the hon. gentleman has, no doubt, the right to give it. I suppose also that, with the unanimous consent of the House that the hon. member could have an opportunity of giving the explanation he wishes to give.

Mr. WALLACE. This is a most unusual and extraordinary state of affairs. They first violate the rules by amending the resolution originally proposed, and, in the second place I suppose, as it is a new resolution, every one will be allowed to speak again.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will waive my right, and I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) will do the same.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is proposed to withdraw the resolution now before the House, and substitute a similar motion except with the alteration proposed. Is is the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) shall have leave to withdraw his motion.

Motion withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN moved :

That all the words after ' That ' be left out, and the following added instead thereof :

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

Most Gracious Majesty:

Your Majesty's most faithful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada in parliament assembled, beg leave most humbly to represent :

That as a token of the civil and religious liberties and of the equality of rights guaranteed to all British subjects in the Canadian confederation, as well as under the British constitution, the British sovereign should not be called to make any declaration offensive to the religious belief of any subject of the British Crown.

That by virtue of the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement, the British sovereign, on the first day of the meeting of the first parliament, or at the coronation, is called upon to make the following declaration :—

' I, A. B., by the grace of God, King (or Queen) of Great Britain and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that I do believe that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever ; and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that I do make this declaration, and each and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope or any other authority or person whatsoever, or without any hope of such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or men, or absolved of this declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope or any other person or persons, or power whatsoever, should dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning.'

That such declaration is offensive to the convictions of all Roman Catholics.

That the staunch loyalty of Your Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Canada and throughout British possessions should exempt them from any offensive reference to their religion by their sovereign.

That in the opinion of this House, the declaration referred to in the above mentioned Act should be amended by eliminating therefrom all these expressions which are especially offensive to the religious belief of any subjects of the British Crown.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I am not familiar with the rules of the House, but I understand that every hon. member is at liberty to discuss this question before the motion is carried. With all sincerity I crave the indulgence of the House in rising to speak on this very important question, more particularly perhaps, as it is not the feeling of the House that I should speak. On an ordinary question, one affecting only the financial interests of the country I would not feel that I needed the consideration of hon. members to the same extent. But, rising to speak at this late hour, and at a time when it may seem to many hon. members that debate is less necessary than it was at an earlier stage, I am obliged to ask the hon. members for every reasonable latitude. I feel, like the last hon. gentleman who addressed the

House (Mr. Lemieux) that it is such an important question that it almost justifies a written address, which is contrary I understand to the rules of the House, rather than those unstudied remarks which may fall from the lips of one who attempts to speak without that assistance. I assure hon. members on both sides, that I approach this subject with diffidence, and also with an honest desire not to say one word which can be offensive to any hon. member of the House or that can be construed as offensive to any of the people that go to make up the Dominion. I realize that it is important too, in this country that the law should be such, as not to unduly or unfairly cause offense to any class of His Majesty's subjects. I realize also that it may well be said that the language in which the declaration which has been so frequently referred to is couched, may be reasonably offensive to some of His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects. I recollect, too, that the loyalty and devotion of British subjects of the Roman Catholic faith have been tested on many occasions. Therefore, I should be sorry indeed if there should be perpetuated in any of the statutes of the British Empire anything that is likely to cause offence to His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects. But, I ask leave to say also that I have not varied very much in my opinion of this matter during the progress of the debate. One subject has become reasonably clear in my mind in a way, that I did not quite anticipate at the beginning of the debate. I had a great deal of doubt as to whether it is competent for this parliament to deal with this question. But, the remarks which fell from the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) were so plain and so convincing in that regard that I am perfectly convinced that it is competent for this House to pronounce upon this question, if properly presented to it.

I venture to say that there is a wide difference between the competency of this House to present a petition to His Majesty and the propriety, or the wisdom, of the policy of pursuing the course we are asked to take here to-night. I still hold the view I entertained at the beginning of the debate, that this question is fraught with the greatest danger to the peace and harmony of this great Dominion, and the constant introduction of questions of this kind is calculated to arouse religious strife among the people. I desire to protest as vigorously as I can against the introduction of these questions on the floor of the Dominion parliament. Whilst we have the right and the privilege to present petitions to the sovereign of the empire, the introduction of this subject at present is unnecessary, and worse, because it is calculated to injure this country. We have already had sufficient racial and religious difficulties in this country without going across the Atlantic and importing others. The great curse of this country is that from time to time some gentleman whose motive I do not wish to asperse, seeks to drag questions of race and religion into parliament. While these questions will do injury to the country, they will not ruin it, because nothing can withstand the progress of this great Dominion. I am astonished that so old a parliamentarian as the hon. member for Victoria should be so wanting in astuteness as to have committed this great error of introducing a measure which can have no other effect than to arouse strife. Notwithstanding that the resolution has been modified, I am prepared to vote against it. I do so for many reasons, and one is that I believe the parliament of Great Britain is prepared to treat this matter on the broad and enlightened principles of the century on which we have just entered. One of those principles is that the Roman Catholics of the empire should receive every consideration at the hands of the British parliament. I am content to leave this matter where it belongs. Almost every gentlemen who has spoken in the House to-night has spoken in favour of the resolution, and claimed liberties which they would never have enjoyed in any other land. I am confident that while the present dynasty reigns over the British Empire the liberty of no one will be in danger, and no Act will remain on the statute-book which is necessarily offensive to the Roman Catholic people of the empire.

Several hon. gentlemen have maintained that the present is an opportune time for bringing forward this question. I do not share in that opinion. It is not an opportune time when the Crown is passing from one head to another to raise such a question as this. If I had any doubts as to the expediency of passing this resolution in its first form, those doubts have been much increased by some of the speeches that I have heard this evening. We find hon. members differing very widely, both as to the existing laws and as to the effect of the resolution if it is passed. For instance, we have the hon. member for West York referring to the Thirty-nine Articles and the Westminster Confession. That fact alone suggests to my mind that there are too many questions surrounding the proposition before this House to justify us in dealing with it, there are a great many questions connected with it that the parliament of Great Britain is more competent to deal with than we are. We should understand exactly the position we are in before making any move in this matter. Then we have the opinion that has been so ably put forth by the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart). I followed him as closely as I could, and I am inclined to think there is a good deal in what he said, showing again that we are in doubt as to the exact position of the question we are dealing with. Then, we have the hon. member for Labelle (Mr.

Bourassa), who put his construction upon this resolution. He argues that under the sovereignty of Britain men of all religions and all creeds have equal rights. Surely we all assent to that proposition. He goes further and says that all creeds ought to be on the same footing. If that is what is aimed at by the resolution, that is not the understanding of many hon. members who have spoken here to-night. There is no distinction at present between the civil status of Roman Catholics and Protestants in the British Empire.

Speaking for myself, I am not prepared to subscribe to that proposition. An hon. gentleman says that we have a right to deal with this question. He puts that right very emphatically, but although he puts that right so emphatically, declaring that we have a right to take part in this matter as regards the British parliament, the hon. gentleman does not look at both sides of the shield. When it comes to the Canadian people supporting Great Britain in the field, the hon. gentleman takes an opposite view. He proclaims, in a resolution which is to come before the House, an opposite doctrine to that which he has just propounded to the members of this parliament. For these reasons, in addition to others which I have given, and desiring as honestly as any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House that there shall be no differences between Roman Catholics and Protestants before the Crown, that there shall be no differences of creed or nationality in this country, or the old land, I wish it to be distinctly understood that this is not the place nor the time to introduce a question of this kind. I submit this with all deference. I feel that I have been speaking at a great disadvantage. I feel that, coming before the House at this time and under these circumstances, I am handicapped, but I want to see the great people of this country, of one origin or the other, whether they are Roman Catholic or Protestant, grow up in peace and harmony together. I do feel, that at the beginning of this new year, the first of the century, it is time to realize the importance of keeping such questions out of the debates of this parliament. I rejoice that our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens have joined with us to fight the battles of the empire. I remember that when Great Britain was in her hour of need Roman Catholics and Protestants went out together as Britons to fight her battles, that whilst, perhaps, they knelt before different altars, they worshipped the same God and waved the same old British flag, and that while worshipping the same God and owing allegiance to the same sovereign, they marched on together to victory, which has always perched upon the banners of Great Britain. My Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, gentlemen of French origin as well as of English origin, unite in wishing prosperity to the great British Empire and the great Dominion of Canada. I am, perhaps, in my earnest desire to see carried out my idea that all shall live in peace and harmony together as His Majesty's subjects, speaking more excitedly than is consistent with a calm declaration of the ideas I have, but coming before this new parliament, at the beginning of a new year and at the beginning of a century which I believe will be the greatest in the annals of Great Britain and the Dominion, I feel it is time for us to unite in this one grand sentiment:

This is our country, strong and broad and grand,
God guard thee Canada, our native land.

Mr. FLETCHER B. WADE (Annapolis). Mr. Speaker, I presume that it will be pleasant to hon. members to know that I do not propose making a speech at this late hour of the night. The only reason that I rise here now is because I desire to correct a misapprehension of a number of hon. gentlemen in the House. It seems to be taken for granted that the only church to which this declaration is offensive is the Roman Catholic Church. That is quite a mistake. I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that there is a large portion of the Protestant Church to whom the first clause of this declaration is quite as offensive as it is to the Roman Catholics. I refer to the Lutheran Church or the Evangelical Lutheran Church. This body of Christians is composed of followers of Luther, and their creed is to be found in the Augsberg Confession of Faith. Luther contended for the doctrine of transubstantiation, and upon that question the Calvinists split and seceded from the church. This is an important body throughout Canada, and more especially in the county of Lunenburg, where I happen to reside for many years. I make this correction in the interest of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) who represents that fine county. I do not purpose engaging the attention of the House beyond this point. I am going to support the resolution, but I do not wish to do so without expressing myself openly, and I express myself openly for the purpose of showing the House and the country that the constituency which I have the honour to represent is far above and beyond all bigotry and uncharitableness.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to detain the House for any length of time, because the suggestion that has recently been made comes so near meeting, if it does not wholly meet, the views that I have entertained from the beginning, that any lengthy remarks are wholly unnecessary. But, if nothing else induced me to detain the House for a moment it would be the discordant speech, I regret to say on this side of the House, that has been made, and which suggests that there is not to be that harmony which, for the sake of our House and for the sake of the country, if not for

the sake of the empire, would be so desirable on an occasion of this kind. I am not going over some of the observations and criticisms which occurred to me at the beginning of the debate. There is, after all, when the views which have been expressed are threshed out, so very little divergence of opinion, I think it a very unfortunate thing that the hon. member for Victoria took charge of this resolution at all, though against himself personally I have not the slightest thing to say. Still he is a Roman Catholic. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is a Roman Catholic, and their positions were not such for that reason—we have to look at things as they are, at prejudices as they exist—as would suggest to either of them that they should when feelings of excitement in connection with religious questions have not died out in Canada, be the first to leap into the breach on an occasion of this kind. There were dozens of hon. members on both sides of this House, strong in the Protestant faith who would have been glad to have had the honour of introducing this question to the House.

If the moderate course pursued by those in England, who are interested in the matter had been followed here, the House would not have been forced to say willy nilly that a certain set of words would have to be adopted before progress was made in parliament. If the proper course had been adopted before, members would not have been dragooned, so to speak, into assuming a position on this question, and members would not be put unnecessarily on their guard, and their suspicion unnecessarily aroused, as apparently is the case with some hon. gentlemen who are going to stand aloof from this movement, which I think from many points of view is so desirable. Take the moderate and prudent example shown by the Catholics of the United Kingdom to the Catholics of other parts of the empire. Instead of holding up the parliament of England until this question was decided just as they wished, with a moderation which shows the strength of their case, they ask that the declaration should be amended and that those parts of it which are especially offensive to the belief of certain subjects of His Majesty, should be eliminated. They do not ask that the declaration should be repealed, as was suggested at first in this House. They recognize, as the Roman Catholic members of this House have cheerfully recognized, that whatever the future may have in store, there must be a Protestant monarch in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. They recognize, too, that there must be a declaration which puts it out of the question that the monarch holds or sympathizes with the Roman Catholic doctrine. That is a position that was not attacked by the mover of this resolution. He candidly admitted that he had no sinister designs in connection with that condition of affairs, and the Prime Minister cheerfully bowed to the existing situation, and did not suggest that that question should be debated here or anywhere within the King's realm. I do not sympathize with the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair), who, judging from his interruptions, is of the opinion that it is a question of splitting hairs, and that if you eliminate the offensive part of the declaration nothing remains. The astute Roman Catholic peers and these astute minds in England recognize that even if their views be adopted, there must be an anti-Catholic declaration made by the monarch of Great Britain and Ireland, and the strength of their case lies in the fact—and I do not see how they can fail—that all they ask is that in making that anti-Catholic declaration which assures the King's subjects of the Protestant faith, it shall not be made in an offensive manner to those ardent Catholics who are loyal subjects of the British Crown. I, of course, have no right to speak as to the views of the Roman Catholic Church, but I hold in my hand the Tablet, the recognized exponent of Roman Catholic views, and in that journal is the moderate memorial of the Roman Catholic peers, which they have placed in the hands of the Lord Chancellor. The article in the Tablet is headed 'Superstitious and Idolatrous,' and the gravamen of their complaint is directed against these five lines in the declaration which are unnecessarily offensive. Every reasonable man here knows—the member for West York, I take it, believes—that these words are unnecessarily offensive to the Roman Catholic subjects of the King. No one has defended the use of those words here to-day, and reasonable explanations were given as to the time they found their way into that declaration. Surely the Catholics in this House cannot ask the Protestants for any more than they should follow the lead of the Roman Catholics who are at the head of this movement in England, and in connection with whose suggestion I can see no danger to the state. If we concur in their action, that ought to be sufficient. I regret exceedingly that there should be any member in this House who feels constrained to prevent a unanimous conclusion being reached on this subject, seeing that the leader of the government and the leader of the opposition, and a large majority of the members are clearly one in desiring to have all the peculiarly offensive words of that declaration eliminated.

Sir, I took pride as a Canadian in the manner in which the debate was conducted. It is one of the most creditable debates that has ever taken place in this parliament since I have had the honour to sit here. It is the only occasion on which a question connected with religion, has been discussed without heat and without offensive epithets thrown across the floor. The moderation displayed was simply magnificent, and when

the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) suggested that I did not go heart and hand with my leader, I almost laughed in his face. I never was prouder of a leader in my life than I was of the hon. leader of the opposition to-day, in the high position he took. Without a caucus, without conference with his party, without any reference to the gentlemen who sat behind him, and newly come to his responsible position, he said to his followers : I leave you all free, but as for myself, I stand out on this broad plane, that I want to see equal justice done to every race and creed in Canada and the empire ; I take my stand for justice, equal civil and religious rights, and I do not wish to see included in this coronation ceremony, or in any of the great functions of state, an epithet that is considered offensive to my Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, or to any of my fellow-subjects of the King. I repeat that I was never prouder of the position taken by any leader of a party than I was of the manly, sturdy, and truly Canadian position taken by the leader of the opposition to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would not have risen, except to add my poor voice, by way of appeal, to all those gentlemen with whom I generally act, that they should do a generous thing, forget the manner in which the resolution was introduced, and the opportunity taken for its introduction, on going into Supply, when no suggestion could be made to amend it, as could be done if the ordinary course were adopted. That course might have been pursued here, which the hon. seconder of the resolution (Mr. Kendall) pointed out, was adopted in the province of Nova Scotia many years ago, when a unanimous vote was obtained, because there was no attempt to force on any one a particular phrase or a particular sentence, and a committee being appointed to draw up an address, there was a strong resolution framed that was acceptable to every man in that chamber. I believe the same thing could have been done on this occasion, and the responsibility of any difference of opinion rests upon the shoulders of the member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan). He has been ill-advised, in my humble judgment ; but notwithstanding all that, I would make as ardent and earnest an appeal for unanimity on this question as I can possibly make to hon. gentlemen on one side of the House or the other. We can strengthen the hands of our fellow-subjects in the United Kingdom to-day in a cause that is good, a cause that has nothing in it which in the slightest degree imperils an interest in the empire, and we can promote that cordial feeling which seems to be growing, and happily growing, in our own country, and particularly in this Chamber.

Mr. GEO W. FOWLER (King's, N.B.) Mr. Speaker, although the hour is late, I propose to inflict a few remarks on the House, for the reason that I do not wish to give a silent vote on this question. I may say at the outset that I am in favour of the resolution before the House, because I believe that the declaration which the sovereign of this empire makes should be made without giving offence to any class or race, or creed, throughout his vast dominions ; and I do not agree with the statement which has been made by some hon. members that this is not the place nor this the time to bring up a matter of this kind. I think this is the very place. It would be a hard reflection upon this honourable House, which is supposed to represent the intelligence of this Dominion, if we 213 men could not discuss a question of this character without arousing race or creed prejudices ; and I am glad to be able to bear the same testimony as the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who congratulated the House on the manner in which this debate has been conducted up to the present time. I must take this opportunity to congratulate the government upon the course which they have taken with regard to this resolution. I wish to congratulate them upon the fact that they have had the good sense to appreciate the suggestion which was made to them by the hon. leader of the opposition. I am glad to be able to congratulate them upon the fact that they saw the peculiar position in which they were placing the House by adhering to the resolution of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan), as it was first introduced, because the resolution which they had evidently determined to support in its entirety was a resolution which went vastly further than the statements which the hon. members made as to the object they had in view. I therefore, congratulate them, that, as in the case of the binder twine discussion the other night, they have adopted the suggestion thrown out on this side of the House.

There is one thing I regret exceedingly, that is, that two of the hon. members from the maritime provinces who have spoken, have shown lamentable ignorance—the one on a question of religion and the other on a question of history. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), who made a very eloquent speech, made a statement with reference to the expulsion of the Acadians a great many years ago. The hon. gentleman said that the reason the Acadians were expelled from Nova Scotia was that they refused to take the declaration which is embodied in this resolution. I am very sorry that the hon. gentleman should have displayed such vast ignorance of that subject, because he comes from the maritime provinces. As a matter of fact, the Acadians were expelled from Nova

Scotia because they refused to take the simple oath of allegiance to King George, and not the test oath at all.

The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) brought up the grievance of the Lutheran Church, a church which has a great many adherents, he says, in the province of Nova Scotia; and he said this declaration affected them and their prejudices. The hon. gentleman has not that knowledge of dogmas or of the creed of the Lutheran Church which he ought to have, in order to speak with authority, or he would know that the Lutheran Church does not subscribe to the doctrine of transubstantiation at all. It subscribes to an entirely different doctrine, the doctrine of consubstantiation, and the hon. member does not seem to distinguish between the two. For the information of the hon. member, and in order to correct the wrong impression which hon. members who are not well versed in religious matters may have gathered from his remarks, let me read from the Encyclopedia Britannica, as to the difference between these two dogmas:

> To commence with the Roman Church. With regard to the doctrine known as transubstantiation, it must here suffice to say that the Church of Rome teaches that the whole substance of the bread and wine in the Eucharist is converted by consecration into the body and blood of Christ, in such a manner that Christ in His entirety, including His human soul and His divine nature, are contained in the elements.

Now, with regard to the Lutheran Church:

> While the continental Reformers were of one mind in repudiating the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the Mass, very wide difference existed between them in their estimate of the grace imparted by the Eucharist and the mode of the presence of Christ in that sacrament. The symbolical books of the Lutheran Church, following the teaching of Luther himself, declare the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and the blood in the Eucharist, together with the bread and wine (consubstantiation), as well as the ubiquity of His body, as the orthodox doctrine of the church.

A wide distinction; and when my hon. friend has further studied the doctrines——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOWLER. I can quite understand how the Minister of Railways might be amused at this, because he has very little knowledge on these matters.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There appear to be a couple of us in that dilemma.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, you and the member for Annapolis. The hon. gentleman has already exhibited his lack of knowledge, when he did not see any distinction between the resolution as brought in by the hon. member for Victoria and the amendment as suggested by the hon. leader of the opposition. But I am very glad that this resolution has been amended in the manner in which it has been, and I shall take very great pleasure in voting for it, and I would be very sorry to see a division of the House on the question. I think we should approach it, as we have almost without exception, without any party feeling. This is another point on which I am sorry the hon. member for Westmoreland should have made the statement he did. He endeavoured to bring politics into this matter, although there are no politics and should not be any in it. Now that the hon. member for Victoria has accepted this amendment, and the government, who are, I have no doubt, behind him in the matter, have also accepted it, I think we should all vote for it without division, and have it unanimously carried.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I had intended to vote against this resolution, and to speak against it as strongly as I could. Not because I do not thoroughly and entirely agree that all those offensive words should be left out of the declaration; but I do not think this is the proper place to introduce such a motion. My feeling is that to bring this and kindred subjects before the House must revive religious strife which has almost ceased, at all events in western Canada. But, as I do not wish that there should be any division in the House on this subject, and after the amendment has been accepted by the mover and endorsed by the leader of the opposition, not taking that as an endorsement of the principle that such a resolution should be introduced into this House at all, I will frankly support and vote for the amendment.

Mr FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I am sorry not to be able to join my voice to the chorus of approval with which the amendment to this resolution has been received. I am sorry that the resolution was brought into the House. There are people to be considered out of this House as well as those in it, and this is a question which touches the hearts and consciences of people of many different classes in all sections of this country. We are placed in this position that we must either vote—so the extremists will tell us—to insult one section of our population, or we must betray the other. If it were within the province of this legislature to decide the question, it might still be right and proper to bring it up in this House, but when it is one outside our jurisdiction, I think we should leave it severely alone. We know that in this country we have suffered in the past from agitations over questions of religion, which were exploited by political brigands and parasites, and we are liable to suffer from similar agitations in the future, if such questions are again introduced. It looks to me as if it were the intention of some people to introduce them. I am not one of those who object to this resolution because it deals with

a subject which is within the sole jurisdiction of the Imperial parliament. I do not object to approaching the Imperial parliament. We have the right to do so, but there are many things which are right, which are not expedient. Having been a member for a number of years of the territorial assembly, I am well aware that however much an irresponsible House may know concerning any certain measure not within its jurisdiction, it is apt to deal with it in a different spirit from the legislature charged with the responsibility of settling the question. I notice there is a degree of carelessness and levity in our treatment of this question that I am sure we would not display if the responsibility of deciding it rested with us. I do not imagine that if we had such a responsibility, a resolution would be approved, hour after hour, in one form, and then, after hours of debate, a radical amendment, changing its nature, would be just as readily accepted. It seems to me that this readiness to accept a radical change argues a sense of irresponsibility, which is not creditable to this House.

With regard to the change that has been made, it is certainly an important one, and makes a radical difference in the resolution. Those hon. members who spoke in favour of the resolution as it stood, by doing so laid themselves open to the charge of being willing to forego the Protestant succession to the Crown of England. But the resolution has been amended in that particular, and now we are only dealing with it as regards the assertion of an insult to our Catholic fellow-citizens. I am not prepared to accept the statement that there is any insult intended. I take it that insult exists by reason of intent rather than by what is said, and there is no intent, and never was any, to insult any one's religious belief by requiring the King to take that solemn declaration.

The seconder of the resolution said whatever rights he claimed for himself he is willing to concede to others. I resemble him in that particular, but I say that the rights which I concede to others I claim for myself and those who think with me. If we admit the principle of Protestant succession to the Crown of England, then we admit the principle of establishing the Protestantism of the King by such form of words as may be necessary, and in so doing we do not insult any man's religious belief. It is the privilege of the members of every church to declare their religious belief by such form of words as they may think necessary. I do not think that our Roman Catholic friends will say that the form of words in which they profess their religious belief could not be construed as offensive to Protestants. No doubt the same view will hold with regard to the profession of faith of the Protestant church. These are subjects on which each one has the right to express his own opinion in his own way.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. McLENNAN. Would you call Roman Catholics idolaters ?

Mr. OLIVER. Nobody calls them idolaters.

Mr. McLENNAN. Read the declaration.

Mr. OLIVER. The declaration reads :

> And that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other saint and the sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitous and idolatrous.

I humbly submit that it does not follow necessarily from that declaration that Catholics are idolaters. I am sorry that other hon. members do not look at this matter as I do. But I decline to be put in the position of stating that our constitution has systematically for 200 years insulted any class of the loyal citizens of this country. I deny that contention. I say that this matter of the declaration of the faith of the King of England is a necessity arising from the fact of the Protestant succession. The intolerance, if intolerance there be, is in that principle of Protestant succession. If a wrong is done, it is because the constitution demands that a Protestant and not a Catholic shall sit upon the Throne. That is where the difference lies between the case of a king and others. No Catholic is debarred from any office or position throughout the King's dominions, but still a Catholic is debarred from a seat on the Throne. That is intolerance if you like. I will admit that it is intolerance, but I will not admit that the form of words by which it is established that the King is, as required by the law to be, a Protestant, is an insult to anybody. With regard to the change that has been made in the resolution, I say that, when the principle of the Protestant succession is admitted, the contention contained in the resolution falls to the ground. The contention that any insult is contained in the constitution is as incorrect as to say that any insult is intended. I cannot, by supporting even this amended resolution, admit, as I say, that the constitution of England has insulted a part of the people of England for two hundred years, nor will I be a party to, saying that the King of England, when he took the coronation oath and made this declaration a few days ago, did, as a matter of fact any more than as a matter of intention, insult the Roman Catholic people of this country. I shall, therefore, vote against the resolution.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). As an independent member of this House, I feel that I would not do myself or the people of this country justice unless I expressed my opinion upon this question. I always had the idea that this parliament was instituted for the purpose of discussing politics and introducing legislation for the benefit of this country. I had no idea that it could at any time have the power to turn itself into a convocation of bishops to

discuss religion. It seems to me that that is what it has been doing since three o'clock to-day, and I think it is time this discussion was ended.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). And it will end the sooner if hon. gentlemen opposite will keep quiet. I am built of the kind of stuff that will stand here till to-morrow morning if necessary. Now, I say, in all earnestness, that I hope and trust that this will be the last time that ever a resolution of this kind will be introduced into parliament. It is an insult to the people of this country for this House to sit here for twelve hours and discuss a thing that is not our business. I am satisfied that the people of England, whom we propose to advise in this matter, understand their business far better than we do, and that we should let them settle this question. I understand, from what the Prime Minister said, that we had been snubbed once for the advice we gave. I hope that that will not happen in this case. I have very little objection to the resolution, but I do object to forcing our opinion upon the British people. What would we think if the British parliament wasted their time in telling us what we should do here? We would think they had better mind their own business. I have not much more to say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin)—but I could talk for a long time if I wished to. I only wish to protest now, and for all time against this question being brought up in this House. If I had to prescribe the oath for His Majesty, it would read something like this: 'I, King Edward VII., a Protestant firm in the faith, solemnly swear that I will give to all my subjects of every race, colour or creed, the right to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences; and no person shall interfere with the people of any religious faith, against the law, or make them afraid for anything they may do in religious matters.' No man, whatever his religion, could find fault with such a declaration as that. I hope that that is the last oath that will be given in this House, and I hope hon. members will all subscribe to it, and will live like upright, good, honest, Christian men.

Mr. WADE. The hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) has been good enough to state that I did not know the difference between transubstantiation and consubstantiation.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. member (Mr. Wade) wishes to make a personal explanation.

Mr. WADE. I fancy that it does not make much difference to this House whether I know the difference between transubstantiation and consubstantiation, but I wish to assert that the statement that I made here that the first paragraph of said declaration is offensive to the Lutherans as well as to Roman Catholics is perfectly correct; and, as authority, I would refer, if I may be permitted——

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. member that at this stage of the debate he is only permitted to make a personal explanation, because he has already spoken once.

Mr. JAMES M. DOUGLAS (East Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MACLEAN. Another bishop.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And this bishop claims the right, as a Presbyterian bishop, to be heard upon this subject, and, perhaps, so far as learning is concerned, he would be able to say as much, and to as good purpose as many of the politicians who have spoken. I rise simply to state that I deeply regretted and felt deeply anxious over the whole question, from the time notice was given of this motion by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., (Hon. Mr. Costigan). I regret the discussion of to-day for various reasons, and especially on account of the precedent which this House has set to-day for discussions of this kind. I certainly desire to follow my hon. friend from the west who has just spoken, and to say that I hope it will not be repeated. I think the politicians are bad theologians, and if I wished to study theology I would never come to the House of Commons to do so. Now, as a Presbyterian, I regret that the creeds of the church which I represent, and of the Church of England, which I so much respect, should be hauled before this House in the unceremonious way that we have to-day witnessed. I can respect the opinions of those who proposed the standards of the church, simply because I appreciate their historical benefit in the church to-day. I know that these men were men of God, were men of knowledge, were men of culture, were men who had the best interest of church and state at heart, and if they gave expression to strong views it was because they were surrounded by strong circumstances, because they were surrounded by oppression and wrongs inflicted upon them. These were the circumstances that brought into life these strong declarations in reference to matters of faith and practice. That is why these creeds have come down to us with such a history, and when we, in the beginning of the twentieth century, speak in the freedom and liberty which we enjoy, we are apt to look upon them as being extremely odious and, perhaps, objectionable. But we need to put them back into their historical setting, and then we will see the wisdom, the tact, the ability, the piety and the prudence of such statements and such declarations.

Now, though I am a member of the Presbyterian Church, and for forty-five years a minister and a religious teacher in that church, and hold to-day my full standing, I claim that I am no bigot, that I sympathize with religious toleration, and that I am quite willing to accord to my fellow-citizens of the Roman Catholic religion in this country every benefit, and every privilege and liberty which I claim as an individual, and would be willing to sustain any movement in that direction. Yet, after all, I deprecate that this matter was brought up for discussion, not only because it will give rise to endless discussions throughout the country, but because it will give to bigots an opportunity to make speeches, semi-political, it may be, and semi-religious, and men who are not reasonable will seek to make capital from this text that we have given them. It would have been better for this government, it would have been a great deal better for this parliament, a great deal better for this country, both religiously and politically, if this discussion had never taken place. I want to say further, that I had the honour in India not many years ago of being present when religious toleration was proclaimed by the Empress of India to the people of India, and the resolution which we now propose is in keeping with the spirit of that declaration. I was opposed to the resolution as it was first introduced, and had made up my mind that I would vote against it. But now that the mover has accepted an amendment which largely changes the nature of the resolution and its bearings, my mind is largely relieved on that score, and I can support the amendment. In questions of this kind it does not do to be too specific, my objection was that the resolution was too specific, and that the whole thing could be better summed up in a single sentence or two, which should contain a general principle without bringing in either the Roman Catholic or any other sect. But I hold that this declaration should be purged of anything that is offensive, in the broadest sense, to any British subject in the empire, and with that in view I am prepared to support the amendment.

Mr. EMMERSON. I rise to make an explanation. I am sure my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) must have misapprehended what I stated this evening with reference to himself. I did make a reference to the fact that the member for Halifax had shown him a lack of sympathy with reference to the very excellent points which he had made. There was a lack of sympathy from those around him, but I referred to the member for Pictou as apparently being the only one who had given any applause to the remarks uttered by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace).

Mr. DOUGLAS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I be permitted a word of personal explanation? I do not feel the need at all of any sympathy from the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) in respect to the matter referred to.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I have not taken up any time so far in the discussion of this matter, and I crave the indulgence of the House for a few minutes. I confess to some embarrassment in view of the amendment which has been suggested to meet the objections which were raised to the resolution presented by the member for Victoria, N.B., (Hon. Mr. Costigan). For my part, I have no fault whatever to find with the remarks with which the hon. gentleman presented his resolution to the House. But, in common with many other hon. members, I think I have good ground to find fault with the manner in which this resolution has been presented. The hon. gentleman desires us to believe that he is actuated solely with a view to secure for those for whom he says he speaks, those whom he represents, an amelioration of the declaration which is now made by the sovereign of this empire. I think that a matter affecting the rights and liberties of any class or section of His Majesty's subjects is a matter in itself of sufficient importance to justify even such a representative member as the hon. gentleman claims to be in asking the co-operation and support of every member of this House. I think if he desired to secure the greatest possible benefit for those whom he represents, before he introduced this resolution it was his duty to see if there was any divergence of opinion, and what that divergence was, between himself and others as to the terms of his resolution. But, instead of pursuing that course, as a man actuated wholly by the desire to benefit his co-religionists might be expected to do, he took the opportunity of moving under the forms of the House when a motion was made to go into Committee of Supply, so that his resolution could not be amended in any way. He made the resolution as stiff and as strong as it was possible for him to make it; and it is only after the resolution has been debated for some nine or ten hours that a slight amendment has been suggested, and I believe has been accepted by the hon. gentleman and hon. members on both sides of the House. I stand here to-night as one who believes from the very bottom of my soul in the principle of civil and religious liberty. I believe also in absolute equality before the law, and I desire that any disability under which Roman Catholics exist, either in this or any other part of the British Empire, shall be removed at once and for ever. That is my confession of faith, and I am not ashamed to make it here. I have made it many times

before, and as long as I am spared I shall continue to make that my confession of faith and of doctrine which I most firmly believe. But, the hon. gentleman, as I have already said, did not ask the co-operation or support of those who differ from him in these matters as to the framing of his resolution, or as to the time and manner of its introduction. If he consulted any person in connection with this matter, he consulted the right hon. Prime Minister, and when, at an earlier stage in this debate, the suggestion was made to the right hon. gentleman by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) that the debate be adjourned so that an opportunity might be given to the hon. gentlemen who, believing in equality, desired to frame a resolution that could be passed unanimously by this House, that reasonable request on the part of the hon. member for East York was absolutely refused. We are kept here until one o'clock in the morning trying to reach a conclusion that will do honour to the Commons of Canada and reflect the voice and opinions of those whom we represent. I say it is a most unreasonable proposition that an amendment to a motion of this kind should be presented to us at this stage of the debate, and that we should be asked to decide at once upon it. As I understand the amendment, it reads as follows. I have only been able to get it into my hands within the past few minutes :

That all the words on the second page of the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Victoria be struck out, and the following substituted : That in the opinion of this House the declaration referred to in the above-mentioned Act of Settlement should be amended by eliminating therefrom all those expressions which are especially offensive to the religious belief of any subjects of the British empire.

The amendment goes a considerable distance to mitigate the objections I have to the resolution, but it does not go far enough; and desirous as I am of seeing the resolution carried out, unless an addition is made to the amendment I shall have to vote against it. Being a layman I do not profess to know what the exact meaning of the amendment is, but the suggestion I would make is that there should be added the following words : 'so long as the distinctively Protestant character of the declaration is maintained.' It seems to me that this is not an unreasonable proposition. It has been conceded by hon. gentlemen who have spoken on both sides of the House, that it is an absolute prerequisite that he or she who is the sovereign of the British empire shall be a Protestant. That condition being admitted and agreed to, if the parliament of Canada memorializes the Imperial parliament, or the Crown, to have an amendment made to the declaration, I think it is not an unreasonable proposition to suggest that when we are asking for changes in the declaration, when we ask that the words which have been objected to, and which are offensive to our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, should be eliminated, we should still preserve the feature of the declaration which has been taken by the sovereigns of Great Britain for the past 200 years—that they shall continue to make a declaration in which the Protestant features in the present declaration shall be maintained and continued. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the view which I desire to present, and I have tried to do it as briefly as I could. Let me say two or three words more. I dispute the contention with all respect and humility which has been presented here again and again, that it is the duty of this parliament to pass a resolution of this kind or a memorial of this kind at any stage of its proceedings. The Prime Minister stated this afternoon in the course of the debate that the resolution which was passed unanimously by this House last year, endorsing the position and action which the Imperial authorities took respecting the Transvaal, had been graciously received and acknowledged by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. It is quite true ; but if my memory serves me right, the resolution which was passed by this House unanimously endorsed the position which the government of Great Britain took respecting the Transvaal, because that government was acting with the desire and with the object to secure for British subjects who resided in that part of the empire the same religious and civil liberty that we enjoy, and which British subjects enjoy in every portion of the empire ; and the reply which was received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies was a reply to an address which expressed satisfaction with the action of the Imperial authorities in their efforts to secure equal rights and liberties to all classes of Her Majesty's subjects. If there was any class of Her Majesty's subjects which did not enjoy equal civil and religious liberty, I would be one of the first to advocate that any disability under which they laboured should be removed. For the past 200 years the declaration has been subscribed to by those who have occupied the position of sovereign of Great Britain, and the British Empire. The declaration was imposed upon them, but why ? Because the framers of that declaration were smarting under a series of the most intolerable wrongs and injustice which alone could justify the use of such language. The hon. member for Victoria speaks as one representing a certain class of this community. He has a right to speak as the representative of that class if he pleases, but I would ask him and the people whom he represents if the church to which they owe allegiance has changed any of its canon law which obtained 200 years ago,

or if its authorities have acknowledged any abbreviation of the rights and privileges and powers which that church claimed belonged to it 200 years ago? Two hundred years ago the head of the Roman Catholic Church—I do not desire to speak with anything but the greatest respect of that august ecclesiastic—claimed the power to depose and absolve. Has he relinquished that power? Does he claim the right to exercise that power and jurisdiction to-day? If he does, not one jot or tittle of the declaration which Her Majesty subscribed to, and which His Majesty subscribed to, should be removed. The foundation which was laid 200 years ago by those who framed this declaration was laid broad and deep and strong. A stately and superb edifice has been erected on this foundation in 200 years. Every man who is a British subject has now the fullest measure of civil and religious liberty accorded to him under the constitution which was then firmly established, and which has been growing steadily in power, up to the present time, and Roman Catholics experience only disabilities that are common to their Protestant fellow-subjects. I think, therefore, that we should be very chary of inviting the Imperial parliament to amend the declaration which was found to be so essential when it was passed. The Prime Minister of England, Lord Salisbury, has made a statement respecting this matter. His attention has been drawn to it by some eminent Roman Catholic peers whose loyalty is above suspicion. Lord Salisbury has pointed to the condition of things which existed when the declaration was placed on the statute-books, and he has referred to the fact that that condition is happily passing away. Sir, the liberties of the Roman Catholics of the United Kingdom and of every other part of the British Empire are perfectly safe in the keeping of the parliament of Great Britain and Ireland. That parliament will, I have no doubt, and I hope very speedily, amend the wording of the declaration that is complained of, and wipe out any portion of it which is especially offensive to any section or creed in this empire. The parliament of Great Britain is charged with that jurisdiction, and in view of the responses which were received from the Imperial authorities when resolutions were passed by this House and by other legislatures in Canada, respecting matters over which we had no jurisdiction, I think we are justified in asking that great care and deliberation should be exercised now before we place ourselves in a position to receive another rebuff. It has been said by the hon. gentleman from Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) and others, that no special sentence or paragraph in the declaration is offensive to any other class or creed of His Majesty's subjects. That may be quite true, but surely we do not overlook the fact that when the declaration was framed it was framed because of the condition of things that then existed. It was framed because of the machinations of foreign potentates against the liberties of the people of England, and it was framed in the only language that could be found at that time which would give that security, freedom and liberty to the English people which they desired. I wish to express my regret that this resolution has been introduced at all into the parliament of Canada. It deals with a question belonging to the parliament of England, that mother of parliaments, that parliament which has always been in the van in promoting the interests of all races and creeds of British subjects. That parliament is seized with the power of amending the declaration, and I repeat that the liberty of all classes and creeds of His Majesty's subjects is perfectly safe in the keeping of that parliament. I do not desire personally to see a division in the House on this question, but if the amendment which has been suggested—and which I believe has been accepted by hon. gentlemen on both sides—is further amended by the addition of the words which I have jotted down, I shall deem it my duty, so far as I am concerned, to support it, and will not take up the time by a division of the House. One word before I sit down. The hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution (Mr. Costigan) and the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) have quoted from the Guardian newspaper which is published in London, Eng. They quoted from the edition of February 13. I would not like to do either of the hon. gentlemen an injustice, but I think they left the impression on the House that the views they were quoting were the views of the journal itself. I draw the attention of those hon. gentlemen to the fact, if I am correct in my premises, that the opinions they quoted were merely the opinions of a correspondent, and the editor is very careful to say in the journal:

> Opinions expressed in signed articles, or in articles marked communicated, or from correspondents, are not necessarily those of the Guardian. The appearance of those articles only implies that the editor thinks they are of such interest as to justify their publication.

The appearance of such a communication in a journal of this kind is in itself an evidence that the people of Great Britain and Ireland are becoming alive to the inequalities which may exist in the declaration; that they are discussing the question of its amendment, and I repeat with all humility and with the greatest possible respect, that the parliament of Canada ought to leave this matter to the authority to which it properly belongs. We have no jurisdiction over it in this parliament, but if we pass a resolution by a divided vote, the force of that resolution will be materially weakened. I

should hope that even at this late hour it might be possible to so further amend this proposition of the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Mr. Costigan) as to have it meet with the unanimous approval of the House so that it might be sent across the ocean as the undivided opinion of the parliament of Canada. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for taking up so much of the time of the House, but I felt it incumbent upon me to say at least these few words before the debate closed and the division was taken.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Costigan).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Kemp,
Barker,	Kendall,
Bazinet,	Kendry,
Belcourt,	Lancaster,
Bell (Pictou),	Lang,
Bernier,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bickerdike,	Laurier (L'Assomption),
Blair,	Lavergne,
Borden (Halifax),	LeBlanc,
Borden (King's, N.S.),	Lefurgey,
Bourassa,	Lemieux,
Bourbonnais,	Lewis,
Britton,	Logan,
Broder,	Loy,
Brown,	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Bruce,	Maclean,
Bruneau,	McCool,
Bureau,	McCreary,
Calvert,	McEwen,
Calvin,	McGowan,
Cargill,	McIsaac,
Carroll,	McLennan,
Champagne,	Malouin,
Clancy,	Marcil (Bagot),
Copp,	Martineau,
Costigan,	Matheson,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Meigs,
Davis,	Mignault,
Delisle,	Monk,
Demers (Lévis),	Mulock,
Demers (St. John),	Murray,
Dobell,	Northrup,
Douglas,	Osler,
Dugas,	Parmelee,
Edwards,	Paterson,
Emmerson,	Pope,
Erb,	Préfontaine,
Ethier,	Pringle,
Fielding,	Prior,
Fisher,	Proulx,
Fitzpatrick,	Puttee,
Flint,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fortier,	Richardson (Lisgar),
Fortin,	Ross (Rimouski),
Fowler,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Fraser,	Rousseau,
Gallery,	Russell,
Ganong,	Schell,
Gauvreau,	Scott,
Geoffrion,	Sifton,
Gibson,	Smith (Vancouver),
Gilmour,	Sutherland (Essex),
Gourley,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Hackett,	Talbot,
Haggart,	Tisdale,
Hale,	Tobin,
Harwood,	Tolmie,
Holmes,	Tucker,
Horsey,	Tupper (Sir Charles
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Hibbert),
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Turcot,
Johnston (Lambton),	Turgeon, and
Kaulbach,	Wade.—125.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Robinson (Elgin),
Blain,	Roche (Marquette),
Carscallen,	Sherritt,
Clarke,	Sproule,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Taylor,
Kidd,	Tolton,
Lavell,	Wallace,
Lennox,	Wilmot, and
Oliver,	Wilson.—19.
Reid (Grenville),	

PAIRS :

For.	Against.
Messieurs	
Girard,	Hughes (Victoria),
McColl,	Ward,
LaRivière,	Cochrane,
Tarte,	McCarthy,
Smith (Wentworth),	Henderson.

Amendment agreed to, and motion as amended agreed to.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN moved :

That an humble address be voted to His Excellency the Governor General praying him to transmit the address of this House to His Majesty in such manner as to His Excellency may seem fit, in order that the same may be laid at the foot of the Throne.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not suppose the House desires to proceed with Supply at this hour. I beg to move :

That the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply at the next sitting of the House.

Motion agreed to.

THE PACIFIC CABLE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I desire to have called the resolution with regard to the Pacific cable, which requires some urgency. My hon. friend the Postmaster General wants to lay some papers on the Table.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). I ask leave to lay on the Table a copy of an agreement between the colony of New South Wales and the Eastern Telegraph Company. I do so now in order that the papers may be looked at by any hon. gentlemen who take an interest in the

matter, so that we may be prepared to proceed with the resolution on Tuesday next.

VISIT OF THE DUKE AND DUCHESS OF CORNWALL AND YORK.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he can inform the House whether he has had any answer from the Imperial government in regard to the proposed change of programme of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York. I am anxious to know, as the British Columbia legislature has unanimously passed a resolution asking Their Highnesses to visit British Columbia, as I learn from a telegram received from Premier Dunsmuir, to-night.

The PRIME MINISTER. I must answer my hon. friend that there is correspondence still going on upon this subject. I am not in a position to state anything further now.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.50 a.m. Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 4, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Century Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Monk.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—Mr. Parmelee.

QUESTIONS.

CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR DORCHESTER COUNTY.

Mr. MORIN asked :

Has a census commissioner been appointed for the county of Dorchester, province of Quebec ? If so, who, and date of his appointment?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The appointment has not yet been made.

PORT HOPE HARBOUR.

Mr. WARD moved :

What amounts have been expended by government in repairing the superstructure of the Port Hope harbour works in each year since 1885?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte) :

1885	$5,089 57
1887	970 06
1888	2,362 72
1889	2,492 31
1890	2,534 20
1891	2,948 30
1892	4,999 92
1893	2,599 77
1894	2,468 98
1895	2,490 77
1896	800 00
1897	999 94
1899	5,515 00
1900	499 31
1900, to December 31	2,014 80
Total	$38,785 65

MISPEC, N.B., BREAKWATER.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. Have tenders been asked by the Department of Public Works for the construction of a breakwater at Mispec, in St. John county, N.B.?
2. If so, have any tenders for such work been received, and from whom, and what are the respective amounts of the tenders?
3. Has the lowest or which tender been accepted?
4. Has the contract been let? If so, to whom, and if not, why not?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte) :

1. Yes.
2. Yes, from—
   Geo. A. Appleby, St. John, N.B., $10,900.
   Clark & Clark, St. John W., N.B., $10,990.
   Simmons & Burpee, Gibson, N.B., $11,487.
   John Burns, Ottawa, $11,963.
   Jas. E. Kane, St. John W., N.B., $14,122.
   Flood & Bates, St. John, N.B., $14,500.
   Reid & Archibald, Halifax, N.S., $15,566.
3. The lowest.
4. Yes, to Geo. A. Appleby, 15 Long Wharf, St. John, N.B.

REGINA, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. DAVIS asked :

1. How many acres of land have been reserved for the Regina, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company from which to select the lands granted to the said company by way of subsidy?
2. When were the said lands set aside?
3. What amount has the company earned?
4. Has said land been patented?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. 2,750,000 acres.
2. By order in council April 4, 1883 ; order in council December 30, 1884 ; order in council June 20, 1887 ; order in council, February 4, 1891, and order in council June 18, 1892.
3. 1,625,344 acres.
4. 120,000 acres of said land has been patented.

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. DAVIS asked :

1. How many acres of land have been reserved for the Great North-west Central Railway Company from which to select the lands granted to the said company by way of subsidy?
2. When were said lands set aside?
3. What amount has the company earned?
4. Has said land been patented?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. 708,826 acres.
2. Order in council July 16, 1889, amended by order in council February 17, 1890.
3. 320,000 acres.
4. No.

P.E.I. MAILS.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Were tenders invited for the carrying of mails between Kensington and Park Corner, French River and Long River, all in Prince Edward Island, in the year 1900?
2. When were tenders invited, the names of the parties tendering, and amount of their respective tenders?
3. To whom was the contract awarded, and amount of his tender?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

Tenders were invited for this service in 1900, the notices being dated the 18th July, and the tenders due to be opened on the 31st August. The following is the list of tenders received :

John C. Durant	$336
Edward Hillman	375
Gordon Tupline	380

The post office inspector at Charlottetown, to whom each tender was in turn sent beginning with the lowest, reported that the sureties for the lowest tenderer declined to act, that the sureties offered by the second tenderer were not good for the amount of the bond, and that the third tenderer, who was the former contractor, was strongly recommended for the service. As a consequence, the department made a contract with the third tenderer, Mr. Gordon Tupline, at the rate of his tender viz.: $380 a year.

JOHN W. MEALEY.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Fowler—asked :

1. Is John W. Mealey, of Pennfield, N.B., an officer of the Fishery Department?
2. If so, when was he appointed?
3. What is his salary?
4. And will he be required to live at Beaver Harbour, or some other place convenient to the fishing grounds?
5. Is he the same John W. Mealey who was an officer of the customs at Lepreaux, N.B., and if so, why was he dismissed?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) :

1. Yes, a fishery guardian.
2. 15th January, 1901.
3. $1.25 per day and expenses, when actually employed.
4. No instructions as to where he should live.
5. He is presumed to be the same man. He resigned his office in the customs on the 15th August, 1899, and his resignation was accepted on the 17th August, 1899. He was not dismissed from the customs service.

HOPEWELL CAPE WHARF.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Fowler—asked :

1. Who were the tenderers for the construction of the Hopewell Cape wharf, Albert county, N.B., and what was the amount of each tender?
2. What time does the contract call for the completion of the work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte) :

1. Warren Downey, & Ernest W. Lynds, Hopewell, N.B. $19,988
   J. B. McManus, Memramcook, N.B. 25,000
   Reid & Archibald, Halifax, N.S. 27,937
   Simmons & Burpee, Gibson, N.B. 28,950
   Heney & Smith, Ottawa, Ont. 29,944
2. 8th October, 1901.

ST. JOHN ELEVATOR.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Fowler—asked :

What is the total amount of grain received and shipped through the new government elevator at St. John?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

Amount of grain passed through elevator at St. John, during winter of 1900 and 1901, up to 1st February, 1901 :

	Lbs.
Wheat	15,673,790
Corn	8,873,850
Barley	654,140
Rye	526,246
Peas	1,090,980
Oatmeal (bags)	215,500

TRENT CANAL.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Who was the successful tenderer for section No. 3 of the Balsam and Lake Simcoe division of the Trent canal, and what was the amount of the tender?
2. Who were the other tenderers, and at what figures did they tender?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Brown & Aylmer are the successful tenderers for section 3, of the Balsam and

Lake Simcoe division of the Trent canal, and the amount of their tender as extended upon estimated quantities is $369,202 25

2. Magann & Gibson $407,665 25
Larkin & Sangster . . . 481,226 50
W. H. Davis 566,783 25
Rogers & Taylor.. .... 532,594 00

MAIL CONTRACT, ALMA.

Mr. McGOWAN asked :

What was the date the last time the contract for carrying the mails from Alma station, Ont., on the Grand Trunk Railway, to the post office was advertised and let by public tender? To whom let and the amount? Has said contract been since renewed by the Postmaster General without tender? If so, to whom, and the remuneration paid for such services? What arrangement was made with the contractor when the service was increased?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

Notices were issued on the 13th December, 1894, inviting tenders to be received at the department on the 25th January, 1895, for a contract for four years from the 1st April, 1895. Two tenders were received viz.: From Alexander Gale, and Edward O'Neill, each at fifteen cents per trip, and the tenderers having been asked to bid again, Mr. Gale, whose offer at twelve and a half cents per trip was the lowest, was awarded the contract at that rate, and a four years contract entered into with him. On the 11th June, 1895, the post office at Alma was removed, and the length of the route increased, and a corresponding increase was made in the rate of payment, which was made fourteen and a half cents per trip. It having been subsequently reported that the service had been satisfactorily performed, and the conditions advantageous to the public interest, and acting under the provisions of section 2, of clause 61, of the Postal Act, authority was given for the renewal of Mr. Gale's contract for a further term of four years from the 1st of April, 1901, on the same terms and conditions. On the 1st of August, 1899, the service of Alma was increased from two to four trips daily, and a temporary agreement was made with Mr. Gale for the additional semi-daily service at thirty-five dollars per annum. This agreement to continue until the expiration of the existing contract viz.: March 31, 1903.

PORT COLBORNE HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. Who was the successful tenderer for the harbour and other works at Port Colborne, Ont., awarded by the government last year?

2. What was the amount of the accepted tender?

3. Who were the other tenderers, and at what figure did they tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte) :

Mr. BLAIR.

1. Hogan & Macdonald.

2. $395,000. M. J. Hogan, 114 Metcalfe Avenue, A. R. Macdonell, Westmount, Montreal.

3. The Kunkin Bros., Construction Co., Cleveland, Ohio.... .... .. $447,399 80
W. J. Pourpore and M. McAuliff, Montreal. .. 475,000 00
H. T. Dunbar, Port Colborne.... .... 532,237 93
Mann, Simpson & Turner, Montreal 553,600 00
Geo. Goodwin, Ottawa.. 631,000 00

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

As regards the Department of Railways and Canals, I beg to reply :

1. Hogan & Macdonell are the successful tenderers for 'improvements at Port Colborne.'

2. The amount of accepted tender applying schedule prices to estimated quantities is $906,519.90

3. P. H. Gilbert .. .. .. $ 921,943 00
Dunbar & McNaughton 978,119 50
Canadian Construction Co.. .. .. 1,024,687 65
Wm. Buckner 1,041,701 60
Hingman, Rogers & O'Brien.. .. .. 1,055,092 75
G. P. Magaime & W. E. Phin.. .. .. 1,056,993 50
M. J. Haney 1,116,785 00
McNamee, Mann, Simpson & Turner.. .. .. 1,142,787 00
Hughes Bros. & Bangs. 1,200,741 80
Randolph McDonald .. 1,574,664 00
M. A. Cleveland 2,331,736 00
B. D. Stacy 3,705,284 00
N. K. & M. Connolly .. 1,115,546 00

ALLOWANCES TO CENSUS COMMISSIONERS AND ENUMERATORS.

Mr. MARTINEAU (by Mr. Talbot) asked : (Translation.)

1. Whether the government is aware of the existence of a lack of conformity between section 24 of the Census Act, Chapter 58, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, and the table of allowances paid to the census commissioners and enumerators, approved by Order in Council of the 11th March, 1891 ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to secure the adoption of a table analogous to that of the 11th March, 1891, for the next census ?

3. If so, is it the intention of the government to so amend said section of the Census Act as to remove the said anomaly and allow the adoption by the Governor General in Council of a table of census allowances adapted to the requirements of each case and to the amount of work done by each enumerator and each commissioner ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). (Translation) :

(1.) Yes.

(2.) The question is under consideration.

(3.) We do not think it necessary to amend the Census Act in order to accomplish that object.

YUKON DISTRICT—LIQUOR PERMITS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

How much liquor, if any, were any or all of the following persons permitted by permit, letter or otherwise, to ship or send into the Yukon district in the seasons of 1899 and 1900, respectively :—
Henry Macaulay, Esq.
— Houston, Esq.
Messrs. Murray and Ross?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Henry Macaulay—No permit was issued to Henry Macaulay, Esq., at any time. The department consented to an importation by Macaulay Bros. of 2,000 gallons of beer in 1900, under permit formerly issued by the commissioner. A permit for this amount was subsequently issued by the department.

—— Houston—2,000 gallons of liquor in 1899, but none in 1900. Permit issued by the commissioner, and subsequently allowed by the department.

Murray and Ross—None in 1899. 6,400 gallons of liquor in 1900 issued originally by the commissioner, and subsequently allowed by the department. 3,600 gallons of beer in 1900.

I may say that my hon. friend from North Oxford (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) who acted for me last year at various times, has called attention to the fact that there is an omission in the return which I laid upon the Table the other day. I will correct it by a supplementary return to-morrow.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW—BOAT-BUILDING AT WHITE HORSE.

Mr. PRIOR—by Mr. Borden (Halifax)—asked :

1. Have any complaints been received by the government from British Columbia or Yukon district about aliens being hired in Seattle and taken to White Horse to build boats there?
2. If so, from whom were said complaints received and on what dates?
3. Did the government acknowledge receipt of those complaints, if any?
4. Has the government taken any action in regard to this matter?
5. If so, what?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

1. Yes.
2. From James Tagg, president of the Shipwrights' and Caulkers' Union, Victoria, B.C., on behalf of that union, received on the 25th February, 1901.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.
5. Instructions have been sent to the Alien Labour officer in Vancouver, B.C., to make an immediate investigation, in order to ascertain the facts, and to report thereon, with a view to further action.

BANK ACT—UNAUTHORIZED USE OF 'SAVINGS BANK,' &c.

Mr. PREFONTAINE—by Mr. Angers—asked :

Is it the intention of the government to so amend the Bank Act as to prevent and prohibit the using by any person or persons of any name or description calculated to lead the public to consider such persons authorized to carry on a banking business, receive deposits bearing interest, give negotiable receipts and discount notes, as for instance by using the words 'savings bank,' 'discount office,' or other like designations?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). It is not the intention of the government to introduce any legislation on the subject at present. The existing law is probably as effective as any legislation could be. Section 100 of the Bank Act enacts that every person assuming or using the title of 'bank,' 'banking company,' 'banking house,' 'banking association,' or 'banking institution,' without being authorized so to do by that Act, or by some other Act in force in that behalf, is guilty of an offence against the Bank Act, and thereby becomes liable to fine, or imprisonment, or both.

BANK ACT—MORE EFFECTIVE INSPECTION.

Mr. PREFONTAINE—by Mr. Angers—asked :

Whether it is the intention of the government to so amend the Bank Act as to provide for a more complete and effective inspection of the financial institutions of the country?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). It is not the intention of the government to introduce any measure on this subject. Under recent legislation provision was made for the inspection of the circulation of every chartered bank by officers of the Canadian Bankers' Association, and arrangements for this inspection are now in progress.

INSPECTION OF POTASH AND ASHES.

Mr. PREFONTAINE—(by Mr. Angers)—asked : (Translation.)

Whether it is the intention of the government to introduce, this session, a measure providing for the compulsory inspection of potash and ashes offered for sale in Canada, in accordance with the petition of the Board of Trade of Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier) : (Translation.) The matter is under consideration.

PRINTING OF 'HANDBOOK OF CANADA.'

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. In what printing office was the 'Handbook of Canada,' which was distributed at the Paris Exposition last year, printed?

2. What was the total issue of said volume?
3. What was the average cost per volume?
4. Who supplied the paper for the work?
5. If printed in any establishment other than the Government Printing Bureau, why was this done?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. S. A. Fisher) :

1. Herald Printing Company.
2. 10,000 copies—5,000 English, 5,000 French.
3. 52 89-100 cents per copy, which was arranged for and approved by the Printing Bureau and done through the Printing Bureau.
4. Herald Printing Company.
5. This was done on a report from the Printing Bureau that pressure of work there prevented this book being printed at the Printing Bureau.

I. C. R.—DISMISSAL OF MECHANICS, MONCTON SHOPS.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. How many mechanics have been dismissed from the railway shops at Moncton since the 7th day of November last?
2. For what reasons have these men been dismissed?
3. At whose instance were they dismissed?
4. Were charges preferred against them, or any of them, and if so, by whom, and were investigations held?
5. Have their places in the shops been filled by new appointments?
6. What are the names of the men dismissed, and of the new appointments?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). On being made aware that this question was on the Paper, I directed that the information should be procured as soon as possible from Moncton. I think it will be several days before I shall have it, but as soon as it comes, I shall notify the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler).

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Statement showing the number of employees in the civil service, outside and inside, permanent and non-permanent, on 1st July, 1900, showing separately the number of English-speaking employees and the number of French-speaking employees in the several departments, with their salaries ; also the number of employees of the first class in each department, with their salaries and their nationalities.—Mr. Angers.

Copies of all circulars, papers and instructions sent out by the Inland Revenue Department during the past year in reference to certain brands of baking powder being condemned by the department, and notifying merchants to cease their sale under penalty.—Mr. Roche (Marquette).

Copies of all orders in council, correspondence, reports, papers and documents in relation to changes in contracts for improvement or construction of the St. Lawrence canals from 1st January, 1897, up to the present time, and in relation to all extras allowed to any and all contractors for or in respect of work upon such canals or any of them, and all papers showing the amount of extras paid to any and each contractor upon each of such canals from the 1st January, 1897, up to the present time.—Hon. Mr. Haggart, by Hon. Mr. Tisdale.

Return of all correspondence, petitions or other documents between the Indian Department and Alexander Marchel, chief of the band of Micmac Indians residing on the Indian reserve, Saint Ann de Restigouche, P.Q., for years 1900 and 1901, relative to the Indian agent or his duties in connection with the said band.—Mr. Sproule.

Copies of all reports, orders in council, papers and correspondence respecting the dismissal or resignation of W. A. Russell, late inspector of steamboats.—Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.

Copies of all orders in council and all correspondence, contracts or agreements, between the government or any member of the same, or any officer of any department, and the Kingston Locomotive Works Company, in reference to the supplying of locomotives or other rolling stock for the Intercolonial Railway; also what payments have been made on same, and the date of said payments.—Hon. Mr. Haggart, by Hon. Mr. Tisdale.

Copies of all correspondence, letters, papers and documents relating to the alleged interference with the fishing berths of the members of the Shad and East Dover Fishing Association in the county of Halifax, and all letters and communications to the government or Department of Marine and Fisheries from the said association, or from any person on its behalf relating to the matters aforesaid.—Mr. Borden (Halifax).

Copy of the memorial to His Excellency the Governor General and any communication to the government of Canada, or any member thereof, respecting the requirements of the Yukon territory, and all reports, communications and orders in council respecting the same or any subject of the said memorial.—Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.

Copies of all accounts, agreements, receipts and vouchers in connection with the settlement of the petition of right, Pictou Harbour Commissioners vs. the Queen, which was completed by payment in 1898.—Mr. Bell (Pictou).

BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan) moved :

That this House is of opinion that the public interests demand that the railway companies of Canada should at the earliest moment be brought under control of a board of railway commissioners, clothed with full power to enforce the provisions of the Railway Act, and to prescribe and enforce the observance of such regulations as may be necessary in the public interest.

He said : Mr. Speaker, the motion I place in your hands is not new to this House. It was first introduced by the late member for Winnipeg, Mr. Jamieson, and later by the late member for Macdonald, Mr. Rutherford, in 1899. Last year I had the honour of moving practically the same resolution in this House with reference to the appointment of a railway commission. Those who are interested in this question

had reason to hope that the government would take some action last year toward the establishment of a railway commission for the purpose of controlling the railroads in this country, and settling disputes between the people and those corporations. But the government have not done so, and still there is a growing feeling in this country that something of that kind should be done. We know as a matter of fact that all agitation in this country with reference to government ownership and control of railroads is the outcome of the way the railroads have been oppressing the people, and discriminating against one part of the country in favour of another. When we turn to the province of Manitoba and see what is taking place there to-day, when we find that the people of that province, in their desire to get relief from railroad monopoly, have undertaken practically to purchase 350 odd miles of railway for seven million dollars, a railroad which is not worth more than three and a half million dollars, we must come to the conclusion that the people are in earnest in their determination to get relief from the monopolies under which they are labouring.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this sentiment is growing stronger in the country day by day. We see articles in the newspapers and read of speeches made on public platforms in favour of government control of railroads. I may say that I am in favour of government control. But the kind of control government should have over railroads is a matter on which there is a great difference of opinion in this country. Some hon. gentlemen in this House are of opinion that the government should undertake the purchase or lease of all the railroads in this country. In that opinion I cannot concur, for the simple reason that I think that would be too large an obligation for the people of this country to undertake at the present time; nor do I think it is necessary for the government to purchase or lease all the railroads in this country. We heard a statement the other day by an hon. gentleman in this House that we could lease the Canadian Pacific Railway system and also the Grand Trunk Railway system for $1 a year each. Well, Mr. Speaker, taking the same basis of calculation as was adopted in Manitoba, I suppose the hon. gentleman would expect the people of this country to assume all the liabilities of these railroads, and all railroads that we might rent in this country. Now, when we take into consideration that the majority of the railroads in this coutnry are bonded for double what they are worth, I do not think this proposition will commend itself to the people of this country. Take the case of the Calgary and Edmonton road as one in point. There is a road bonded for five million dollars; and I think you will find the statement in the report of the Minister of Railways that the road did not cost more than three million dollars. I wonder if those hon. gentlemen who propose that we should lease these roads or purchase them, think we should pay to any corporation five million dollars for a road that they tell us only cost three million dollars. Take the Regina and Long Lake road, and you will find the same thing occurs there. You will find the statement in the report of the Minister of Railways that that road cost something like two and a half million dollars, and you will find that it is bonded for $3,800,000; and so on all along the line.

I suppose there is hardly a road in this country that is not bonded for double what the road is worth. In my humble judgment it would be a very foolish thing for the government to go into a scheme of this kind, but, there is another system of controlling the roads. We have power by the Railway Act, under section 224 and some other sections, to regulate rates and see that there is no discrimination. This is all the control the people want. All that we require is to provide some machinery to make that provision effective. It may be said that we have the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, but the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is composed of men who are very busy, who have not time to take up all the cases that should come before them, and the business of the country is rapidly increasing. The carrying corporations are extending the lines of transportation, opening up new roads, and it is time that we had some authority that we could rely upon to bring the railways under control, and to do away with unjust discriminations. Now, I do not think the people of the country care very much whether the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the Grand Trunk Railway, or any other companies own the railways, or whether they operate them, so long as the roads are under proper control, and so long as they are not oppressed by being charged excessive rates for carrying the products of the country from one part to the other. We have paid millions of dollars in subsidies to railway corporations in aid of the railways that have been built during the last few years, and not only have we paid millions of dollars in money, but we have given some sixty odd million acres of the best and most fertile lands in the North-west Territories to railway corporations, and I think it is not an unreasonable request to be made by the people, who really have the greatest interest in the soil of the west, that somebody should be appointed to control railway corporations and to see that the people are afforded a reasonable amount of relief. I may say that I am not opposed to granting railway subsidies. I believe that in a new country like this it is impossible to have railways built into new portions of the country unless the government give

some assistance to the parties who undertake to build these roads. If we are to make room for new settlement in the west we have to open up new tracts of agricultural lands, and the government should come to the aid of railway corporations who undertake such works, but, the time is past when we should continue to grant either land or money to these corporations. What I would propose would be that the government should, where it is necessary to build a railway—and where there is no necessity, a railway should not be allowed to be built—give to the corporation that undertakes to build that road a guarantee of their bonds. The government should guarantee their bonds to a certain extent, proportionate to the cost of the road, and take a first mortgage on the road to secure the loan. When the country fills up, and when the road commences to pay and the earning power of the road is such that it can pay interest on its bonds, it would be an easy matter for the company to get other parties to take up the bonds, thus relieving the government of their guarantee and the government would relinquish their mortgage. If a corporation were not able to meet their obligations the government could take over the road, which would then belong to the country, and the country would have an asset for the money it had advanced. That would be a preferable plan to the one we have hitherto adopted of granting large tracts of land and large sums of money in subsidies to railway corporations.

As to the proposal to appoint a commission, I may say that it is not a radical measure. They have had a railway commission in Great Britain for a number of years. The Act appointing the commission there was passed in 1873, and a commission of three was appointed to hold office for five years. They were to receive £3,000 each, and were to be assisted by two assistant commissioners of £1,500 each.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is that the English Act ?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes ; they were to hold office during good behaviour, one of the commissioners being a business man, another a railway man, and another a lawyer. So that you see that they appointed a railway commission years and years ago in Great Britain in the same way that we are asking to have a commission appointed in this country. In the United States, and we will be more interested, I suppose, because that country is close at hand and we know what is taking place there, nearly all the states of the union have had railway commissions. I have here, in my hand, the 23rd annual report of the Iowa State Railway Commission, and if any hon. gentleman will take the trouble to read this report, he will come to the conclusion that the sooner we have a railway commission in this country the better it will be for all concerned, not only for the people, but for the railway corporations themselves, because, I suppose, there are cases where people complain without having justification for the complaints they make. We find that this is no new or radical proposal. In the United States they have two kinds of railway commissions ; in the old states, Massachusetts, for instance, they have what is called an advisory commission. An advisory commission is a commission which is appointed without power to arrange rates or settle disputes. They are appointed to arbitrate and advise as to disputes, and to make a report to the legislature, if a settlement has not been made, so that the legislature will then be in a position to legislate intelligently, and give relief to the people. In the western states they take a more advanced view ; Illinois led off, and the other states followed in the appointment of commissions with power to regulate freight rates, to settle disputes and to deal with complaints of discrimination, not only that, but to deal with any dispute that may arise between the individual and the railway corporation. I have here the report of the Iowa commission, showing in one case where they have settled a dispute between a railway corporation and grain shippers about the scarcity of cars. That is a thing that we are troubled with all the time in the North-west Territories. Again, there is a case of excessive rates charged which the commission settled. Again, the people complained that they were not getting sufficient facilities for the shipping and handling of grain, and this case was settled. There are two cases in which complaints were made by shippers that they were overcharged. These cases were settled. Another case involving the laying of a side track into an elevator was settled. We have, in the west, disputes as to getting side tracks laid in to elevators. There are several other cases besides those which I have mentioned which were settled in Iowa. Any person reading this report must come to the conclusion that such a commission as this would be a good thing for us to have in this country. In reference to a commission here, I would suggest it should be established on the same lines as those adopted in the western states, a commission with power to deal with all disputes between the individual and the railway corporation. Another thing I would suggest in reference to the functions of a railway commission in this country, is this : There is not the least doubt, as every hon. gentleman in this House knows, that a great deal of the time of the House, not only this year, but in years gone by, has been taken up in dealing with what are called 'straw charters.' Charter-mongers come here to get charters in the hope of being able to secure a subsidy. The

moment they have a charter and get the subsidy they have something to sell which has not cost them anything. They toil not, neither do they spin. It is high time that that sort of thing should be stopped, and that these charter-mongers should be choked off.

If we had a proper railway commission appointed we should have all applications for railway charters submitted to that commission, which would investigate at to whether there was necessity for the proposed roads being constructed, and on the report of the railway commission for or against, parliament could deal with the application intelligently. That railway commission could also report on the probable cost of the construction of the road, and then parliament could insert a clause empowering the incorporators to bond that road only for what it was likely to cost, so we would not have a repetition of the scandals in connection with the Calgary and Edmonton road and the Regina and Long Lake road in which people were enticed—to use a mild expression—to invest their money without any chance of getting it back. That was an injury to the credit of Canada. If all these applications for charters were referred to a competent commission we would have fewer applications here session after session. There are cases too in which legitimate railway companies ask for charters which should not be granted, because if you build a line parallel to an existing line the work will have to be divided between the competing lines, and somebody will have to pay the piper. If a line is paralleled in one portion of the country the people living on that line in another portion of the country will have to make up for the loss, and in days gone by the people of the North-west Territories and Manitoba have suffered in that respect. We feel strongly on this railway question in Manitoba and the Territories, and we have a right to do so because we have suffered for years and years from railway oppression and extortion. Nevertheless you have gentlemen, employed no doubt by railway corporations, travelling through the country and writing letters to the press trying to make people believe that there is no discrimination and that the people in one part of the country are treated just the same as the people in another part. In the North-west Territories we are some 2,000 miles from the head of ocean navigation at Montreal and close to 3,000 miles from the sea-board. The great problem with our people is as to how they are to get their products to the markets of the world so as to enable them to compete with people living in other localities. We do not expect to get our produce carried for nothing ; all we want is reasonable rates. We are prepared to pay just as much as they pay in any other portion of the Dominion, but when we are made to pay double it is time for us to raise our voices against this oppression.

I have taken the trouble to prepare a few figures in connection with this discrimination. It has been said there is no discrimination in the west, but I am prepared to prove to the House and to the country that discrimination does exist there in connection with the carrying of our products. Look at the enormous freight rates we pay on wheat alone. We pay 14 cents per hundred pounds for carrying our wheat from the city of Winnipeg to Fort William or Port Arthur, a distance of 448 miles.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). It was 21 cents a few years ago.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, that is true. Up to three years ago it was 17 cents a hundred pounds from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, and then the government of the day came to the relief of the settlers in that portion of the country, and in the arrangement they made for the building of the Crow's Nest Pass railway they got a reduction of 3 cents a hundred pounds on the freight rate. Let me tell the House that that comparatively small reduction, on the average wheat crop of the province of Manitoba amounted to something like $600,000 saved to the farmers. The production of wheat in that country is increasing by leaps and bounds and we may assume that if this increase continues, then in five years about one million dollars would be saved to the farmers of that country on account of this small reduction alone.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). What distance did you say that wheat was hauled ?

Mr. DAVIS. About 448 miles. If we take into consideration that wheat is hauled by the Canada Atlantic and Parry Sound Railway, including water stretches from Chicago to Montreal for 4½ cents a bushel, while we in the North-west have to pay 8⅝ cents a bushel from Winnipeg to Fort William ; it will be seen that it was high time that the people of Manitoba loaded themselves with liabilities to the extent of some $14,000,000 in order to try and get relief.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Give the distance from Chicago to the sea-board via the Parry Sound railway, and it will make your comparison more effective.

Mr. DAVIS. From Winnipeg to Port Arthur, a distance of 448 miles, we are charged 8⅝ cents a bushel. From Chicago to Montreal via Parry Sound ; water stretches, 525 miles ; land or rail, 379 miles; in all a total of 904 miles the rate is only 4½ cents a bushel. This other railway company charges 4½ cents a bushel to carry wheat 904 miles while the Canadian Pacific Railway charges the people of the west 8⅝

cents a bushel for hauling it 448 miles. We have been told that there is no discrimination in the west, but I have gone to the trouble to get the present western local tariff as well as the traders' tariff, and also the general tariff, because these gentlemen have two or three tariffs in the west; they have a tariff for traders, and a tariff for the ordinary individual, and I cannot understand why one person wishing to ship a car-load of goods should be called upon to pay more because he is not a jobber.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you mean car-load and part car-load lots.

Mr. DAVIS. Car-load lots.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Have they two distinctive tariffs by car-loads ?

Mr. DAVIS. They have two tariffs, one for the trader and another for the other man. Some goods are classified as No. 2 by local rate which are the same as No. 5 in car-loads.

From Toronto to Winnipeg, a distance of 1,091 miles, groceries and goods of that kind, which are fifth class freight, pay 82 cents per hundred pounds, while from Winnipeg to Prince Albert, a distance of 609 miles, the rate for fifth class freight is 80 cents per hundred pounds. We pay in the west, within two cents a hundred pounds to carry goods 609 miles, of what the Toronto people pay to haul their goods 1,091 miles. Let us look at the condition of affairs on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am well aware that the government have not the same control over the Canadian Pacific Railway on the main line as they have on the branch lines, but it appears to me that the Canadian Pacific Railway management are charging these exorbitant rates to a greater extent on the branch lines where the government might be expected to step in and give the people relief. On the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Winnipeg to Calgary, a distance of 840 miles, the first class freight rate is $1.82 per hundred pounds and the second class, $1.57.

Mr. WALLACE. Is that by car-loads or by smaller quantities ?

Mr. DAVIS. It is according to the way you send it, by car-loads or not. Fifth class would not be fifth class if sent at local rates. It is the ordinary rate for car-loads at local rates.

Mr. WALLACE. That is in small quantities.

Mr. DAVIS. That does not make any difference for the purpose of my present argument. I am showing that on the same class of goods and the same quantities sent to different points, they sometimes charge more for the shorter distance than they do for the longer distance. From Winnipeg to Calgary, a distance of 840 miles, the first-class rate is $1.82 per hundred pounds; second class, $1.57 ; third class, $1.25 ; fourth class, 90 cents ; fifth class, 80 cents. Now, take the rate from Winnipeg to Prince Albert, a distance of 609 miles, according to the Canadian Pacific Railway folder, or some 230 miles less than the distance from Winnipeg to Calgary. The rates are : first class, $1.89, or 7 cents per hundred pounds more than from Winnipeg to Calgary : second class, $1.57, the same as to Calgary ; third class, $1.25 ; fourth class, 90 cents ; fifth class, 80 cents. I would have no objection if they charged the people of Calgary just as much as they charge the people of Prince Albert ; but when they charge the people of Prince Albert 7 cents per hundred pounds more than the people of Calgary, though the distance is shorter by 230 miles, I think the people of Prince Albert have good reason to kick.

Take lumber. The rate from British Columbia to all points in the Territories is 50 cents per hundred pounds. From British Columbia to Regina, from British Columbia to Prince Albert, or from British Columbia to Winnipeg, the rate is the same—50 cents per hundred pounds. I have been told on good authority by a gentleman in the business, that occasionally they send it to Fort William, 800 miles further on than Winnipeg, at the same rate. What position does that place the people of my district in ? It kills our local trade. We have three sawmills in Prince Albert, and if they want to ship lumber out they have to pay prohibitory rates, so that it is impossible for them to compete. I do not think that is a fair way to treat our people.

I have made a comparison of the maximum tariff on first-class goods west of Lake Superior with the maximum tariff of the Canada Atlantic Railway on first-class goods. The rate in the west for 30 miles is 27 cents, on 50 miles 35 cents, on 100 miles 54 cents, on 200 miles 80 cents, on 250 miles 92 cents, and on 450 miles $1.33 per hundred pounds. Compare these rates with what the people in eastern Canada have to pay. Between Ottawa and Depot Harbour, the maximum tariff rate on the Canada Atlantic, for 56 miles is 26 cents, for 102 miles 34 cents, for 200 miles 46 cents, for 254 miles 46 cents, as against 92 cents in Manitoba and the Territories for 250 miles. For 363 miles on the Canada Atlantic, the rate is also for 46 cents per hundred pounds.

We hear a great deal about the railroad monopolies of the United States. Gentlemen connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway try to make the people of this country believe that if the large railroad corporations of the United States got a footing in this country, our people would be bound

to suffer. It is all a question of sentiment. We know that the people of the United States are getting their work done by the railways for one-half of what the people of this country have to pay the Canadian Pacific Railway for the same work. These are the maximum tariff rates in the state of Iowa, fixed by commission : 30 miles, 17·16 cents per hundred pounds ; 50 miles, 20 cents, as against 35 cents charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway in the west ; 100 miles, 24 cents, as against 54 cents in the west ; 200 miles 40 cents, as against 80 cents in the west ; 450 miles, 63½ cents, as against $1.33 charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway in the west for performing the same service. And still we are told by those gentlemen who want to exclude competition from this country, that if we allow the American railroads to get a footing here, the country will be ruined. I hope to see the day when some of these American railroad corporations will get a footing in the country, so that we may get relief from these excessive charges, and that magnificent country west of Lake Superior may get a chance to develop. I do not see why the Canadian Pacific Railway corporation should own that country. Is it not enough that the people of this country gave that corporation $110,000,000 in lands and money, but we must hand over the whole country to them ? I hope the members of this House will see to it that when other companies seek for charters to build railways into that country, those charters shall be granted, notwithstanding what the Canadian Pacific Railway Company may say.

I have another statement which has been sent to me by the president of the Board of Trade of Prince Albert, Mr. F. C. Baker. He says the rate from Winnipeg to Prince Albert, 603 miles, on first-class goods, is $1.89, while the rate from Winnipeg to Regina, 356 miles on the main line, is $1.12, while on the branch line from Regina to Prince Albert, for 247 miles, we have to pay $1.15. In other words, we pay 3 cents more for 250 miles than the people of Regina pay for 356 miles. That is a clear case of discrimination against the town in which I live.

We have heard a great deal about the long haul, and I wish to draw the attention of the House to that phase of the question. Let us look at the rates on coal oil, which is a commodity not used so much in the towns and villages as by the farming population. From Petrolia to Winnipeg, a distance of 1,200 miles, the fifth-class rate is 61½ cents per hundred pounds. From Winnipeg to Prince Albert, 609 miles, the rate is 65 cents. So that we are paying 3½ cents more for hauling our coal oil 609 miles than is paid for sending it 1,200 miles. There is a case of discrimination. It might be supposed that you would get a lower rate from Petrolia to Prince Albert because of the long haul. But if you add the two local rates together, from Petrolia to Winnipeg, and from Winnipeg to Prince Albert, they come to $1.26½, whereas the through rate from Petrolia to Prince Albert is $1.37½, or 11 cents more. In other words, you could take a car-load of coal oil from Petrolia to Winnipeg, unload it there, load it again on the cars and ship it through to Prince Albert, and you would save 11 cents per hundred pounds. And yet, we are told that the people of Prince Albert have no discrimination to complain of.

I have taken this from the Toronto Globe, and I believe it to be true. It certainly has never been contradicted. From Brantford, Eng., to Toronto, the rate on wool is 17 cents per 100 pounds. Compare this with the rate from Crane Lake, N.W.T., to Toronto of $1.50 per 100 pounds, and the excessive charge imposed on the people of the North-west Territories is at once apparent. How is it possible for the people of that country to live and pay such exorbitant freight rates ?

Take the rates on cattle, the largest industry in the North-west Territories, and a very large one in Manitoba. From Prince Albert to Montreal the rate is $180 per car, and the value of a car-load of cattle is $680. I am not grumbling at this, but want to make a comparison. The rate from Toronto to Prince Albert on a car-load of apples, the average value of which is $190, is something like $375 now, and two or three years ago it was $518. I paid $518 freight on a car-load of apples from Seaforth to Prince Albert. When I ordered the apples, I had no idea that I would be charged such an exorbitant rate.

Mr. KAULBACH. How much did you pay for the apples ?

Mr. DAVIS. $190, and I paid $518 freight. As a consequence, I lost about $250 on the car-load, and I did not go into the apple business any more. This is a matter which affects, not only the people of the Territories and Manitoba, but of the eastern provinces as well. When you have good crops of apples in the eastern provinces, you find it difficult to dispose of them, and they are often left to rot on the ground. But if reasonable freight rates were charged, you could easily dispose of them in the Territories and Manitoba. We produce wheat and cattle, but we cannot produce fruit, and are willing to exchange. But if a man has to pay $5 a barrel freight on apples, you can easily see that the average farmer cannot afford to indulge in luxuries of that kind in order to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway to pay its president $50,000 a year and the rest of the officials in proportion

In the early history of the country we expected to have to pay rather high freight rates, but it is high time these rates should be reduced. We hear a great deal about

American railways coming in to oppress our people. Let me show what the people of Massachusetts have to pay for hauling freight per ton over their railways and show you how these rates were reduced from year to year. The following statement gives the freight and passenger rates :

MASSACHUSETTS.

Average Freight Rates per Ton per Mile.

Year.	Rate.
1871	$3 11
1872	2 81
1873	2 75
1874	2 64
1875	2 45
1876	2 17
1877	2 07
1878	1 92
1879	1 91
1880	1 82
1881	1 71
1882	1 71
1883	1 72
1884	1 64
1885	1 59
1886	1 64
1887	1 62
1888	1 50
1889	1 55
1890	1 45
1891	1 42
1892	1 36
1893	1 39
1894	1 33
1895	1 28

MASSACHUSETTS.

Average Passenger Fares per Mile.

Year.	Rate.
1871	$2 51
1872	2 43
1873	2 32
1874	2 30
1875	2 30
1876	2 23
1877	2 22
1878	2 18
1879	2 11
1880	2 05
1881	2 02
1882	2 00
1883	2 00
1884	1 92
1885	1 88
1886	1 88
1887	1 85
1888	1 90
1889	1 87
1890	1 82
1891	1 83
1892	1 83
1893	1 83
1894	1 80
1895	1 78

In the Territories we pay three cents and four cents passenger rates per mile, and up to last year we paid five cents per mile on the Regina Long Lake and Saskatchewan Road, yet this country has paid that road three times more than it has cost. We gave it 6,400 acres of the finest lands in the country per mile. They will not take ordinary land, and I understand there is a suit pending because they refuse to take the lands offered and want the choicest. Besides 6,400 acres per mile, they get $80,000 per year for twenty years for carrying the mails, and they have never earned more than $2,000 or $3,000 a year in that service. Take the lands at $3 an acre—and they have not sold one acre at less, and some they have sold as high as $6 or $7 an acre—that makes $19,200 per mile as the value of the land, taking its lowest value of $3 per acre. Then take the cash subsidy of $80,000 a year for twenty years, and you will see that this corporation has received not less than $20,000 per mile.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I have seen an estimate which figures out that the $80,000 per mile for twenty years capitalized is equal to $6,000 per mile.

Mr. DAVIS. I am making a very low estimate. The value of the lands is $19,200, and the hon. member for Lisgar tells us that the value of the mail subsidy is $6,000 per mile, which would bring the total subsidy up to $25,000 per mile. What did the road cost ? Take the report of its cost issued by the company, and you can rest assured that when they made that report they made it so as to show as large a cost as possible. It shows that the road cost $10,000 a mile, and the people have given them actually $20,000 a mile. I suppose their heavy charges for freight and passengers are to meet the interest on the bonds, and it appears they have bonded the road for $3,800,000, although it only cost them $2,500,000. Into whose pockets the difference went I do not know, but I do not think it is fair that we should be called on to pay the interest on money that did not go into the construction of the road at all, but into the pockets of the speculators.

In 1895, the last year for which I have a return, the people of the state of Massachusetts only had to pay 1·78 cents per mile passenger rate, and yet we are told by interested parties that if you allow American railways and capital to come into Canada our people will be oppressed. For my part I would like to see more competition, and hope the day will come when we will have it.

It is high time the government took some action with reference to this commission. There is an agitation for the establishment of a railway commission going on in the country and gathering force as it goes. All the leading papers in the country are taking this question up, and it is one the government cannot ignore. They will have to take some action and take it in the near future. Let them appoint a board of railway commissioners for only four or five years if you like. Such commissions have been working in the United States for twenty-five or thirty years and have proved successful, and if we had a commission appointed to wipe out

the discrimination and force the railway corporations to impose fair and moderate charges, as we have the power to do under the Railway Act, you would soon find the cry for government ownership and control of railways disappearing. All this agitation for government ownership is due to the fact that the people are desirous that something should be done to relieve them of the oppressive railways rates which are now charged.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Before that motion is put, I would like to offer one or two observations. I may say that after a study of the railway question carefully for the last four or five years, I am scarcely so sanguine as my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), that the appointment of a railway commission would accomplish all that he thinks it would. I will tell you why I think so. In the first place, the railways have been stocked and bonded for an amount far in excess of their cost, in many cases double and treble the cost of the roads. Now, they always maintain that before you should allow government to regulate the rates on railroads, you must allow interest to be earned on all the stock and on all the bonds that the road carries. They will meet you with this proposition, that there are vested interests, that capitalists in Europe have purchased these bonds and this stock in good faith, and that it is only reasonable to allow a proper interest to be earned on this stock and bonds. There is another reason why I think a railway commission would be largely ineffective. When the contract for the Canadian Pacific Railway was made in 1881, exactly twenty years ago on the 15th of last month, a provision was inserted whereby the company was allowed to earn 10 per cent on the capital actually invested in the road before the government could exercise any control of the rates. That is a statutory provision which would meet the commission at once. If this railway commission were appointed it would be absolutely unable to control the rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway until they have earned 10 per cent on the capital actually invested.

So here is one difficulty that would meet you, the determination of the amount of capital that was invested in that enterprise. Now, in order to get over that difficulty I moved a resolution in this House some four sessions ago for the appointment of a commission by parliament to ascertain the actual cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway in order that parliament, if it desired to secure control of the rates, might know when the company earned 10 per cent on the money actually invested. My own recollection is that the gross earnings of the Canadian Pacific Raiway run up to nearly thirty million dollars, and that the actual earnings to-day are a good deal more than 10 per cent, probably thirty per cent, I do not know but 100 per cent on anything they have put in. I wish the House clearly to understand this proposition. Why should the Canadian Pacific Railway be allowed to earn 10 per cent, or any per cent whatever, on capital that the Canadian people have put into the enterprise ? As the hon. member for Saskatchewan pointed out, although he did not give you all the facts, the Canadian people gave to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company twenty-five million dollars in cash, and it handed over completed railroads, the Thunder Bay branch, the Yale and Cariboo section, and a section in eastern Canada, all of which had cost the Canadian people thirty-five million dollars. That is to say, the government made practically a cash payment to that company of sixty million dollars. In addition to that, we gave them twenty-five million acres of the best lands in that vast country ; and so particular is this company with regard to the selection of these lands that the Minister of the Interior told us the other day they have declined to accept all their land grant because they are very anxious to obtain the very best land in that country. What is the result ? The member for Saskatchewan told us a moment ago that the land grants on the Regina and Long Lake Railway have brought $3, $4 and $5 an acre, they have never sold an acre for less. I was able to show on the floor of parliament last session that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company never sold an acre of land, in Manitoba, at least, for less than an average of $4 or $5 an acre. But let us take the land grant at $3 an acre, and we find that in addition to giving that company sixty million dollars in cash practically, we gave them seventy-five million dollars worth of land, or a total subsidy to that company of practically $135,000,000, not speaking of all the other concessions that we have given them.

Mr. Speaker, let me state that the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate's own estimate of the whole cost of construction of that railway was $91,500,000, and that included $10.000,000 for equipment. Now, having given the company something in the neighbourhood of forty-three million dollars more than the actual cost of the road, why should we be called upon to stick to that clause allowing them to earn 5 per cent on what it actually cost ? Why should the country be obliged to pay, in high freight rates, 10 per cent on the money that the country actually gave to the company ? My contention in parliament four or five years ago was that we should appoint a commission to ascertain if that company spent $1 of its own money in the construction of that road; and if that company did not spend $1, then,

having ascertained that fact, we would be able to say: You shall not be allowed to earn 10 per cent on what the country gave you, and we shall take control of your rates. If parliament would adopt the suggestion I made a few years ago for the appointment of that commission to ascertain exactly what the company had put into the enterprise, then I think we would be able to control the rates on this vast transcontinental road. I maintain that until you are able to control the rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway, your railway commission is in a large measure bound to be ineffective.

The only cure for the transportation question that I can see, is in government ownership and control of railroads. But I do not think at the present time that the finances of this country would warrant the government in purchasing all the railroad systems of this country. I believe that the government should do what I urged on the floor of parliament two sessions ago. The government now own the Intercolonial Railway, which they have recently extended into Montreal, and I believe if it could secure control of the Parry Sound Railroad, and then acquire control of the Rainy River Railway, and get access into those vast wheat fields of the west, we could effectively control the transportation question of this country, and it would not cost a large amount either. It would not require a great deal to control the Parry Sound road up to Parry Sound, and afterwards securing railway communication from the head of lake navigation into the wheat fields of the west, then the question would be largely solved. If the people of that great country are able to send their products away at decent rates, then I do not think there will be much to complain of. If the government controls one road and is able to fix the rate, then all other roads would be obliged to meet the rates which the government makes on its road.

When the question was before parliament two sessions ago, when these vast subsidies were given to the Rainy River Railway, I myself, seconded by the member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) moved a number of resolutions relating to that subject. I wished to have the government appoint an officer who should superintend the construction of that railroad, in order that we might ascertain exactly what it cost—so that, if parliament desired, at any later date, to put into effect the government ownership of even one railway, it would be able to acquire this road with the knowledge of the actual cost. And I added in the resolution that it should be acquired at the cost price, less the subsidies which the country had given to the road. That resolution, I am sorry to say, did not carry. I believe that one reason why it did not carry was that the House was not fully seized of the importance of the question. I believe that hon. members had not given sufficient study to the transportation question, and did not understand the true nature of the proposition I put forward at that time. I moved another resolution—and I think there are signs throughout the country that the people are beginning to understand the importance of the question—that the rates on that road should never be higher than would produce 6 per cent on the cost. The crux of the transportation question is the limiting of capitalization. You must not allow charges, fixed or otherwise, to appear in these enterprises more than is actually necessary. If you limit the stocking and bonding to the actual necessities of the case, it is easy to see how you protect the producer, for you can then control the rates; you will not be obliged to allow charges to pay a percentage of 4, 6 or 10 per cent on capital that never went into the road. What has happened in regard to the Rainy River road on which we made such a strong fight? In addition to the $4,000 per mile which the legislature of Ontario granted to that enterprise, in addition to the $6,400 in cash that this parliament granted, making in all $10,400 a mile given by the public to assist that road, we find that we also gave power to stock this road for $28,000 a mile, and to bond it for $20,000 a mile. So that, for all time, that road is loaded with a capitalization of $48,000 per mile, and for all time the settlers will be obliged to pay the interest in freight rates on that enormous capitalization. And what are we told here to-day? We are told that the Manitoba government is coming to the relief of this company by guaranteeing the bonds of the road for $20,000 a mile. What would be the result?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does that include the whole mileage?

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Two hundred and ninety miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not cover any portion of the mileage of the Rainy River Railway, does it?

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). It covers the mileage, the hon. minister will understand, from the western terminus of the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western, a point known as Stanley station. The company that own that through road bought the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western. It goes two hundred and ninety miles west to Fort Frances, and the province of Manitoba, judging from the reports, is about to guarantee the bonds on that section for $20,000 a mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is any portion of that in Ontario ?

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). It is all in Ontario. The point I make, the hon. minister apprehends, is that the country gave $10,400 a mile in cash, and the people also will give this 4 per cent guarantee on $20,000 a mile, so that the people will have practically given in cash and undertaken to give in a guarantee, as good as cash, $30,400 a mile. And, as I tell you, the result is that for all time the people of that country are obliged to pay high freight rates on this over-capitalization. I believe the time has come when there are sufficient people in this country who understand this question to say that unless we limit the stocking and bonding to the actual necessities of the road we shall never be able to exercise any effective control over freight rates. I have reason to believe that a strong attempt will be made this session to limit the stocking and bonding of railway lines in order that a commission such as my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) moves for may be of some effect.

Now, I am not prepared to say that a railway commission such as is called for in the motion would not be of considerable advantage. Probably, in doing away with discrimination, in regulating long hauls and short hauls, in regulating rates over branch and trunk lines, it might be of some effect. I believe, and I think it likely the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) agrees with me, with the 10 per cent clause as it is, and with the lines over-capitalized as they are, even with a railway commission, we shall not be able to exercise any effective control. Why, Sir, let me give two or three facts with regard to what this country has given for its railway system. The people of Canada have given in cash, up to the present time—and I include the municipalities, the provincial governments and the Dominion government —$223,000,000 in cash for railways. From what the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) told us the other day, it appears that the country has contributed 60,000,000 acres of land for the construction of railways. You will agree with me that, in view of the statements made by my hon. friend (Mr. Davis), and in view of the facts produced in this House from time to time, $3 an acre is a very moderate estimate of the value of this land. Estimating on that basis, you will find that the people of this country have given $403,000,000 for the construction of railways. Just let the hon. members of this House pause and think for a moment what that means. It means that the people have given far more than would build the entire system of railways in this country. And what do we own ? We own the Intercolonial Railway, which, I presume, actually cost about $25,000,000—we paid $50,000,000 for it, but it was not worth that amount of money. Think of this expenditure in connection with the proposition that we shall attempt to regulate rates by appointing a commission. We cannot do it. The only way in which rates can be effectively controlled in this country is for the government to own and control one road on which there shall be no over-capitalization, and on which fair rates shall be charged, based on the actual cost of the road. When the government takes that position, I assert, we shall have the transportation question effectively solved. As I have said, I am not one who says that the country should, at present, go into the enterprise of controlling all the railroads of the country. But, I would be willing to go even that far, if we cannot get justice in any other way. Look at the example of the Australasian colonies. According to an article in the North American Review that I read recently these colonies have paid $600,000,000 for their railways. At present those railways charge more favourable rates than ours do, rates in accordance with the condition of the settlers, and they are able to pay 3 per cent on that vast sum of money, and pay operating expenses as well. If that can be done in the Australasian colonies, why can it not be done in Canada ? It is perfectly true that we have made this bad start ; it is perfectly true that we have paid this vast sum of money and have practically no return for it. But, surely, Sir, we are not going to perpetuate this colossal error. The time has come when the transportation question is knocking at the door of parliament, and unless the people's representatives deal with this question, I want to say the people will deal with their representatives later on. I shall not oppose the motion, Mr. Speaker, because, as I said, I believe some good may come of the regulation of these rates in various ways. I shall listen with great interest to any debate that may occur on this question, and particularly to the views which the government may give us at the present time. I may say, before I sit down, that I think if anything is to be done in this matter it ought to be done soon. We have been led to expect from session to session that we would have this railway commission appointed, and I think it would be gratifying to members of this House, and also to the country, to know that the question was soon to be settled one way or the other and not keep it dangling before the public any longer.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of offering any remarks upon this question until I heard of the deplorable state of Canada in a railway sense from the two hon. gentlemen who have been discussing it. I have got up to say that I feel quite differently about it. I cannot see any reason why such a pessimistic view should be taken of our present

transportation facilities and of the position of Canada in regard to its railways and to the transportation question. I did not suppose that on this motion we would be going into the whole railway and transportation question, because the question involved in the motion is only one of the very important propositions in connection with our railway transportation system. I am at a loss to understand the cause of the grievous state of affairs that these hon. gentlemen seem to have discovered in regard to our railways, not that I am interested any more than they are in railways. Since I have been in this House I have had no interest in railways; I have none to-day any more than they have. I have had some experience of the difficulties of getting railways built in this country, because the only railways that I have been interested in were roads of a local character where we wanted to build them through to different parts of the province of Ontario, some years ago and some very recently. We had very great difficulty in accomplishing this. How did we manage to get them? Something like the manner in which the Canadian Pacific Railway was got. The most of them were of a much smaller pattern. We wanted to get railways through the old-settled parts of the country where the pioneers had gone in years ago with their axes and yoke of oxen and hewed out their homes. These pioneers had for fifty or seventy-five years been taxed for carrying on all the public affairs of the country. We found it impossible to get these roads constructed except upon the principle of the people helping themselves. The people offered bonuses. There is scarcely a township between Lake Erie and Georgian Bay that has not contributed by bonus to obtain railways. Why? Did they do it to give away their money? Did they do it on any other principle than a mere business proposition? It was a business proposition. You can be sure that the hardy pioneers who built up the country, and who were a long time without transportation facilities, having discovered that railways would be a great boon to them, would not have given away their hard-earned dollars unless they thought there would be some return. Why did they give away anything? Because it was found impossible to get money to build railways otherwise. So they offered what are known as bonuses and the government of Ontario, before the Dominion government entertained the proposition at all, established a system of giving bonuses to railways, municipalities following that up. But, money in addition to the bonuses was required, and I have had considerable experience in helping to secure the construction of railways in that part of the country, not, however, in the way of making money out of them. I happened to be one of those gentlemen who did not have much money to put into such enterprises, but who tried to find means of raising, with the assistance of the municipalities and the government, the balance of the money required. The government and the municipalities knew that they were giving this money to enable the balance of the money to be obtained which was always a hard proposition. These hon. gentlemen who have spoken say that it was very unwise and that great difficulties have resulted. I totally disagree with them when they say that it makes a great deal of difference how much stock or bonds are issued. It did not make scarcely any difference for the reason that the propositions in those days were left largely to the promoters. We did not care so much whether the promoters got permission to issue a lot of bonds or a few bonds, a large amount of stock or a small amount. We were satisfied whichever way they could work the scheme as long as we got the road after having subscribed our money as taxpayers. Go through the country to-day, even through Manitoba and the North-west Territories, where there is so much talk about the Canadian Pacific Railway, and ask the people there if they would have these railways taken away from them and get their money back. They would laugh at you and very properly. I want to go roughly and quickly over this question. Apart altogether from what has been given by the country or for what railways have been bonded, the money that has been put into railways in Canada in addition has never returned 1½ per cent to the people who put it up. That is a proposition which, if hon. gentlemen will look into it, will be borne out. Take the Grand Trunk Railway, for instance, the road most heavily loaded with bonds, stock and preferences. Why was it so? Why did we from time to time help it? Because, if the government of Canada, in times past, had not come forward and given assistance it would have entirely disappeared. Millions of money had been sent across the sea for investment in the road, and widows and orphans had put their money into it in the belief that they were going to get a big return. I remember once in the history of the road that $10,000,000 of common stock was sold at 10 per cent or ten cents on the dollar and the company induced people to believe that they would get big returns that they bought it. If it had not been for that financial transaction, away back in the history of the road, the Grand Trunk Railway would have been forced to shut up. That was the pioneer road in Ontario and Quebec. I remember how glad I was to see it. I had never seen a railway train and I had never seen any cars, except a few on the old Northern Railway which ran out of Toronto. That stock is worth less to-day, about five or six cents on the dollar, than half a century ago when these people bought it. The government had to help the company out of a hole with several millions of dollars.

Take the actual money which has been put into the road and there are many millions upon which not one cent of return in interest has been obtained. The bonded debt and stock were so large, looking at it in this day, that it would be absurd to try and float a scheme of that kind now. But it cost the government of Canada a good deal. That was the pioneer road and there are thousands of people across the sea, or their descendants, who will never receive a cent of return on their investment. It is well that we should look upon the other side of the picture. I am one of those who believe that the first business is to get the railway, secondly, to get it on the best terms possible and don't bother your head too much about those who undertake to raise the balance whether they have bonded it for much or little. I will tell you why. Under our law, except in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the amount of the bonded stock has nothing to do with the fixing of the rates. If a case is brought before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, the question to be decided there is what is the proper rate, and not what is the rate charged.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). How would you ascertain a proper rate ?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) can answer, but it is one of the most difficult problems I know of. Some hon. gentlemen assume that the government or a railway commission can in some way decide off-hand, but these gentlemen have not studied the question or they would think differently. How are you going to say what is a fair rate ? I tell you that you will have to get an education that no man in this House has to-day before you can decide that.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I can tell you.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I have paid some attention to the question ; I have consulted men who have devoted their lives to it and I have read books upon it, and all agree that it is a most difficult problem, although I will agree with these hon. gentlemen that you have to watch the railways. But look at the condition of things in Canada. The fact is that the farmer in the most remote part of Ontario can land his produce in Liverpool cheaper than the farmer in Wales can send it to London. What do these gentleman say to that ? The truth is that the people of Canada wanted railways and were not afraid to assume responsibilities to get railways, and were willing to give men a fair margin of profit who took the risk of raising the necessary money to build these railways. There is not a country of the same population under heaven that has a better water or rail transportation system than has Canada. I just wish to say that, in order to relieve myself of the depression which I might experience by listening to the pessimistic views of some gentlemen in this House. I made up my mind to say something upon the other side of the question. Let me say one word about the Canadian Pacific Railway and about this 10 per cent. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson, Lisgar) remember the difficulty there was in getting anybody to undertake the Canadian Pacific Railway ? Does he remember how earnestly and honestly the two political parties in the early days of that tremendous undertaking were concerned about that work; and does he remember that its initiation and successful carrying into effect would have paralyzed any small nation except Canada ? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) talked to-day about the lands in the North-west and he counts up their value by the millions. But how much were those lands worth before the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed ? Why, we have under our control the alternate sections which, even if we gave for nothing to settlers who would go in there and develop them, are still a most valuable asset. I believe, Sir, that we made a good bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway. What if we did give the Canadian Pacific Railway several millions, have we not a return for it ? I tell you that the enhanced credit of Canada at home and abroad by the successful carrying out of the Canadian Pacific Railway, is worth twice the number of millions we invested in it.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tisdale), stated that our North-west lands were worth nothing before the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed. Does he not think that if the government built that road themselves with the money they gave the Canadian Pacific Railway that those lands would be just as valuable to-day ?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Certainly, but if the hon. gentleman had a political part to take in this House in those early days as he has to-day, would he have dared to say that Canada should have assumed that burden ? He dare not. The best men of both political parties, men who knew as much in those days as the best of us know to-day, agreed that things should have been done as they were done and the people of the country were satisfied. Had Canada not made that bargain her credit would not have been such in the interim as to enable her to carry out the other immense public works of the country. By giving the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway to men who could raise the money abroad, the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed and the chances are that it might not have been constructed otherwise. You have to draw a distinction between things as they existed then and things as they exist at the present time. I will not

be any meaner as a public man than I am as a private citizen, and I say that even if we had made, which I deny, a bad bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway, yet it was made in broad day light by the representatives of the people of Canada, and the bargain should be maintained to the letter. If we act in good faith we will maintain our self-respect and have a higher standing as a nation than if we act in bad faith, even though we made money by doing so. Whether it was a wise bargain or not we should stick to it, and although we did cancel part of the contract, yet I believe that the Canadian Pacific Railway agreed to it at the time. I am no defender of the Canadian Pacific Railway people, and I have no reason to be particularly friendly with them. My interest has been in the railways in my own province, and if I have been more friendly to one railway than the other it has been to the old Grand Trunk which was the pioneer road in the older provinces, and which enabled us to build these local roads and to turn them over to a company that could handle them as we could not. It is to the credit of the Canadian Pacific Railway that they have gone outside of the mere operating of their main line, because had they done nothing more they would never have paid a cent on the money invested. But they have their telegraph lines, and their sleeping-cars, and their steamship lines, all auxiliaries to the main line and the earnings of which go into the same treasury and enable them to pay dividends. If there was nothing but the bare Canadian Pacific Railway, then notwithstanding all the money we gave them, I doubt if they would today be able to pay 2 per cent on the actual money they raised. Well, Sir, there are men who fought me in 1874 on the political question as to whether it was a wise thing to make the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and have the road built, and I am glad I have lived to see them recant the views they then held. The prime minister of the province of Ontario ; one of the brightest men in that province—and I say it though he is politically opposed to me—he has acknowledged the mistake he made in opposing the Canadian Pacific Railway in the early days. I am not afraid to stand up here and bear testimony to a great corporation that has carried on an immense work under the greatest difficulties, and has made a brillant record for this country. Let me tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) that in my opinion this railway commission might not be the unmixed blessing he thinks. We have evidences on every side that there is going to be discussion on this railway commission question in this parliament.

I have lately consulted a report of the commission that was appointed some years ago to consider this question. That commission was composed of able men, with Sir Alexander Galt as chairman. They took the best expert evidence they could obtain as to the most efficient tribunal that would be available to control rates, railway disputes and similar matters ; and they recommended the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I think that body has administered its duties fairly well. I supported it when the Conservative party were in power, and I have supported it just as strongly since hon. gentlemen who are opposed to me politically have had charge of it. Why did the commission prefer that tribunal ? It would have several good features. It would be sure to be composed of able men, from whichever party they came ; and not only able men, but men responsible directly to the people for their places and for the way they administered their trust. They were given plenary powers. They had the absolute power to enforce their decisions, and even if necessary to order out a force for that purpose. It is impossible to have any other tribunal equal to it in these respects. You could not vest such powers in a railway commission, because it would be a reversal of our constitution to do so. Therefore, I sympathize with the members of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council in wishing to compel them to retain their present powers. I am quite sure they would be willing to resign the duties imposed upon them, and to place them upon other shoulders, but I do not think those duties would be as promptly or satisfactorily attended to. Further, there would be great difficulty in getting three men qualified to act on a railway commission. In the United States they have sometimes had these railway commissions, they have sometimes abolished them, and they have sometimes brought them back. So far as I am concerned, I am quite content with a Railway Committee of the Privy Council, composed of my political opponents, rather than relegate to a railway commission such as we could choose such powers as we could confer upon it.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). The hon. gentleman did not understand me to give an unqualified endorsement to the appointment of a railway commission ?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I give an unqualified fealty to the present tribunal in preference to a commission. Having thus expressed myself, I do not wish hon. gentlemen to suppose that I do not think it wise to have this discussion. I do not want them to suppose that while I disagree with them, I am finding fault with them in any way. I am glad to see them bring up these questions for discussion, because that is the way to get light. But I prefer to go slow, and to hold by what we have found to be good rather than to take the chances of an untried experiment.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, this very important subject has been pretty thoroughly threshed out in

this House, not only this afternoon, but in previous sessions, and I had no idea that there was any possibility of a difference of opinion upon it anywhere in the Dominion of Canada. I had not thought that there was any person who would get up and earnestly combat the advisability of appointing some additional body, different from anything we have in the country at the present time, to regulate the operations of the railways. But the sentiments which have been expressed by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Hon. Mr. Tisdale), indicate that there is an opposition in the country and in this House to the idea of the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). I notice that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) applied the term pessimist to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson.)

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I did not apply to any individual, nor to this proposition. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. SCOTT. I understood the hon. gentleman to apply the term to those who hold the ideas expressed in this resolution. I am one of those myself. I think the hon. gentleman himself is a worse pessimist than we are, because we express the view that certain conditions may be improved. I do not understand that the hon. gentleman disputed the facts set out by the hon. member for Saskatchewan and the hon. member for Lisgar; but he has no idea that any improvement in existing conditions is possible. Therefore, I think he is the worse pessimist. One opinion the hon. gentleman expressed was that it was impossible under our constitution for such a body as that suggested to be created and to perform any valuable service. To meet that point, I think it is only necessary to refer to one of the facts stated by the hon. member for Saskatchewan—the fact that in the mother country, the land from which we get our constitution, some such body as that suggested was created, and existed for a number of years, and is still in operation. If it is not impossible in England, it cannot be impossible in Canada, for our constitution is very similar to that of Great Britain. Another point which the hon. gentleman raised was the difficulty in the way of reducing freight rates, owing to the very low interest which stockholders in railway companies have been able to reap since railways have been operated in this country. That is perfectly true, I believe, even of some of the lines of railway in the North-west Territories which have been referred to this afternoon by the hon. member for Saskatchewan and the hon. member for Lisgar. Take, for instance, the Calgary and Edmonton road. I believe the stockholders in that road, at least the present managers, are having great difficulty in earning sufficient from the operation of the road to pay the interest on the existing bonds. It is perfectly true that these stockholders are in this difficulty, that they cannot get a fair rate of interest on their investment. But what is the reason? It is to be found in the insane method by which the roads were built and the corporations created. If the stockholders have difficulties to meet, certainly there were some promoters who had no difficulty at all in making a very good rate of interest on their investment, because, as has been stated, the Calgary and Edmonton road was constructed in such a manner that its promoters did not put a single cent into it, and were able besides to put into their pockets an amount almost equal to that which the road cost. The country kindly gave the promoters, not only the amount which the road cost, but a duplicate amount to put into their pockets.

This is not a new question, but one which has been pretty thoroughly and widely discussed. The conditions existing with respect to excessive and discriminating freight rates are pretty generally admitted. Even the hon. gentleman who last spoke did not dispute any of the statements made by the two hon. gentlemen who preceded him; and admitting the facts, it is evident that the government will have to take the matter up and try and devise a remedy. This subject has been already discussed this session. I am bound to admit that I am inclined to a certain extent, to favour some of the views expressed here since this session opened, by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), who is not here this afternoon, and quite ready to admit that I am in favour of the principle of government ownership and operation of railways in Canada. But I must also confess that I lack some of the faith with which my hon. friend from East York is blessed. I lack faith in the idea that $2 taken out of the treasury of Canada would be sufficient to secure government control of all the railways in Canada, and I possibly lack a little of the faith of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), who has spoken this afternoon. I have very grave doubts as to whether government ownership is a practical immediate remedy. While the people in the Territories are suffering from excessive railway rates, they are also suffering from lack of railroads. While one of the needs of the North-west Territories is lower freight rates, another is a greater mileage of railways. We have settlements in that country, which have been waiting seventeen or eighteen years for railway communication, and which to-day are still distant sixty or seventy miles from any railway. Unless this parliament is willing this year or next year to accept the principle of government ownership and operation of railways and apply that principle immediately, I would not confine myself to advocating that remedy alone. I hope and trust that, with the assistance of the Minister of

Railways, some of those people who have been waiting for railway communication during so many years, and who settled under the definite promise, given by those in authority at that time, that railway communication would be furnished them at an early day, will find their expectations realized very shortly.

The hon. gentleman who spoke last (Mr. Tisdale) did not dispute any of the facts presented by the two hon. gentlemen who preceded him. It is entirely unnecessary for me to take up the time of the House by supplementing these facts. I will confine myself to relating one instance which came under my own notice. Some months ago a firm in Vancouver ordered a piece of machinery from Glasgow, Scotland, and about the same time a firm in Regina ordered an identical piece of machinery from the same people manufactured in the very same place. Would you believe it, Sir, when I tell you that the piece of machinery laid down in Regina cost in freight within a few cents of $100 more than the piece of machinery laid down in Vancouver, 1,500 miles farther away. That is an instance of what the people in the North-west Territories have to complain of.

One of the points raised by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), which would tend to lessen our faith in the proposition submitted by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), namely, the establishment of a railway commission, is the existence of what is known as the 10 per cent clause in the agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the government. That is something which must remain there until eliminated by purchase or some other means, and which would limit the power that a railway commission would have over the railway company. But even taking that objection into account, there is in Manitoba and the North-west a considerable mileage of railways not covered by that contract and to which, consequently, that 10 per cent clause does not apply. I do not think I am very wide of the mark when I say that there are probably a thousand miles of railway west of Lake Superior, between Lake Superior and the Rocky Mountains, to which that clause does not apply.

If the statements made by the hon. member for Saskatchewan respecting rates on the branch line from Regina to Prince Albert are true, then there is good reason, even though the commission could not touch the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to consider whether a commission should not be appointed to control rates on the thousand miles of road not under the ten per cent clause. However, I was somewhat surprised to hear the objection raised by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), because I recollect that last year or the year before, when some other railway contract was up in this House for discussion, he suggested inserting in the contract a provision

embodying exactly the principle embodied in this ten per cent clause. He went over the ground this afternoon establishing the fact that my recollection was accurate and that he had moved for the insertion of this provision limiting the returns to six per cent—the difference between six per cent and ten per cent being not one of principle, but of detail. I do not intend to take up the time of the House at greater length. But if this House and the government admit the facts presented, they must, in all reason, apply their minds to find a remedy. If this House and the government state that government ownership does not afford an immediate, a practicable remedy, then let us be told what is such a remedy. If the government and the House hold that such a commission as is now suggested will not constitute a practicable and effective remedy, then let us be told in what way an adequate remedy may be found. Surely if we admit the conditions, if we admit the fact of these discriminations imposed upon the people of the west—and if what the newspapers state be true, the evil does not exist exclusively in the west, but the people of the eastern provinces have reason also to complain—it is the duty of this government and the duty of this parliament to find a remedy and apply it as speedily as possible.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). It is not necessary to add anything to what has been said in proof of the necessity of a railway commission whose duty it would be to adjust fairly the rates as between shippers and as between different localities. All I wish to say is, that while a railway commission is necessary, in my humble opinion, towards remedying the present conditions, it does not and cannot, in the nature of things, provide a complete remedy for those conditions. Some of those conditions, I am afraid, have gone beyond remedy. But the fact that there are or may be such conditions as cannot be remedied makes it all the more necessary that we should provide against the recurrence of like conditions in all cases in the future over which we have control, and with the responsibility for which we are charged. The point has probably been alluded to by other speakers, but I wish to emphasize it, that the great difficulty we have, or shall have, in dealing with the question of rates on our railroad system is the fact that the railroads of the country have been permitted to be overloaded with indebtedness. In view of that circumstance, and in view of the facts laid before the House, I desire to place before hon. members the great and urgent necessity of providing against over-capitalization of all railroads chartered by this House in future. I hold that if this House allows railroads to be bonded on the basis of their possible earning power, instead of requiring that they should be bonded only on the basis of their cost, this House cannot

afterwards come in and regulate the rates below the point that will permit those roads to earn a fair interest on the amount of indebtedness which has been incurred with the consent of this House. We should provide in all railroad charters hereafter granted that indebtedness should not be allowed beyond the cost of the road. Then, we pay for what we get and we get what we pay for. We know that we cannot have railroads without money. Our complaint against present conditions is not that we are required to pay interest on the cost of the roads, but it is that we are required to pay interest on double and treble the cost of the roads; and we ask that for the future we shall be ensured that, whatever the railroad may cost, it is only on that cost that we shall be required to pay interest in the way of railway rates.

Now, as there have been instances given of peculiar rates, I wish to draw attention to an instance also, the more particularly because this is in connection with the rates over the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, a railway the rates on which, we were given to understand, the government absolutely controlled. I have a memorandum placed in my hands which purports to give the local rates charged over that road, between certain points previous to May, 1900, and since May, 1900. I find that, from Lethbridge to Cranbrook, previous to May, 1900, the first-class rate was 99 cents per hundred pounds; second class, 82 cents; third class, 65 cents: fourth class, 49 cents; fifth class, 44 cents; and tenth class, 22 cents. I find that since May 14, 1900, the rates have been: first class, $1.27 per hundred pounds; second class, $1.06; third class, 85 cents; fourth class, 64 cents; fifth class, 58 cents; and tenth class, 29 cents. The people who live along that line of road very naturally asked the question, and I may tell the House and the minister that they asked it very pertinently during the election, how, if this government had control of the rates over that road, they permitted that increase to be made. I was not able to answer them, and I ask the Minister of Railways now: Has the government, as a matter of fact, control over those rates, and if it has, what were the reasons which led them to permit this increase of rates to take place? I think anybody will agree, upon comparing the rates previous to May, 1900, over the Crow's Nest line, with similar rates in other parts of the country, that those rates were certainly high enough. But they were increased very materially after May 14, and the people along that line, and I, as their representative in this House, want to know whether that increase was made in defiance of the government or with the consent of the government.

Mr. ROBERT HOLMES (West Huron). Before the question is put, I would like to make a few remarks on this subject. I think that the public at any rate look for some measure of government control, or at least for a commission that should to a certain extent control the rates. Personally, I am not acquainted with the grievances that are claimed to exist in regard to inequalities in freight rates, but I have seen a good deal of discussion about them in the public press. Those of us who have paid any attention to this question will have noticed in the press lately a number of articles concerning the practice of discrimination in freight rates on the part of railway companies. It occurs to me that the forms of discrimination, if they do exist, have more bearing upon the interests of the North-west and Manitoba than upon those of the province of Ontario.

In this connection we are reminded of the discussions that took place when the original contract was made with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Liberal party at that time contended that under the proposed contract certain evils would arise in the future that would cause a great deal of difficulty and a great deal of trouble; and people are apparently realizing now that these evils prophesied by the Liberal party are actually upon them. But, there is no doubt that the people look for some measure of redress; and I am sometimes of the opinion, whether wrongly or rightly, that the people of the North-west, judging by the arguments that are advanced, look for the same consideration and the same rates as the people of the older settled provinces. It strikes me that many of the arguments advanced by the people of the North-west tend to put the matter upon the same footing as in the older settled portions of the country, and they are asking for the same consideration. Now, I am not saying that the Canadian Pacific Railway discriminates, but all their arguments seem to be directed against the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway may deserve the criticisms levelled against it or it may not; all I can say is that the undertaking of constructing that railway was one of enormous magnitude. But people seem to be looking for some form of redress whereby the grievances that they claim to suffer may be removed. I understand that a system has been in vogue in the old country for a number of years, introduced away back in the early fifties, which might be some guide to us. A commission was appointed for a period of five years, and proved so successful that it has been repeatedly reappointed and exists, I understand, at the present time. In the neighbouring republic we find railway commissions existing that are endowed with certain powers to adjust grievances between the people and the railway companies, and to supervise rates and deal with attempted discriminations. Apparently these commissions have proved successful there, and it is possible a similar commission might prove successful in this country.

The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) made a remark that the public expected the Dominion government to deal with questions of this kind, and if the government do not deal with them the public will deal with the government. There is a certain amount of force in that. I am not prepared to go quite as far as the hon. gentleman does along that line, but the public no doubt look to the Dominion government to take some steps, or to enact some legislation, to bring about a better state of affairs than exists at the present time. I am not a very extensive shipper, so personally, I have no grievance to complain of; but parties who are large shippers have complained to me at different times that unfair discrimination is made by the roads, discrimination which they cannot overcome. They have no court of appeal, and they have no way of redressing their grievance, and consequently have had to submit to them so far. It seems to me that some measure of this kind might well be introduced into this country. So far as my opinion goes it leans toward a government commission.

I do not propose to go into the side issues, so to speak, bearing upon this question further than to make a passing remark in reference to government ownership of railways. I am not yet sufficiently advanced to give my consent to government ownership of railways. I think, however, I can foresee a good many difficulties in connection with the successful management of railways by the government. I have noticed that the arguments advanced by members on the other side of the House, with the exception of the hon. member for Lisgar, with respect to government ownership of railways, have come largely from men who were instrumental in fastening upon the North-west, the very railway that they are trying to get control of now, men who, in their papers or in their arguments on the floor of the House, were instrumental in fastening upon the North-west the very objectionable system that they are to-day asking this government to assume control of, and to use for the benefit of the people. I do not believe that the principle of government ownership of railways is theoretically correct; it seems to me there are a great many grave dangers in connection with it. I am satisfied that the people in the western part of Ontario, as well as in other portions of the province, are by no means united in favour of the principle of government ownership of railways. It seems to me that the easier solution of the difficulty might be in some form of legislation like the appointment of a railway commission or tribunal of some sort that can deal with matters of this kind.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). I rise to say very briefly that I am in favour of a commission, as moved for by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). I believe that the time has arrived when, if the government cannot see its way clear to purchase and manage the railways of this country, they certainly ought to appoint a commission of able men to manage the railways irrespective of party politics. The farmers' gatherings all through the country, in Ontario, at least, have expressed themselves strongly upon this matter, and they are all desirous of a commission being appointed for the purpose of settling differences between the people and the railways, and preventing discrimination in favour of exporters or importers and against the farmers. We have heard four hon. gentlemen from the North-west Territories and Manitoba speak this afternoon in favour of the appointment of a commission. They are all suffering from the effects of the overcharges of the railways. I am satisfied that Ontario has a grievance, especially when the railway companies will carry freight to the seaboard at a cheaper rate than from a point in Ontario. The Grand Trunk Railway will carry freight as cheaply from Chicago to the seaboard as from Listowel. There must be something wrong when railway companies are allowed to discriminate against the farmers of Ontario in favour of the farmers of the North-west Territories and the farmers of the United States. I think something should be done, and done quickly. The country is expecting this government to do something. I believe it has been promised. I believe the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) has stated that something of this kind will be done, and the people are looking for it. I have nothing more to say except that I fully endorse the motion that has been made by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) and supported by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) and others.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Mr. Speaker, I was going to suggest that there are a couple of hon. gentlemen who would like very much to say something upon this motion, but who are not in the Chamber at this moment, and perhaps it may be agreeable to the House to call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAM A. GALLIHER (Yale and Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, in reference to the motion before the House, I would like to add a few words to those which have already been said by hon. members before me. I live in the western part of the country myself and represent a western constituency. I have personally experienced the hardships that have been complained of so much in regard to excessive rates, and have done so for the past twenty years. I do not propose, for my part, to abuse the Canadian

Pacific Railway here to-night, or any other railway company. We are all more or less proud of that great transcontinental line known as the Canadian Pacific Railway, but, at the same time, it behooves us to watch carefully and see that the road is giving us justice and giving us justice in every respect. Now, the question for us to consider is not so much as to whether this or any other road has made a good bargain or whether it has received more than it should have received from the country, as it is whether we are suffering in any part of the country and the remedy that should be provided to alleviate that condition. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) made reference to a matter that I would like to bring up again. He referred to the rates charged on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. I have before me a resolution of the board of trade of the town of Fernie, which is in my constituency, setting out the exact facts and figures, and I can do no better than read what they say as an illustration of the condition that prevails. The following table showing the freight rates charged from Lethbridge to Fernie, a distance of 141 miles, will be of interest. Between these points, prior to the 14th of May, 1900, the rates, which were then considered excessive, were as follows :

Class.	Rate.
1st	69 cents.
2nd	58 "
3rd	46 "
4th	35 "
5th	31 "

An hon. MEMBER. Between what points ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Between Lethbridge and Fernie, a distance of 141 miles on the Crow's Nest line. That is up to the 14th May, 1900. On that date, the rates were increased, and now are :

Class.	Rate.		Former rate.
1st	$1 02	as compared with	$0 69
2nd	0 85	" "	0 58
3rd	0 68	" "	0 46
4th	0 51	" "	0 35
5th	0 46	" "	0 31

This is an illustration of there being something wrong in connection with the management of that road, though, as I understand, there was a clause in the charter granted for the building of that road giving protection in the matter of railway rates and we will assume that when the Canadian Pacific Railway started out they did not commence by charging the least possible rate they could charge, but, I think, we may safely assume that they charged the rate they were entitled to. Then, why has that rate, in some instances, been practically doubled? I merely quote this statement in support of the figures given by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) and to show that even on a road subject to a certain amount of government control these rates have been increased. I do not know whether the matter has been reported to the government or not. If it has and if it has not been remedied I think I might ask that the matter be looked into.

It is my opinion that this is a matter which should be taken up by the government, and if it is found that the present system of managing our railways is not satisfactory, then some other way should be sought. Whatever good might come from the appointment of a railway commission in the older provinces of Canada, we expect that it will be of comparatively greater benefit to Manitoba and the Northwest and British Columbia. My views on the matter are very much similar to those expressed by the hon. gentleman from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), who moved the resolution. I am in favour of the appointment of a railway commission, and even if that commission does not accomplish all that we hope from it, at all events its appointment will be a step in the right direction. There are, doubtless, some portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway which cannot be fully placed under the control of a railway commission, but it must be remembered that there will be other portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway built in the west, and there will be other lines constructed throughout Canada, and all these, at least, will come within the scope of the proposed commission. If this commission is appointed it will be its special duty to attend to railway business alone, and as the hon. member (Mr. Davis) has said, they will be able to take into consideration such railway charters as are applied for to parliament and decide whether they are necessary in the public interest or not. If found not to be necessary they should be rejected by parliament. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion proposed by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis.)

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). Although this question has been threshed thread bare in this House, and we can hardly expect to have any fresh light on the matter until some practical plan is submitted to the House, yet I wish to express my opinion very briefly upon it. My predecessor in the representation of Winnipeg, the late Mr. Jameson, introduced a motion similar to this one in 1898. He referred to the fact that the government had promised to bring down some kind of measure providing for a railway commission, and he excused himself in speaking to the motion on the ground that his remarks might probably prepare the minds of hon. gentlemen for the expected measure. Now, it seems to me that the railway question in the country has made a great deal more progress than the questions of a railway commission in this House. There is need for some stronger control over our railways than we have now ; some government supervision, some-

thing that will bring the railways nearer together in the matter of rates and abolish that discrimination which is so rampant all over the country. Cases of discrimination have been presented to this House so many times that there is hardly need to refer to them, but one very flagrant case in connection with the furniture trade has come to my notice. On a car-load of chairs from Ontario to Vancouver, the rate is $1.17 ; on a car-load of bedroom suites the rate is $1.38 ; on a car-load of mixed furniture the rate is $1.68 ; and if there be included in it any upholstered goods the rate is $2.08. It is plain that this discriminates against the small dealers and in favour of the big dealer, who can order a car-load of each kind of article. The effect of this discrimination is to absolutely prohibit that small dealer from buying Canadian goods and rather than pay the high freight rates, it is cheaper for him to buy in the western states and pay freight and duty on the goods that he sells to Canadian citizens on the Pacific coast. In spite of all the difficulties that have to be overcome, I have hope that a railway commission can accomplish some good, because in ten or a dozen states of the union where railway commissions have been operating from ten to twenty years, satisfactory results have accrued to the farming and business communities. At the same time, I must say that I do not believe that the appointment of a railway commission will ever prove a proper solution of the transportation problem in Canada. That, in my opinion, can only be attained by government ownership of the roads. At the present time the people of the country have to bear all the burdens of the construction and of the operation of these railways, and, sometimes they have to bear the cost of maladministration, and yet we practically have no say at all in their management, and no control over their rates. If I believed that the appointment of a railway commission would in any way militate against progress in the line of government ownership, I would not be in favour of it, because I do not believe that a railway commission will be a final solution of the difficulties that have to be overcome in this transportation question. The very extent of our country demands that we should look to finality in this matter, and the only way we can govern the roads effectively is by government ownership, operation, and control.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Many years ago, when this question was first introduced to the notice of the Canadian parliament by Mr. Dalton McCarthy, then member for Simcoe, I supported it. There was a growing feeling in the country that some competent power should control the railways and adjust disputes between the railway companies and the shippers throughout Canada. The agitation grew stronger from year to year, both in this House and in the country, until the government were obliged to ignore it no longer. Then a commission was appointed to inquire into these troubles and to ascertain what would be the best remedy. As a result of the report of that commission, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council was established. I held then, as I have ever believed since, that that was only a makeshift with a view of causing the agitation to subside, and to leave the railways still under the control of parliament. It seemed to me that the railway companies had some kind of cinch upon the parliament of the day, so that they felt safer in the hands of parliament, than under the control of an independent commission, and from that time onwards such cases as have been brought to the notice of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council have been adjusted by that body. As to the workableness of that body, and as to whether it has fulfilled the expectations of the people, it is unnecessary for me to say much at the present time, because the country knows as well as I do that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has failed to meet the expectations or desires of the people, or to give the people confidence in the tribunal.

The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) expressed the opinion very strongly that a railway commission would be an unworkable body in this country, and referred to the fact that railway commissions in the United States had not done all that was expected of them. But when speaking of that subject, I thought he did not display a very intimate knowledge of what had been accomplished in the United States through railway commissions. If he had been as familiar with the workings of those commissions as some United States writers, he would have, at least, conceded a great deal of good had been accomplished by them —that while they failed to do all that was expected of them, it could not be successfully established that they were a failure. Where they were a partial failure, it is for us to inquire what were the causes of failure, and whether those causes would apply with equal force in Canada. In my judgment they would not. The principal cause of their failure in the United States was the fact that different states were governed by state laws, so that when a railway passed beyond the boundary of one state, it came under a different law. But that is no reason why the same difficulty would be met with here. We have no provincial laws that would interfere with the working of a commission, because all our railways are largely under the control of the Dominion ; and a railway commission which had its authority from this parliament would be able to exercise a very effectual control over them in every part of the country. But the history of railway commissions in the United States—and I

have taken some trouble to look into it—is that they have been of very great benefit to the people, remedying many grievances, and readjusting many difficulties between railway companies and the people, in many cases to the satisfaction of both.

The hon. member for South Norfolk rather read to the House a lecture on the subject of interference with railway companies. The hon. gentleman said that we hear the pessimistic utterances of men against railway companies—companies who bond railways for very large amounts of money and then complain when we endeavour to readjust the tariff of rates on these railways, and point out that they are not earning a fair rate of interest on the money invested in them. Lest I should do the hon. gentleman injustice, I will quote his own words as I took them down: 'We are talking about conditions and difficulties of railway problems of which we know little,' and he went on to give us a history of the difficulties encountered in promoting railway construction twenty-five or thirty years ago. I remember when the hon. gentleman was one of the most active railway promoters in western Canada, and I know that he had many difficulties to contend with at that time. But the hon. member should not forget that we are a progressive people, and are advancing all the time. It was much more difficult to get capital to invest in railway construction then than it is to-day. The difficulty that existed then does not exist now. While to-day capital is plentiful, and a great deal of money is going into railway construction, it is, to my mind, a matter of great importance to control the bonding power of these railways because the railway companies always put up the plea, when an agitation is started for a reduction of freight rates, that they are not earning a reasonable interest on the money invested. When such a plea is set up, it seems to me that it is the absolute duty of parliament to see that these railway companies are not loaded down with bonds and watered stock to a much greater amount than actually went into the construction of the roads. What we want to know about a particular road is, what amount of money actually went into its construction. The capitalist who put his money in is entitled to a fair interest upon it; but it cannot be successfully established that we are in duty bound to protect capitalists who have watered the stock, and who desire to get out of a road what they never put into it.

We cannot shut our eyes to the agitation which exists in the country to-day, which is becoming more strong and widespread, which is growing with such rapidity as will soon compel parliament to take note of it and deal with this vexed problem. It must be dealt with in the near future, and the government which is not capable of dealing with it will be obliged to give place to one that will deal with it, and deal with it successfully.

The hon. gentleman gave us an illustration of what he regarded as unfair freight rates compared with what the farmer is getting to-day. He says the farmer in the most westerly portion of Canada pays less on his produce shipped to Liverpool than the farmer around Liverpool gets his goods taken to London. Whose grievance is that? It is the grievance of the farmer around Liverpool, and let him fight his own battles. That has nothing to do with our grievances in this country. The hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) made the statement, which, I presume, is capable of proof, that on a piece of machinery brought from Glasgow and laid down at Regina there was over $100 more paid for freight than is charged on a like article carried several hundred miles further and landed in British Columbia. Why should that be the case?

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. Because there is competition.

Mr. SPROULE. I hope that when the parliament of Canada puts money into railway enterprises, it is acting for the whole people of Canada, and the people have a right to expect that they will get fair-play in proportion to the distance of the haul. I am told that the railway problem is a complex one, requiring years of experience to understand, and that if a railway did not often haul goods long distances below actual cost, it would not get the business at all. Far better not get the business than do it under cost. When the western farmer had the privilege of carrying a barrel of flour from Minneapolis to Montreal at 25 cents a barrel, while the farmer of western Ontario had to give a share of his hard earnings to build a railway, and in addition was compelled to pay 35 cents for the hauling of a barrel of flour to Montreal, I say that Canada is paying its money for the benefit of the western farmer near St. Paul, rather than for the benefit of the farmer of western Ontario. Then, I am told in the same breath that it did not pay the actual cost of transportation. If it did not, why should we pay a part of that cost? Is it to help to bring the western farmers around Minneapolis and St. Paul 500 miles, nearly 1,000 miles, nearer the market in which they sell their produce than we do the Canadian farmers here?

This question must be dealt with in the near future. The sentiment in favour of settling it is growing so strong that the government cannot ignore it much longer.

The hon. member for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) said that the establishment of a railway commission would be an interference with the constitution. How would it interfere with the constitution? There can be no interference with our constitutional rights in the appointment of a railway commission. 'No parliamentarian or

statesman will deny that we have the power and the right to establish such a commission without thereby violating in any degree the spirit of the constitution. It is just as much within our rights to do this as to make any other law for the purpose of controlling the railway companies.

I was rather amused at the illustration given us by the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher), of the discrimination in rates on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. That brought to my mind the strong plea of the hon. the Minister of Railways in favour of giving that road a subsidy of $11,000 per mile, namely, that it would provide the farmer with reduced freight rates, and that the control of the freight rates would be in the hands of the government, and there would be no danger of discrimination. That was the plea he gave to justify the large subsidy of $11,000 per mile, and the illustration given by the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo now shows how little credence that plea was entitled to. The hon. member, by his argument, justified the contention on this side of the House that there was not sufficient provision made for the control of the freight rates by the government, and not sufficient justification for the large subsidy given that company.

The hon. member for South Norfolk said that we had no reason to bother ourselves at all about the bonding of the roads so long as the railways were built. That seems a very short-sighted policy for an hon. gentleman of his experience to advocate. It seems to be that we are bound to take cognizance of the bonding of these roads, and keep it within reasonable bounds. Otherwise should we ever take the power to in any way control these railway corporations, we will find ourselves confronted with the same dilemma in which we are with the Canadian Pacific Railway to-day, and will be told that we must not do anything which would prevent any company paying the interest on its bonds, and on its watered stock, as well as on the money that actually went into the construction of the road. Are there any members here who know anything about the Great North-west Central Railway Company, which has a Bill before the House to-day ? If there are, they will remember that in the course of twenty years we were obliged, on two or three occasions, to provide, when amending the charter of that railway, that the company which took it up would furnish the money to pay its debts. There were thousands of dollars piled up against that road before a mile of it was in operation or even built. Another example is the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. Where did the money go which was voted for that railway by the Dominion government and the government of the province of Quebec ? Should we ask that company to lower its freight rates, they would claim that they must be allowed to charge sufficiently high rates to pay the interest on this money, or otherwise we would be doing an injustice to its creditors. Had we exercised the proper control over the expenditure of capital by these companies, and not have allowed them to squander it as they did, we would not be confronted with the dilemma in which we are to-day. Then there is the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company which has been before the country for many years. I give these examples to show the unwisdom of allowing railway companies to borrow money on bonds, and distribute it among railway promoters and charter brokers and others, and then have it charged up against the road as a debt, to meet the interest on which it is entitled to charge heavier freight rates than otherwise would be required. I give this as an answer to the hon. member for South Norfolk, that we should not concern ourselves at all about what the companies bond their road for, or how they water their stock or pile up debt.

We are rapidly reaching a day when one of two things must be accomplished. Either the government must control the railway companies, or the railway companies will emphatically and entirely control the government. Some people think they are doing that to-day. I am glad to see that occasionally our Minister of Railways puts up apparently a pretty good fight against them, but whether they are too strong or he fails to keep up the persistence absolutley necessary to success, the result seems to fall far short of his expectations. He, however, has my encouragement to any extent he can be induced to go in opposing the pretensions of these corporations.

I am not one of those who believe that a railway commission would remedy all the evils from which we are suffering. There are many reasons why it would not, but if it remedies only a tenth of the evils complained of, that would amply justify its creation. If the commission does not come up to what we expect, it will be easy to amend it. We know that the railway commissions in the United States have been beneficial in many respects, and we have more reason to expect success in this country because our railways are nearly all Dominion roads, and we are not hampered by any state laws as these commissions are in the United States. It is said that as our railways extend in the United States and draw considerable traffic from there, a railway commission would not be effective. But that argument would apply with tenfold greater force to railway commissions in the United States, where each state has its own railway legislation. I think it would be workable to a greater extent than many people suppose. While I do not believe it would entirely cure the evil we have to contend with, I think it would be a step in the right direction. But there

is one thing sure, and that is that in the near future something must be done. Some tell us that the remedy should be the purchase and ownership of the railways by the state. That seems a gigantic undertaking, and one for which we are hardly prepared. I have sometimes thought that we should bring our efforts to bear in a way of increasing our own railway by extending the government railway to the lakes, and ultimately it might reach the Pacific coast. This would give us the through railway that would offer a salutary check upon the two great corporations that seem likely, in the near future, to control all the railways of the country. Such a project involves a much smaller financial undertaking than the buying out of all the railways, and I would rather favour that. But I must say that there is a growing feeling that the day will come when the state will be obliged, in some way, to take charge of the railways, or to have control of them by purchase or otherwise. But, for the present, let us make a step in advance of what we have done in the past. It seems to me the only reasonable thing would be the establishment of a proper railway commission to do the work very largely on the same lines as those followed by a similar tribunal in the United States.

Mr. WILLIAM F. McCREARY (Selkirk). Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to have spoken on this question to-night, as I had no notice until this afternoon that the subject was coming up. This is a question the history of which is practically the history of Manitoba and the North-west Territories for the last twenty years ; it is a question calling for thought and preparation on the part of one who is to speak upon it. I will not weary the House with details of cases of discrimination in freight or passenger rates or excessive rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for I believe these matters have been thoroughly dealt with by previous speakers. But I would refer to one or two phases of the question that, it seems to me, have not been sufficiently dealt with. Several speakers who preceded me have told you that grants have been given to the Canadian Pacific both in cash and in public lands. They forgot, however, to mention that these lands have been free from taxes ever since they were given to the Canadian Pacific Company, which, if translated into terms of money, would represent a very large sum. These hon. gentlemen forgot to tell you that these lands have been increased in value, not, as one hon. gentleman said this afternoon, by the fact of the line being built, but by immigrants coming in and settling on the homestead lands alongside, improving them, and building roads, bridges, schools, and so on.

As I have said, the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway is almost contemporaneous with that of Manitoba for the last twenty years, and it would be well to refer back to 1881 and to speeches made by members of this House at that time, some of whom are still here. I regret that time has not permitted me to refer to the debates on that occasion. As a resident of Winnipeg, however, I can remember looking over the newspapers at the time, and scanning the reports of speeches of the leaders on either side. I can remember that the leaders of the opposition of that day made most strenuous efforts to have certain clauses inserted in the contract which were not accepted by parliament. And it is for that reason that we suffer some of the grievances we are labouring under to-day. I can recollect certain prophecies made by Sir Charles Tupper —I was going to say 'promises,' but I remember that Sir Charles Tupper denied that he had made promises and said that they were prophecies. He prophesied in 1881 that, in ten years from the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, there would be two million people in that country, and we would export, if I remember the figures well, 60,000,000 bushels of wheat per year. No part of that prophecy has ever been fulfilled. I regret to say that the census of 1891 showed very small advance over the natural increase of the population for the ten years between 1881 and 1891. When Sir Charles Tupper made that prophecy in this House, I feel assured, he honestly stated what he believed. I believe that that hon. gentleman was, in most of his acts, a friend of the west. I believe that when he was a member of this House, and also when he was High Commissioner in England, his intentions were honestly friendly to the western country. But I believe that, unknowingly, he placed in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway a weapon by which his prophecies were defeated. The first difficulty arose when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company gave the construction of the road to a company composed of their own managers. The first steal, if we may use the term, was made when this construction company made millions of dollars out of the building of the road, which stands charged to the people of Manitoba to-day. The next difficulty arose in 1884—I believe, when, as you know, the farmers' union was formed in Manitoba—many farmers in Manitoba began to see that the road which was to have been of so much benefit to us was a monopoly that would take the profit of everything they raised. I remember attending a meeting of that union in the Opera House in Winnipeg. I saw men there take off their coats and make speeches of a most declamatory and inflammatory nature—almost to the extent of threatening war. I afterwards saw many of the men who attended that meeting, among them some of the most solid farmers of the province, go to Minnesota and Dakota to escape this octopus whose tentacles were closing around them—and many of them can be found in those states to-day. It went on

till 1886, if I recollect aright, when the merchants of Winnipeg and the farmers of the west saw that this Canadian Pacific Railway, unless there was some competition in rates, would take the profits of everything in the country—that everything would belong to that company. We clamoured for lines to be brought in from the south. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) said this afternoon that the Canadian Pacific charter had been altered in 1886 so as to allow other lines to come in. And how did that come about? If you had been at a place called Fort White, near Winnipeg, at that time, Mr. Speaker, you would know why they had allowed other lines in. You would have seen citizens there, church members, peaceful men, standing at that crossing where the diamond was being put in at two o'clock in the morning, with something in their hip-pockets besides tooth-picks—and they meant business. When the box-car of the Canadian Pacific Railway with forty men aboard came up to that diamond, those men saw that the safest thing for them was to get out of the car. Time has gone on, but Sir Charles Tupper's prophecies are far from being fulfilled. I claim that one of the greatest causes retarding immigration into the North-west has been this Canadian Pacific Company. I must do them the justice of saying that during the last three or four years they have made some concessions to passengers going into Manitoba and the North-west Territories from the south. They have also given a pretty low rate on freight that is settlers' effects—a $6 rate on car-load lots from the boundary line to Winnipeg. The Northern Pacific Company does the same. They have also given a low rate to Edmonton—about $42—on car-load lots, and also a low rate on passenger traffic. But when the immigrant wants to go back to see his friends, he has to pay four cents a mile, and an exorbitant freight rate on everything he wants to take out. You can easily imagine the effect that it will have upon people coming from the United States, and from the old country as well. Some Russians, for instance, who have come in the last five or six years, after they have been accustomed to travel at the rate of one-third of a cent per mile at home, when they are told that they have got to pay four cents, they walk. That is the way they get over the difficulty. The same plan is followed by some merchants living down in the country not far from Winnipeg, in the town of Selkirk, twenty miles away. I have known them to employ teams of horses to draw their groceries, coal oil and so forth, instead of taking them by railway. They say they can make more money that way than by paying the Canadian Pacific Railway rates.

Now, I would like to discover the best means for relieving the province of Manitoba and the west generally of this condition of affairs. It is a matter that will require considerable thought. Government ownership is a very popular cry. It is a fad in the minds of some people. But the difficulty is that it has not yet been tried in Canada sufficiently to warrant any man of sound judgment in saying it is going to be an unqualified success. I have had a little experience in municipal matters, and for a number of years, in our city of Winnipeg, we worked for municipal ownership of public franchises, when I was a member of the city council in 1895, 1896 and 1897, we undertook to municipalize our waterworks. We raised three-quarters of a million dollars under a by-law, and went into that scheme. I am sorry to say, and my hon. friend across the floor, from Lisgar, will bear me out, that these waterworks have not been the success I should like to have seen them. I believe the principal is all right, but unfortunately one thing and another has happened so that the people are not altogether satisfied with the result. We must also say that the management of the Intercolonial Railway for the last twenty years, or for the last number of years, has not been so satisfactory to the people of Canada as it should have been. I very much fear that according to our present system of government it may be some time before we reach that millennial stage by which government ownership of railways will be in the best interest of the people. I very much fear that so long as party government prevails in its present hard and fast lines, no matter how religious and pious party politicians may be in power, they will be too much disposed to favour their own friends and make the railway management a political lever, for such management to be in the best interests of the public. All these matters have got to be taken into consideration before we should have government ownership. I observe with some pleasure that the Hon. Geo. W. Ross proposes or suggests to construct a line of railway to Temiscamingue. I would like to see this experiment tried in the province of Ontario, before it is attempted in the great Dominion.

I believe that a railway commission properly conducted will be the means of doing much good, but I think a great deal depends upon the powers of that commission. I trust that the commission will not be empowered merely to settle questions of discriminations in rates, I trust that it will not be limited to settling time tables and matters of that sort; but that it will have such powers as will enable it to go back and examine this charter given to the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1881, and to consult the best attorneys, irrespective of any railway company that can be found, to see exactly what the meaning of that charter is. A charter has sometimes to be studied, to be read very closely, and several times before the full gist of it is comprehended, and I take it, that if solicitors of ability were to take up that charter and to look up that

clause which seems to trouble the hon. member for Lisgar so much, they might find means of getting over that ten per cent clause. I would not be surprised if solicitors could even find means of getting over that. I recollect very well we had a charter given to a street railway company in the city of Winnipeg, and some years ago the company refused to level their tracks with the street crossings. They refused to do several other things that the city engineer required of them. He gave them a notice as required by the charter and they refused to comply. Another solicitor was called in, and I pointed out to him clause two of the charter, and I said: Doesn't that clause mean that if they won't carry out this thing you can take away their charter? A bill in equity was filed within two or three weeks to take away their charter, and they came down off their perch immediately and did whatever the city of Winnipeg required of them. For years the city of Winnipeg had no idea they had such power.

There is no doubt that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, if properly brought to task, will do much better than they are doing to-day. This is borne out by a statement made the other day by Mr. Shaughnessy, president of the road, when Mr. Roblin, now premier of Manitoba, brought in a Bill to purchase the Northern Pacific Railway, to guarantee its bonds and to make a certain bargain with the Canadian Northern road. Immediately we saw Mr. Shaughnessy come to the legislature and say: Don't do this for God's sake, I will come down, I will give you a reduction of four cents within the short space of two years if you will not give this charter to that company. That shows what can be done if the people of Manitoba are in earnest. Now, Sir, I believe that this commission will not fulfil probably all that is expected of it, it will not carry out everything that we require. But, I believe it is a step in the right direction, and after we have had it two or three years, and find that it is not relieving the west of the disabilities under which they are labouring, then will be the time for the western politicians, irrespective of party, to join hands and hearts and come down to eastern Canada and to this parliament and demand that the government build such roads as will enable our new province and the western territories to achieve the destiny for which they were carved out.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). If you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, I desire to add something that the hon. gentleman has omitted. He said that government ownership had not been tried sufficiently in this country to warrant any man of sense and judgment advocating it. It may be that what he says is correct. But government ownership has been tried successfully in Austria-Hungary, in Belgium, in Switzerland, in Germany and in the Australasian colonies, and so far as figures go, has proved to be an absolute success.

Mr. McCREARY. I was speaking of Canada. The conditions may be so different in those European countries that they would not apply here at all.

Mr. A. S. KENDALL (Cape Breton). I do not rise to take part in this discussion, but merely to put myself on record. I come from the eastern part of Canada, where we have the advantages or disadvantages of a state-owned railway, and for one I desire to say that I think the advantages entirely outweigh the disadvantages. A great many of our people are in sympathy with the desire of the west for state-owned roads. Now it has been made apparent here that the people are suffering from undue exactions by the railroad in the way of freight rates. The influence which these railway corporations have acquired in this country is a subject for alarm. It has been my opportunity to sit in the committee room during a number of sessions as a spectator, and I must say that the safety and welfare of this country have depended upon the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, and other great railway corporations were trying to cut one another's throats. When these great corporations are united as they doubtless will be before long, and united perhaps with the big coal combines of the country, they will have power to make and unmake parliaments. These big corporations do not care for politics, except in so far as one party or the other will serve them best. For these reasons I say that while I believe this commission will give some measure of relief, for one I shall never be satisfied until Canada owns her railroads.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I should be very much inclined myself to despair if the facts were such as stated by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Kendall), and I should feel bound to draw the same conclusion as he does from those facts. The hon. gentleman suggests that if the time ever does arrive, and he imagines it is likely to arrive at some not remote day, when the two great railway corporations, the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway, shall unite their interests, they then will have such a controlling power over the parliament of this country that we will be absolutely at their mercy. I feel constrained to express the opinion that even if the time should come, and I am not so sure that that time has not already arrived, when, to all practical intents and purposes, the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway are in entire unison in their railway policy, I should be very loath indeed to acknowledge that the people of this country will be unable to defend themselves and to take good

care of their own interests. I think that the railway companies will be sorry to find themselves in antagonism to the people of the country. I think they will not find it to their interest to excite any such conflict, and I believe, Sir, that the managers of these two railways are in their hearts convinced that in such a conflict they are bound to succumb. The people of the country are not in their hands. A few individuals here and there may be largely subject to their influence, but the great body of the people of this Dominion, I am happy to believe, if the time arrives, and they are called upon, are able to go to the polls, and record their votes irrespective of what the two great combined railway corporations may demand. That is my conviction, and I believe that to be the conviction of the majority of the members of this House, and if that were not my conviction, I would despair of the future of this country. I have followed with all possible interest the discussion that has so far taken place, and I have followed with like interest the discussions which have ensued from time to time, and particularly within the last two months in the newspaper press upon the question of a railway commission, and if one is justified in forming any judgment as to what the state and trend of public opinion is upon this question you would be justified in concluding that the people of Canada are rapidly coming to the opinion that a railway commission would be a very important advance, and that they think its working would be attended with good results. I believe that to be the state of public opinion. I am not in a position to say whether that opinion is founded upon good reason, or whether it is founded upon sufficient ground or not. I am inclined to think that a great many of the most earnest and active and vigorous advocates of a railway commission are led to conclude that it will be a panacea for all of the ills upon grounds which are not sufficient. I have heard, during this discussion, hon. gentlemen specifying their grievances, the grievances of their people, the grievances that are complained of in different sections of the Dominion, and the grievances which they have mentioned, I am bound to say, in my opinion, as far as I have been able to form one, are largely grievances that do not admit of remedy at the hands either of a railway commission, or any other tribunal that can be set up by legislative enactment. Take, for instance, the case mentioned by two or three hon. gentlemen who have spoken. One hon. gentleman, I think it was the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) mentioned one case, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) mentioned another, and the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) another. These cases are all very similar. One hon. gentleman said that it was a grievous wrong, and parliament ought to remedy such a wrong, that it was possible for the wheat shippers of Chicago to have their wheat carried to the Atlantic seaboard at as low a rate as the farmer at Listowel could have his grain carried to the seaboard. I think reflection will convince anybody that you cannot remedy that state of things, and that if it is a grievance, a grievance it must continue to be. Why? Because the railway company which is carrying grain from Chicago to the seaboard is obliged to carry it at such rates as will enable it to get the business there, or not carry at all. Our railways which are competing for the traffic from Chicago to the seaboard will carry for rates equal, or very trifiingly in excess of the rates to which the hon. gentleman refers, if engaged to carry grain. If the legislature should provide, either by its own direct enactment, or through a commission, that the railway should be forbidden to carry grain from Listowel to the seaboard at the same rates that it charges to carry from Chicago to the seaboard, what would be the result? The grain would either not be carried from Chicago to the seaboard, or it would not be carried from Listowel to the seaboard. The railway company would make its choice as between the two businesses. Which shall it hold, and which shall it abandon? It would have to determine which was the more profitable. It would have to take into account all the conditions existing, and to say—and the Railway Committee would have to yield to the force of the argument—that the business between Chicago and the seaboard will not be done by this company, or that it will not be done by another company. So that, no injustice is being done to the Listowel farmer. He will not have his grain carried one fraction of a farthing less by reason of the fact that you have prevented the railway company from hauling wheat from Chicago to the seaboard, and he may have to pay an advanced rate because the increased business the company may be getting in its haul from Chicago to the seaboard may enable it to carry grain at a somewhat lower rate from intermediate points. In my opinion it will be impossible that you can so legislate as to prevent business being done under these conditions, so long as railway companies have to confront one another between competitive points. The existing law, the Railway Act, which was framed after due consideration upon this point, I apprehend, contains a clause which distinctly limits the application of the discriminating rule to the case of the carriage of freights between competing points, recognizing that if they did not do that they would be likely to strike a blow at the business of the country which would be vastly more injurious to the general interest and vastly more likely to be productive of the dislocation of the general business of the country

than it would be to omit such a provision from the Act and make an arbitrary rule which shall prescribe that every railway company shall carry every pound of freight hauled on its line at precisely the same comparative figures. I do not think that can be done. That is only one out of many illustrations which can be given of the same character, and which go to show that when you are dealing with questions of this intricate character, of this complicated nature, you cannot work out the ideas that you may think are equitable and just, and at the same time have regard to the demands of business and the conditions which are existing upon the other hand. But, Mr. Speaker, when I say this, I do not pretend to advance it, and I would not be understood as advancing it, as a reason why a commission cannot with great advantage be established by the law of the land. I desired to point that out to show, merely by way of illustration, that the strong reasons which have been urged in this discussion so far by my hon. friends—and they do impress me as being cases of very great grievance—are not reasons upon which it would be wise for parliament to arrive at the conclusion that a railway commission will be able to provide an adequate remedy for these things, and that we will find it a complete answer to all the complaints that are being made.

My hon. friend mentioned a somewhat similar case when he spoke of machinery which was brought from Glasgow and carried all the way from Vancouver at a rate of about one hundred dollars less than the same kind of article was carried from Glasgow to Regina. Is that not a case precisely in point? There are two or three railways running in competition between the Atlantic seaboard and the Pacific coast. These railways are competing with each other for the business, and in order to secure that business they are obliged to cut under one another, and in doing so they cut their rates down to the lowest possible limit; and so they get the business. Is it any real injury to the people who may be located along that line that the freight is carried by a railway company in this country rather than by a railway company in the United States, and brought in by one of these connecting lines to the Pacific coast? Would it be an advantage to this country that we should force that traffic over one of the United States lines? That would be the result, however, if we would say that a railway company cannot impose upon goods which are brought to any point short of the Pacific coast, a rate which, proportionately would be higher than the rate to the coast itself. Hon. gentlemen will see, on a moment's consideration, how full of all sorts of difficulties these questions are. Do not let us jump to the conclusion that a railway commission is going to provide an adequate and complete remedy for all these difficulties, but, taking a moderate view of the question, let us see whether or not there are not things which a railway commission can accomplish which has not been accomplished under the jurisdiction of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

With respect to the action of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council in the past, I may fairly claim that it has endeavoured, and with some success, to deal effectually and vigorously with such cases of discrimination under the law as have been brought to its notice. Let it be remembered that all that has been described here to-day as discrimination is not in any sense discrimination under the law. People are apt to give a much wider interpretation to the meaning of the word 'discrimination' than our present law would warrant, than the word bears in law, under which a railway commission has been established in any other country, or under which a railway commission will be or can be safely established in this country. A railway commission has been established in the mother country. Let us look for a moment how it operates. When I visited England a few years ago I spent a couple of days in the beautiful fruit-growing county of Kent. It is a great strawberry-growing county, and I asked the people about how they forwarded the berries to the London market, the price they paid, and the charges for freight. They told me that for many years they had regarded it as a great grievance that the strawberry-growers and shippers of France, Holland, and Germany were able to send their strawberries to the London market at a lower rate of freight than they themselves had to pay, although they were within from forty to sixty miles of London. I asked an intelligent gentleman with whom I was conversing: Why does not your railway commission apply a remedy, and his answer was: The railway commission cannot prohibit the shipment from the continent at these low rates; they cannot control the rates, and our fruit-growers have to fight it out for themselves, and do the best they can. Yet our friends in some parts of Canada think that a similar condition of things can be remedied by the appointment of a railway commission in this country. They cannot afford a remedy in England under the railway commission, or at least they do not do so, and the inference is that, although the railway commission has ample power, they have not found it expedient to interfere, and we may assume that they have very good reasons for their course. We cannot tell in what direction a general dislocation of business would ensue if these matters are thoughtlessly meddled in, and, while relief cannot be afforded in a particular case, or class of cases, it might be attended with serious consequences in other directions, and result in a larger degree of injury being

done. Let me refer again to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Speaking with the best recollection I have of the various questions which have been brought to my attention since I have been Minister of Railways, I am not aware that there has been any case of discrimination in rates that has not been dealt with by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, if under the law it could deal with it. I remember one or two cases in which we were able to decide that there had been discrimination, and which were dealt with effectually. The House will remember the complaint as to the arrangement made by the Standard Oil Company with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. That complaint was capable of being proven within the law, and when it was proven there was no weakness in the arm of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to deal with it. We did not hesitate a moment to make up our minds as to what we should do, and the result was that this grievance was abated at once. I do not remember any case in which a complaint was made to us from any part of the country, in which we did not endeavour to get at the facts, and when it appeared that there was discrimination in the sense contemplated by the law, we have applied the remedy. There have been many complaints made to us of alleged discrimination, but there was no discrimination in them in the sense intended by law, nor was there discrimination in the sense that could be intended by any law we could pass. Hon. gentlemen complain of high rates upon many grounds. I will take the case that was mentioned to-day—the increase of rates between Cranbrook and Lethbridge, or between Lethbridge and Nelson. What is the fact with regard to that case ? The fact is that the rates which are now being imposed by the railway company are not in excess of the rates which they are authorized by law to impose, under the schedule which was fixed by the Governor in Council, with the best information at our disposal. It is true, there was a raise in the rate not very long since; but that raise occurred in this way. There was a reduction previously ; or, when the rate was first fixed, it was away below the schedule. For some reason or other, the companies concerned felt that these rates were too low, and they raised them ; but they did not raise them beyond or up to the schedule of rates allowed them by law, or when the tariff was submitted to and approved by the Governor in Council. It does not follow by any means that because we approve of a schedule of rates, the railway companies will always or to any great degree maintain their rates up to that schedule. That is the maximum. We have to fix a maximum. It is the only way in which rates could be fixed by us or by a railway commission. We cannot fix a rate to-day on this railway for a part of its line, and another rate to-morrow for another part of its line. We have to make a general rate for a district or area of country, arriving as well as we can at a conclusion as to what would be a fair and reasonable maximum rate to allow, from the best information we can gather, considering the different conditions of the different belts or areas. We have to consider the cost of operating the line. We do not often consider the question of the cost of building the line or the extent to which bonds have been issued. These are not the things we have in our minds ; but we have thought that we could best arrive at fair results with regard to a tariff of rates by comparison with other roads operating under like conditions, in other countries it may be, or in our own. For instance, when we were determining what we would approve as the maximum scale for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, we took pains to ascertain what were the schedules allowed and in operation upon the lines to the south of the boundary traversing the same description of country as our own ; and I will state to the House now that after a careful comparison of the rates, local and through, which were fixed by the authorities in the different states and territories to the south of the boundary line, we fixed as the maximum a lower schedule of rates upon the Canadian Pacific Railway traversing the Crow's Nest Pass than were allowed on those other railways. In every single instance, I think, we fixed lower rates in respect to all the classifications of goods and in respect to all the distances. At all events, we did so in the great majority of cases. So that it is not fair to say, and it cannot be said with a knowledge of the facts, that the schedules upon the Crow's Nest Pass Railway are higher than the schedules upon the other roads which are traversing east and west, south of the boundary line.

I have no doubt that while these maximum schedules are as they are, there are reasons why some of the railways to the south, perhaps all of them, may issue their tariffs upon a lower scale than the maximum. I have no doubt that they do it just as we do it. Possibly they may under some particular circumstances make some of their classifications lower and some of their distances lower. But we cannot by any possibility avoid that, and no tribunal, no railway commission, could reach a general conclusion as to what ought to be a fair maximum rate, in respect to all those classifications and in respect to distances, in any other way than the result was arrived at by the Governor in Council. It is not a thing which is capable of mathematical demonstration. There is no way in which we can figure out what would be absolutely right, what the business ought to stand, or what the business would not stand, what the conditions of the people will enable them to pay, or

what the conditions of the people in a locality will not enable them to pay. We cannot reach these results by any precise scientific method. We have to do it in a crude way, by comparison with other railways, and railways whose applications are before us. When you come to examine, therefore, into the complaints which are so frequently made in the public press, as a matter of fact many of them will be found to be based, in the first place, upon insufficient information, and in the next place, upon the drawing of improper inferences from information which they may accurately have.

But, all the same, I frankly acknowledge, as I stated a moment ago, that there are strong reasons why it would be well for us to try the experiment of a railway commission. It is not possible for us to introduce a Bill for that purpose at the present session. I may frankly confess that if any culpability attaches for the non-presentation of a Bill of that kind at the present session, I would be in duty bound to assume the largest measure of responsibility upon myself. I want to disabuse the mind of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) when he suggests, not probably intending to do anybody any injustice, that my inclination may perhaps be all right, but that I find myself overborne or prevented by the influence of others, or perhaps by my colleagues. I want to say to the House that so far as I have any means of judging, my colleagues are as well disposed as I am to favour the experiment of a railway commission, and I confidently believe that it will be one way of convincing the public mind that there are difficulties in the way of handling these questions which are not of a political character, which do not take their rise from any political influence or pressure, but which are necessarily incident to the transaction of a business that has grown to enormous proportions during recent years, which it is an immensely complicated problem to solve. I do not say that the railway commissions in the United States have not done good work, but they have fallen very far short of the expectations which were formed for them. I do not say that the railway commission in England has not done good work, but I do say that it has absolutely failed to meet the expectations which were held out respecting it, and there is a strong agitation in that country against its continuance.

During the course of this discussion, some of our friends have pointed out a few matters which they think might fairly come within the scope of such commission. The hon. gentleman from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) thought that the charter-mongers perhaps might be sent adrift if a railway commission were established, and that the duty might well be imposed upon the commission of investigating into the sufficiency of all applications to parliament for railway charters, and reporting the conditions upon which these charters should be granted, and the extent of bonding privileges that should be conceded. I hardly think that parliament would be willing to denude itself entirely of the power of granting railway charters. We are supposed to make some inquiry into these applications. We are in the habit of inquiring into the necessity for the railway asked for and of imposing restrictions against the excessive issue of bonds. It is not difficult for any member of parliament to procure information as to the reasonable necessity of constructing a railway in any section of our country, nor is it difficult to get information as to the probable cost, in a general way, and we usually have that information furnished us. When there is any conflict as to the granting of a charter, the subject is pretty thoroughly discussed, and we have ample means of forming a judgment as to whether the charter should be granted or refused. I question, therefore, whether it would be well for parliament to refuse to retain in its hands to the fullest extent the right of granting these applications made from time to time. The question of railway construction is not one which has ceased to be, by any means, a live question. I believe that we are only entering upon the work of railway construction in Canada. Railways are just as necessary as highways. You will have to increase your railways in our great western country, ten-fold, twenty-fold, perhaps one hundred-fold, before you get that country developed. We are, in fact, only upon the threshold of the opening up and proper development of our great western inheritance. Let us not forget that the people in these different localities are impressed to a degree that we perhaps, in this section of the country, can hardly realize, with the importance of having railways laid down in their midst. These railways are an absolute and vital necessity to the filling up of this country. And when the people are crying out for railways, I do not think it would be wise policy for parliament to place undue obstacles in the way of chartering these roads.

The same experience will be undergone in the west that we have had in the east. We will find the people there crying out almost in despair for the construction of railways in every section of the country, giving, and themselves supplicating their municipalities to help, calling upon the provincial legislatures to contribute, and also upon the Dominion parliament to come to their rescue. They do so because railways are to them a paramount necessity, and because there is no reasonable amount of debt that they would not feel justified in incurring in order to secure railway construction in their midst. Therefore, we in this part of the country ought not to be any less generous in our treatment of applications for rail-

way assistance in these unopened sections of our great west, than we have been in the past when dealing with applications for railways nearer the great centres and in the older provinces of Canada. We must not shut our eyes to the growing necessities of that country ; we cannot refuse to give it liberal treatment. If we should, we would be adopting an unwise policy, and one which will be attended with much more serious results than even going a little to the extreme the other way.

I do not think I would be justified in dwelling any longer on this question. I did not intend speaking at such length, but I wish to make one concluding remark. The Bill to establish a railway commission cannot be introduced this session. I stated in the House last year that I hoped at an early date to be able to introduce such a measure, but at that time I did not sufficiently carry in mind the fact that as soon as parliament was over, we would be plunged into the engrossing occupation of a general election. That absorbed pretty well all the time and attention which would have been possible for me to give to any other subject, and from that time down, there has not been any opportunity open to me of taking the subject up and considering and examining it as it must necessarily be considered, weighed and examined, if a Bill was to come up for consideration of parliament in such a form as it ought to come before receiving the sanction of this legislature.

In the meantime, and while we are waiting for another session, we are considering now whether it might not be to advantage that we should set somebody to work who, without our incurring a very large expense, might become possessed, by inquiry upon the spot, of the real facts and the full extent of the grievances which may be remediable, and which are finding expression in the public press and on the floor of this House. Such an investigation would be attended, I think, with two great results—it would put us in a position, when we finally draft our measure, to know, at all events, the nature of the difficulties which, so far as it is possible to do so, we hope to be able to surmount ; and it would, at the same time, enable us to find whether or not there are at the moment existing in these localities any grievances which the Railway Committee itself could deal with and deal with promptly, before we should have time to introduce and pass a law dealing with this subject. That is the feeling and disposition of the government. My own personal desire, Mr. Speaker, is that we should grapple with the question—a question necessarily of great importance, and one that is engaging largely the attention of the general public throughout the whole of Canada—and grapple with it vigorously. Let it strike where it may, so far as any improper railway interest is concerned. Railway interest we must consider, but improper, unreasonable railway interest we are not justified in considering. And when I say that this is my own feeling, I am bound to say, as a matter of justice to every one of my colleagues, that I believe, from what has occurred and from the opinions they have expressed, and from what they have said to me, that they are as deeply sensible of the importance of our meeting, as fully as possible, the complaints which are being made throughout the country, and are as strongly disposed as I am myself to aid in any measure which will ensure an adequate and efficient remedy.

Mr. DAVIS. In closing this debate, I would like to take a few moments to answer some of the statements made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and also statements made by the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair). If I understand the argument of the Minister of Railways, it amounts simply to this—that without competition, the people can get no relief, for, in discussing the point brought up by the hon. gentleman from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) with reference to the haul of grain from Chicago as compared with the charge from Listowel, Ont., I understood him to say that competition would force the railway companies to give a lower rate from Chicago than from Listowel. Now, as I have said, we in the North-west Territories live at a distance from the head of ocean navigation, and we had hoped for some relief from the rate charged on our grain from the grain fields of the west to the head of navigation, and I cited this afternoon the fact that we were paying 8⅔ cents per bushel for hauling our grain from Winnipeg, 448 miles, as against 4½ cents paid by the people, no matter who they are, who have their grain hauled a thousand miles, in round numbers, to Montreal, on the lakes, and the Canada Atlantic. So, I think we had a right to claim some relief. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) says that the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the kindness of their hearts, have offered to reduce the rates on grain to the lakes to 4 cents a bushel, provided the people of Manitoba will deal with them instead of dealing with a competing line, the Canada Northern. In view of this fact, I think the people of the west may justly claim that the government should step in and give them some relief. It seems to me a sad thing if the government cannot do this. If we must get competing lines in order to secure cheaper freight rates, it is a good thing for the people to know that fact. But, I submit that if one railway can do all the work under proper supervision and control, it would be better to have one railway than two ; for, if they have one railway, it can do the work for less than two railways can do it for when it is divided between them.

Of course, we do not expect that a railway commission would be a panacea for all the ills that flesh is heir to. We never advanced that idea. But we think that with a properly constituted railway commission we could get relief from some grievances. I showed this afternoon that the local rates on coal oil between Petrolia and Winnipeg, and Winnipeg and Prince Albert, are together 11 cents less than the through rate from Petrolia to Prince Albert. That is a grievance that a railway commission could deal with. Other questions also would arise. We have had any number of grievances in the North-west. For instance, for two or three sessions here, a good deal of time was taken up in discussing the Elevator Bill, and trying to get relief for the people in the handling of their grain. If we had had a properly constituted railway commission, the question could have been dealt with by that commission without troubling this House. Another point was that referred to by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) in connection with the locating of a station. We do not want to be at the mercy of a railway corporation, because a big corporation like the Canadian Pacific Railway Company can make or break towns. If we propose to tax them and they do not want to pay the taxes, they can remove the station to some other place and build a town there. The case referred to by the hon. member for Alberta was that of Pincher Creek. A branch of the Crow's Nest line, passed within two miles of Pincher Creek. The people of the town petitioned the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to place their station at the nearest point to the town. The railway company replied that on account of a grade or something, it was impossible for them to do so. So they put the station about two miles up the track, or about four miles from the town. Then the people applied to the government, I suppose to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, that my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) thinks is so much better and more suitable to the requirements of the country than a railway commission, but the reply of that body was that nothing could be done. But, lo and behold, a short time after, the Canadian Pacific Railway wrote and wired to the people of Pincher Creek, telling them they would place their station on the very spot where the people asked them to build it in the first place, and would do it without money and without price, though, in the first instance, the people offered a certain sum if they would place it there. A question of that kind could be settled by a properly constituted railway commission if we had one.

Now, I want to point out another fact to the Minister of Railways and Canals. In the town in which I live we have a salt deposit, and we would not have to go more than 250 miles east with our salt in order to be able to develop quite an industry in that town; but we cannot do it simply on account of the freight rates. We find the people in Goderich load their salt as ballast on boats going across the lakes, and get such low rates from the Canadian Pacific Railway, that they can place their salt down in competition to us, and drive us out of our own markets. I claim that is a grievance.

Now, I find in comparing the rates between Buffalo and New York over the New York Central, and it is about the same distance as from Winnipeg to the great lakes, that the shippers over that road have to pay something like 3 cents a bushel as compared with the 8 2-5 cents per bushel that we pay for the same distance in the west. I have shown this afternoon that they charge in the town of Prince Albert, in which I live, more for hauling stuff 609 miles, than they charge the people of Calgary for hauling 840 miles. I do not see where the long haul comes in there. If they hauled for the people of Calgary for the same price as the people of Prince Albert, then there might be some force in the argument of the Minister of Railways and Canals; but when they charge us 3 and 4 cents per 100 pounds more for carrying freight a shorter distance than they charge the people of Calgary, I think we have a grievance.

I want now to refer to the speech of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale). That hon. gentleman appears to me to be a venerable Rip Van Winkle. He appears to have been asleep for the last 15 or 20 years and to have just wakened up; because he has treated us this afternoon to a tale of ancient history about the Grand Trunk Railway. He tells up that the Grand Trunk Railway, with all the money that had been invested in it, much of which he says was invested by widows and orphans, had never paid more than 1½ cents per mile on the money invested. I wish he had gone further and told us how much money had been invested in the road. I think it would be found that the road is bonded to about double what it is worth. As was said by the hon. member for Grey, the people should not be called upon to pay interest on double what a railroad is worth, but only upon the exact amount taken in the first place to build the road. Is it right that the people of Alberta should be called upon to pay interest on 5 million dollars, when their road only cost 3 millions by the statement of the company in the blue-books ? I do not think that is a fair proposition. Therefore, I say it is time some steps should be taken by the government; and if we cannot get relief by a railroad commission, then we will have to go a step further, and the government will have to take control of the roads as they have done in Australia and other countries.

Look at the bearing of this question on the North-west Territories. If we are ever to get that country opened up and developed,

its mineral resources with its wealth of timber and fisheries and agricultural lands, we must have some relief from railroad oppression. We will not get people to come into that country otherwise. A pioneer who is an intelligent man is sent in by his fellow-farmers to look out locations, and the first thing that man will do is to inquire what he will have to pay for hauling his produce to market. When he is told that he will have to pay 8 2-5 cents a bushel for hauling his grain 448 miles, he will compare that rate with what the people have to pay in the United States, with what they have to pay in Australia and other countries, in the Argentine Republic and in Brazil, and that man will go somewhere else to seek a location on account of the exorbitant freight rates.

I am sorry the Minister of Railways thinks we cannot get a measure of relief from this commission. I think, however, it would be well to give the experiment a trial. I have studied the report of the railway commission in the United States, and I find that outside of the question of freight rates altogether they have been a great advantage. I do not suppose a railway commission would cost more than $40,000 or $50,000 a year, not too big a sum for a country growing like this. There are a hundred ways in which it could be a benefit to the people. Take, for instance, a poor farmer in the west whose cow or horse is killed on the railroad track. He makes an appeal to the railroad corporation for compensation, and if they feel disposed in the kindness of their heart, they will give him something for it, but in case they refuse to pay him he is at their mercy, and can do nothing, because they will carry the case from court to court, and finally to the Privy Council, and the poor man will be ruined. If you had a properly constituted railroad commission that poor man could carry his case before them, they would investigate it, and if they found that he had a just case, they would order the corporation to settle with him, and if they refused to do so they would have the government to deal with instead of that private individual.

The hon. member for Norfolk said this afternoon that the Grand Trunk Railway had not paid more than 1½ per cent on the money that had been invested. And what is the reason? Because the money has been wasted. There is a case in point, an object lesson for any gentleman who has passed over the road between this town and Toronto. I have looked out of the window and seen about 50 miles of railroad graded upon which there had never been a tie or a piece of iron laid. That road cost about $600,000 of the money of these poor widows and orphans the hon. gentleman was talking about. If there had been a properly constituted railway commission existing in this country at that time, that money never would have been wasted, because a charter would never have been granted.

The Minister of Railways thinks that parliament would be denuding itself of its powers by placing the control in the hands of a railroad commission. I never made a proposition of that kind. What I said was that when an application was made to this House, and that application was handed over to a railroad commission for them to examine into the facts and report back to this House, on that report parliament would be in a position to deal intelligently with the question. That is what I said. With all due respect for the members of the Railway Committee, I do not think that they are at all times seized with all the information that they should possess. Some gentleman comes there with a beautiful map and places it on the wall and shows the point where the road is going to, and perhaps it does not go within a hundred miles of the point shown on the map. That is about all the information they get, and we pass these charters. I would like to know how many bogus and straw charters there are in this country at the present time. You have them all over the North-west Territories; you have railroads running to Hudson Bay and Timbuctoo, and everywhere else, on which there has never been a shovelful of mud turned, and never will be. But these people come back to parliament and ask for an extension of time so that they may be able to keep this charter until something turns up so that they can turn it into money; or perhaps under a government that is a little soft in that respect they may be able to get a subsidy, and then they will have something to sell. I say if a properly constituted commission was in existence, we would not be troubled with this charter-mongering. We have suffered from that in the west.

Take the case mentioned by the hon. member for Grey this afternoon, the Great North-west Central. That charter was granted some twenty years ago, it bore a land grant of 6,400 acres per mile, they built 50 miles, and they never built any more until forced by this House two or three years ago to build 20 miles, and that is all that they have ever done. Still the people have settled 100 miles ahead of that line, waiting for relief, and nothing is being done. I hope the government will see its way clear at least to try the experiment of appointing this railway commission. The Minister of Railways says there is a disposition in England to do away with the commission. But, we find in the United States for the last 25 years they have been in existence, and I am sure that the people in that country are too intelligent to keep anything of that kind in existence if it was of no benefit to the people.

We find that the reports of every state that has a commission are placed before

the country, and you can see exactly what they are doing. I would advise all the hon. members of this House to take the trouble to read these reports, and, as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said this afternoon, they would find from them that a great deal of benefit had accrued to the people. I am sure that when the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) shuffles off this mortal coil the people of the North-west Territories will erect a monument to his memory, because he has always exerted his influence so strongly in committee and out of committee in their interests. From a political standpoint, I would like if the hon. gentleman would come out through the North-west Territories and express himself as he has done in this House this afternoon. It would be the best thing that could happen for the Liberal party. I believe it would do them more good even than the trip of the late leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), because, in place of having six seats in the entire country west of Winnipeg after the elections as is now the case, the opposition would then have none. I hope the government will, in the near future, see their way clear to do something in the way of trying to give the settlers, not only in the North-west Territories, but of other parts of the Dominion, the remedy that is needed by appointing a railway commission.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I would like to say a word. So far as this motion is concerned it does not seem to point to anything very definite. The motion is :

That the public interests demand that the railway companies of Canada should, at the earliest moment, be brought under control of a board of railway commissioners, clothed with full power to enforce the provisions of the Railway Act.

Well, the Railway Act is enforced to some extent by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and possibly to some extent by the courts, and it is occasionally difficult to find out whether you are to go to the court or the Railway Committee of the Privy Council with a particular matter. So far as that uncertainty or difficulty is concerned, it seems to me that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) may very well devote his attention to it, and amend the Railway Act for the purpose of making that clear. I had occasion some time ago to examine the Railway Act with respect to a difficulty between two railways, and I found a great deal of legal difficulty in knowing whether or not you should go to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council or to the court. That is a subject which might very well be dealt with by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in framing legislation. As to the project of transferring the power to enforce the provisions of the Railway Act, so far as they are enforceable by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, to a railway commission, that depends to some extent on the question as to whether the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is found to be an efficient body for the purpose for which it was intended. There may be something in the suggestion which has been made, I think, by the hon. mover of this motion (Mr. Davis), with respect to the want of time on the part of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to deal with these matters, but, on the other hand, we have the assurance upon which, no doubt, we may rely, of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, that every case which has been brought before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has been dealt with by that body. I understand the hon. gentleman to give that assurance to the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, that is so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The rest of the motion is clothed in terms almost as delightfully vague as those in which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals expressed his intentions in regard to this commission in the future.

And to prescribe and enforce the observance of such regulations as may be necessary in the public interest.

I think almost every hon. gentleman in this House may be permitted to support the principle of this resolution in regard to that, but, possibly, when we came to decide among ourselves as to what regulations were in the public interest, there would be a good deal of divergence among hon. members on one side or the other as to what these regulations should be. However, so far as that particular portion of it is concerned, it is worded in such a delightfully vague manner, that I am sure there is hardly an hon. gentleman in this House who will have the heart to say a word against it.

I agree with the hon. gentlemen in this House who have doubted whether it is possible by means of a railway commission, or by any legislation, to bring to an end the evils and the complaints in respect to railway transportation. So far as a railway commission is concerned the words in this resolution mean nothing at all. The question is : What powers are you going to give the commission ? Are you going to give it merely advisory powers, as in Massachusetts, or the power of a court, as in other states ? What do you mean by a railway commission ? That is the thing you must decide in the first instance, and the House can not be prepared to pass upon the subject intelligently upon any such vague resolution as this. You must first

bring down a measure, and say whether you are going to have an advisory commission or to give it the power of a court, and you must reasonably define all its powers, before we can intelligently discuss it. It does not seem to me that there is really anything very definite in this resolution. Undoubtedly a railway commission will not necessarily bring to an end the evils which have been spoken of here to-night. That is perfectly plain from what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has told us, and from what other hon. gentlemen have told us in regard to the state of affairs in England to-day. If a railway commission would bring all these evils to an end, the farmers of Wales would not be complaining that it costs them more to carry their produce to London than it costs the farmers of Ontario to carry their produce to London. I do not suppose it is possible to cure a matter of that kind by any legislation. As the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has pointed out, this is a very complex question. You have to take into consideration competing lines, you have to take into consideration the lines which compete by water and the lines which compete partly by land and partly by water. You cannot cure all of these matters by appointing a railway commission and passing Acts of parliament. The great complexity of business transactions makes it absolutely impossible to deal with matters of this kind to the satisfaction of every one, and possibly makes it necessary that incongruities of this kind should sometimes exist.

I do sympathize with the remarks of the hon. mover of this resolution respecting the granting of what he calls straw charters and the giving of enormously large bonding powers to railway companies. I do not believe that railway charters, or any other charters in this country, should be made the subject of speculation, and I also recognize the fact that this is an evil which may not be very easy to deal with. I have tried to think out in my own mind some remedy for an evil of that kind, and I may say that I have not completely satisfied my own mind as to what would be the best mode in which to deal with it. It occurred to me that possibly if we required from the promoters of every new railway company the making of a deposit which would guarantee good faith and an intention on the part of the people who received the charter that they intended to build the railway, good might result, but possibly the only effect of that would be that when they came to sell the charter they would charge a higher price from the persons to whom they sold it. I do not at all feel sure as to what the proper remedy is, although I entirely agree with the suggestions of those who believe that some remedy should be found. Bonding powers should correspond with the cost of the road in some reasonable degree. There are two reasons amongst others for that. The first thing that occurs to me is that by giving too large bonding powers you may be leading into a trap unwary investors, and in the next place, although the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals assures us that the question of the amount of bonds, or the question of the amount of stock does not enter at all into the consideration of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council when dealing with rates, nevertheless we know that these things are put forward in the public press, if they are not put forward any place else. That is an additional reason why the bonding power should be carefully guarded, and I take it that the Minister of Railways is of the opinion that these should not be unduly extended. I hardly thought that the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) gave sufficient weight to what was suggested by the hon. member from Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall). What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall) said was that if all or the majority of the great railways of Canada combined in a vast trust with persons who became possessed of enormous interests in connection with the coal and iron and other industries of the country, there might be fear in the future. I do not think the hon. member intended to suggest, nor do I intend to suggest, that there is any present or immediate danger in Canada of that kind. I am not suggesting that, but we know that so far back as in 1886 in the United States it was publicly charged that great trusts did exercise a very pronounced influence upon legislatures. In fact the statement made by responsible persons went very much further than I have indicated. I am only suggesting, in passing, that possibly what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall) said might require a little more serious consideration than the Minister of Railways was disposed to give it upon his attention being first directed to it. It seems to me that in its present form the resolution is so extremely vague as not to commit the House to anything beyond the proposition that a railway commission could do the work of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council better than the work is being done by that body. I am not sufficiently familiar with the way in which the Railway Committee of the Privy Council discharges its duty to say whether that is the case or not, but if we take, as we are bound to take, the statement of the Minister of Railways on that point, it seems to me that that particular portion of the motion hardly seems to be justified by anything that has been advanced in support of it.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). There is just one point to which I would draw the attention of the House, because it may give some indication of the wild statements that have been made by some hon. gentlemen in this discussion. The hon. gentleman from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) has referred to the Regina and Long Lake Railway. If he

will refer to the railway returns he will find that the gross earnings of that railway company for the last year amounted to $100,702, and the working expenses amounted to $115,-500, so that the road was operated in favour of the country through which it passes and in favour of that hon. gentleman's constituency at a direct loss of $15,000. If the road had been built for nothing—as far as the country is concerned it was built for nothing—it has paid its bondholders or shareholders not one dollar interest, and it is being operated now at a loss. It has been operated at a loss since the day it was opened. It was a very unfortunate thing to build a road in such a country, but the origin of that road was because the government wanted to build a railway into the Prince Albert district after the rebellion. The reports in the department at that time showed that the land through which the railway ran was supposed to be good land, but it has turned out that the land is barren land until you get near Prince Albert. I can see no future to the road, and unless some change takes place there is only one thing that can happen to it, and that is that the road must be closed up.

Mr. DAVIS. It should never have been built.

Mr. OSLER. Quite right, it should never have been built ; but it cannot be continued to be run at a loss and the question of the exorbitant charges have nothing to do with the working of that road, or with the rates which may be charged upon it.

Motion (Mr. Davis) agreed to.

VIRDEN, QU'APPELLE, REGINA AND MOOSEJAW TOWN SITES.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto) moved for :

Return of a certain report presented to the Department of the Interior by the commissioners appointed on June 19th last to audit all accounts and investigate and report upon all matters connected with the administration and sale by trustees of the town sites of Virden, Qu'Appelle, Regina and Moosejaw.

He said : I wish to make a few remarks on this motion, because perhaps there are very few hon. gentlemen in the House who are aware what this Town Site Trust is. In 1882 the Canadian North-west Land Co. bought about two million acres from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and with that they bought a half-interest in the town sites from the western boundary of Manitoba to the boundary of British Columbia. For that they paid at the rate of one-half dollar an acre extra, or nearly a million dollars. The government asked that they should be interested in certain town sites along that district, and consequently the government obtained a half-interest in four town sites, Regina, Virden, Qu'Appelle and Moosejaw. Trustees were appointed to administer the town sites, and the trustees were Lord Strathcona, Mr. R. B. Angus, Mr. Scarth and Mr. Osler. Those trustees administered the town sites and they sold altogether about a million dollars worth of lots. They administered under an agreement with the government, and I think they acted strictly under the terms of that agreement. In June last the government appointed a commission to inquire and report on these town sites. The report was brought in and it was handed to two or three of the government newspapers, and in January last these papers, the Globe especially, commented upon that report. The Globe headed its article :

Money Flew Fast in the Good Old Tory Days—Discoveries made by the North-west Townsites Commission—Fleecing the Government—How Mr. T. M. Daly made a handsome price for land in which he had no rights—Mr. Davin's loan—How the Government was made to pay for Mr. Davin's Newspaper Plant—Heavy Refunds to Speculators, some of them represented by trustees—Large sums paid out in Unauthorized Salaries—Cash Statement—Government out about $50,000—Names of Witnesses called before Commission—Mr. Osler Objects to Testifying—Text of the Report of the Commissioners.

Now, the Globe makes a summary of the report, the main points of which are : That Mr. Daly received $6,400 for a section of land in Virden which had really belonged to the government. The renting and final purchasing of the building of the trustees by the government at an exorbitant price. The trustees lending the money to Mr. Davin to start a newspaper. The trustees refunding various sums to persons who had bought for speculative purposes ; the government charged improperly for many town sites; and that Mr. Osler, Mr. Scarth and others drew large sums of money in salaries and otherwise. Now, the land which the government contributed toward those town sites realized in the actual sale not much more than one-third of the whole amount ; that is to say, the land contributed by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the other parties was very much more valuable.

I have a report here by Mr. Hamilton, the land commissioner, and Mr. Ogden, the auditor and comptroller of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in which they answer these charges as they are made. As regards the Virden town site, Mr. Daly had a claim upon it, and it was necessary to secure that claim at once, or the sale of the lots would have been lost ; the station and town site would have been located elsewhere :

The agreement for the administration of the town sites states the amount of land to be contributed by each party. In the case of Virden, the entire quantity is to be contributed by the government. There is nothing unusual in this, as at that time any party owning land was very willing to give all the land to have a station and a town site located, retaining a half interest in the net proceeds of sale of lots in the town. The commissioners find that Mr.

Daly had rights on the south half of the section until he dismissed the entry, which was probably done when he was paid $6,400. The government contributed the section and the $6,400 was paid to clear the title. The whole amount should have been charged to the government instead of one-half.

With regard to Mr. Davin. At that time I had not the pleasure of knowing Mr. Davin personally; but the loan to him was made for the purpose of establishing a newspaper in the new government town—a very wise and necessary expenditure. I think that even now the government feel that it is necessary in some cases to contribute to the support of newspapers. I notice in a return that one newspaper published in the largest city of Canada, receives in pap or in contributions $40,000 or $50,000. The amount in question was contributed quite properly, and was an investment which paid, because advertising had to be done; and while the newspaper was apparently carried on at a loss, Mr. Davin's covenants were released, when the property had to be taken back by the trustees, which was a very proper thing to do. Certain money was refunded at Regina, after full consideration and investigation, because very large taxes were running up there, and that had to be done in the interest of all parties.

It is claimed that certain salaries were paid to Mr. Scarth, Mr. Campbell, and others as extra clerks. These salaries were perfectly proper, and were chargeable to the trustees and the government. The Canadian Pacific Railway in the same case paid a very much larger sum for salaries than was charged to the government. The trustees, I may say, in connection with the administration of these town sites, have never personally drawn one dollar. Report says that I drew a certain amount—$500. I did draw an amount—I think it was $1,200. I drew that money when the office was being removed and certain clerks were being discharged. I saw no other way of bonusing those men; and, as I was entitled to remuneration as a trustee, I drew a certain insignificant amount for that purpose. The administration of this trust, amounting to $1,000,000, has been carried on without the expense of one dollar charged by the trustees to the government; but if they appealed to a court in Ontario to-day, those trustees would be awarded a remuneration of at least $50,000 for their work. Thousands of deeds and thousands of agreements have been signed. A gratuity was paid to Mr. Gosling, who, when the business was large, was employed as the chief accountant. The business fell off, and naturally he was paid a comparatively small sum on leaving the trustees. Now, I make the statement that from first to last there has never been a trust in Canada administered so faithfully, so squarely, so thoroughly, for the benefit of all concerned.

It is charged further that there were certain rebates made to parties who purchased town lots. That is quite true. Rebates were made to a great many town lot purchasers, amoung others to a Scottish company. Mr. Scarth was connected with that company. It had spent hundreds of thousands of pounds, I think, in the development of north-west interest. It had established a stock farm on the Manitoba and North-western Railway, and had brought out high-class cattle, the result being that from along that line to-day probably the finest cattle that are brough from the North-west come. Too much credit cannot be given to the enterprise of that company. Unfortunately, the venture proved a failure. The trustees, with the consent of the government, refunded to that company $30,000 or $40,000 of the money which they had expended in town lots in Regina. So far for being blamed for that, I say the trustees are entitled to every credit.

I can understand that probably it was a proper thing for the government to have a report made on this subject, although every year audited statements were submitted to the government, approved and accepted by the government, and the money due to the government was paid over. But this report was made, and was handed out to one or two government newspapers, apparently for the purpose of having those newspapers comment upon two or three gentlemen connected with that trusteeship. They singled out one of the trustees, who has been for a number of years a government official. Perhaps his place was wanted, and a little excuse was necessary. The chief attack, however, has apparently been made upon myself. The report closes with a statement that Mr. Osler objected to testify. I did object to testify, but under these circumstances. The two commissioners came into my office one morning with a shorthand reporter, their secretary. They began asking me questions concerning this town site in 1882, before I had anything to do with it. I was not a trustee until nearly a year and a half after that. They began to ask me questions about financial matters, about payments that took place eighteen years ago, and I replied that I was quite unprepared from memory to talk about such transactions. The books had been taken from Toronto seventeen years ago, I think, and I did not see them after they had gone to Winnipeg, and concerning the transactions referred to, I knew nothing personally. I told those commissioners that perhaps I could tell them where and how they could get information, but if they were going to examine me on matters that occurred nearly twenty years ago—matters connected with figures—I refused to testify without having the books sent down from the North-west. In that refusal, I think I was perfectly justified.

I do not think that the commissioners were justified in completing their report by emphasizing, as they did, the fact that Mr. Osler was the only one who refused to give evidence. The only inference that can be drawn, as far as I can see, is that the government expected to find some serious irregularities in the administration of that town trust, and the commissioners found that there were no irregularities. The report was given out to two or three newspapers, which made this severe attack. As soon as the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is the only company having anything to do with the government, was apprised of this report, it asked the government for a copy of the evidence. This report was published in the Globe on the 5th of January, 1901. But up to this date, the government have failed to comply with that request. These two commissioners, acting by themselves, taking what they saw fit to take, looking at the books as they liked, brought in an account showing that the trustees are liable to the government for $40,000, and asked them to put that to the credit of the government.

An hon. MEMBER. Who were the commissioners ?

Mr. OSLER. Mr. Smart and Mr. E. F. Stephenson. The Canadian Pacific Railway is directly responsible to the government for the administration of that trust. These trustees were accepted by the government, but the Canadian Pacific Railway was the original trustee, and assumed all liability for the share of the government's money that would accrue. Application was made to the government for this evidence, so that a more complete answer might be given, but that evidence has not yet been furnished. The Canadian Pacific Railway then asked that the government refer the accounts to a commission or to a court, and the government simply wrote saying : We do not propose to take further action in this matter ; place this money to our credit.

The trustees, one and all, for a long time have desired to resign. They wish to have this trust divided and be no longer partners with the government. They applied to the government to have this done, and the government at one time accepted the suggestion, but since then the government have changed their minds, and only on the 27th February last they wrote to Mr. Hamilton, the land commissioner :

> Dear Mr. Hamilton,—I have yours of the 23rd inst., with reference to a division of the remaining lots of the towns of Virden and Qu'Appelle, Regina and Moosejaw. In reply, would say that it is not thought advisable to make a division at the present time.

This is a report of the commissioners on the four trustees, who each assumed equal responsibility—Lord Strathcona, R. B. Angus, W. B. Scarth, E. B. Osler—and it casts a slur upon the administration of those gentlemen. Yet, in the report, from end to end, there is not a single item, which is not a credit to the administration of that trust from the beginning to the end. There is not a single item or transaction which has not been approved by the government. There is not a single item or transaction, in the whole administration of that trust for nearly twenty years, which does not reflect credit on the ability, honesty, and forethought of the trustees. Those trustees have administered that trust for themselves, for the North Western Land Co., and for the government, the government receiving half of the net proceeds. They have sold in that time within a few dollars of $1,000,000 of town lots at prices running from $10 up to several thousand. Of course a good many of those sales had eventually to be cancelled after the boom burst and the purchasers could not meet their payments. The trustees have paid the government some $200,000 for its half-interest, when the real interest of the government in the land sold was only $132,000.

There is one other complaint made by the commissioners which I have overlooked. They say that the Canadian Pacific Railway took to itself some acres of land at $3 an acre, but the only objection that could be raised to that is that the Canadian Pacific Railway should have paid anything, because the agreement provides that both the government and the Canadian Pacific Railway shall have all the land required for railway or government purposes free.

I do not propose to comment upon this report. If I were to express myself as I feel, I am afraid I should be called to order very suddenly and sharply by the Speaker. But I cannot understand how such a report came to be issued. I cannot understand how the government could have asked to have such a report made, or to have that report issued exclusively in two or three partisan journals, with the headings outlined and whom to attack marked out, and then have refused to give at once a copy of the evidence. I cannot understand how the government should refuse to dissolve a partnership, after bringing in a report which is interpreted by the newspapers to mean that these trustees have administered wrongfully that trust. Why the government should have refused absolutely to dissolve the trust and allow the trustees to withdraw from the administration is something I cannot understand. Who instigated this report, I do not know. I only know that it was issued apparently for the purpose of doing harm and injury, and issued in such a way as to try and mislead the public and cast a slur upon the trustees, who, I venture to say, have administered the property in such a way as no other public trust has ever been administered in this country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I do not know that

I can find fault with my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) for the tone in which he has discussed the report, a copy of which he has moved for. It might, perhaps, have been expected, under the circumstances, that my hon. friend would take an early opportunity of making a statement to the House which would explain, to some extent at least, the statements which were made in the report referred to. Some of the remarks my hon. friend has made would naturally leave a somewhat incorrect impression upon the minds of hon. members—though I desire to be understood as not in any way imputing that my hon. friend has intended to mislead the House. In the first place, so far as the refusal to furnish the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with the evidence upon which this report was made is concerned, I never heard of any such refusal until I heard it from my hon. friend just now. If the company had made application to me or had made application in such a way that it would have come before me personally—and I may say that the company has not shown any great backwardness in coming to my office and calling attention——

Mr. OSLER. I may have been misunderstood as to the refusal. I have delayed asking this question, and the government have been applied to for a long time back, since shortly after the report was made, and they have failed to send the evidence. After the report was made, one would have thought that the evidence would be sent, but, up to this date, neither the Canadian Pacific Railway nor I have received nor been able to get the evidence.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What I was saying was this, that the government is not in the position of having refused to give a copy of any evidence taken by the commissioners; and I was proceeding to say that if the company wrote an ordinary official letter and did not receive it, they could have called my personal attention to it, and they would have received the papers without any delay whatever. So, there has been no intentional refusal to furnish any evidence or papers whatever. As to how this report came to be made—and as my hon. friend assumed a moderate tone in discussing the matter, I do not purpose going into the subject at length or making any strong remarks in regard to it, because the report will speak for itself when it is laid before the House—when I had been in office for some time, I experienced some difficulty in dealing with the accounts of the trust to which my hon. friend has referred; and, from time to time, it is necessary, for the purpose of carrying on the business of the department, to get more information than we were able to procure. At different times, I thought I would cause an examination of the accounts to be made for the purpose of getting an exact record of what had taken place. I may say that I had not the least notion, in bringing about this examination, that my hon. friend or any of the trustees had been guilty of any personal dishonesty; but I thought—and I think now—that, as the minister responsible for the conduct of this business, it was my duty to direct an investigation into these accounts so that, as the minister responsible, I might know what had been done with the moneys, and also know in what manner the business had been conducted. The commission to make the examination was issued to two gentlemen both of whom are first-class accountants and both men thoroughly competent to conduct such an investigation, one being Mr. Smart, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, and the other Mr. E. F. Stephenson, who was an officer of the department before I took charge of it, and who is, I believe, a son of the late Rufus Stephenson, M.P. Mr. Stephenson is a most trusted officer of the department, one of the most competent in the service of the department. These two gentlemen went through the various accounts and made a thorough investigation and report. Now, the question whether the report is correct or not is a question which, if it is disputed, cannot be decided by an adverse statement made by Mr. Ogden, the auditor of the Canadian Pacific Railway nor by a statement made by my hon. friend on the floor of this House. I have no intention of entering into an argument that the report of the commissioners was founded on fact. These gentlemen spent some time, I believe, in going through these accounts. It was a very laborious task, I was informed. The report speaks for itself. If its accuracy is disputed, that question can only be settled in the proper quarter by a judicial tribunal. The report having been made, we asked the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who are responsible for the due performance of the trust, to place to our credit the amount of money which, the commissioners concluded, had been improperly charged against the government; and I think it is only necessary for me to state the facts to the House in order that the House may perceive that that was my plain duty under the circumstances, and that I could do neither more nor less. So far as the suggestion that my hon. friend has made that there was anything further than an effort to investigate this matter which had been made part of the business of the department and to have a proper record of it, and, when moneys were found to be due to the government to have them placed to our credit, I can only say there was nothing in my mind except simply to accomplish that purpose. And I submit, with all confidence that nothing further has been done. The question whether the moneys were properly charged against the government, whether the moneys found by the commissioners to be due to the government are to be paid or not is one which my hon. friend and I

cannot settle by debate in this House. I am free to say that I cannot agree with some things my hon. friend says. I cannot agree, for instance, in connection with the town site of Virden, that it was proper to charge the government one-half the cost of the town site when the government furnished half the land—I do not think they should be called upon to pay $3,200 for land they had furnished themselves. Then, to speak in connection with cases that seem very clear, I do not think that in the case of taxes paid by the trustees, all the taxes should have been charged against the government.

I am not going into a discussion of that, further than to say that the commissioners found that in the case of the taxes which were paid upon the property which the trustees held in trust, the government owning one-half of the land, the Canadian Pacific Railway one-quarter, and the Canada North-west Land Company one-quarter, the Canada North-west Land Company alone was liable for taxes. The trustees paid the taxes and they charged it up against the fund, so that the government had to pay its share of the taxes for which the Canada North-west Land Company was liable. The commissioners make a plain statement of the fact, and show that the money ought to be refunded. I have the report in my hand in which the commissioners state the facts. If there is any answer to that, it will be for the Canadian Pacific Railway, for my hon. friend and his co-trustees, to show it when the proper time comes. I have simply to say that upon the face of it, the report does not at all indicate that my hon. friend's statement is correct when he says there was nothing objectionable in regard to the transaction of the business by the trustees. When I say that, of course, my hon. friend and every member of the House will understand that I am not in the slightest degree suggesting there was anything improper from a personal standpoint, but only that close and personal supervision was not given by the trustees. In fact I presume my hon. friend had not an opportunity to give that personal supervision. Lord Strathcona, the High Commissioner, is equally responsible with him, and I do not suppose that Lord Strathcona ever saw or heard anything connected with it since the very early days of the trust.

But if my hon. friend thinks that there is anything in the slightest degree objectionable with regard to the position the department has taken, I can only say to him that the report having been made after full and careful investigation by gentlemen who were thoroughly competent for that purpose, and I am satisfied thoroughly unbiased in every possible way, I conceive it to be my duty to see that that money is collected and placed to the credit of the government. As for the government refusing to agree to a division of the property concerned, I may say that I have never refused to make a division of the property. In fact for the last two years, I have desired that there should be such a division. My hon. friend will see that before we can have a division of the property we must have a settlement of the account, and the government are quite prepared that the account should be settled and the property divided as soon as possible. I have no desire to enter further into a discussion of the matter. A copy of the report will be duly laid upon the Table of the House, and hon. members will have an opportunity of judging of the statements for themselves.

Mr. OSLER. The Minister of the Interior would have us believe that the government is always quite willing to refer this matter to the courts. Now, let me read him what Mr. Drinkwater says on the 9th of January:

> I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th instant, informing me that the report of the commissioners who recently held an investigation in connection with the management of the town sites of Virden, Qu'Appelle, Regina and Moosejaw, a copy of which accompanied your letter, had been approved by order in council. I understand from these documents that the government proposes that the lands comprised in the town sites in question shall still be managed and dealt with by the present trustees, and in the manner indicated by that report, namely, that the sale of the lots shall be made to extend over a term of two or three years, in which time sales by public auction at intervals of certain of the lots could be held until the whole are disposed of. I am directed to say that this company prefers that the trusteeship be ended at once, and that a partition take place between the parties interested in these lands without delay. I shall be glad to know that this course is acceptable to the government, and that you are prepared to discuss the best method of carrying it into effect.

On behalf of the North-west Land Company that same request is made to the government. Then there is another letter from Mr. Smart dealing with that question, and finally a letter on the 27th of February, referring to the question, pending the settlement of the accounts, in which he says :

> I have yours of the 23rd instant, in reference to the division of the remaining lots in the towns of Virden, Qu'Appelle, Regina and Moosejaw, and in reply would say that it is not thought advisable to make a division at the present time. Will I return your maps to your address in Toronto?

There is a distinct refusal to make a division, no reference to a settlement. Now, then, with reference to the other matter of referring the question, the department say :

> I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 7th instant, having reference to the report of the joint town site trustees, in which you intimate that the company would desire that the question as to placing to the credit of the

government the sums mentioned in the report as being due to the Crown should be submitted to the Exchequer Court, and requesting that a copy of the evidence taken by the commissioners may be forwarded to you on which to prepare the company's case, and you ask further whether the course suggested as to referring the matter to the Exchequer Court is agreeable to the government. In reply I am directed to say that the government has not decided upon any course with regard to this matter, except to ask the company to make the necessary credits in the books of the trustees, so that the amount mentioned in the commissioner's report may be shown to be due to the government in this connection.

Now, it is plain as anything can be that the government refused to submit that matter to the Exchequer Court or to any court. They say that an amount of money arbitrarily found by partisan commissioners shall, without any reference, be at once acknowledged by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and by the trustees to be due to the government. That is directly and absolutely asked. In reference to the request that the matter be referred to the Exchequer Court, surely I am justified in saying the government refused to recognize that course. I think it is unreasonable, unfair, it is not the proper course to take under such circumstances. If the government found that the trustees were indebted to them and the trustees refused to acknowledge it, their only honourable course would have been to refer it at once to arbitration, or to some tribunal. These figures are arbitrary figures brought in by partisan auditors. On the other hand, the accounts sent in by the trustees from year to year have been approved by the government, the moneys have been paid to the government during all the twenty years they administered the trust, five years of which were under this government, to which they rendered statements in exactly the same manner as they rendered them under the late government. The trustees had no indication or suggestion from the government that everything was not absolutely right until this report was published in the Globe. That is the first that we ever heard of it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think my hon. friend is trying to make a grievance where no grievance exists. The letter of Mr. Smart to which he refers is in regard to the question of submitting the matter to the Exchequer Court, and merely stating that the government had not decided finally upon a course. If the Canadian Pacific Railway secretary suggested a certain course, the government was not called upon immediately to assent to that, the government was entitled to give the matter consideration. The trustees have been handling this money and doing this business for many years.

Mr. OSLER.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think the hon. gentleman is in order in speaking again.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am aware I am not in order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it is not a matter of personal explanation——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is not a matter of personal explanation, but my hon. friend was out of order when he rose to reply to me.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, he was not out of order. I do not want to object if the hon. gentleman has any personal explanation to make.

Mr. OSLER. I do not object at all.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is a matter of public business, it is not a matter of personal explanation. What I was about to say was that my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) is endeavouring to make a mountain out of a molehill. He has endeavoured to show that we have refused to refer this to the courts, because Mr. Smart simply said that the government had not decided upon that course. In so far as the other question is concerned, to which Mr. Smart's other letter referred, the letter is simply one of a similar character. It does not make a final decision, nor does it profess to do so. I think my hon. friend will find, when he comes to go into this matter with the same degree of care that the commissioners have gone into it, that his ideas upon the subject will undergo somewhat of a change, and I think he will find that the statement he has made, that this is the report of partisan auditors, is not justified by the fact. If the word 'partisan' is used in the sense in which it refers to the political proclivities of the commissioners, certainly, Mr. E. F. Stephenson could not be considered to be a partisan of this government, and I think, therefore, that the personnel of the commission was as fair and as free from partisan bias as it could possibly be under the circumsances.

Mr. OSLER. I would ask to have the evidence produced.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That can be included in the motion.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The motion is amended by including the words 'with the evidence.'

Amendment agreed to, and motion, as amended, agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Experimental Farms for the year 1900.—(Hon. Sydney A. Fisher).

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The resolution respecting the Pacific cable will probably be the first order, then Supply, with the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) on deck.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 5, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

BRITISH YUKON RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 40) respecting the British Yukon Railway Company. He said : This is simply to enable the company to extend its line from White Horse to Dawson City. The length of its present line is 120 or 130 miles, all of which is in Canada except 16 miles.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Saskatchewan and Western Railway Company.—Mr. LaRivière.

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Klondike Mines Survey Company.—Mr. Fraser.

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the St. Lawrence Lodge.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company, and to change its name to the Ottawa, Gatineau and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Champagne by Mr. Ethier.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That for the remainder of the session Government Orders shall have precedence after questions on Thursdays.

He said : In making this motion, I may inform the House of the government business, not only so far as it is already before the House, but so far as it is intended to bring in other business. There are on the Order paper two Bills to be introduced by the Solicitor General, one relating to the Franchise Act and one relating to the Elections Act. These Bills will be introduced, probably, to-morrow. Then, the Minister of the Interior contemplates introducing a Bill for the consolidating of the Indian Act. The Minister of Finance contemplates introducing the Bill, which was announced in the speech from the Throne, concerning the mint. A Bill will be introduced concerning the Alien Labour law. The day after to-morrow the Bill concerning the Alien Labour law will be introduced, and the other two probably in the course of a week. It is expected that supplementary estimates will be introduced not this week, but early next week. I will not say that this is all the legislation to be introduced this session, but if there is more, it will be of a light character.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Can the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) give us any information as to when we may expect his budget speech ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Some day next week, but a more definite announcement will be made next Thursday.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). The business brought before the House so far has been very largely promoted by private members, members of the opposition. I think the government have had ample opportunity to forward their measures, and that they will still have sufficient opportunity without at once taking one of the private members' days. We have not reached a point in the session—though I believe it is quite understood on both sides that we are to have a short session—for such a step. The government has not its business in such a form as to make such a step necessary. I think the government should not be in a hurry, considering that private members have been diligently bringing business before the House, and at this stage one of the days devoted for private members' business should not be taken.

The PRIME MINISTER. I certainly must give the opposition credit for putting a great deal of matter on the Order paper. But, as to anything further than that, I cannot say that they have shown any remarkable diligence, for, day after day the same motions standing in the names of hon. gentlemen of the other side have been called and allowed to stand. However, I would not quarrel with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) on this subject. I do not believe I could change his opinion on this subject and I am sure he could not change mine. However, if my hon. friend will accept such an arrangement, I will agree not to take next

Thursday but the Thursday following. I ask to have the resolution amended to that effect.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not agree with the Prime Minister. I think that hon. members on this side have been making it very interesting for the members of the government. However, I shall not oppose the motion as it is now proposed.

Amendment agreed to, and motion as amended agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise to a question of privilege. I find that in 'Hansard' of the first of March my name is recorded as having been paired against the motion introduced by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., (Hon. Mr. Costigan). I desire to say that that pair was arranged for the original motion as introduced by that hon. gentleman, and not for the motion that was voted on by the House. Had I been in the House when the vote was taken I would have voted for the resolution as amended.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). I desire to ask when I may expect the returns I moved for early in the session, one with reference to the cost of elevators in St. John and Halifax, and the other for certain information respecting immigration.

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire to explain——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I shall be very glad to make immediate inquiries, and, if there is any information that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) has asked for and that has not been forthcoming, to supply it as speedily as possible.

Mr. WILSON. The resolution passed the House early in the session.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no doubt the matter is being attended to.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am in the same position as the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson).

Mr. WILSON. I would like to have an answer from the Minister of Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) as to the return relating to immigration.

THE PACIFIC CABLE.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following resolutions :

That whereas by 'The Pacific Cable Act, 1899,' His Excellency in Council is authorized to guarantee payment of five-eighteenths of the principal sum of £1,700,000 sterling, to be applied in establishing direct submarine telegraphic communication between Canada and Australasia ;

And whereas in lieu of said sum of £1,700,000 it is estimated that for the purpose aforesaid there will be required a sum not exceeding £2,000,000 sterling, which sum of £2,000,000 the government of the United Kingdom is willing to advance ;

1. That the Governor in Council is authorized to guarantee payment of five-eighteenth parts of the principal and interest of and upon the securities to be issued by the government of the United Kingdom for raising the said sum, namely, £2,000,000 so to be advanced.

2. That section 3 of said Act be repealed.—Mr. Mulock.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). This resolution to some extent changes the financial scheme as authorized by the Dominion Act of 1899. Under that Act power was given to His Excellency the Governor in Council to assume as our share five-eighteenths of the total liability, which was limited to £1,700,000 sterling. It has since been ascertained as a result of actual invitations for tenders that the cost of the cable will exceed somewhat that amount, and it is estimated that the work under contract for the cable and its incidentals will call for the financing of about £2,000,000. Accordingly, the resolution enlarges the liability of the Dominion government from its percentage of the £1,700,000 as provided for in the Act of 1899, to the same percentage of a sum not exceeding £2,000,000 sterling.

It would be right for me to point out to the committee before it gives its sanction to this measure, that since the Act of 1899, some change has taken place in the conditions that existed when parliament sanctioned our entering into that arrangement. The Australasian colonies, or states as they would like to be called, own the telegraph lines, and of course that circumstance is a guarantee that a cable in which those states or any of them are interested, is sure to receive much business patronage through the governments of Australasia. Since the contract was signed on the 31st of December last, by the Imperial government, and by the other contracting parties for the construction of the cable on the 16th of January last, the state of New South Wales made an agreement with the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company, a cable company of great strength financially and otherwise, that is, I think, the only cable company connecting Australasia at the present time with Europe and the commercial world. That contract which I allude to, made two weeks after the conclusion of the contract

by the Imperial government and the other governments on behalf of the Pacific cable partners, grants to the Eastern Extension Cable Company, certain concessions and privileges practically in competition with the government of New South Wales in the carrying on of telegraph business within New South Wales. They therefore are given an advantage that they did not enjoy when we entered into the arrangement for competing for Australasian cable business. I do not know, had we a veto, that we would have insisted upon the government of New South Wales not making such a concession. Nevertheless, that concession has been made, and it seems to have some appreciable effect, I do not see to what extent, upon the financial success of the Pacific cable as a self-sustaining enterprise; and therefore, I deem it proper to call the attention of the committee to that fact before they give their sanction to this measure. It is of course too late, I recognize the fact, for us to recede should we desire to do so, because the contract has been signed by the various governments, and the work of the cable, I presume, is now under construction. I do not know that the concessions granted will have a damaging effect upon the financial result of the enterprise, at the same time I feel it my duty to bring the matter to the attention of the committee.

I would also say that instead of the money being borrowed as was contemplated in 1899 by the commission itself, and the various partner governments guaranteeing their respective shares, the Imperial government proposes to borrow the money, the various governments undertaking to bear their proper share of that Imperial loan. That circumstance does not at all affect the liability, it is only altering the machinery. In 1899, it was thought the money would be borrowed through the direct intervention of the commission, now it is going to be borrowed on the credit of the Imperial government, the various colonial governments guaranteeing to indemnify the Imperial government for the portions they respectively assume. These are, I think, the only material circumstances that have occurred since 1899, and I therefore move the resolution.

I wish to suggest one or two verbal changes. For example, I see they have left out the words 'therefore be it resolved.' Those words should go in just before section 1, after the words 'is willing to advance.' Then at the end of section 1, it is proposed to add the following words :

> And to pay amounts from time to time payable in respect of such guarantee out of any moneys forming part of the consolidated revenue funds of Canada.

There appears to be no uniform practice in legislation in this House for those words being in each money Act which authorizes payment. But inasmuch as any such liability would have to be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund, it seems to me that as a matter of correct drafting those words should always appear in measures of this kind for creating a statutory financial liability when it is not necessary or intended that there shall afterwards be a vote of parliament in order to meet the liability in question. In this particular case we might any day be called upon during a recess to pay our share of the sinking fund of the Imperial loan, and therefore the government of the day should have power to discharge its liability under the Act without having to wait for a vote of parliament.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not quite understand from the hon. gentleman the reason on account of which it is supposed that the sum of £2,000,000 instead of the sum of £1,700,000 will be required. I read the agreement which the hon. gentleman placed on the table of the House a few days ago, and I do not quite understand the bearing which it has on the resolution as now proposed. I see that the resolution really deals only with an increase in the amount. As the hon. gentleman brought it in, it seemed at first as if we were to guarantee something, which we did not propose to guarantee by the Act of 1899, because, in the first part of his resolution he refers to the Pacific Cable Act, 1899, as guaranteeing the principal only. Upon referring to the Pacific Cable Act, I find that by subsection 2 of that Act, the Governor in Council was authorized :

> —to guarantee payment of five-eighteenths of the said total principal of the said debentures, limited as aforesaid, and of interest as aforesaid on the said five-eighteenths.

The only difference is as between £1,700,000 and £2,000,000, this government guaranteeing five-eighteenths of both principal and interest on the increased sum.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is also a press clipping which has been placed in my hands, the meaning of which I do not quite understand. Possibly the hon. gentleman will be able to make perfectly clear to me what it does mean, if it is authentic. In the Canadian Gazette of the 22nd February, 1901, there is this reference to the scheme :

> The Melbourne Argus says that the Victorian government is communicating with the governments of Queensland and New Zealand with a view of forwarding a combined message to the Pacific cable board suggesting a joint purse undertaking with the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company.

I will pass this clipping across so that the hon. gentleman may read it and may inform us what is the exact meaning and bearing of that reference, if it is authentic.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, I thought, in connection with the motion that is now before the committee, that we would have had some statement from the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) in regard to the general policy of the government in connection with the telegraph system of this country. I thought he would have come forward here to-day and made a proposal to nationalize the telegraph system of Canada, in connection with this cable scheme. It has been shown that a system of cables, even when state-owned, unless the land lines are controlled by the state, will accomplish very little good, and the proof of that is instanced in the case of the Mackay-Bennett cable across the Atlantic ocean. A company was organized with a large capital, and it succeeded in establishing a first-class cable system across the Atlantic, between Great Britain and the United States, but the men interested in it found that in order to make that cable system an effective one, they had to own and control land lines, and the ally of the Mackay-Bennett cable is the Postal Telegraph system of the United States, which had to be organized and capitalized and a great deal of money spent in connection with it. I would like to see this Pacific cable scheme go through. I am quite prepared, and I know my constituents are quite prepared, to vote our portion of the money, but while we are doing that, I think the announcement ought to be made that in order to realize the benefit of that cable system, we should have a nationalized telegraph system in Canada, and make one the complement of the other A very important deliverance on that line was contained in a letter which Sir Sandford Fleming read the other day in this city, at the meeting of the British Empire League. Sir Sandford Fleming, after a most careful study of the question, and no man either in the old land or in America, has given more consideration to this question, makes this statement :

> In my open letters which have been published in England, Canada and Australia addressed to the Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, the Hon. Wm. Mulock and the Rt. Hon. Lord Hopetoun, it is pointed out that by nationalizing our telegraph service by land and sea the charges on messages to and from the most distant parts of the empire can be reduced to one-eighth or one-tenth the rates at present exacted.

Now, there is a most important statement, and I wish to call the attention of this House to the fact that a gentleman who is an expert in regard to telegraphic service, says that if you nationalize the cables and nationalize the land service telegraphs you will cut down the cost of cabling and of telegraphing to one-tenth of the rates we pay now. Just think of it ! It is practically saying that if you pay 25 cents for a message now, you will get a similar message transmitted for 2½ cents. I do not know that we will come to such a low point as that, but we will get a much better service than we have to-day at very much less money, if the cable and telegraph lines are nationalized. Sir Sandford Fleming has said it, and reports have been presented in Congress of the United States, and they all go to show that to be the fact. The land lines are nationalized in Great Britain and all over Europe ; we ought to be prepared to go at least as far as they have gone, and the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) ought to tell the country now that he has under consideration a proposition to nationalize the telegraph system of this country. What will be the cost of nationalizing the telegraph system of Canada and running it in connection with the post office, as is the case in Great Britain and in the Australian colonies ? It will cost a comparatively small amount of money, and what will be the result of it ? Cheap telegraphy removes a great deal of the trouble and inconvenience that are experienced by trade, by reason of distance and other conditions of that character, and if you have a national telegraph system in connection with the post office, you can run it cheaper than in any other way. In every little village you will be in a position to establish a post office and to pay a decent wage to a man who will conduct the post office, who will be an operator, and who will, if necessary, take charge of the telephone lines in that village. That will form a grand service, namely, the public will have the telephone, the telegraph and the post office, all in one building, and combining all those services under one man, to whom you will be able to pay a good salary and who will give good service. What can the telegraph lines do in the way of supplementing the service of the post office ? Trade will be largely increased and men will be able to do business in a country like Canada by telegraph instead of through the mails. If you can transmit twenty-five words for ten cents, look at the impetus that will be given to trade when a man can do all his correspondence, for instance, between Montreal and Vancouver, by telegraph. You cannot imagine how that will help business in this country. Take out of the way places, where there are only two or three mails in the week ; if you have a national telegraph system, bringing every little hamlet in the country into touch with the business centres, see what a convenience every business man in that hamlet will have People so situated will be in touch with everything outside and at a nominal cost The telegraph service of this country is the easiest thing of all to nationalize. We have heard a great deal about nationalizing the railways. That is a very expensive proposition, I have been told, but it is not such an expensive proposition to nationalize the telegraph lines.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. How much would it cost ?

Mr. MACLEAN. There are two ways in which you could do it. You could do it by duplicating the lines we have in Canada at probably less than $5,000,000—I am not speaking exactly as to that—or you could take over the lines that are in existence to-day, and there is a special provision in the Telegraph Act for that purpose.

There is another thing which I wish to urge as one of the great benefits that a national land and sea telegraph service renders to the public. We in this country, and all over the British Empire, are trying to build up an Imperial public opinion. We wish in Canada to think on all great public questions the same as they think in England or in Australia. There is only one way to create that great Imperial public opinion from one end of the empire to the other, and that is to have a national telegraph and cable system which will enable us to have the freest exchange of public opinion from one end of the British dominions to the other. The news that we get in Canada from England comes to-day through American channels. The Canadian press at this moment is hardly able to pay the present toll rates, and to give that quality of news to the Canadian public which they desire, and which the Canadian public ought to get. But, if we had a national cable system with a nominal rate for press messages at night, when the cable is not busy, our people would know in the morning exactly what they think in England, exactly what they think in Australasia and South Africa, and that news would be transmitted daily at almost a nominal cost. At all events, it would come to us independent of the United States. I have watched this thing very closely. I have seen the class of news that comes to the Canadian papers by way of New York. It is not British opinion, it is not Imperial opinion, but it is British opinion changed, modified and distorted in order to suit the people of the United States. The Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) proposes to do what the other colonies have done; he proposes to supplement what they have done, but he fails to do what they have done by nationalizing our land telegraph service in connection with this cable system. The hon. gentleman could well afford to take us into his confidence to-day and to, at least, tell us whether he is considering that proposition or not. Like everything else, when a national proposition comes before this country, we, unfortunately, take the worst end to begin with. I am in favour of this Pacific cable scheme, but I cannot help thinking that if we wanted to strike a first-class business proposition, it would be for Canada and Great Britain to lay down an Atlantic cable. There is any amount of business there, not for one but for five cables owned by Great Britain and Canada; a cable that would pay a big dividend, and probably cut the present rates down to one-quarter. That is the cable I would like to see first laid and operated by the mother country and Canada. But, unfortunately, as I have said, when anything national is to be done, the hardest end, and the most expensive end, is first experimented on. In the case of the Intercolonial Railway, we commenced to build it at the end, and through the northern portion of New Brunswick, and in the province of Quebec, where there was very little traffic, and when we got it just to the point where the traffic originated we stopped there. That was an extravagant railway proposition for Canada. Sir, I want to see state ownership applied to railways and to telegraphs, at that point where there is lots of traffic for the line, whether it be a cable, a telegraph, or a railway. In the present case we are asserting the principle of government ownership just where the conditions are least favourable. I am satisfied to take this meausre as it is to-day placed before us, but I hope the minister and the government will act in the light of the experience of the Mackay-Bennett cable, where they found their whole expense realized nothing until they established at great expense a system of land lines throughout the states. I say the government ought to tell us now whether they are going to have a really national system, which can only be achieved by their ownership of the land telegraph lines in Canada and a cable across the Atlantic. Let us have a state-owned cable from Great Britain to Canada; a state telegraph system in Canada, across the continent to the Pacific ocean, and a state-owned cable across the Pacific ocean to Australasia with the land lines in Australia also forming a link, and then you will have a really national system. We would then have an Imperial telegraph system that will give to the public, according to Sir Sandford Fleming, a service costing about one-tenth of what it costs at present. I believe the statement of Sir Sandford Fleming is correct in that respect. I believe that the Postmaster General thinks it is correct, and if he does believe it, I hope he will move on these lines. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that in this proposition he is up against the greatest monopoly almost in the world to-day, viz., the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company. This monopoly will cut the throat of this scheme if it can possibly do it. It may be a competitor with the Postmaster General in getting hold of the land telegraph lines in Canada. If that great company in London thought they could block this scheme, that is one of the first things they would try to accomplish. I do not say they can do so, but, at all events, at every point the Postmaster General will be met by that great corporation trying to block this proposition. In this proposal the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) has my entire sympathy, and I believe he has the sympathy of the whole of Canada. The government here is moving

on the same lines as the Imperial authorities and as the Australian authorities, but in one sense they are lacking, and that is, that they are not making provision for the nationalization of the land telegraph lines in Canada, and they are not making provision for a state-owned Atlantic cable between the mother land and Canada in connection with which there is the most money to be earned.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition called my attention to an item which appeared in the Canada Gazette, of February 21 last, containing a suggestion from the Melbourne Argus, that there was some idea afloat for the constitution of a joint court as between the Pacific cable commission and the Eastern Extension Company. There is no danger whatever of any such agreement as that. It can only be carried out with the consent of the Pacific Cable Commission and of the various governments concerned. I am quite satisfied that the commission which is sitting in London, and which is entrusted by the various governments with the carrying out of this scheme, would never dream of being parties to such an agreement except on the authority of their principals, the respective governments that have appointed them. You may be sure that the people of Canada will be taken into full confidence and consulted before any such arrangement as that is made.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition also asked me how this increase from $1,700,000 to $2,000,000 was arrived at. Since the Act of 1899 tenders were invited, but, as we know, it is one thing to estimate the cost and another to find out what the contractor will do the work for. In 1899, we proceeded upon the report of the Pacific Cable Commission, which, in 1894 and 1897, furnished the various governments with estimates.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Were not tenders asked ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, tenders were invited, and I have a list of the tenders here, if my hon. friend desires to see them. It was all done through the commission in England, and the various governments were consulted, and on the advice of all parties concerned, a contract was entered into which it was thought was the best to make, having reference to all the tenders. I will place that contract on the table.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You misunderstand me. I believe the estimate of $1,700,000 was based on tenders received at that time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the reason for the difference ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think that you could call these real tenders. There was an inquiry made as to what it would cost, and a sort of tentative tendering took place. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) asks why the increase ? I think it may be accounted for in two ways. First, I think their specifications call for a cable with more copper core than was contemplated in the original specifications. There has also been a slight increase in the cost of materials. For these reasons the contract for the construction of the cable amounts to-day to £1,795,000 ; and the balance of the £2,200,000 is for incidentals which will in all probability turn up in connection with the scheme. For example, it will be necessary to have a repair ship stationed in Canadian waters and a repair ship in Australian waters. There are also some expenditures for surveys incurred by the commission. We have been asked by the Imperial government to accept that round sum as affording a sufficient margin for carrying on the enterprise.

With reference to what my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) said, that this scheme does not go far enough, in that it does not provide for the nationalizing of Canadian telegraph land lines and an Atlantic cable system, those matters do not form any essential part of this Pacific cable scheme, but at the same time they are very proper subjects for discussion by the people of Canada themselves ; and if my hon. friend favours, as he does, the nationalizing of the cables and telegraphs, then he is quite consistent in approving of this as an instalment of that work, and I know it has his hearty endorsement. If this were the proper occasion for it, I would give some views of my own, which might be of very little value, but which are the result of some inquiries on the very question to which my hon. friend has referred ; but I am afraid that I would be diverting the discussion from the real question before us.

Mr. MACLEAN. You might give a squint.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know that I can add anything further.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. gentleman tell us at what stage of progress this work is now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The contract calls for the completion of the work by the 31st of December, 1902. It is then to be in full working order.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). To whom has the contract been given for the construction of this work ? Is it not to the Eastern Extension Company, which has the rival lines to South Africa and Australia ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The contract is with the Telegraph Construction and Maintenance Company, Limited, doing business at 38 Old Broad street, London, England.

Mr. MACLEAN. Who is the president of that company ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not the faintest idea.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). Is not that practically the same company as the Eastern Extension Company ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). I would call the minister's attention to that, and I think he should see that this line does not fall under the control of the Eastern Extension Company.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It cannot get under its control without the consent of the government.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I may inform the hon. gentleman that this is the company which laid the old Atlantic cable.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It seems to me that we have too large an interest in this undertaking to go on with such a very heavy expenditure without knowing whether or not the allegation just made is correct. If it be a fact that the Eastern Extension Cable Company have the contract to lay our cable, they certainly have in their hands great power to control its destinies in the future. I think that in the interest of Canada the hon. minister ought to be able to give us some further information in regard to that.

Mr. MACLEAN. I might point out that this company is so strong that it not only controls the Eastern Extension Cable Company in the matter of cables, but it has cornered every steamship and factory that can be employed not only in the manufacture but in the laying of cables ; so that if we did not make a contract with them to-day, the probability is that we would not get a cable for years, until the factories could be got ready to produce the necessary material. There is a practical monopoly in both the manufacture and the laying of cables, and this company controls that monopoly. So that there is every reason why the minister in charge of the project should see that the interests of the country and the interests of the empire are protected. This great monopoly, as I told him before, will try at every stage to balk the building of this line and its completion within the proper time ; and I trust that the minister will tell us that there is a strong penalty clause in the contract for the completion of the work within the specified time. If there is not such a clause, this great monopoly will attempt to balk the line and do everything they can to prevent its realization.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). I am very glad indeed that we can at last assure ourselves that the cable is a reality. I am sorry to learn that one of the colonies, New South Wales, thought fit to vary the terms under which the land lines should be worked after the agreement between the colonies and Great Britain had been signed. To some extent that may affect the working of the cable ; but it is well, I think, that the matter, has been closed, and I should judge that after this no other colony will enter into an agreement with a rival company, which would render its own liability greater. With regard to the increased cost over the estimate, I think that is quite natural, because materials have advanced in price, rubber especially. With regard to letting the contract to a company which has more or less interest in the Eastern Extension Cable Company, I understand that that can hardly be helped, because that company has practically a monopoly of the work of laying cables, and if you advertised for tenders for the work, and that company did not get the contract, I dare say that it would advance the price of rubber and other materials to such an extent as to increase the cost of the cable by 40 per cent or 50 per cent. This is a construction company, I understand, and under their contract they must hand over the cable to the government. It is a very wealthy company. I do not see any ground for fear that the fact of their having the contract for laying the cable will give them any control over it afterwards. For my part, I am delighted at the prospect of having the Pacific cable laid within the period named.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is there a penalty clause in the contract ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The contract calls for payments as the cable is manufactured. It is to be made in three sections, and as it is made the government pays for it. There is a certain sum reserved, which is to be paid for the laying. So that it is like a contract for goods which are delivered and paid for as the work goes on.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is there a penalty for the performance of the work within the specified time ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think there is a penalty. I will send the contract to the hon. gentleman, so that he can see it.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. minister should not ask us to go on with this unless there is a penalty provided for securing the completion of the contract within a certain time. I do not want to see the contract. The minister ought to be in a position to tell us what it contains.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not draw the contract.

Mr. EDWARD HACKETT (Price West, P.E.I.) In these days of steam and electricity, I am in favour of our keeping pace with the progress of other countries in these lines, and am therefore not opposed to the building of this Pacific cable telegraph line. But we ought to guard ourselves against anything in the shape of a monopoly. In Prince Edward Island we are suffering because of a monopoly established there some fifty years ago, when a small cable, nine miles in length, was laid between Cape Tormentine, N.B., and Cape Traverse, P.E.I., On every message which we send to any part of Canada outside of the island we have to pay twenty-five cents extra to this cable company for the transmission of the message over that short line. Last year this matter was discussed by the hon. the Minister of Marine, who stated that there was no monopoly. I do not know what the hon. gentleman has done since then to have this matter ventilated, but at all events we are still under the same old monopoly. What we object to is not so much the twenty-five cents we have to pay for the use of this cable, as to the fact that those people close their doors at eight o'clock in the evening and only open them at eight in the morning so that there is no telegraphic communication with the mainland during the night time whatever. And last year when our young men were away fighting in South Africa for the old empire, their friends in Prince Edward Island were unable to hear from them at times unless they got the news over this cable. I would press the necessity therefore on the hon. minister of guarding against anything in the shape of a monopoly in connection with this new cable scheme. I would ask also the hon. the Minister of Marine to tell us what has been done in the way of remedying this great evil in Prince Edward Island of which I complain, and under which the people there are labouring to-day. The people of Canada are paying this company a subsidy of $2,000 a year for this telegraphic communication, and you will understand that deprived, as we have been the present session, during some eight or ten days, of a mail service from Prince Edward Island, we should at least have the advantage of cheap telegraphic communication with that province. But instead we are taxed twenty-five cents each message for the use of that short cable. I would ask the hon. the Minister of Marine what he is doing to relieve the people from this great monopoly and unjust tax.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). The subject of telegraphic communication with Prince Edward Island is somewhat alien to that now before the House, but I have no objection to saying that the opinion I gave last year, namely, that there is no monopoly in the present Anglo-American Cable Company between Prince Edward Island and the mainland I still entertain. The hon. gentleman seems to think that for some reason or other I have changed that opinion. I never have had any reason to change it. The present cable communication is maintained by the company, or its successor, which had the contract when we came into confederation in 1873. By the terms of confederation the Dominion was obliged to pay to that company the same yearly subvention that was paid by the island before confederation, and we have continued to do so ever since. The charges exacted by the Anglo-American Company upon the people of the island are, in my opinion, extortionate and excessive. I have never failed at any time to tell the Anglo-American Company that such is my opinion. I have been in communication with them for over twelve months, and there is a vast amount of correspondence, which I would be very happy, at the proper time, to lay before the House, my object being to have the charges which the company make against the people of the island, and those who have telegraphic communication with them, reduced to a reasonable amount. At present negotiations are going on with another large cable company, with the object of inducing it to extend a competitive line to Prince Edward Island, and in the present state of the negotiations I do not wish to say anything which would give rise to controversy. It may be that these negotiations will be successful, or they may not, but whatever can be done is being done by myself and my colleagues to give the people of the island fair play in the matter of telegraphic communication. If, when the matter is fairly before the House, my hon. friend desires to discuss it, I will be happy to discuss it with him, but I do not think this is the proper time to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the hon. the minister is scarcely exercising business shrewdness in connection with this transaction. We are paying out a large sum of money in a haphazard way. We will imagine for the moment that it was desirable for the Dominion to build another railway as a competitor with the Canadian Pacific Railway, what would the people of Canada think if the government should give the building of that competing line to the Canadian Pacific Railway themselves, and make no provision as to when the contract should

be completed or the quality of the stuff put into the line. One could hardly call that shrewd business dealing. If the contract be given to the Eastern Cable Company, which will be the great competitor of this line, we will be committing the same mistake. True the line is to be finished in December, 1902, but there is no penalty attached to the non-fulfilment of that condition, and therefore the construction may go on indefinitely, and we will have no redress. It will be decidedly to the advantage of the Eastern Extension Cable Company to delay the construction, because every month's delay means a very substantial profit to them. I think there is scarcely sufficient information to justify paying out the money.

On section 2,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before this is passed, I may say that it might possibly have been better to have had a penalty in this contract, but the absence of a penalty would not prevent the recovery of damages. The company have contracted to do the work within a particular time, and will be liable in damages if they fail to do so; but as the government is really a party to the contract—I observe that Lord Strathcona has executed it on the part of the Dominion—it might be well to consider the suggestion of the hon. member for West York.

Mr. MACLEAN. That contract is not yet completed, it is subject to revision. There will be suggestions made in various parts of the empire. And I think that, before he authorizes anything further, the hon. minister should consult his co-contractors and have them unitedly insert a penalty clause. The company may not be of such a character that you can recover from them. While the liability may be there, there may not be assets sufficient or of a character to indemnify this country if they do not perform. And even money will not pay for the inconvenience the empire may be put to in this matter. If it is not too late I make the suggestion now that the hon. gentleman should consult his co-signatories and have some provision made for the insertion of a penalty clause.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). I would take the liberty of suggesting—while I do not think it possible to amend the contract, it being already signed—that it is, nevertheless, possible to exercise due precaution that the material of which the cable is made shall be the very best. During the recent South African war, almost weekly one or other of the cables broke. If this Pacific cable breaks, it means at least two or three months and possibly more before it can be resurrected and put in working order. If the Eastern Extension Co. is the concern to manufacture the cable and if they have secured a monopoly of the construction of all the cables in the British Empire we must not treat them differently from any other monopolists. If it is in the interest of their other lines that this cable should break periodically, we may reasonably expect that the cable will break. I would suggest that engineers should be appointed to see to it that both the manufacture of the cable and the laying of it should be properly done.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It has taken many years for the various governments to arrive at the present stage in connection with this cable; and it is to be borne in mind that, in consequence of the long distances that separate these governments, it is not so easy as between man and man to debate and settle terms and embody them in a contract. In this particular instance, our cousins from the Antipodes have their delegates in London as we have also, while the representatives of the Imperial government are there, of course. These together constitute a board to which is entrusted the practical carrying out of this scheme; and they have, in their wisdom, prepared this contract. I have no doubt, after supplying themselves with expert information as to the sufficiency of the specifications. The original specifications were prepared upon the advice of Lord Kelvin—such is the statement in the report of the Pacific Cable Commission of 1884 and 1887. I know of no higher authority on electrical matters than Lord Kelvin. We may assume from the composition of the board that the specifications are equal to the requirements of the occasion. With reference to the action of New South Wales, I may say that what they have agreed to is much less harmful than what was originally proposed. They originally proposed to grant these concessions at once, and that would have given the Eastern Extension Telegraph Co. many years of a start in gathering business throughout New South Wales. But, as the result of protests continued throughout many months, they finally yielded that point and the concessions to be granted to New South Wales cannot be enjoyed until the Pacific cable is an accomplished fact. Though, as I have said, they entered into that contract sixteen days after the contract for the construction, still, the negotiations leading up to it had been continued for a length of time.

Section agreed to.

Resolutions reported and agreed to.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 45) to amend the Pacific Cable Act of 1899.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—PAY OF COLONIAL TROOPS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that the notice of motion to be discussed to-day by the request of the Minister of Militia (Hon. Mr. Borden, King's), who is ill, is held over. However, I will take the opportunity for calling the attention of the government and the House to a statement which appears in the London Times of February 22nd last :

PAY FOR SOUTH AFRICAN SERVICES.

Mr. W. Redmond asked the Financial Secretary to the War Office if he could state how many men of the rank and file in South Africa are receiving in pay or in pay and allowances as much as five shillings a day, and to what regiments they belong.

Lord Stanley. I am unable to give the details asked for. I may state that the Imperial Yeomanry, Imperial Bushmen and the majority of the colonial corps are paid at this rate. In cases in which a lower rate of pay has been issued to colonials it has been supplemented by the different colonial governments.

Mr. W. Redmond. Can the noble lord state why the colonial troops are paid at a rate so much higher than that paid to the regular army? Would they not come otherwise?

I do not wish to discuss this matter, but I wish it placed on record so that the attention of the Minister of Militia and the government may be drawn to the fact that the English understanding of the matter is that all colonial troops have been paid at the rate of five shillings a day. We are aware that there is dissatisfaction existing among some of our Canadian soldiers because some have been paid up to five shillings a day, and others have not been paid up to that figure. I shall not discuss the question further than to say that when the first Canadian contingent went to South Africa, they went on the understanding that they were to get one shilling a day. It was not, as is suggested in this report, that they required high pay to induce them to go out and fight for the empire. I think, possibly, all round, it is a mistake if this pay has been increased in one case and not in another. It will give rise to general dissatisfaction. When I first brought up this point, I was clear in taking the ground that the various localities sending these troops should have nothing to do with paying them, that the Imperial authorities alone should have in their control all the payment of these contingents. I merely lay the matter before the First Minister in order that the question of equality of pay all round may come under the consideration of the government.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

Public Buildings—Ottawa Military Buildings—New store $25,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). The sum of $10,000 is asked to fit up what is known as the Seybold building. I have been obliged to rent that building for census purposes. There was no other building available, and my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, came to me and said I must find a building. It has to be fitted up with a new heating system, we have to make partitions and build an elevator, and so on, and for these purposes the sum of $10,000 has been asked from me by the chief architect. We have rented it for three years, at the rate of $3,500 per year. The chief architect, who has charge of that work, has looked all over the town, and cannot find a better building.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a very large rent. What means were taken to see whether there were other buildings available ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect would naturally have charge of that kind of work, and he looked all over the town. I may say that I myself consulted real estate agents, and looked all over the town, and could find no other building.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What other offers were made ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No other offer was made for that kind of building.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was there any public notice given that such rooms were desired ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, we did not advertise, it would have been of no use, because the city is not very large.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand the hon. gentleman says that he and his chief official went privately through the town ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy minister and the chief architect, who both of them have charge of that work, looked all over the town and could not find any other building.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What were the names of the real estate agents that the hon. gentleman consulted ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A number of them, I cannot remember their names. I know the chief architect told me he had looked all over the town and could not find anything better.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman stated that real estate agents were consulted.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I remember right, I spoke to Taggart & Son, and I also asked several other people. I think I spoke to Ahearn & Soper.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If I understand the hon. gentleman, this building, for which he is paying $3,500 a year, was the only building available for the purpose in the city of Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. I may say that I have also consulted with my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, whose officers have also looked over the ground.

Mr. BENNETT. Are any changes made in the building, and who is to pay for the repairs and for the changes, and what will be their extent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are going to make partitions and repairs, and this sum of money is asked precisely for that object. I was going to say that my colleague and his officials looked after other buildings, and, in point of fact, this was the only one they could find available for that purpose.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the amount required for making the repairs and alterations ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect is asking $10,000 for those purposes.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand the building in question is on the north-west corner of O'Connor and Sparks streets, a large three-storey stone building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it was formerly occupied as a wholesale house. Now, the minister comes down with a statement that seems rather large, that $10,000 is to be expended on this building in fitting it up for offices. May I ask the minister if he has a building which adjoins the Rideau Club, known as one of the Nagle buildings, and is now occupied by the Customs Department ? What is the lease of that building, and who paid for the repairs on that building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy minister tells me that we are paying a rental of $1,800 for the building occupied by the Department of Customs. I just stated that this building on Sparks street we had rented for three years ; we have got an option to keep the building.

Mr. WALLACE. I should think so, for that rent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think my hon. friend could do any better. My officials and the officials of the Department of Agriculture have looked all over the ground themselves. We are free to keep it for three years only, or to keep it for any length of time. The census work could not be postponed, and I had to find a building.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman happen to know what that building cost a couple of years ago ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could not say.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The rent would pay for the building in four years.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the cost of the repairs on the Nagle building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed by the deputy minister that we spent about $5,000 on repairs.

Mr. BENNETT. As I understand the Minister of Public Works has been making recently two deals in renting premises. The first one with which he seems to have started in is what is known as the Nagle building, adjoining the Rideau Club. I have heard it said in town that that property belonged to the estate of the late Mr. Nagle. There are two buildings there, and if my recollection is correct, I heard that the two buildings were offered for sale for $12,000. Now, under the circumstances, it seems startling. Two buildings are offered for $12,000, and apparently there is very little difference between them in point of appearance, and I presume in point of value ; yet, in face of that, assuming, for the sake of argument, they are both of the same value, what do we find the minister has done ? He has taken a building that is offered for $6,000, and he has expended no less a sum than $5,000 upon it in repairs. He says he pays $1,800 rent for it, therefore he is paying to the owners of the property the modest income of 30 per cent on what they purchased it for themselves. Then, in addition to that, he has improved the building to the tune of $5,000. Now, if we are to judge other cases by this one—I do not know myself, I have heard no estimate of the value of the so-called Seybold building, but it is fair to assume there is an equally bad arrangement in the interests of the country. Now, if the minister, as he announces, is going to spend $10,000 in improving this Seybold building, I think, before the committee votes him that money, it would be well to consider whether that investment should be made. In the first place, if the sum of $10,000 was spent on this building in what is known as the third storey or the garret. There would be for all time to come in this property a large number of rooms which might serve the purpose of these census enumerators. It is well for the House to consider whether or

not this large investment should be made, of spending $10,000 on improvements, and then to pay this large rental, $3,500, for the next three years. I would ask the hon. minister to consider whether it would not be better to spend this large sum of $10,000 in improving the third storey of the building here, so that after it had been used by the census staff it might be available for other purposes of a public nature.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Seybold building had been offered for $12,000 ?

Mr. BENNETT. No, I said that the two Nagle buildings, near the Rideau Club, were sold at $12,000. The hon. minister is having the use of one of these buildings, and a fair price of that will be $6,000, yet on that building, which was offered for $6,000, the minister has expended $5,000. I think that is correct, according to his statement, and it shows that on this $6,000 investment he is paying 30 per cent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect and the deputy minister tell me that they have never heard of any such offer as $12,000 for the building that was rented last year. But what has been done last year has been done last year. We are discussing an item of $10,000 to be spent on the Seybold building.

Mr. BENNETT. Who owns the Seybold building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is owned by Mr. Seybold.

Mr. BENNETT. Any others ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the hon. minister know if it is owned by Messrs. Seybold & Russell, and that Mr. Russell is the collector at the port of Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All I know is that I have only to deal with Mr. Seybold. Last year we were short of space. I tried to buy the building, and Mr. Seybold asked $100,000.

Mr. BENNETT. You did not give it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I did not give it. When I came back after the election, I found myself confronted with the fact that it was necessary to have a building for the census. I had no choice because that building was the only one available for that purpose. It was large enough, and it was the only one available.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose Mr. Russell was the only one available for the collectorship of customs. I understand that formerly Messrs. Seybold & Russell occupied this building. Mr. Russell gets out into the collectorship of customs. That was not put up to tender. I suppose he was the only suitable man for the position. Then Mr. Seybold is dealt with by way of this lease, and he has the only suitable building for the purpose, so that Messrs. Seybold & Russell have been singularly favoured. It may be, as the hon. gentleman says, necessary that all that should be done, but I am glad it does not happen every day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let us come straight to the point. We were short of a building. I am obliged to pay rentals that I should not be obliged to pay. There is only one way of avoiding it, and that is by erecting another building. We are short of buildings. The business is extending. We cannot take the census without having a large staff of officers, and we must locate them somewhere.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do nothing more than express my amazement. It may be that it was possible, as the hon. minister says, for his officers or himself to get a suitable office to accommodate the men who will be employed in this special work except under these extraordinary terms. They are most extraordinary. Whether the original cost of the building was what has been mentioned or not, the rental is enormous, although the hon. gentleman says that with all the efforts made by himself and his officers, he could get no other building that was suitable. There is this amount of $3,500 a year for three years, and there is this proposal to spend $10,000, or possibly more, on the building, all for the benefit of the owner of the property. It is an unusual and a most extraordinary transaction.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). Mr. Speaker, I may say that at the time the requirements in regard to the census were first brought up last fall, the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was not in Ottawa. I consulted with the gentleman who is in charge of the census as to the requirements for the census work. I then asked him, in conjunction with the chief architect of the Public Works Department, to see if a place could be found in the city to suit these requirements. As my hon friend knows very well, there must be a large staff of clerks engaged in the tabulation of the returns of the census, and that work will last probably for two or three years. These people have to be accommodated in a convenient way, and together. You cannot scatter them in different buildings. The accommodation required was very difficult to find. As a matter of fact, after considerable investigation there were only two buildings to be found which were at all suitable. One was in some

rooms in a building known as the Slater block on Sparks street, and the other was this Seybold building. The Seybold building was a very much more convenient chamber and more suitable for the work, and I therefore asked the hon. Minister of Public Works to try and secure that building on such terms as he could. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) spoke of the value of the building and said that it was worth $12,000.

Mr. BENNETT. No, it was another one.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Well, I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I went over that building completely, and I venture to say that the building alone, to say nothing at all about the land or its situation, or any adventitious value which may be attached to it, could not be erected for less than $60,000, to-day, in Ottawa. Of course, buildings of that class are difficult to find for this purpose, and one must expect to pay a little more than the ordinary rate of interest on the investment in the building. I think the rent required was not out of the way, in view of the circumstances. As to the improvements which are necessary and for which this vote is asked, no matter what building we might take, a large amount must be spent to provide the necessary accommodation, and to make it suitable for these men to work in. We cannot get, in a building erected for ordinary purposes, accommodation suitable for public offices and public work. A large portion of this expenditure will be incurred in providing heating apparatus in the building, which does not belong to the owners, and would not go back to the people who owned the building. It is necessary to heat it for those who will be employed there and a large portion of the expenditure will be for heating.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And to buy furniture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, furniture and desks.

Mr. WALLACE. We are getting a little more of this so-called information. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) tells us now that it was he who did the work of getting this building.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I did not say so.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr Tarte) had just told us that he had scurried all over town examining other buildings. He added that his officers had done this and that so that if anything is wrong his officers can come in for a share of the blame. He was asked if he had consulted the real estate agents, but he rather scurried around that question. Why did he not consult those men who carry on the real estate business and ascertain what suitable places there were available in Ottawa, so as to save himself from all this racing around the city that he had to do in order to secure this building, which we now learn was recommended by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and which was right under their noses and before their very doors ? They are giving $3,500 rent for a building which was sold a few years ago, I am told, for $20,000 at a mortgage sale, and they are giving it to one of their political friends in accordance with the doctrine recently laid down by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon Sir Louis Davies), who told us that when any good thing was going, they were going to give it to their friends.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. So we will.

Mr. WALLACE. They are very generous with their political friend, Mr. Seybold, in this arrangement, and so they are carrying out the doctrine laid down by the minister (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). A few years ago, when the Langevin block was erected the officials did not half occupy the building.

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh.

Mr. WALLACE. The First Minister laughs.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, this is a free country.

Mr. WALLACE. We then moved the Patent office into the Langevin block and gave it four times as much space as it formerly occupied, but since the Liberal government came into power they moved it out again, and they also moved out the Department of Indian Affairs, and yet they have not enough room for the scores of their political friends they are appointing to office. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) tells us that they are out every day hunting around Ottawa for buildings to rent in order to accommodate the friends of theirs they are crowding into office. This is the economical government that is doing this. I remember how they used to denounce the Conservatives for filling up the department with useless officials ; but now they are appointing double the number themselves. They are renting all the buildings around town for the accommodation of these useless public officials. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) laughs at that, but he will laugh at the wrong side of his mouth when he begins to explain this to the people of Canada.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is very laughable, too.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, it is very laughable to think that hundreds of thousands of dollars, the money of the people is being squandered on favourites of the government in

accordance with the doctrine laid down by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. They complained that the Conservatives appointed too many officials, but the Liberals have appointed scores and hundreds since they came into power, and the Minister of Public Works tells us that he is running around Ottawa looking for buildings to accommodate them. That is a nice condition of affairs, and the country will demand to know more about it than the ministers have yet deigned to explain.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) knows perfectly well that this building is for the accommodation of the census staff, which is not a permanent addition to the public service.

Mr. WALLACE. They will be permanent for three years.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) was a member of the Conservative government which took six years to finish the census which we hope to finish in three. The hon. gentleman, who was Controller of Customs, also knows well that accommodation was required for the statistical service which has been brought to Ottawa recently, but which formerly was conducted in different parts of the country, and that staff is no addition to the public service.

Mr. WALLACE. Indeed it is, and I give the minister notice that we will investigate it a little later on.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When the investigation comes, it will be found that what I say is true.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is clear from the statements made by the ministers themselves that they are to-day paying more in the way of rental and for improvements on these rented buildings, than would meet the interest on the outlay for the erection of a first-class building which would belong to the government. As it is at present we are simply making improvements for the landlords. It is bad financing, and the government cannot justify this extravagance. If a building is needed to accommodate the public employees then the government should come forward with a proposition to erect, and that proposal would be more in the line of good financing.

Mr. POPE. What about jobs for their friends ?

Mr. MACLEAN. They would have more accommodation for their friends than they have to-day, and the country would still save money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In point of fact that may be true, but the census work had to be done and I could not help myself.

Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Agriculture stated that the last census took six years to complete. The census was taken in 1891 and the general elections were held in 1896, five years afterwards. Was the census not completed when this government came into power?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There were some of the census staff still in my office and I dismissed them.

Mr. TAYLOR. Were they still doing census work ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were working still on census work, as far as I know. They were on the census staff and I suppose they were working at census work.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the census work was not completed, why were they dismissed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because I closed it down.

Mr. TAYLOR. If I remember correctly, every volume of the census returns was printed and published one or two years before the election. If it took six years to finish the census, that would bring it down to 1897. That statement can hardly be correct. Now, I will ask the minister where was the work of the 1891 census done ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was done in the Langevin block to a large extent; not altogether.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, the entire census staff was accommodated in the Langevin block, and the Patent branch and the model room were in that building at the same time. When this government came into power they went to their friends and hired a building for the Patent office and the model room, and they left the upper flat of the Langevin block vacant. I ask the minister what takes the place of those departments in the Langevin block now ? How have they managed to fill it up, and to rent buildings from their friends besides. I think the work was completed in 1892 ; but what has been done in these two flats ? Have the departments over there increased the staff so much in four or five years that they have filled up two flats of the Langevin block with new officials ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. One of the great difficulties I have is to find enough room for the work performed by the different departments. I have been obliged during the last year or two to fit up the attic of the Langevin block for the Indian Department.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Indian Department is in the Eastern block.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Part of it. It also occupies the whole upper

story of the Langevin block. If my hon. friend will be kind enough to look over that building, he will find that there is no available room. My hon. friend is a reasonable man, and he knows that the business of this country has increased vastly. For instance, the business of the Department of the Interior has trebled. The business of the Department of Public Works has doubled. He knows very well that a business man cannot do a business of $500,000 in the same building in which ten years before he was doing a business of only $25,000.

Mr. WALLACE. Is that the difference between the past and the present?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not quite so much, but it is a vast difference, and that is why we have to have more officials and more room. It is no pleasure to me to rent offices in Ottawa.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). It seems to me that there is something in the nature of very bad management in this transaction. The minister says that he made an effort to buy the Seybold property, and got a price on it. He said he was asked $100,000 for the property, and did not take it. The people of Canada would have been better off if he had taken it. The government can borrow money at something under 3 per cent; but he is paying 3½ per cent per annum on $100,000——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Only for three years.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). And in addition to that he is spending 3½ per cent per annum for repairs and charges.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And furniture.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). So that for three years to come he is going to spend 7 per cent on $100,000, twice the amount it would cost the people of Canada if he had bought the property. But, surely it would not be necessary to pay $100,000 for it. The property was sold a short time ago for $20,000, and surely it would have been possible for the government to have taken possession of it under expropriation proceedings. Then it would have been the subject of arbitration, and would probably have been got for $30,000 or $40,000; and, besides, all the improvements made on it would have become the property of the people of Canada. If, as the hon. gentleman says, the government are pressed to find accommodation for the increased number of public servants who are coming here, it strikes me that he should look a little further ahead, and realize what every member of parliament realizes before he is here three months, namely, that the accommodation provided for parliament and the public officials is perfectly inadequate. He should not wait until real estate advances to an extravagant figure. Intelligent management on the part of the Minister of Public Works would have dictated that he should have advised his colleagues to proceed at once to secure such real estate within the neighbourhood of the public buildings as would give the government of Canada accommodation not only for the present but for the future. I should think a scheme which would involve the purchase of the whole block between Metcalfe and O'Connor streets and Wellington and Sparks streets would be a capital investment. The minister would deserve more commendation if, instead of pursuing a piecemeal policy, involving vast expense to the country, he would formulate some proper business-like scheme which would give to parliament and the officials the accommodation they must have, not only for the present, but for years to come.

Mr. SPROULE. I am afraid that the same practice obtains in some of the departments as we find about this House. During the last few years, since hon. gentlemen opposite came into office, we find in every portion of this building, both downstairs and upstairs, where rooms were available a few years ago for the use of members, there are none available to-day. What has become of them? They have been taken for the accommodation of the additional employees engaged by the party for the time being in power, until we find all the rooms practically occupied by a few officials. I presume it is the same in the different departments, and thus we find the government renting buildings here and there and filling them up with the army which they are employing to do the work of the country. I wonder what will be the case when we get through with taking the census. It will be an interesting sight to see what accommodation will have to be provided for that army in the work to be done a few months hence. I think it is time we called a halt. Members of parliament find it difficult to get a seat anywhere around here to do their private work. Rooms which were available a short time ago are not available to-day. They are taken up by the Speaker of the House or the Deputy Speaker or by some employees, and members of parliament who come to do the business of the country are told, You have no interest in these rooms or control over them; they belong to us. They are controlled by the Speaker, or the Sergeant-at-arms, or some other official, and we are denied the use of these rooms—for the business we are called here to do. A few years ago the members of the opposition had seven rooms; but three of them were taken away this year, and were given either to the friends of ministers, or to some employees. We had formerly a large general room downstairs, which was at one time used as a drinking room; but we cannot use it any longer. If a member wants to bring a private secretary here to

do any work, he has no place to go. Sometimes he is told to go to the library, and the library people tell us, You have no right to bring these people here. And there is no place else to take them. I think that the same thing is going on with regard to other departments. They are being filled up by a large army of employees, friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, whom they are pensioning on the country for many years to come. Hence comes the necessity for renting other buildings and paying very high rents—rents out of all proportion to the value of the buildings. If it is necessary that we should have these buildings, they can be purchased for a very moderate sum. Instead of renting them at the figures we are doing, we should rather buy them and save paying such large rents.

But I am told that we do not need them at all, and I presume, if ordinary economy were exercised, they would not be required. The country has not developed to such an extent in the meantime, and the work of the department has not developed to such an extent that we should require to rent new buildings for the public service.

Mr. BENNETT. In view of the high-handed manner in which the hon. minister acted in the past when he rented the Nagle building, we ought to know what he is doing at present. In that case the Minister of Public Works rented a building which was sold for $6,000, and after spending $5,000 on it in repairs, he paid a rental of $1,800 per year. It is true that that matter is not under discussion, but in the item before the House the minister is paying $3,500 a year for a building and spending $10,000 on it for repairs, and that building was sold a few years ago for $20,000. Capitalizing the rent paid, that would mean that this building is to-day worth over $60,000, and yet it was sold at public auction for $20,000.

What are the facts? A few years ago, when the census was taken and when all the public officials were occupying the present building, there was still ample room for the census staff, and to-day the Minister of Agriculture has rooms rented on Sparks street, to which he has transferred a number of the patent officials and the models, so that there is more room to-day in the Langevin block than there was ten years ago. It is nothing short of an outrage to ask us to pay $3,500 a year for the next three years for this building and spend $10,000 in repairing it, and if this vote passes, every bit of repairs done will be done by day labour and not by contract under competition, just as the hon. minister has work done from time to time on other public buildings. The hon. gentleman has been deliciously frank to-day, and the reason we have not far to seek. He has been thwarted in his idea. He never wanted to rent a building, but wanted to build another large departmental block, and now that he has been foiled in that design by his colleagues, the House is getting the benefit of his revenge in all these details which he has given.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman has re-stated that this building is worth about $20,000.

Mr. BENNETT. I ventured no such opinion, but I said it was sold at public auction for $20,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would like to know on what occasion that was and how much mortgage was assumed at the time by the purchaser. If the hon. gentleman will undertake to get any valuator in Ottawa to value that building alone, without the land, as it stands, at less than $50,000, I would be very much surprised.

Mr. WALLACE. Did the government take any such precaution?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not aware that they did. That is a matter which concerns the Public Works Department. The hon. gentleman went on to make other statements which were wider of the mark than many others. He said that the Minister of Agriculture had moved a lot of his staff down to another building in Sparks street with a lot of models. There is not a member of the staff in that building.

Mr. BENNETT. Why does the hon. gentleman allow all those beautiful models to be unprotected by his staff?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is a caretaker there from the Department of Public Works who keeps that room as he used to do the room in the Langevin block when the models were there. As soon as we get possession of the Seybold building, that room can be given up and the rent saved and we can deduct the rent of that room and the room adjoining, occupied by the Public Works Department, from the rent of the Seybold building.

As to the work in the Langevin block, the hon. gentleman does not understand what occurred after the fire in what is known as our western departmental building. At the time there was a large number of clerks in the public service, accommodated in the attic of the western block. We all know the deplorable loss that we suffered from that fire. We found that the attic was practically a fire-trap and that it would not be proper to allow public records and papers and men engaged in public works to continue in such rooms. The same condition was found to exist in the attic of the eastern block, where a large number of clerks of the Interior Department were accommodated in a way in which it was a shame that men engaged in the public service should be kept. Valued records of the Interior Department were stored in that attic, and had a fire started it would have been practically impossible to save them. We would lose records that

could not be replaced, valuable interests in the North-west Territories would be injured, and endless litigation would follow. The result was that the Interior Department was moved bodily to the Langevin block. The rooms formerly occupied by the models were placed at the disposal of that department and the rooms on the floor below. In my own Department of Agriculture, the number of employees has, to a certain extent, increased in consequence of the largely increased work done, and I was obliged to take for that work the rooms formerly occupied by the census staff. To-day in the Langevin block there is no accommodation for the census staff, and consequently the Minister of Public Works has to look about for a building in which to do that work. The Patent Office also has increased in the number of employees, in consequence of the large increase of applications for patents and of an effort on my part to overtake the arrears in the applications for patents which were before the department when we came to office. The Interior Department has also largely increased and requires greater accommodation. The result is that every room and every space for a desk in the Langevin block was occupied before the work of the census began. Until the Seybold building is ready for occupation, it is impossible to carry on the work of preparing for the census except under extreme disadvantage. Hon. gentlemen opposite have talked about the erection of a new departmental building. It is possible that it would be wise to construct such a building. But everybody knows perfectly well that the work of construction would occupy at least two years. Meanwhile, the day for the census is fixed, the work must go on, and the clerks who are to do the work must be accommodated. Therefore, the hon. Minister of Public Works, instead of undertaking the construction of a building, buying a suitable building, as was suggested by my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) rented a building until such time as a decision as to a new public building can be come to. I venture to say that it is not fair to make comparison as between the new work carried on by the customs in the Nagle building or the work of the census, and the work being done when the present government came into office.

Mr. BENNETT. Now that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has, I hope to his own satisfaction, shown, first, that a census is going to be taken, and, next, that it is desirable that a census should be taken, let us discuss the question of this building. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works how it is intended to expend this $10,000—by his favourite method of day's work or by tender and contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The money will be spent in buying furniture and in making necessary repairs. And these repairs, as every one knows who is familiar with these matters, cannot be done otherwise than by day's labour. My hon. friend has just alluded to the western block. He reproached me with having built that by day's labour. I did it that way, and I employed union men, and for that I was congratulated by all the union men in Canada. I say without hesitation that, when you can find good foremen, work carried on by day's labour is cheaper and better than that done by public tender and contract. I am surprised that my hon. friend would even suggest that, for repairs of this kind, tenders should be asked for. There is a partition to be put here, a door to be cut there, and so on. Where is the sensible man who will say that such work can be done by tender and contract ? My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) says that I am very anxious to erect a new building. I have no anxiety about it ; but it is quite evident that some accommodation must be provided. I know very well that when I shall come and ask for money to put up a new building, I shall be strongly opposed, and accused of wanting to spend money lavishly. But now I am told that because I want to rent a building, I am spending the money foolishly. My hon. friends on the other side are very hard to please. I have not pleased them in the past, and I am afraid I shall not succeed much better in the future. But I rely on this—that the sensible men of the country will not take much stock in the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. BENNETT. In Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We shall see in a short time whether Ontario will take stock in them or not. Ontario needs only to be talked to a little in order to understand. I have great confidence in Ontario.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But Ontario has not much confidence in the hon. minister.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. member for Pictou should not speak of a province lacking confidence in me. The hon. gentleman's own province has no confidence in him. He has barely secured his own election. But I have been elected in my own province, and I am here not alone, but some of us are here with a pretty strong backing. Let the hon. gentleman be a little more careful.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What about Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Ontario is all right. The hon. gentleman and some of his friends have succeeded in making Ontario wrong. But I am glad to take this opportunity of congratulating the hon. leader of the oppositon (Mr. Borden,

Halifax) of repudiating them. They have appealed to passion and to racial prejudice. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has not done so. I say that sensible men cannot take much stock in the position assumed to-day by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for East Simcoe has moved a motion to strike out from the estimates $10,000 that I have agreed to pay to provide means for carrying on the census work of this country. Now, the rental may be a little high. I do not believe it is too high. But, suppose it is, am I going to close the doors of the building upon the staff of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and scatter them to the winds so that no work can be carried on ? My hon. friend has taken an untenable position, and I think if he were a little older and a little wiser, he would not insist upon a vote. I have no more to say except this—that my long experience, both in the press gallery and in this House, leads me to believe that a party does not gain much by such tactics as those of my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) is resorting to.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Agriculture speak as though this census work had come up suddenly. These hon. gentlemen have been in power since 1896. They knew that the census was to be taken in 1901. Why in the world was not some provision made a year of two ago ? Why leave the providing of rooms until the day they want to use them, and then go to a political friend and pay two or three prices for accommodation ? The hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte), a few moments ago, tried to make the House believe that he had gone to every agent and every landlord in the city inquiring for rooms. But when asked to give the names of the parties applied to, he could not give any. This is a case like that of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) stating the other night that every dollar voted—and it is no wonder the opposition protest—is handed out to political friends to pay for goods and services at double prices.

Item voted : Yeas 90, Nays 50.

Slides and Booms—St. Maurice District—
Increased facilities for descent of timber on the St. Maurice river $50,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This sum of money is asked to provide improvements for the descent of timber on the St. Maurice river. These works were begun in 1852, and since that time there has been growing up a magnificent succession of industries, among which I may mention the well known Grande Mere Mills, which this year we expect will consume about 2,000,000 logs. Those works are productive works, that is they yield more than it costs to maintain them. This year we expect to derive a revenue of about $30,000 from these works.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And to spend how much ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is only part of the money that will be necessary. The money we will have to spend this year will be over $100,000. These works have cost the country up to date about half a million dollars. In 1899, there was a damaging flood that carried away a large number of logs, and it is to avoid a recurrence of such an accident that this sum of money is necessary.

Paris Exhibition, $30,000; Buffalo Exhibition, $30,000; total $60,000

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This first item of $30,000 is to close up the accounts in connection with the Paris exhibition. The time has come now when the exhibition accounts can be completely closed up and the work practically completed, provided this money is voted. I may explain the need of this money by saying that last year I asked an amount that I thought would be necessary for the Paris exhibition, basing my request to the House on a statement which I received from Paris of the expected requirements. I took that request to mean from the date that it was sent to me, but I found afterwards that the commissioners intended it to mean from the 1st of July. Therefore, I made an error of something like $25,000, in the request which I put before the House last session for what I considered necessary to complete the work at the Paris exhibition. A few items have come up since then, amounting to a few thousand dollars beyond what I had expected, and the result is to-day that I am obliged to ask for $30,000 to close the account of the Paris exhibition. I should be glad to give the committee any information they may desire with reference to the Paris exhibition. I will only say just now that from the reports that have been received in this country of the results of that exhibition, the flattering accounts which have come in, not only from all over Canada, but from the press of the world, and from the utterances of a large number of people who visited that exhibition, I feel satisfied that the Canadian exhibit there was worthy of the country, and it has accomplished, in spreading the reputation of Canada as a productive and industrial country, much more than could have been expected from the amount of money there expended I feel extremely gratified at the results of the Paris exhibition, which was conducted under the management of gentlemen who have shown themselves to be eminently qualified for that work, the whole under the presidency of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. CLARKE. How much has been spent up to date ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not at the moment a statement of

the actual expenses up to date, but the total expenditure covered by this vote and all previous votes will be $315,000. Before this I had a vote of $285,000, and this $30,000, making $315,000, I am satisfied from the estimates laid before the department by the commissioner now in charge will cover all the expense.

Mr. POPE. I would like to ask if this is the only detail we are to get concerning this item, a mere request for another $30,000?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am perfectly willing to give all the information that the committee require. I will give full details of the expenditure.

Mr. WALLACE. How much did the commissioner receive for his expenses ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Which commissioner ?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister of Public Works. I suppose he was the one in charge ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The chief commissioner, Hon. Mr. Tarte, received an advance of $3,000 when going to Paris, and $3,000 more was later sent forward, making a total of $6,000 for the commissioner's work.

Mr. WALLACE. How long was he away ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. About five months.

Mr. WALLACE. Did his salary as minister go on while he was acting as commissioner ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, certainly.

Mr. WALLACE. And he got all these thousands of dollars while his salary was accruing ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He got no salary as commissioner to Paris.

Mr. WALLACE. No, but he got $6,000 all the same.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, that was placed at his credit.

Mr. WALLACE. How many other commissioners were there ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was originally a board of eight commissioners, four being officers of various departments and four being appointed specially to this work. Three of these special commissioners went over to Paris. Prof. Robertson, who is one of the officers, was obliged to make a trip there for a few weeks, Prof. Saunders went there to represent Canada at agricultural conventions, and Mr. Gourdeau, the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was in Paris the most of the time, I think, all the time from the opening of the exposition. The hon. Minister of Public Works was away from Canada about five months.

Mr. WALLACE. Are we to be furnished with all the details of the expenditure of these commissioners and the chief commissioner ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The details will appear in the accounts of the commission. I have not them available here now.

Mr. WALLACE. Are they in the Auditor General's Report ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are, up to the 30th June.

Mr. WALLACE. That does not cover the interesting part of the accounts.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They will appear in the Auditor General's Report for next year.

Mr. WALLACE. Then, we will have the pleasure of waiting a year.

The PRIME MINISTER. Deferred pleasure ; that is all.

Mr. WALLACE. We must have the particulars of all the bills that make up this expenditure of $315,000. How much did the building cost ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The building cost $87,600, and we received back $10,600 which we had paid to the Imperial commission for accommodation in the Imperial space. They charged us that, but they returned us the amount I have stated. Our share of the cost of the colonial building, which was to embrace the colonies of the empire, was $76,958, practically $77,000.

Mr. WALLACE. That was for space ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For the Canadian share of the colonial building.

Mr. WALLACE. That is in addition to the $87,000 for the Canadian building ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, no ; there was no Canadian building. There was a British colonial building, for which we had to pay our share, and our share amounted to the sum of $77,000 in round figures.

Mr. WALLACE. A gentleman who is quite competent to judge, I should say, told

me that he saw the Canadian building at Paris, and he estimated that he could put up that building for $10,000 and make a profit on it at that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am sorry for that gentleman's judgment.

Mr. WALLACE. I can say to the hon. minister that if he knew that gentleman as he is known in the city of Toronto, he would have a good deal of respect for his judgment. That is his statement about this building. Every statement I have heard is to the same effect, that the moneys which it had been rumoured were paid for that building were exorbitant. We have the statement of a total expenditure of $315,000 and the disbursement of it. The chief commissioner, while drawing his salary as Minister of Public Works in Canada, and performing none of the duties of the Minister of Public Works for all these five months in the year, was drawing $6,000 of our money, and if the newspaper reports were correct, he was spending a large portion of his time in England, where the duties, I presume, of chief commissioner at the Paris Exposition, would not call him. I would like to know if the minister would read to us the details of the whole expenditure so that we may have them before us. We are entitled to that before we vote any more money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Allow me to explain, Sir.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to have the explanation of the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Will the hon. gentleman have the kindness to hear me ?

Mr. WALLACE. We will listen to any information that is given.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman must do so. The hon. gentleman stated somewhere during the last campaign that I had spent $100,000 in erecting this building, which, he has repeated to-day, could be erected for $10,000. I had nothing whatever to do with this building. When I reached Paris the building was up.

Mr. POPE. Or it never would have been.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The building was up. The hon. Minister of Agriculture had arranged with the Imperial government that Canada would form part of the colonial exhibit. The charge of the building had been entrusted to a Royal Committee in England. Then, I say, when I reached Paris the building was up. I must immediately say that the building was not creditable to us. It was nobody's fault except the fault of the Royal Committee. Not one single member of the committee had crossed the channel and gone to Paris. I immediately sent for the architect and I asked him where the specifications were. I could not get hold of them, and I only saw them a few days before I left. I asked him whether there were any specifications and whether they had been followed. I took him around the building and he was obliged to admit and recognize that the specifications had not been followed. I asked him whether he had given notice to the Royal Committee, and he said : 'No, I did not give notice.' I immediately communicated with my colleague and with Lord Strathcona, and we did with a bad job the best we could. To say that the building is only worth $10,000 is, if I may be permitted without offence to say, stating something which is ridiculous.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much would you say it would be worth ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would say between $40,000 and $45,000. I visited the building with one of my colleagues. One of my colleagues was in France and that same gentleman, no doubt that the hon. gentleman alludes to, a big contractor, was with me. Several Canadians came there and admitted that the building was not creditable to us. It proves that at the next exhibition we should go on our own hook. When my colleague went to London all the colonies had undertaken to take part in the exhibition. It came out that only Western Australia and Canada took part in the exhibition. Practically we were alone, because Western Australia is a pretty small colony and had only an exhibit of gold. When I reached Paris we could not even get admission to the exhibition grounds without going to the English officers and asking for tickets. My hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) reproaches me with having gone to England. Well, I have gone there and I will go again I hope, and I went there on that occasion in connection with the exhibition. I felt that Canada as the independent nation we are, as a self-governing country, was entitled to have a proper standing at Paris. I went to the Royal Committee and represented to them that I would not stay in Paris unless I were credited directly to the French authorities. I did not care for myself. It was easy for me to have a personal standing in Paris, for I have relations there, but I made up my mind that I was doing my duty towards Canada in insisting that Canada should be properly represented. The Royal Committee did not seem to understand me, and then I prepared a memorandum that was forwarded through Lord Strathcona to Mr. Chamberlain, and it is my duty and pleasure and pride to say that forty-eight hours after Mr. Chamberlain read my statement I was directly accredited to the French authorities. I went to England for that very purpose on two occasions. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) believes

that I have spent a great deal of money. Well, I have spent $6,000 of the money of the people of this country. Will you permit me to state here that I should have spent a great deal more. Forty-two nations were represented in Paris, and I am sure that I am the commissioner who spent the least of all those. There were smaller nations whose commissioners spent a great deal more money than I did. I do not of course compare my position to that of the English commissioner, but I am sure that Col. Jenkin has spent in entertaining and advertising his country a larger sum of money than some hon. gentlemen imagine. Those who have been a minister, those who have travelled; those who know what a nation is; those who know what a great exhibition is, will not reproach me with having spent too much money. Perhaps I may be permitted to say that I have spent a very large sum of money which I have not the means to stand. I judge from reading the debates in the House (I trust that I may say it without offence to anybody), that the position was not stated as it should have been stated. I wrote to some friends of mine on the other side of the House begging them not to make such statements as were made. An ex-minister of the Crown whom I am sorry not to see here stated in the House that we should not have spent more than $25,000 on the Paris exhibition. We have spent about $300,000, and we obtained the grandest advertisement that Canada ever obtained on the European continent. Our exhibit was a most creditable one, and if the building —with which we had nothing to do—was not creditable, the exhibit was most creditable to us, and I must compliment my hon. colleague and friend (Hon. Mr. Fisher) and his officers on the splendid showing they have made on behalf of Canada. I may say that all the staff in Paris did their duty thoroughly and faithfully. As far as I am concerned myself, I have done my best to advertise Canada in France, and in Belgium, and everywhere I was able to speak. If an account of my speeches is asked for at a latter period I shall be most delighted to give it to the House, but we are discussing a financial question just now. I have no hesitation is saying that no expenditure of money will bring to us better results than the money that was spent on the Paris exhibition.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Has the Minister of Agriculture made any provision in the supplementary estimates for the exhibition at Glasgow next summer ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). How much?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell off-hand, but I trust sufficient to make a very creditable display.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Is any provision made for the exhibition at Buffalo?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There will be in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. I made some remarks in the House last year with reference to the Paris exhibition, and I do not know that we could have a better opportunity than this of getting explanation from the minister on what seemed to me then to be improper conduct on his part. I refer to the reception to President Loubet. The president as the representative of France visited the exhibition, and I presume expected to be received by Col. Jekyll, the representative of the British Empire in his department. That would appear to be proper, but the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) contended that it should take place in the building belonging to Canada, and that as he was there to represent a portion of the British Empire, an independent country, that the reception should take place in the Canada department. If it did not take place there, in a somewhat peevish way the minister declared that he would close the Canadian exhibit. In my judgment such conduct on his part was very improper and some explanation should be made by the minister regarding it. I have no doubt that he will give an explanation that may put a different face on it from that conveyed by the information we got from the press of this country. As to the exhibition itself, I have a letter from a friend who was in Paris, and he does not seem to have quite as high an opinion as to the value of that exhibition as the Minister of Public Works has. He speaks of it in some respects as being creditable, and other respects he thought it was not a fair representation of Canada. He says :

As to the exhibits here, they were not what they ought to have been. I have seen better individual exhibits at provincial fairs in my own country. It was ahead of Australia and perhaps India, but it could not touch Mexico either for design of the pavilion or beauty of arrangement. It was all right in one thing, that it did not go in for a foolish display of nicknacks, to the detriment of industrial exhibits. Compared to the arrangement and character of the Russian exhibit, it was very poor, as outside of the exhibits purely and simply, no information was given regarding the country either as regards colonization or industrial purposes. All Canada wants for success to-day is capital, and there is plenty of it lying idle here awaiting favourable opportunity of investment, but the details of mining and other wealth of the country were altogether too meagre to attract the attention of any capitalists. There was a large amount of space taken up with a lot of trash, such as exercise books for school children of ten or twelve years of age, and you will no doubt know what kind of an exhibit that would be. Such things as this made the exhibit look rather childish, in my judgment. The rest of the ex-

hibit represented the industries of Canada well enough. Had the arrangements been better, and had more information been given, and also had the materials of which the exhibit consisted been of a higher class, it would have been much better. The art exhibit was simply ridiculous.

I am not one of those who feel inclined to criticise very severely the amount of money spent by the minister, because while he was there, I am bound to believe that he was trying to do the best he could for his country, and a man in that position cannot be niggardly. Therefore, if there was more spent by him than we might think necessary, we must make allowances. Some of those who visited the exhibition say that it was a comparative failure, while others say that it was a great success. I have given that as the evidence of a Canadian who was living there and going in and out day after day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture how it happened that there was no proper supervision over the construction of this building. I understand from the Minister of Public Works that he regarded the building as unsuitable, as not built according to the specifications, and as worth very much less than we paid for it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will give the hon. gentleman full explanations after recess.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has rendered a great service to me in asking me to explain the incident of the visit of President Loubet. One morning I read in the Paris newspapers that the president was going to visit the exhibits of the foreign colonies. I had not been notified, although I had been directly accredited to the French authorities. I made preparations. To understand the matter properly, it is necessary to know that there were three main doors to the colonial pavilion on the Avenue d'Iena. In that pavilion Canada had, of course, the largest place. If I remember rightly, Canada had 90 per cent of the space, and paid 90 per cent or thereabouts of the cost. Then, there was Western Australia, and the little island of Mauritius. I made preparations to receive M. Loubet by our main door. In this country, we are in the habit of receiving by our main door, not by our kitchen door. But I found that the British understrappers, who had managed to log-roll in London, had arranged for President Loubet to come in, not by the main door of the building, the Canadian door, but simply by one of the small doors, and only to pass through a small section of the Canadian exhibit. He would simply go into our kitchen and see the stove exhibit, and a small corner of the Canadian exhibit. I felt that it was my duty to Canada not to allow British understrappers to slight us in that way; and if any hon. gentleman from the other side of the House had been there representing this country, he would have done just what I did. I am glad to say that there were present, when that incident happened, not only French Canadians, but a large number of English Canadians, and they all sided with me to a man. As I say, preparations had been made. A band of music had been engaged. There were three or four hundred Canadians of all creeds and races there to receive M. Loubet and the distinguished people who were accompanying him. When I learned that we were going to be slighted in that way, I said to one of those English officers that I would rather close all the doors of the colonial building than submit to such an insult. My hon. friend from Grey is altogether wrong when he is under the impression that M. Loubet's visit was intended for the British pavilion. It was intended for the foreign colonies. The British pavilion was on the Avenue des Nations, on the other side of the Seine, while the colonial, or rather the Canadian building, was on Trocadero square—two different places altogether. Mr. Crozier, chief of the protocol, was informed of the incident, and as soon as he learned that such a trick had been attempted upon the president, he changed all the arrangements on the spot, and the president came into our exhibition by our main door. An explanation was given a couple of days afterwards to the English newspaper men who were in Paris, and I may say that they all congratulated me on the firm stand I took. Now, my hon. friend from Grey is altogether wrongly informed when he states that the exhibition was not a credit to us. As a commercial exhibition, I make bold to say that it was the most complete on the ground. There were European nations which had bigger exhibitions, which had art exhibitions ; but, as a commercial exhibition, the Canadian one was a very great success indeed. The number of prizes or medals it secured is the best evidence of that fact. The exhibition of grain, of lumber, of minerals and of fruit was very fine. I do not know that I need say anything more, except to add that the Canadian commissioners and staff at Paris did their duty faithfully towards this country. We had a little trouble and a great deal of work. As has been truly said, the building was not what it should have been, and we were obliged to spend some money in decorating it, but when we had covered our sheds with drapery and other decorations, it looked very presentable.

I must take strong exception to what has been said by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) concerning the educa-

tional exhibit. Our educational exhibit was a great credit to us. The province of Ontario, perhaps, did not do as well as she should have done, but all the other provinces had very nice exhibits, and I think the installation of our educational exhibit was one of the best, if not the best, in the building.

Mr. SPROULE. That only shows the different impression created on different minds. We have the view of the hon. gentleman who was there to superintend, and who naturally would give as favourable a report as possible, but I have simply given the view of an independent Canadian who went over the exhibit.

I brought to the attention of the House to-night this matter of the reception of President Loubet, because, as represented to us by the press, it certainly bore a very different appearance from what the hon. minister has given us to-night. I brought it to the hon. gentleman's attention for two reasons—not because I was uninformed with regard to it, because I read a lengthy explanation of the hon. gentleman, which satisfied me in a measure that he was perhaps not as much to blame as represented. But my principal object was to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of giving the House an explanation which would remove the impression in the public mind created by the accounts in the press. As we understood the reports then, it was the duty of Dr. Jekyll, who was the representative of the Imperial parliament, to receive President Loubet, but the hon. minister told us differently, and I am not going to say that there was not good reason for his conduct. But it did seem somewhat out of keeping with the dignity of the situation and what might be expected from a minister of the Crown in a British colony, to use the representative of the British Empire in that way. The hon. gentleman spoke of Dr. Jekyll as the British understrapper.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I never mentioned Col. Jekyll's name—far from it—I am glad to say that he behaved towards us very nicely indeed, but he came very late, and there were other people before he came to whom I could not pay the same compliment. Col. Jekyll behaved towards us like a gentleman and a friend, and on the very occasion of President Loubet's visit he was by my side and was very glad to be with us. But he came to Paris about the same time as I did myself, and the wrong that had been committed towards us was then done. If the commissioners who had been before in Paris, were on the floor of this parliament, without any distinction of origin or creed, they would tell stories that would induce the press on both sides to make up their minds that when Canada again took part in any exhibition anywhere, we should go on our own hook. And I may add that the commissioners at the Paris exhibition in 1878 told me the same story. We were simply looked down upon and treated, not as representing a self-governing nation, but to a certain extent as inferiors. Within my hearing is one of the commissioners, and if he were free to speak he would say something that would astonish you more than anything I have said. I exonerate completely Col. Jekyll from any blame. When he came to Paris he did his best to help us, and did help us very materially indeed.

Mr. SPROULE. I came to the conclusion I did from the speech of the hon. gentleman when he said the British understrapper did so and so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Understrappers.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the difficulty was with the representative of the British Empire through whom officially any arrangement should be made. I am glad the hon. minister made the explanation because his remarks seemed to reflect in an unkindly manner on the representative of the British Empire. As to the wisdom or otherwise of our taking part in an exhibition of that nature, independent entirely of the British Empire, I am not going to criticise, because I am not in a position to judge. But it seems to me that as long as we are a colonial dependency of the British Empire, it would not be inappropriate if we were in some way or other under the wing of the empire to which we belong, when making a display in a great country like France.

I have given the impression of a Canadian who visited the exhibition. Where he thought it was defective was largely in the fact that although we had exhibits of our mines, there was, comparatively speaking, no information to be had with regard to our mining laws and the condition of things in this country. In many departments he said the exhibition was a success. He spoke of our fruits being very fine and serials, but that, in his judgment, in some other lines it was very poor, and he spoke especially of the exhibit of educational books for children and the art department as being very poor. I am not giving my own impression but only those of one who went there on a visit.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not mean to say that Canada should be altogether independent of England. I did not mean anything of the kind. But we are a self-governing colony, we are making our own tariff, for instance, quite independent of England. An exhibition is a question of business and not of foreign policy, just as when we are making our own laws. And in that Paris exhibition, our interests in some lines conflicted with those of British exhibitors. We were large exhibitors in agricultural implements, and so was England. We were large exhibitors in cotton,

and so was England. Before I reached Paris, an arrangement had been made that sixty judges altogether would be given for the British Empire, including her colonies. We were occupying 44,000 feet of the ground in the British Empire, and the British Empire itself was occupying 200,000 feet, so that we were entitled to have about one-fifth of the judges in number. I found that we had only four. I said that that was wrong and insisted strenuously on being given more.

Arrangements were made. It was agreed between the English and the French authorities, as I say, that sixty judges should be given for the whole British Empire. Of that number, the British Commission in London had given only four judges to Canada. Was that reasonable, was that fair, especially when we had interests conflicting with those of the British exhibitor ? In questions of business the Englishman does not care much whether you are an English Canadian or a French Canadian—if he has to fight against you he does it ; if he can carry the medals and prizes against you he does it. I insisted strongly on a change, and, with the help of Lord Strathcona and Mr. Chamberlain, I gained some small points. The correspondence asked for by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) will show the strenuous efforts we made to secure, not justice, but a small share of justice. We did not get the number of judges we should have got. But the thing turned out right. I represented to Colonel Jekyl that if the Canadians did not get the prizes to which they were entitled, there would be great disappointment and resentment in Canada. He helped me to the best of his ability. I give these explanations at some length because I feel that this is not a party question. There will be other exhibitions. My hon. friends opposite may then have crossed the floor. If so, they will find themselves sometime in the same position that we were in ; and I beg of them, as I beg of my friends on this side, to take the stand, once for all, that we are a self-governing country; and, in matters of business let us stand by Canada—Canada before all. That does not prevent us from being good, loyal subjects of the King. But we have business of our own, we have a realm of our own, and let us try to exploit it to the best of our ability.

Mr. HACKETT. I have been much pleased to find that, at the Paris exposition the province of Prince Edward Island was among the foremost in taking prizes. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that for oysters, one of the products of Prince Edward Island, we were awarded first prize. Those who love to partake of the luscious bivalve will be pleased to know that at that great exhibition, where the province was brought into competition with the whole world, it won first prize. But we have in Prince Edward Island other products besides oysters. We produced there an individual who was elected to the legislature a little over a year ago to oppose the local government. His name is Pineau. He was a Conservative and was elected by the Conservative people of Prince county. The local government was in extremis, and if Mr. Pineau got in, it was believed they would have to resign. But what do we find ? The Minister of Public Works states that he was in need of help in Paris. If he had taken Mr. Pineau with him he would have had all the help he required. Mr. Pineau was approached by an agent of the government, Dr. Wickham, in Tignish, the district in which he was elected. This gentleman went to Mr. Pineau and said : If you will support the local government, or if you will leave the province and go to Paris as commissioner of the Dominion government you will be paid a salary of $5 a day and $5 a day expenses. Mr. Pineau came to Ottawa. Would not you consider it a singular proceeding for a man elected by the independent people of Prince county to oppose the party to which the hon. Minister of Public Works belonged should come here and remain for a week in the very shadow of this building in conference with the hon. gentleman or his agents ? He was purchased by the government, and that fact remains a stain, a blot, upon our history. But Mr. Pineau did not take the trip to Paris, Mr. Wise, a member of the local legislature upon whom the party of hon. gentlemen opposite were depending for support, opposed the local government, and it was found that the presence of Mr. Pineau in the legislature was necessary and it was——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never saw the man.

Mr. HACKETT. He was here for a week, and I am told on the best authority that he was in close communication with the hon. gentleman's (Hon. Mr. Tarte's) private secretary. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) will say that he never saw him. Perhaps the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) will say that he never saw him. But the fact is that Mr. Pineau was waiting here in Ottawa for instructions to go to Paris under the Minister of Public Works. This, I say, is a blot upon our history. When the electors vote for a man, they wish to have him as their representative and not to have him bribed by a hostile government needing his support. While I am proud of one product of Prince Edward Island, the oyster, I am ashamed of the product of Pineau, and I am especially ashamed that I supported the man who came here and sold his support to the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am sorry the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) has given us such a picture of his own province. I confess it is new to me, because

I did not suppose that Prince Edward Island put forth such a product as he speaks of. I was quite prepared to hear that that province had taken the prize in oysters, because I had the pleasure on many occasions of partaking of those oysters. But, as to the other, the hon. gentleman has surely jumped at a conclusion. I dare say Mr. Pineau was here, but I do not know it. So far as I know, no member of the government saw him here. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Hackett's) friends may have seen him. As minister in charge of the Paris exposition, I can tell the hon. gentleman and the House and Prince Edward Island, and the country at large that I never saw Mr. Pineau, never had any communication with him directly or indirectly; Mr. Pineau did not go to Paris in connection with the Paris exposition, and the hon. gentleman will search in vain in the accounts of the Paris exposition for one cent paid in any way to Mr. Pineau. I trust that this statement is sufficiently categorical to convince the hon. gentleman that, whatever the Conservative electors in Prince Edward Island may choose, they do not choose a man that this government tries to buy or buys in any shape or way. One or two questions were asked me before recess, to which I take great pleasure in replying. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) asked for explanations in connection with the building in Paris. That building was entirely managed by the Imperial Commission, and the Canadian Commission had neither part nor lot in the contract for its construction of any connection with it.

When the invitation to Canada came to us to participate in the Paris exhibition, it came through the Imperial authorities, as was natural that it should, coming from a foreign country. We were informed that they would be pleased if we would take part as a colony of Great Britain, and that they would make the arrangements necessary to secure a proper opportunity for the various British colonies to be represented at Paris. Those communications indicated to us the steps which the Imperial commission had taken for this object. They informed us that the building would be prepared under their control and management for the products of the colony, and that that building would have to be submitted to the French authorities for acceptance. They asked us if we would take part in an exhibition in that building, and if we would pay our proportion of the cost pro rata to the space occupied. As the minister in charge of these things, after consultation with my colleagues, and discussion with gentlemen in Canada who had taken some part in former exhibitions, that was agreed to. Lord Strathcona, the High Commissioner of Canada in London, was appointed as our representative on the colonial committee of the Imperial commission, and all the work in connection with the Imperial commission was done through Lord Strathcona. Plans of that building came out here, the estimates having been prepared in London, and we were informed that that was what had been arranged for us, and we had either to accept that or refuse to take part in the exhibition.

It happened that summer that I was in England on other business, and I attended one or two meetings of the colonial committee with Lord Strathcona. I made some suggestion in regard to the details and plan of the building, which were taken into consideration and some of them accepted. But on the general question of the plans of that building, its construction, its cost and everything connected with its management, we had practically no word to say. At that time it was expected and intended that Cape Colony, with the various Australian colonies and New Zealand, would take part in the exhibition. We were informed that one-third of the whole space of that building would be at our disposal. We protested energetically that that was not sufficient to a proper representation of Canada at such a great exhibition as that in Paris. From time to time various of the Australian and Crown colonies decided they would not take part, and as they so decided we were asked if we would take the space which had been accorded to them. Finally, the result came about that we had over eighty per cent of the space in that building accorded to us. We took this, not because we desired to do so, but because we found that the Canadian exhibitors, commercial men, manufacturers, agriculturists, men engaged in forest industries, and the lumber trade of this country, were demanding more space than we had at our disposal; and therefore, we felt it was necessary to have larger space than was at first accorded to us. We, therefore, took the opportunities that were presented to us, and whenever the Imperial authorities informed us that more space was available, we seized upon it greedily in order to satisfy the claims and demands of the Canadian exhibitors who wished to exhibit at Paris.

Hon. gentlemen, therefore, will see that so far as we were concerned, so far as my own management of the department was concerned, so far as the management of our commercial interests was concerned, we had practically nothing whatever to do with the construction or the cost of that building. I may say that when one of the commissioners first went over to Paris and saw the building, he protested against its method of construction, and against the quality of the building. Afterwards, when my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, went over there, he again protested to the Imperial commissioners as to the quality of the building. I am satisfied from what I know, and from the reports given to me since, that that building was not up to the mark, that it was not worth the price that was paid for it; and I withheld for a long time the final payment, because I believed Canada was

not fairly charged with the amount which the Imperial commissioners asked from us. But after the Minister of Public Works reached Paris and had discussed these questions with Mr. Jekyll and other Imperial commissioners, and with Sir Montague Ommany, Under Secretary for the Colonies, who came over to Paris to look into this matter, and after the Minister of Public Works had gone to London and consulted with Lord Strathcona, the chairman of the colonial committee of the Imperial commission, and after this whole question had been thoroughly discussed, we received a letter from the Imperial authorities stating that as the architect had signed the reports upon the building and had accepted the building, as the contractor had the certificates of the architect for the building and for its construction, we practically had no recourse ; the Imperial authorities distinctly informed us that we had no recourse, and they called upon us to foot the bill. I may say that so far as I saw, we had no recourse. I protested to Lord Strathcona, and asked him to protest to the Imperial authorities in his capacity as chairman of the colonial committee. He did so, and I have in my department to-day a letter from Lord Strathcona, in which he strongly urged me, and advised me, in his capacity as a member of the Imperial commission, and as representing Canada on that commission, to pay the bill and settle the matter, because he could see that we had no recourse, and no other alternative.

That is the position of affairs to-day. I regret extremely to have to say that that building was not commensurate with the demands of Canada for the products which were put into it, and I have no doubt whatever that the inferior character of the building militated considerably against the success of our exhibition there. But when my hon. friend and colleague, the Minister of Public Works, went over to Paris, seeing the inferior quality of the building, seeing there was danger that our exhibits would not be properly presented, and would not look well in that building, he undertook to make some decorations in the interior of the building, and he so far succeeded, with the co-operation of the other commissioners and of our staff there, as to make the building inside a creditable one, and fit for the splendid exhibit which the people of Canada put into it. This added somewhat unexpectedly, but reasonably, I think, to the cost we were put to in regard to this exhibition. I do not think that I need say any more in regard to the building.

Mr. CLANCY. Before the hon. gentleman leaves that question, would he say upon whom the duty devolved to look after the character of the building ? In other words, whose duty was it to see that a suitable building should be provided for Canada, for which we had to pay a certain portion of the cost ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The colonial committee of the Imperial commission, on which our representative was Lord Strathcona.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand there were specifications sent out here.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Plans, but no specifications.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, if Canada was going to pay a proportion of the cost of this building, why did not the hon. gentleman see that specifications were produced, so that we might know what we were going to pay for. I would also like to ask the hon. gentleman whether, when it was suggested that we should pay a portion of the cost of this building, any estimate was furnished to him as to what the building would cost ? I am not prepared at present to concur in the view that there should be no recourse. I cannot understand how this business has been transacted so that we pay double what this building is worth, and have no recourse against any one. There must be fault somewhere, and I want to find out where it is.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that the whole question lay in the hands of the Imperial commission. We were invited to take part in the exhibition by the Imperial commission. We did not stand as an independent country ; we had to deal with the Parisian authorities through the Imperial commission. When we were invited to attend the Paris exhibition, a request was made that we should deal with the Parisian authorities. That was refused by them and refused by the Imperial authorities, who desired that the British Empire should stand together and act as one empire in connection with the Paris exhibition. The Imperial commission appointed a special committee known as the colonial committee, to deal with colonial exhibits. These were the conditions upon which we should take part in the exhibition. We had to accept or reject them. We might have said that we did not wish to make an exhibit at the Paris exhibition. An estimate was made of the cost in regard to the building. The first letter I had said that it would not exceed 10s. per square foot, and that the cost of administration would not exceed 5s. per square foot. Later on it cost more, and before the final acceptance of the contract the price was stated at 12s. 6d. per square foot. As a matter of fact, the final cost went a little over that even. I can assure the hon. gentleman that in this matter the whole affair was in the hands of the Imperial committee, that we had practically no control, except that we had the right to refuse to go to Paris at all, and the idea we had at

the time the Imperial committee undertook this was that we could safely and satisfactorily entrust to such a committee, composed of the leading men of the empire and representatives of the colonies, whose chairman was Lord Strathcona, the construction and management of such a building, and that our interests would be carefully safeguarded. When that was agreed to and when we accepted that position, we were satisfied that the colonial building was to be for the whole of the British colonies and that we would have about one-third of the space in it, and be obliged to pay only for one-third of the cost. As time went on we accepted further responsibility by taking more space. We were driven to that by the demands of intending exhibitors who desired to show Canadian products in the building, and a refusal to accept their products would have entailed an enormous amount of disappointment to the people who wished to make these exhibits and great loss would have resulted to the Dominion of Canada had not these exhibits gone to Paris. Under these circumstances I cannot see, myself, as the minister in charge of this department, how the government of Canada was in any way responsible for that building. We had to take our share of it as it was given to us by the Imperial commission, and the Imperial commission did all the work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not at all the question of the empire standing together, so far as I understand it ; it is a question of the administration of the hon. gentleman's department. The hon. Minister of Public Works very plainly stated to us, only five minutes ago, that matters of this kind are matters of business.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are, I think. Are they not ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They are matters of business. I agree with the hon. gentleman, and I am quoting him as against his colleague, who seems to think that it is not a matter of business but a matter of keeping the empire together.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not a bit of it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think the hon. gentleman's explanation is satisfactory. He seems to think that this was a trifling matter because it involved only one-third of the cost of the building, but it is a very considerable sum of money—$25,000 or $30,000. What I venture to suggest is that it would have been a proper thing for him to have proper specifications and an estimate made as a business matter for the purpose of finding out what kind of a building we were going to pay for and how much we were going to pay for it

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We had that information, and if the building had been up to the contract and specifications there would have been no fault found.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Very good ; then, I do not understand how the hon. gentleman expects the committee to believe that there is no recourse. Here are the contractors and here is the architect, here are the specifications and you would expect the architect to proceed according to these. There is the contract to do certain work up to a certain standard and for a certain sum of money. We have the safeguard of responsible contractors and the safeguard of an architect. Some one must be responsible for seeing that the building would be erected in accordance with the specifications. Either the contractors are liable, or if the contractors have been relieved by any unjustifiable action of the architect, the architect is liable, and I suppose he is a responsible man. How then could the hon. gentleman expect us to understand that there is no recourse against any one ? I do not understand it. If the Imperial commission was the body that dealt with these contractors, have they not a valid claim against the contractors ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not say they have not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has said that there is no recourse.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I say that we have no recourse.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We have recourse directly or indirectly.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We may have recourse against the Imperial commission.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to know if the hon. gentleman has asked the Imperial commission or the Imperial government to take action against the contractors ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Through Lord Strathcona, yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If so, has any action been taken ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They declined to do so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, it would be extremely satisfactory to the committee to have their reply placed upon the Table of the House, so that we could understand it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have Lord Strathcona's letter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It would be satisfactory to know why it is that when the commission made a satisfactory contract with certain contractors to do a certain work, and when that work was super-

vised by an architect, that the work done is not up to the value which it should have been, according to the hon. Minister of Public Works, by about one-half? Why is it that, under such circumstances, the Imperial commission should decline to take action against the contractors ? It seems to me that the hon. gentleman should give us some better explanation than merely stating that he has asked them to do this and that they have declined to do it. For what reason have they not taken action against these people, if the facts are as the hon. gentleman states them ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Speaking from memory, I may say that the letter in which Lord Strathcona communicates this decision, stated that the Imperial committee found that the architect whom they had employed had given his certificate to the contractors, and that consequently they did not feel that they had any recourse against the contractors.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But, they have recourse against the architect if he is found to have acted improperly. Under the circumstances disclosed to this committee by the hon. Minister of Public Works, I venture to think that they would have a perfect recourse against the architect. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) what is the meaning of the item which I find in the Auditor General's Report, page D—12, and which states that the government has paid this architect—I do not know whether this architect had anything to do with this building or not——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)—three hundred and sixty dollars on account of fees, and $30.12 for a trip to Baden, Switzerland.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is not the same architect.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What architect is this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will explain that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is another matter altogether.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We will deal with that presently in order that we may close this matter first.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Very well.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the architect passed this building, which the hon. Minister of Public Works says is worth only half the money which it cost, he must be liable for his dereliction of duty in doing that, and if the contractors are not liable the architect is. If we cannot have recourse against one we must have recourse against the other, because it is not possible that the money of this country shall be paid out for a default of that kind and no one be responsible for it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As to this architect, I may explain that when I reached Paris the inside of the building looked like a barn. I thought it was my duty towards the exhibitors and towards Canada to give the building a better appearance, and with the consent of my co-commissioners we engaged a young Canadian, who has been studying in Paris during the last five or six years, and he rendered us very valuable services, and we paid him that sum of money and something more.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then this vote is for the purpose of assisting to hide the shame ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) had been there he would have done just as I did.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have no doubt

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He would have done better, perhaps, but he would have proceeded on the same lines. As soon as I reached Paris I protested to the Royal Committee in the strongest terms, and that correspondence will be brought down. I represented to them that this Canadian building could not possibly be according to the specifications, but I could not get hold of these specifications until a couple of weeks before I left. No member of the Royal Committee had visited Paris, and the architect, who was the architect of all the other colonial buildings, was left to carry out the work alone.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. minister know his name ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was Mr. Clowes. I do not see what more could be done by us to protect Canadian interests. The architect had given his certificate, but it was actually raining in the building. I was afraid it would fall on our heads, and we made them strengthen it, and we succeeded at least in preventing the rain from destroying the exhibits. To achieve even that required a good deal of energy. The Canadian government is not to blame in this matter, except that from the start we should have made up our minds to erect our own buildings. The Minister of Agriculture has stated that the French authorities declined to deal with Canada. I am bound to say that on that point my hon. colleague has not been rightly informed. This is not a party or a government question, and as I have been there I know what took place. The French authorities allowed nations who are less independent commercially than we are, to exhibit on their own hook. Egypt exhibited on her

own hook, and Egypt is not quite as independent as we are. Bulgaria, which is under the thumb of Russia, had an exhibit of her own. If the French authorities alone were concerned we would have been allowed to exhibit as a self-governing nation, because the French authorities realize, as we realize ourselves, that we are a self-governing people. However, I can quite understand the strong desire of the British authorities that the whole empire should stand together at the Paris exposition, and it is to that desire that the Canadian government yielded. Whether we have been right or wrong it is for the Canadian people to judge. Speaking from the experience I acquired in Paris, I say without hesitation that we made a mistake. We meant well, but it would have been better for the British Empire had we exhibited independently as a self-governing colony. We would have been under the wing of the British Empire just as well, but we would have had more prestige ; we would have had more latitude ; we would have had a better social standing, if I may say so. The word ' colony' is not understood on the continent of Europe as it is understood in the British Empire. The word 'colony' in Europe means a subordinate body. As a matter of fact, I do not know that any country other than England has under her wing a single self-governing colony. I had to explain over and over again, every time I had an opportunity of speaking, that we were a self-governing country, because we are not as well known on the other side as some of our friends think we are. It is for these reasons that, perhaps, we have made a mistake, a well-meant mistake, in not exhibiting on our own account as a self-governing country. I cannot repeat too often that an exhibition is a question of business and that there are no foreign relations involved in it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No one pretends for a moment that there is the slightest objection to erecting this building in connection with the other colonies or with the Imperial government. That is not the question. We are delighted to join with the other colonies and with the British government in the erection of the building, but the point is that in doing that we should use ordinary business methods. We should have had estimates and specifications, and, if we find the building has cost more than it is worth, as the Minister of Public Works states——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That cannot be denied.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In that case we should be in a position to seek recourse against the person responsible. That is the only point there is about it. All I desire to ascertain is, that the Department of Agriculture, which has charge of that duty, has taken the necessary means towards that end. I do not think the Minister of Agriculture would venture to deny that some one must be responsible for damages on account of this default. If an architect leaves a building as described by the Minister of Public Works, with the rain coming through the roof, he must be responsible. I do not know whether the minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) himself indulged in this pastime with his subordinates, of bailing out the water with buckets and covering up the exhibits when it rained——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That had to be done.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. Minister of Agriculture desires the House to believe that an architect who is guilty of leaving a building in that condition is not to be responsible to any person for his default.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman seems to suggest that there is some hesitation on the part of the commission to have recourse against this architect. I cannot believe that that commission would have any hesitation about proceeding against that architect unless there is some reason that has not yet been disclosed to this House. The hon. gentleman having referred to the letter from Lord Strathcona. I was anxious that he should lay that letter on the Table in order that the House might judge as to the reasons which have been advanced for this course, which seems to me somewhat singular.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am sure that the leader of the opposition has not the slightest desire to misrepresent me.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not at all.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I had no desire to say that nobody had recourse against this architect. What I did say was that he had no recourse against the architect. The Dominion of Canada had no buildings erected there. We were a part of the British Empire invited by the Imperial Commission to take part in that exhibition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What I understood the hon. minister to say was that Lord Strathcona said there was no recourse.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What Lord Strathcona said was that the Imperial committee were not in a position to take action aainst the contractors, because they had the certificate of the architect. No doubt the hon. gentleman would say that the Imperial committee should take action against the architect. I presume he is right as a lawyer to say so. So far as I know, the Imperial committee did not take any such action, but they did require from me the payment of our share of the

cost of the building. I have the letter, which I shall be only too glad to lay on the Table for the information of the hon. gentleman, because I am sure he will understand that I am not wishing to misrepresent the facts at all; but I do not wish it to go abroad that I am giving the opinion that the Imperial committee had no recourse against either the contractor or the architect. What I say is that the Dominion government had no recourse except to pay for our share of the building, which was the condition on which we accepted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask at what stage had the building arrived when the Canadian commissioner first protested? Also, at what stage had the building arrived when the Minister of Public Works raised a protest. I understood from the Minister of Agriculture that protests had been raised on two different occasions by the two gentlemen to whom I have referred.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The first protest I think was verbal on the part of one of the commissioners, who saw the Imperial agents on the subject. I could not tell the hon. gentleman at what stage the building had arrived. It was a few weeks or perhaps a month before the opening of the exhibition. The Minister of Public Works did not reach Paris until just before the opening of the exhibition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The building was then completed?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Nearly completed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I reached Paris on the 27th of March, and, if I remember rightly, I went to the building the very day after I arrived. I had with me Mr. Clowes and Mr. Humphrey, one of the contractors, and I told them at once that, although I was not an expert, I had enough experience to be sure that no architect would specify such a building; and I protested immediately afterwards to Lord Strathcona. We several times obliged Messrs. Humphrey & Company to improve the building, and make it as good as it was possible to make it.

Mr. WALLACE. It is a good thing that this House and this country are not often treated to the spectacle which we have here to-night—two ministers acknowledging to the grossest negligence and incapacity in the management of their departments.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. WALLACE. They shake their heads. What was the speech of the Minister of Public Works? Was it not confession from beginning to end that everything had gone wrong? Our money was voted by the parliament of Canada two years ago. The Minister of Agriculture came here and asked parliament for $175,000 for the Paris exposition. That was after careful estimates and calculations of the space that would be required, and he pledged himself to the House and the country that nothing would be left undone to see that the money was carefully and economically expended, that good value would be obtained for it, and that competent men would be got to administer it. What do we find to-day? $140,000 is required in addition to the $175,000, which we were assured would be all that would be required; $140,000, and more than that absolutely thrown away without any beneficial results for the people of Canada. It is a confession of incompetence from start to finish. What did the Minister of Public Works tell us a moment ago? He admitted that all was wrong, but he said the Canadian government were not to blame. He has a habit, which we have seen a hundred times in this House, if anything goes right, to claim credit for the genius and the admirable management of the Minister of Public Works, whereas if anything goes wrong, he says, It is my staff—I will cut their heads off. I think we have had enough of that sort of thing. He told us that in his opinion the building was worth $40,000 or $50,000. I do not know where he got the experience to be a competent judge. For myself, with the greatest deference to him, I refuse to acknowledge his judgment in the matter at all, especially as his interests all go to make the value of the building as great as possible. A gentleman in Toronto, capable and competent, said he could put up that building for $10,000, and I will take his opinion a hundred times over on that matter before the opinion of the Minister of Public Works. The hon. gentleman says the Canadian government are not to blame. Who is to blame? We voted the money, and the Minister of Agriculture gave us the assurance that it would be economically, carefully, and wisely expended. He told us of his plans and schemes. Where are those plans and schemes to-day?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All carried out.

Mr. WALLACE. All scattered to the four winds of heaven—nothing carried out. Like all the plans and schemes which the Minister of Agriculture has presented to the House in times past, they have been an utter failure. Now, I am a little mystified about this matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. Hon. gentlemen opposite say 'hear, hear.' They are mystified also. First, one minister went over, then another, then a whole army of ministers crossed the Atlantic, and visited Paris, and took in the exhibition, and viewed the buildings, and enjoyed themselves, all at

the public expense. I say we are mystified, and the ministers themselves are unable to give the particulars. To get out of it, they say this is not a party question. What is it ? The party on this side of the House had nothing to do with the expenditure of these thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars. All we did was to vote the money, and we did it with fear and trembling, because we knew it would not be put to a good and proper use; and our fears have been verified. Why, I read in the Auditor General's Report this item : Payments to Colonial commission on account of space, &c., $87,600. This is only on account. Is that for the building that was erected jointly by the Canadian and by the other British governments ? I would like to ask that question of the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Public Works, or anybody that happens to know it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was for the Royal commission, for the building and the space in the Imperial space in the main building, both included. Out of that we received back $10,641 from the Imperial commission as they had made a mistake in charging us for space included in their own allotment.

Mr. WALLACE. I am delighted to know that we got $10,000 back. But this is only a payment on account and we have no information as to the total amount. Is this the total ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. It is satisfactory to find that we paid only $87,000 for nothing and got back $10,000 of it.

There is another item here. I see that one H. Fabre had appartments fixed up for him, I presume in this building. Is that correct ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Where ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the city of Paris, rue Jérôme.

Mr. WALLACE. Then the government of this country, without an appropriation from parliament for that purpose——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. WALLACE. There was nothing said, when the government asked the vote of $175,000, about $7,641 being paid to fix up the appartments of Mr. Fabre in the city of Paris. Why should that be charged against the Paris exhibition ? This was not in the exhibition at all but miles away in the city of Paris. It was the residence of Mr. Hector Fabre. The minister has told us so.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not tell you anything of the kind.

Mr. WALLACE. Did the hon. gentleman not say it was in the city of Paris ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but I did not say it was the residence of Mr. Fabre.

Mr. WALLACE. What residence was it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was the offices and not the residences.

Mr. WALLACE. I must say that the offices are delightful and beautiful to behold—something that would charm the eye and please all the senses. In the office there is an ante chamber and to furnish that chamber with Wilton carpets and chairs—two at $27 each—and a letter box $19.30, and a lot of other things, cost $186. Then there is the reading room, laid also with Wilton carpets at an expense of $99.97, a table $57.90, book-case $86.85, desk $13.50, two arm chairs $57.90, six other ordinary common chairs $81.06. The total for the reading room is $419.75. This is just a common every day office.

Then you come to the rotunda and veranda: Wilton carpet $52.83 ; curtains and poles $26.63; window blinds, $26.05; table, $28.95; three chairs, $40.54 ; large sofa, $86.85 ; three easy chairs, $86.85, and sundry other things on the rotunda and veranda, making a total of only $367.42.

Then we come to room No. 1 and there we find a Wilton rug, $19.30 ; curtains and other hangings, $19.30 ; window blinds, $10.62, one sofa, $28.95 and one $19.30 ; easy chair, $18.34 ; two office chairs, $13.52 ; walnut cabinet, $11.58 ; office table, $19.30, and so on, and that room only cost $203.63.

These are the poorly furnished shed offices of Mr. Fabre in Paris. Then we come to room No. 2 : Wilton carpet, $66.17 ; two sets window hangings, $48.25 ; two pairs curtains, $5.79 ; blinds, $11.58 ; mantel decoration, $4.83 ; sofa, $57.90 ; office chair, $15.44 ; two easy chairs, $57.90 ; two chairs, $27.02 ; desk, $96.50 and wardrobe, $33.81. This room only cost $424. This is one of the commoner rooms apparently required for offices in the city of Paris. I would like to know what return we get for the moneys spent.

Then we come to room No. 3 : Wilton carpet, $56.62 ; window hangings, $19.30 ; blinds, $4.83 ; mantel decorations, $4.83 ; desk, $19.30 ; book-case, $31.84 ; office chairs, $12.55 ; sofa, $48.25 ; easy chair, $27.02 ; two chairs, $27.02. Total for that room only $254.45.

Then we come to room No. 4, and I think that when the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Agriculture were around they must have been entertained in room No. 4 : Wilton carpet, $93.23 ; two sets window hangings, $61.76; two pairs curtains, $5.79 ; blinds, $9.65 ; four double portières, $115.80 ; mantel ornaments, $4.83 ; table, $11.58 ; desk, $96.50 ; book-case, $67.55 ;

table, $19.30; office chair, $14.48; two chairs, $27.02; drawing-room furniture one set: Sofa, two easy chairs and four other chairs, $347.40—making a total for the drawing-room of only $874.89.

Then we come to room No. 5: Wilton carpet, $54.43; window hangings, $19.30; blinds, $4.83—a good many blinds——

An hon. MEMBER. Pull down the blinds.

Mr. WALLACE. I suppose that is what the hon. minister would like—to pull down the veil of oblivion over all these entertaining items. Mantel decorations, $4.83; one blind, $7.72; desk, $96.50; mahogany, $38.60; office chair, $14.47—in all, $388.32.

Room No. 6 and other rooms follow and a number of other items. And in addition to all the items I have read, and deducting $1,300 or $1,400 for insurance, and so on, we still have $3,000 and more for furnishings in addition to the items I have read.

Where did they put the $3,000 additional furniture? Under what authority did they act? When did parliament give them power to make these expenditures? Was this expenditure part of the programme the Minister of Agriculture had in mind when he asked us for $175,000, and told us what he was going to do to make an exhibit worthy of the Dominion? Now we find the money squandered, we find that the ministers have helped themselves liberally, and no account given, of course. They say: You cannot entertain in a way to show Canada off in the best light without spending money. Why, Mr. Chairman, when we looked at the newspapers of that time, we saw telegrams: 'Mr. Tarte is in London;' 'Mr. Tarte left for London to-night'; 'Mr. Tarte has been in London for some days.' And there were significant stories as to the business that took him so frequently to London. Another question—this furniture, which has been charged at $7,641—where is that furniture now?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is there in the office.

Mr. WALLACE. What office?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Fabre's office in Paris.

Mr. WALLACE. This was bought and charged to the Paris exposition, and it remains there now that the Paris exposition is over. Is that furniture needed there—$7,641 worth? If so, what did Mr. Fabre do before it arrived? Did he sit up all night in a chair? Of course, the government did not get those rooms for nothing. What was the rental of them? I do not see it charged in the account. Was that part of the $109,000 for the particulars of which, the First Minister tells us, we shall have to wait another year? Is it proposed that the furniture shall remain there, and that this great mansion is to be rented at a high rental, like the old Seybold building here? The government must give us further particulars. They pretended to make a clean breast of all they knew. They told only what they could not avoid telling. We must have an explanation of this $87,000, less the $10,000, which we have been told has been returned, for that building, which was worth $40,000 or $50,000 according to the Minister of Public Works, but which was not worth more than a quarter of the money according to more competent authority. We want to know what was done with the money of the people of Canada that the Minister of Agriculture, with his usual incapacity, pledged himself two years ago, would be administered economically, which promise he has been utterly powerless to carry out. I would like to ask another question—there are a lot of names here, headed by the Minister of Public Works as chief commissioner, and these other commissioners also spent large amounts of money. I would like to know who was Jas. Jardine, one of the commissioners.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We produce him—he is here.

Mr. WALLACE. What did he do, I would like to know? When this building was found to be only a worthless barn that did not even keep out the rain from heaven, was there nobody of all these commissioners who could look at it with the eagle eye of the Minister of Public Works and know that the roof would leak, and that it was an improper building to hold the exhibits of Canada? Now, Mr. Chairman, we shall have to have these two ministers give us a little more information about the way the $315,000 of the people of Canada was squandered.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I always like to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace). He is unique. In my long experience I have never met such a character as he. It takes a man of some ability to make a speech such as the one he has just delivered—ability of a certain order which, perhaps, not many people would like to possess. If the hon. gentleman knew a little more of the world, the world that was in Paris, and is to be found at any exhibition of this kind, he, even he, would not have ventured to say what he has said to-night. Canada is a great country, and her people would not like her to appear in the eyes of the world as a beggarly country. There were many eminent people from all parts of the world in Paris. All the nations represented in Paris had their buildings and offices, 'appartements,' to use the French word, which, I believe, is English also. England had large space in all the buildings, and besides that, in Avenue de la Bourdonais, Col. Jekyll had appartements much larger than the Canadian ones. We took advantage of the Canadian agency in

Paris, which is located at 10 Rue de Rome. It was furnished with decency, as Canada has to be treated everywhere, so that we might be able to receive people who called upon us. I was there most of the time receiving people from all parts of the world, including, of course, the Canadians who visited Paris—I am glad to say we saw thousands and thousands of them. The Canadians who came to Paris had a right to be received somewhere, had a right to have rooms where they could read or write or transact business. I wish the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) had gone to Paris. He would have seen that all the nations spent vast amounts of money in entertaining. I am sorry that I ever accepted the position of Canadian commissioner in Paris, and I will tell you why. We were invited everywhere, entertained everywhere, but, with the limited amount of money I had at my disposal, we were not able to do honour to this country as we should have been able to do. We can be reproached for nothing except that we did not know what was going to take place in Paris. Instead of spending what we have spent, we should have spent a good deal more. Think of what that exhibition has done to advertise Canada. There are even in this country business firms who spend $500,000 a year in advertising. I know a firm in Canada in which one of our senators is interested, which spent last year $1,000,000 in advertising. The Paris exhibition was a great advertisement for Canada. Was it not reasonable, was it not decent, was it not our duty to have rooms there furnished in a decent manner to receive the visitors who were calling for information ? The furniture that was purchased is the property of this country ; and if the hon. gentleman ever goes to Paris—I wish to God he would go sometimes, because he would learn a little refinement, which he so sorely needs.

Mr. WALLACE. He will take no lessons in that from the Minister of Public Works, nor in integrity either.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think any lesson I would give him would be altogether lost. I have not the slightest intention to teach him any lesson. But this I must resent—when I hear a man who was nearly becoming a minister speak as he does to-night, I say that the country should not stand it. He has said things which I would characterize, if the word was parliamentary, as being a disgrace to this Canadian parliament. We are not such a small country after all that other nations should look upon us as not understanding our duty. The hon. gentleman has again referred to my London trips. I did go to London on several occasions. If I understood him right he has spoken about ' ominous stories' as to what led me to London. I do not like to have any misunderstanding, I like plain language. If the hon. gentleman has heard any 'ominous stories' let him tell those stories in the House. This is the proper place.

Mr. WALLACE. I will do it at the proper time, never fear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The proper time is now.

Mr. WALLACE. I am the judge of that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let the hon. gentleman speak out—speak now. I have nothing to hide either in my public life or in my private life. If the hon. gentleman has anything to say, let him say it now. I know one gentleman who, last year, was villain enough to circulate stories in this parliament. He is no more a member of the House, and he won't come back here for some time. Let us have plain speaking between members of the House. Sir, the hon. gentleman has spoken of my commissioners, he has slighted one of them, Mr. Jardine. Mr. Jardine is not here. He has been a most painstaking commissioner in Paris. There was abundance of work for all of them, and they have performed their work successfully and zealously. I am glad on this occasion to bear testimony to the success and energy with which they performed all their duties.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I feel proud that Canada took so honourable a position at the Paris exhibition, and that even the province of Prince Edward Island made a creditable show of its products. But we are very sorry that such an enterprise as the Paris exhibition should have been prostituted to such political debauchery as the hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett) has brought to the notice of the House to-night. I think, Mr. Speaker, it would have been a good thing if the roof of that building had fallen in on some of them, rather than that such disclosures should have been made to the people of this country. Now, what are the facts in this connection ? The Minister of Agriculture treated the affair in a light manner. I have before me the declaration of a respectable gentleman, made in regard to this Pineau matter, and I am going to read it to the House, because it is well that the House should have a true understanding of the state of the case :

I, William Callaghan, of Ebbsfleet, Prince county, province of Prince Edward Island, do solemnly declare that on or about February 9 last, Henry J. Pineau, M.L.A., of Ebbsfleet, called on me and said that he wished to speak to me on an important matter, and wanted my advice. He stated to me that he was approached by Dr. Wickham, of Tignish, and was offered, if he would accept, that he (Mr. Pineau) could get the appointment of commissioner to the Paris exposition with the pay of $5 per day and all expenses. He further stated that Dr. Wickham told him he would have to go to Charlottetown to see Premier Farquharson, who would direct him to the Deputy Minister of Public Works, Ottawa, for further instructions. I told him he was adopting a dangerous course, and better mind what he was about, and go to Tig-

nish and see his friends, which he promised to do. He said it would be a great thing for him to see his own country—France. I afterwards saw Mr. Pineau. He told me that he had a letter in his pocket, and his appointment was all right, to date from April 15 to December 1, 1900.

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

(Sgd.) WILLIAM CALLAGHAN.

Declared before me at Ebbsfleet, Prince county, province of Prince Edward Island, this 28th day of May, A.D. 1900.

CHARLES DALTON,
J.P. for Prince County.

Now, we have also another declaration to the same effect, and then we have the following letter from Mr. Pineau himself :

Ottawa, March 8, 1900.

Mr. James W. Shea,

Dear Sir,—I now take the pleasure of writing you a few lines to let you know that I am in Ottawa at present, and I must also tell you that it is a fine place. I have seen a good deal already. I must also tell you that I have been well received by the government here, and I am weighting for orders to go on which I think will be to-morrow or next day I was all over and Seen all the House of Parliament the House of Commons and the Senate Chamber and I must say it is a fine Place to see. it is no wonder that they are so Keen to get here. you keep my C.M.B.A dewes paid up I will send you money in a few days the 10 lb. twine I got from you you can get it Back you can also get your men Boarded at our place if you want and See that they have what they want. You give them what is right for Boarding them I Know you will do that you can tell them at Home if you See them that you got a letter from me I Suppose Some people are very mad at me for doing what I have done I Could not Help Myself it is what every man is doing looking out for himself not more at Present I Remain yours truly

I will write you in a few days and will give you more in detail

HENRY J. PINEAU.

Now, there is a letter of the gentleman himself, and you have the sworn affidavits of two reliable persons. The history of the matter is simply this. The government of Prince Edward Island had lost the confidence of the people, and in consequence a number of by-elections. There was a by-election to be held in the first district of Prince and the life of the Farquharson administration depended upon winning that seat. They lost the seat, but the Dominion elections were coming on, and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I presume, was very anxious to keep the local government in power on the island so as to give him a little prestige. So negotiations were entered into, and they sent this Dr. Wickman to this man Pineau, who was financially embarrassed at the time, and the result was that they got him spirited away to Ottawa. Nobody knew that he was coming up, but they got him here. He was in communication with the government, and it does not matter whether or not the hon. Minister of Agriculture or the hon. Minister of Public Works gets up and says : I did not know he was here. I did not see him. That has nothing to do with the case providing he was seen by the Deputy Minister of Public Works or by any member who was authorized to approach him. This shows that the deed was perpetrated and that the government had a hand in that transaction. Will these hon. gentlemen get up and declare before the committee that they knew of no man from Prince Edward Island being up here——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Who was seeking a position of some emolument in order to be paid for some deed he was doing on the island ? I think the matter should not be treated so lightly, and I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the hon. Minister of Public Works should get up and tell how much of this money credited to the Paris exhibition was paid for the people of Canada, and how they excuse the expenditure of $312,000 for advertising Canada and doing other things when we know that they were prostituting the money of the people of this country to the uses of political debauchery. I think the expenditure needs more explanation than the hon. Minister of Agriculture has given to the committee.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, since you have allowed a little extraneous matter to be thrown into the discussion, I would ask for time to throw a little extraneous matter back in reply. The hon. member from the western part of Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hackett) has referred to Mr. Pineau, you may be surprised to know that I also know a little about Mr. Pineau. Perhaps the hon. gentlemen opposite would like to know how we got the information we have. I am sorry I cannot take them into my confidence. However, I am willing to deal with a few occurrences. It is stated that Pineau came to Ottawa. I do not know whether that is so or not. It was actually stated that he came under the malign influence of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), or of his private secretary. I do not know whether that is so or not, but I am informed on what I consider indisputable evidence that in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite that hon. gentlemen opposite sent a spy, a detective, after this man Pineau to Boston.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. KENDALL. This I do know that a man went down and met Pineau after rather a difficult hunt, and he said, so I am informed: Pineau, you want money. You have been brought under the influence of the Liberals, but we have as much money as they have, and we can furnish you with what is necessary for you to go back to Prince Edward Island, and put yourself right with your own party. Now, let me say that I know that an

agent was in direct communication with a gentleman who is a very prominent factor in the Conservative party, who was so important a man in the Conservative party that he was selected to play a very important part in the late elections.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) knows very little about the matter. Where does he get his information? Who was the spy he spoke about? Surely the hon. gentleman was not the spy himself? Did he go to Boston himself? He was in the pay of the government, he was supporting them, and while he was working in connection with the bait freezers was he hunting up Pineau at the same time? Pineau was paid as my hon. friend says. All I have to say is that we in Prince county, a little over a year ago, elected Pineau to go to the legislature of Prince Edward Island to oppose the Farquharson government, and, that fresh from the people, he was seduced from his allegiance and taken away and bribed by the present government to support their friends in Prince Edward Island. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) knows very well about the case. He says that Pineau was approached by a Conservative who said that we had as much money as the other side, and that we were going to buy him to support us. Why should we, the people who elected Pineau, be obliged to buy him? He was elected by the free votes of Prince county. This man was debauched. He was brought here by the government, and was held in the shadow of these buildings for a week, and told that he would be sent to Paris. My hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) has read to the committee a letter sent to a friend in Prince Edward Island. He has also read a declaration made by a reputable gentleman in West Prince, who swore to the statement made by Pineau that he was to go to Charlottetown to Mr. Farquharson, and that he would be directed by him to the Deputy Minister of Public Works in Ottawa. That statement has not been refuted by any evidence on the other side. It is a blot upon the fair fame of the country that we should have a government that would buy a man like this. If the government cannot hold power by the intelligent votes of the electors of this country they have no right to hold power at all, and when we find that this government is assisting a local government to maintain power it is a shame and a disgrace that should not be upheld by the people of this country. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) may think that he is entitled to some consideration in this House. If he has been going around hunting Pineau, if he has been the spy, he should be condemned. The Auditor General's Report shows that he has received thousands of dollars of the people's money in connection with these bait freezers. Is he the man who, through Dr. Wickham, approached Pineau, and if we believe his statement we must believe that he followed him to Boston with the bait in his pocket, and gave it to him to support the local government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am authorized by the Deputy Minister of Public Works who is now on the floor of parliament to say that he does not know Pineau, and that he has never seen him, and I am adding on my own behalf that I would like to know where Pineau is now.

Mr. KENDALL. I may say in reply to the hon. member from West Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Hackett), that I do not think he is serious when he asks if I was the spy employed by the Conservative party to hunt up Pineau. In the second place, I tell him that the man who was employed in that work undertook to carry a constituency in this country with no other qualification than his bank account, and later, if necessary, we can demonstrate this.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call your attention, for a moment, to the fact that the last speaker (Mr. Kendall) is scarcely a disinterested witness in this House. The Auditor General's Report contains a record of the hon. gentleman's transactions.

Mr. KENDALL. Read it.

Mr. CLANCY. I am going to read it for the benefit of the hon. gentleman, and, perhaps he will not be quite so fresh when I have done.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would ask hon. gentlemen to keep as near the discussion of the item under the consideration of the committee as possible. I think we have been wandering away from the point under discussion. I would appeal to hon. gentlemen to keep within a reasonable limit of the question before us.

Mr. CLANCY. I bow with great pleasure to your ruling, but I would like to know if you have laid down one set of rules for some gentlemen——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CLANCY—I am asking a very proper question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CLANCY. I said I bowed to the hon. gentleman's ruling, and then I have a right to ask his reasons for that ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I had no special reference to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) more than to any other member. We have been wandering away from the question before the committee, and I would appeal to members on both sides to keep as near to the discussion as possible. That is my ruling.

Mr. WALLACE. A reference to Pineau who was engaged to go to Paris, is quite within the question.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He was not engaged.

Mr. WALLACE. We will not be diverted from doing our duty in having a thorough investigation.

Mr. CLANCY. I desire to say that I am going to submit to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. gentleman who took his seat a moment ago can find protection under it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I desire to say once more that Mr. Pineau was not directly or indirectly——

Mr. HENDERSON. I rise to a point of order. The Minister of Agriculture is discussing Mr. Pineau, which he has no right to do under your ruling. Now, I will ask the Minister of Agriculture to sit down until we get the Chairman's ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My ruling in regard to Mr. Pineau is that we have heard just enough of Mr. Pineau.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) with the Auditor General's Report in his hand, was preparing to criticise items of expenditure in connection with the Paris exposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. SPROULE. That is what I understood.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not for hon. gentlemen to say 'No, no,' when they do not know what book he had in his hand. Was not the hon. gentleman for Bothwell quite in order in discussing the Paris exposition ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman from Bothwell stated that he was going to quote some figures in reference to another subject.

Mr. SPROULE. He did not say it was another subject.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is what I understood, and when I noticed that we were wandering outside the discussion before the committee, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) saw that I was right and the excuse he made was that I allowed others to do so, and then he like a gentleman sat down and waived his contention.

Mr. CLANCY. I did not state what subject I was about to deal with, and so the hon. gentleman is entirely in the dark.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, that we have heard enough of Mr. Pineau, and I will say nothing further on the subject. There are, however, matters connected with the Paris exposition of which I wish to speak. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) quoted certain individuals who apparently have been to Paris and have expressed their opinion against the good name of the Canadian exhibit. I was surprised to hear such expression of opinion, because during last summer when I was unfortunately prevented by pressure of other business from going to Paris. I took every possible means of seeking information from Canadians who had been to Paris, and I watched the press carefully to see what opinions were published in regard to the Canadian exhibit. I was extremely gratified to find from private individuals occupying high positions in this country and abroad, from gentlemen intimately connected with the party opposed to us politically, as well as from those who are entirely indifferent to politics ; a universal consensus of opinion that the Canadian exhibit at Paris was a credit to Canada, and that it was a surprise to people from other countries who previously did not understand or appreciate the material and industrial progress of our country during the last few years. I felt that the Canadian exhibit at Paris was costing a considerable amount of money, and that if it did not fulfil its object, this would have been an unjustifiable and extravagant expenditure. I felt myself to a large extent responsible for that expenditure, but from the knowledge that has come to me, I have no hesitation in justifying before the House and before the people, that expenditure, and, Sir, had we spent much more I would have been ready to justify it, because of the vast beneficial results achieved for Canada. I have heard encomiums from Canadians who have gone to Paris, and from foreigners who were sent by their various governments to examine into the economic condition of their rivals in the great commercial markets of the world. I have the testimony here that our Canadian exhibit was one of the most successful in its economic aspects of all the exhibits at the Paris exhibition. In the gathering together of the exhibits, the Canadian commssioners adopted the view that we should not make a flash exhibit of pastimes and side shows to attract the ordinary vulgar crowd for amusement sake, but that we should make an exhibit of the economic products of Canada, so that those who wanted to buy raw material or manufactured products would be lead to make inquiries in Canada for commercial purposes, and to place orders here which would redound to our profit commercially. That was the object with which the exhibits were gathered together, and that object I commended. I took upon myself as Minister

of Agriculture to see that in four great classes the department over which I have the honour to preside, should be worthily represented. We collected an agricultural exhibit, a horticultural exhibit, a mineral exhibit, and an exhibit of forestry, and of fishery and game products, and we put these exhibits collectively before the world, and I am proud to know that as a result every one of these exhibits obtained the grand prix, the highest award possible at the Paris exposition.

In addition to that, we provided the facilities by which the Canadian exhibitors were enabled to go to Paris and exhibit in ordinary competition. We paid the cost of transporting the exhibits to Paris. We paid the expenses of the commissioners, who devoted nearly a year to the preparation of the exhibit, who went through the length and breadth of this country, giving information to the industrial classes, to the agricultural classes, to those engaged in mining, in the fisheries and in forest work; and by these means we were able to stimulate the people of Canada to make a creditable exhibit. I found, what was a matter of extreme gratification to me, as I am sure it must be to all Canadians, that when our commissioners first went through Canada and asked the people to prepare exhibits for the Paris exhibition, they were told on all sides: We are so busy with the ordinary affairs of commerce, our workshops are so busy with orders ahead that we can hardly meet these orders, and we cannot afford the time to prepare exhibits for the Paris exhibition. This was a condition of affairs in which we might well rejoice, a condition which had come about within two or three years, but which unfortunately had been unknown in Canada for many years before this government came into power. That was the condition of the industries of the country under this administration in the year 1899-1900; but by reason of the value which the Paris exhibition would be to the industries of the country, and by reason of the urgent solicitations of the commissioners, Canada did for the first time in her history make a creditable display of her industrial products and show the world that in many classes of manufacturing she could take a proud position in competition with the other nations of the world. This was a contrast to what she had done a few years before in the Columbian exhibition at Chicago, where every Canadian had to hang his head in shame at the miserably inadequate display which Canadian industries made there. But we were determined to show that Canada could take a position in the industrial world of which she need not be ashamed; and the result has fully justified our confidence. I have the long list of awards which were given to the Canadian exhibits at Paris, and I will read it to the House:

AWARDS to Canadian Exhibitors.

Class Number.	Exhibit.	Grand Prizes.	Gold Medals.	Silver Medals.	Bronze Medals.	Honourable Mentions.
1	Non-edible agricultural produce	3	2	3		7
2	Secondary education	1				
3	Higher education	1				
4	Teaching of fine arts			1		
6	Commercial teaching		1			
7	Works of art				5	
9	Sculpture and engraving			1	1	1
11	Typography	1			1	
12	Photography		2	1	1	1
13	Books and bookbinding		1	3	1	
14	Maps		2	1		
16	Medicine					1
17	Musical instruments		1	2	3	
20	Engines					1
21	General machinery			2	1	
22	Machine tools			1		1
28	Civil engineering			4		
29	Plans of public works	1	2		1	
30	Carriages		1	2	4	4
31	Saddlery			1		
32	Railway and tramway plant			1		
33	Plant for mercantile marine			2	2	
35	Implements, rural cultivation	1	5	6		
38	Agricultural statistics	1	1			
39	Vegetable food products	5	4	1		
40	Animal food products	3				
41	Non-edible agricultural products		2			

AWARDS to Canadian Exhibitors—*Concluded.*

Class Number.	Exhibit.	Grand Prizes.	Gold Medals.	Silver Medals.	Bronze Medals.	Honourable Mentions.
42	Honey		1			
43	Horticultural appliances			1	2	
44	Kitchen garden plants		1			
45	Fruit	10	65	26	8	
49	Forestry appliances			1		
50	Forest products	1		2		
52	Products of hunting	2	7	5	2	3
53	Fishing appliances and products	1	1	1		
55	Appliances, manufacture food products				1	
56	Farinaceous food products	1		1		
58	Preserved food products		1	2		
59	Sugar and confectionery		1	2	4	
61	Syrups and liquors		1	2		
63	Minerals	6	13	11	8	4
64	Metallurgy		3	3		
65	Metal working		2	3	2	1
66	Decoration and furniture of buildings			1	4	1
68	Wall papers			2		
69	Household and art furniture			2	2	1
72	Pottery			1		
74	Heating apparatus		1	1	3	1
78	Dyeing and bleaching appliances				1	
79	Sewing appliances			2	1	
80	Cotton—thread and fabrics	1	1	1		
82	Woollen fabrics		1	1	1	
83	Silk fabrics		1			
84	Lace and embroidery				1	
85	Tailoring and dressmaking			2		
86	Clothing trades		4	6	1	
87	Applied chemistry			1	2	2
88	Manufacture of paper	1	2			
89	Leather and skins		1	1	1	
90	Perfumery			1	1	1
91	Manufacture of tobacco		1			
92	Stationery		1		1	
93	Cutlery				1	
95	Jewellery				1	
98	Fancy articles, brushes, etc			1		
99	India-rubber products		1	1		
100	Toys				2	
109	Provident institutions		1	1		
112	Public charitable relief		2			
	Total, 394 awards, including	41	136	117	70	30

Although this is an extraordinary showing, I have still to make an explanation to show that it is more important than at first glance it might appear to be. A large number of these Grand Prix and gold medals were given for what are known as collective exhibits. In other countries these collective exhibits were not so largely made use of; but our competitors were individual exhibitors and in that way they got a much larger number of prizes. For instance, our fruits were collective exhibits, made either by provinces or by the Dominion, and these collective exhibits could only obtain one Grand Prix for each exhibit. We could have divided each of these collective exhibits over and over again, and in that way have got a Grand Prix for every portion of that exhibit. And I will venture to say, in connection with the fruit exhibit at Paris, that a totally new conception has come into the minds of the people of the continent of Europe as to Canada; that is, for the first time in many generations, the old story of Canada being a few acres of snow has been absolutely and for ever set at rest, and to-day Canada is known to be a land flowing with milk and honey, and the people of that portion of Europe appreciate this country at its true worth.

I have here another statement which I would like to refer to; for while this statement of our success is absolute, there is a comparison of which we may well feel proud. I have here a comparative list of the awards granted to the Canadian exhibit and those granted to the mother country. In many of these things we would naturally

come to the front; but I would be rather surprised to find Canada coming to the front in competition with the old land in certain products which for centuries she has been working up. Take, for instance, books and binding. Great Britain received ten awards, but Canada received five, almost half as many or more in that highly finished product as the mother country was able to secure.

Take musical instruments, Great Britain received three awards but Canada received six, or this young country had doubled the success of the mother land in this line.

Again, in general machinery, in which the old land has for centuries been the leading country in the world. Great Britain received eleven awards and we received three, and that, I think, is a most creditable showing for Canada in this, to her, comparatively new field.

In carriages and vehicles, the mother land received five awards and Canada eleven, one of which was a grand prix, and there was no such award given Great Britain.

In agricultural implements, in which the mother land entered into keen competition, Great Britain received twenty four awards and Canada twelve.

In horticulture, with the gardens and the soil of England close at hand, right at the doors of Paris, while our products had to come over 3,000 miles, Great Britain received two awards and we three.

In fruits we received altogether 109 awards, and our fruit had to come over 3,000 miles before they could enter into the competition.

In minerals—and I understood an hon. gentleman opposite to say a little while ago that in that line Canada was not properly represented in mineral display—Canada received forty-two awards and the British Isles only fourteen. In other words, we trebled their success.

In hunting apparatus, we received six awards against Great Britain's eleven, and in the clothing trade we received eleven against her twenty. In the manufacture of paper, we received three against Great Britain's four, and in leather manufacture and skins we had three awards against Great Britain's four.

Altogether Great Britain received 853 awards, and we received 394, or very nearly half as many. I venture to say that this is a showing of which every Canadian should be proud, and of which I certainly, as the minister responsible for the collection of the exhibits and their display in Paris, am proud and have no hesitation in putting before the country without fear of criticism.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman a list of the prizes taken at the Chicago exhibition. He made some unfavourable comments on our exhibit there, and I presume he will read to the House, to be fair, a list of the prizes taken by us at that exhibition.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the list. I was not responsible for that exhibition.

Mr. CLANCY. But the hon. gentleman is responsible for the statement he has made.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think I know as much about the Chicago exhibition as the hon. gentleman. In certain lines, Canada made a remarkable success, but in the industrial lines, nobody will dispute the fact that Canada's exhibit at Chicago gave to the world the idea that she had no manufacture worthy of the name. In her natural products, she made a splendid showing. And again in Paris, she made a very gratifying display, but what I want to emphasize is the fact that in this Paris exhibition, for the first time in the history of Canadian exhibits at any international or foreign exhibition, Canada came to the front as an industrial and manufacturing country.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thanks to the National Policy.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman and his friends know well that in 1896 the people of Canada were tired of their administration of the National Policy and expelled them from the government benches, and the wisdom of the people is shown in the fact that four years later, under the wise policy of a Liberal administration, our industries had advanced in leaps and bounds and we made an exhibit at Paris which has opened the eyes of the world.

Hon. gentlemen opposite find fault with the way in which the money was spent in the Paris exhibition. But the reason is not far to seek. They remember the good old days when they were able to reward their own friends by their lavish expenditure at the exhibition in Chicago, and cannot conceal their chagrin at the fact that these matters are now in the hands of other men who are able to use them to better advantage to the country.

These hon. gentlemen have read letters criticising Canada's exhibit. Let me read a statement which I am sure these hon. gentlemen must admit comes from an unprejudiced source:

> It will be surprising if this show in Paris does not draw world-wide attention to Canada's mining.

I think the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) took some exception to our exhibit in that line.

Mr. WALLACE. I made no reference to our mineral exhibit.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Then it must be the hon. gentleman's understudy, the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule). I sometimes mix the one with the other.

And the enormous possibilities in the investment of capital. There is no display of mineral wealth from any country represented in the Paris exhibition except the United States which can for a moment compare with that of Canada, and certainly never before has so large, varied and rich a show of mineral from any single colony been seen in any international exhibit.

The same article goes on to say :

In the little space allowed to Canada, the Commissioners have visibly displayed raw material as most likely to attract attention to the immense forest wealth of Canada . . . It would be difficult for England to make a better show of elementary and intermediate education, and in some respects Canada puts the old country to shame.

A little while ago some hon. gentlemen on the other side said our educational exhibit was not worthy of the country, but as a matter of fact, in primary education, Great Britain received only 33 awards and Canada 18, and Canada got high awards for her primary, intermediate and university exhibits. Now here is another extract :

In some departments Britain was foremost, but generally speaking she has allowed it to appear that France, Germany and America are the three great commercial countries and that France is the great colonizer. Canada, however, has put her best foot foremost, and with that loyalty to the empire and the interests of her own people which distinguishes her in these days among the younger nations, she has set up at the Trocadero a show of her industries and boundless resources which will advertise her throughout the world. Her corner of the exhibition is at all times one of the liveliest of the whole show and in proportion to its size perhaps attracts more real business than any other.

That is taken from the Mail and Empire of August 29, sent by its special correspondent at the Paris exhibition. There is another thing I would like to put before the House :

A comparative estimate of the value of Canada's exhibit can only be formed after seeing the products and industries of other countries.

A comparative estimate of the value of Canada's exhibit can be formed only after seeing the products and industries of the other countries. It is gratifying to be able to state that from a commercial point of view, our Dominion leads the whole exposition. This is a testimony of many competent judges, including a number of Frenchmen. We have not the rich and artistic products which dazzle the eyes in the pavilions of the foreign powers, but we have a greater number and variety of useful manufactures than any other country. The number of grand prix which have fallen to our share will be a surprise to many. We have already won the highest awards in forestry, fish and game, agriculture, canoes and minerals, and it is more than likely that the grand prix will also be given to our bicycles and agricultural implements, which are in the annex at Vincennes.

That article is from the Montreal Daily Star of July 21, 1900—again a moment of clear vision accorded to the blind. The Montreal Gazette of August 25 says :

Cold storage good——

Mr. FISHER.

Hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes twit me a little with the failure of cold storage, but the Montreal Gazette says my exhibit in Paris was an excellent one.

A large stand, showing Canadian apples, &c., gathered last fall and preserved in the cold storage, attracted great attention. Cold storage is not familiar yet to the crowds, who would hardly credit that the fine specimens of apples were not wax imitations. Had the French commissioners granted sufficient room, it was the intention of the Canadian commissioners to make cold storage a very prominent exhibit. As it is, all that is to be seen of this marvellous invention is in a little out of the way cellar, where the Linde British Refrigeration Co., of London and Montreal have their system in operation.

And then he goes on to describe the exhibit we have there. Now, let us take extracts from other papers. I have here a statement from the Manitoba Free Press, with the testimony of a prominent citizen of Winnipeg, Dr. McArthur. I do not know the gentleman, but he says :

Canada had the finest display of natural products. Canada had the only cold storage exhibit on the grounds and it excited a great deal of interest.

Here is a statement from a French newspaper, which, to save the nerves of hon. gentlemen opposite, I will not read. But here are one or two statements which I will take almost at haphazard from a large number. I find, from gentlemen who have had experience in exhibition work, and who have no connection with Canada or the Canadian commission in any shape or way. For instance, Mr. B. I. Rose, commissioner for British India, our rivals in the exhibition, occupying the adjoining building to us, and naturally desirous to putting forward their claims, says :—

With over twenty-five years' experience of international exhibitions, I can without hesitation testify that Canada's representation at Paris this year is the best and most perfect that the Dominion has ever made and I believe will result in a great increase of her trade. The elaborate statistical and other works (printed in both French and English) dealing with the products and resources of the country compare most favourably with those of all other countries and reflect the greatest credit on the government of the Dominion.

(Signed) B. I. ROSE,
Commissioner for British India.

Here is a gentleman who is engaged in trade in England, and whose business is especially interesting to us, because he is interested in the produce trade—Mr. Walter Stark :

I have been exceedingly pleased in looking over Canada's exhibits, and must say it does both the producers, and those who have been responsible for display, very much credit. Such a splendid display of Canada's products must be an eye opener to Europe and should be of great service to the Dominion.

Here is a French gentleman of special qualifications as a representative of the Chambre

de Commerce de Lyons, and I am afraid, even though it grates on the feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite, I shall have to read it :

Paris, October, 1900.

Having been intrusted by the Chamber of Commerce, of Lyons, to gather the elements of a collection of samples, in connection with the industrial and agricultural production of Canada, I have received from Mr. Auguste Dupuis, the secretary of the Canadian section at the Paris Exposition, all desirable data and information. The Chamber of Commerce, of Lyons, would receive with acknowledgments any collection it would please the Dominion government to send them.

(Signed) F. VERTAN.

So, here we have an anticipation on the part of a French gentleman, representing the Chambre de Commerce de Lyons, of a large augmentation of the trade between Canada and France in consequence of the exhibition. Here is another gentleman from France, who was particularly authorized to study the products of foreign countries, and especially of colonies, for the purpose of helping the French government in the development of their colony in Algiers :

Mr. Amédée Rebattu, lumber merchant, from Bone (Algeria), a member of the statistical committee of the 'Algerian Statistical Union' and a member of the jury (class 90) at the exhibition of 1900, asks for information concerning the use and manufacture of cold storage appliances for the preservation of fruit.

He came to us for information and specimens in regard to cold storage. Here is another gentleman, the assistant commissioner general of Great Britain :

Paris, Nov. 29, 1900.

I am delighted to be afforded this opportunity of placing upon record my admiration for the successful manner in which the work of the Canadian section of the Paris exhibition has been carried out.

The installation of the exhibits, combined the most remarkable illustrations of the industrial wealth and progress of the Dominion with general artistic effect which it would be difficult to surpass, whilst the courtesy and experience of the organizers naturally contributed in the highest degree to the success of the section.

(Signed) EDMUND R. SPEARMAN
Assistant commissioner general
of Great Britain.

Mr. HUGHES. To whom is that letter addressed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These were expressions written in a Canadian book at the Canadian exhibit at Paris. And Col. Herbert Jekyll says :

Paris, Nov. 29, 1900.

I have much pleasure in bearing witness to the admirable display made by Canada at the exhibition. In spite of the limited space which it was possible to place at the disposal of the Dominion, the exhibition was so well organized and arranged, that it afforded a good representation of the resources of the country and reflected the greatest credit on the able officials who were charged with its installation and administration.

(Sgd.) HERBERT JEKYLL,
Commissioner General of Great Britain,
Secretary of the Royal Commission.

And here is another I would like to lay before the committee, a representative of Belgium, a gentleman specially qualified to give an opinion :

In the magnificent show of Canada's industries and products at the Trocadéro, I was enabled to see a striking corroboration of what I had previously read in magazines and other publications. I am delighted to have this opportunity of testifying to the same.

(Signed) LTE. ROLUI,
15 rue des Augustins, Bruxelles.
In charge of the information service for the export of agricultural products from Belgium.

Now, the hon. gentleman opposite has spoken about a certain individual whom they have quoted. I have also here quotations of certain individuals whose names I think will be acceptable even to hon. gentlemen opposite. Here is one :

My friends and I are greatly pleased with the Canadian exhibit and I, who with dear love remember my old home, rejoice to realize my country's improvement, development and increasing prosperity.

(Signed)
MACDONALD N. EARNSCLIFFE.

Here is another :

The thoroughly practical character of the exhibit combined with effective and tasteful arrangement (which is in itself a work of business capacity) cannot fail to strike the observer with highly favourable impressions.

In my own case these impressions are of course made peculiarly agreeable, because of the many pleasant associations awakened by renewed acquaintance with typical products of the country which must hold a firm place in the regard of those who have partaken of the hospitality of 'Our Lady of the Sunshine.'

(Signed) ABERDEEN.

Here is another :

I am delighted to be afforded this opportunity of congratulating our brethren of Canada upon their magnificent and most interesting industrial and agricultural exhibit.

(Signed) A. GOUBARD,
Member of the Rouen Chamber of Commerce.

Here are several others from Canada, but I will not read them because they are largely a repetition of each other. But, I want to read this one signed by a gentleman who was one of the committee on food products:

The fruit exhibit is admirable and defies description. I shall be delighted to know the names and addresses of the various fruit producers and to represent some of them in Paris. Being an agent for food products, I could easily place those products on the market, and especially canned fruit in the natural state, such as peaches, plums, raspberries and apricots.

(Signed) E. CERF,
Agent for food products.

I will give this one :

I have visited most parts of the world, and I believe the Canadian display of fruit at Paris exhibition is the finest I have seen.

(Signed)

CHEVALIER KENN DE HOVGERWOERD, Consul General in Turkey, Persia, Arabia, Siam, etc., Les Sources, Champagne, Seine-et-Oise, France.

And this one :

Being a manufacturer of preserves, am highly pleased with Canadian show of fruit. Shall at any time be pleased to receive lists, &c.

(Sig.) S. G. CANNING, Birmingham, England.

And this one :

I am surprised at the great variety of fruits and qualities. No one certainly who had not visited Canada would dream of the variety and beauty.

(Signed) ANTOINE MONFERRAT, Alexandria, Egypt.

Here is another gentleman from Redhill, England, who says :

Absolutely the best show of fruit in the exhibition, which is a great and pleasant surprise to find.

I think I have read enough to convince hon. gentlemen opposite even, if they are open to conviction at all, that an unprejudiced opinion of this exhibit was that it was extremely creditable to Canada, and greatly extended the reputation of Canada abroad.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. gentleman say how many newspaper correspondents were paid by the government during the Paris exposition, and who they were ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not pay anybody whose opinions I have read. I think there were one or two gentlemen connected with the press who were attached to the exhibition commission. They were there only for a short time, and were employed to give information about Canada, for which they were especially well equipped. I did not pay the Star, I did not pay the Mail and Empire, I did not pay the Montreal Gazette, I did not pay the Baroness Macdonald, or any of these other people whose opinions I have quoted.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has not answered my question. I asked how many newspaper correspondents, apart from those whose opinions the hon. gentleman has been reading to boom himself, were paid by the department for their services during the exhibition ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have told the hon. gentleman that I think two gentlemen connected with the press were employed.

Mr. CLANCY. Who were they ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One of them was a gentleman from the city of Quebec, Mr. A. Girard, who received a small sum of money to go over there and write to the Canadian papers an account of the exhibit, and write about to the foreign press. The other gentleman was Mr. Wilkinson, from British Columbia.

Mr. CLANCY. Did any of these articles emanate from Mr. Girard?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not one of them, unless possibly the Mail and Empire and the Star may have employed him. But certainly he did not write any of the opinions that I have just read.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). To what Canadian newspapers did he contribute ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. To Le Soleil of Quebec, and two or three others. I have not quoted the opinion of a single one of these papers. I have not quoted the opinion of a paper in Canada except of the three that I have mentioned, the Mail and Empire, the Star and the Gazette.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). I notice in connection with the Paris exhibition, under the auspices of my good friend who, like myself is a temperance man sworn not to touch, taste or handle, an account for 40 gallons of alcohol at $1.90 a gallon. Was this for the use of those red parlors ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That alcohol was bought for the purpose of preserving fruit. And here I would like to mention, since the hon. gentleman has brought the subject forward, that one of the most effective and remarkable exhibits in the Paris exhibition was the fruit exhibit. We were able, by reason of the excellent management of Prof. Saunders, of the Experimental Farm, who had charge of that particular exhibit, to collect in the autumn of 1899, fruit from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia. The fruit was carefully collected by chosen agents throughout the orchards of Canada, and sent into cold storage in the city of Montreal in the autumn of 1899. It was kept in Montreal until the spring of 1900, it was then picked over again, packed and sent over in our cold storage departments on the steamers to Liverpool. It was sent by express from Liverpool to Paris, and put into our cold storage chambers in the Paris exhibition. That fruit was able to go out, after a passage from British Columbia, of over 6,000 miles, to Paris, in our cold storage arrangements, to come into competition with the fresh fruits of Europe, to beat them and to obtain the highest awards which were granted to any fruit on exhibition at Paris. During the summer of 1900 we again collected fresh fruit in Canada and again sent specimens of the large fruit of all the provinces in the Dominion. Again we were able to come into competition with the fresh fruits of France, Germany, England, Belgium and all the European countries,

sent straight from their own orchards by express only a few days' journey to Paris, and again Canada succeeded in beating the world and getting a larger number of awards than was given to any other country for fresh fruits. This is remarkable testimony not only to the quality of the fruit production of Canada, but to the perfection of the cold storage transportation facilities which were provided by the government for the benefit of the producers in Canada in puting their wares on the foreign markets. I do not know if there is any particular necessity for my saying anything more on these matters. If particular information is desired, I shall be glad to give all I have at my disposal. I will say this, however, that in connection with this exhibition, in connection with all the expenditure in regard to it, with every item and every detail, I am perfectly willing that the truth should be known that hon. gentlemen opposite should sift it to the bottom. I am satisfied, and know that in the hands of the commissioners who had it in charge, appointed by this government, the expenditure has been absolutely and entirely proper, correct, pure and free from any scandal whatever, and I will challenge an inquiry on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, by themselves, or in any way they can conduct it, to find out if there is anything different from what I say.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is almost impossible to get the hon. gentleman's estimates through, because he insists upon talking so much about matters that have really very little to do with them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is very unpalatable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And he takes up the time of the committee very unnecessarily. I trust he will not read very much more French while the hon. Minister of Public Works is in his seat, because, at the time, I saw the expression of agony on that hon. gentleman's face. He has a very sensitive ear and I think in justice to that hon. gentleman the hon. Minister of Agriculture should not repeat that performance. The hon. gentleman seems to want to introduce a sort of budget speech into the discussion of his estimates. He seems to think that we should consider the history of this country in regard to protection and free trade during the past twenty-five or thirty years, and that for the purpose of glorifying himself a little it is desirable that he should go into matters of that kind. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the industries of which he has spoken with so much pride, and of which we are also proud, were fostered by the policy introduced by the Liberal-Conservative party——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)—while he and his friends were running around the country talking about commercial union, free trade as it is in England and unrestricted reciprocity? Does the hon. gentleman think that a discussion in respect to these matters is really necessary for the purpose of getting his estimates through? Why is it that he introduces controversial subjects that have nothing to do with the question before the House, not pretending to give explanations to the House of the estimates which we are now endeavouring to pass? I will not assist the hon. gentleman in obstructing his own estimates by dwelling further upon that. I will leave it at that and let his remarks go for what they are worth. It is perfectly clear, however, from what the hon. Minister of Agriculture has said, that the hon. Minister of Public Works was not required in Paris at all. The hon. gentleman has explained to us that he did it all.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not go to Paris.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I feel inclined to move to strike out of these estimates the sum of $6,000 for the hon. Minister of Public Works, because it is perfectly plain that the hon. Minister of Public Works was merely the fifth wheel to the coach. The hon. Minister of Agriculture has done the whole of this, and he is the man who alone should be recognized in regard to it. This is the only case in the history of this government during the past four years in which the hon. Minister of Public Works has been compelled to sit in the background. I am firmly convinced that the country will recognize that on this one occasion at least the hon. Minister of Public Works is completely overshadowed by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Now, apart from matters of this kind, which really have not very much to do with what we are dealing with, but which were introduced unnecessarily altogether by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who is supposed to be trying to get his estimates passed, I desire to ask him a few questions which have really something to do with the matter under consideration. I notice that there are a great many people mentioned on pages D—10, 11 and up to 14, of the Auditor General's Report, to whom sums of money have been paid for travelling expenses and services. I will point out to the hon. Minister of Agriculture who they are, as we require from him some explanation in regard to them. In the first place, there is Miss Mary Barry, D—10, to whom $1,069 has been paid. Then, on page D—11 there is Mrs. Dandurand—I do not know if my French is much better than that of my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher)——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is good.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).—to whom $1,420 has been paid. Then, there is Mr. Dupuis, page D—11, to whom $2,486.24 has been paid;

Mr. Faribault, a very worthy and competent gentleman, whom I personally know, from the Geological Survey, $732.02; Miss Anna Galbraith, secretary, $560.85; Mr. A. H. Gillmor, $2,034.72; Mr. P. H. Gillmor, assistant commissioner, $591.48; Mr. A. Girard, to whom the hon. gentleman has referred, $200; Col. Gourdeau, the worthy Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, $1,380.50; Henri Hains, D—12, $678.90; Mr. Andrew Halkett, $760.67; Mr. Robert Hamilton, $1,964.65; Mr. W. H. Hay, of the Experimental Farm, $950.35; Mr. James G. Jardine, $4,199.42. Then, I may observe in passing, that Mr. Lancefield's studio in Ottawa has been paid $20 for three copies of enlarged photographs of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Hon. J. I. Tarte and Hon. S. Fisher.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is too dear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is dear? Does the hon. gentleman think it is not a good photograph?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I trust the minister's features have not been delineated before the nations of the world in such a way as not to do him complete justice. Then, there is Miss Eva LeBouthillier to whom the sum of $582 has been paid; Mr. A. P. Low, of the Geological Survey, to whom $258 has been paid; Mr. J. Marchand, architect, Paris, to whom $390.12 has been paid. I think the minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has explained that that was necessary on account of the disgraceful condition of the building on his arrival. Then there is Mr. J. M. Macoun to whom the sum of $1,489.79 has been paid; Mr. W. A. McKinnon to whom $839.56 has been paid; Mr. J. X. Perrault, commissioner, to whom the sum of $4,126.24 has been paid; Mr. W. D. Scott, commissioner, to whom $4,297.06 has been paid; Mr. R. P. Small to whom $822.70 has been paid; Mr. Angus R. Stuart to whom $478.50 has been paid; Mr. J. O. Turcotte to whom $1,153.56 has been paid; Miss E. L. Turcotte to whom $276 has been paid; Mr. J. W. Comeau to whom $755.53 has been paid; Mr. L. A. Cusson to whom $1,790.96 has been paid; Miss P. Cusson to whom $318.20 has been paid; Mr. A. D. Verrault to whom $288.65 has been paid; Mr. C. W. Willimott to whom $648.48 has been paid. Of course so far as the gentlemen who are employed on the Experimental Farm, or in the Geological Survey who are in the service of the government and whom we know, we understand they have the qualifications necessary for the work which they undertook to perform. But with regard to the others whom we do not know, I desire that the hon. gentleman shall explain what was the nature of their previous employment, if any; what qualifications, if any, they had for the work to be performed in Paris. With respect to each of them, including the officials of the government, I desire to know what the special duties of each of these persons was in connection with the exhibition in Paris. I venture to think that possibly some of the time which the minister (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is devoting to other subjects might have been more profitably employed in giving us this information.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall be very glad to give the hon. gentleman all the information he desires in regard to these matters. Miss Mary Barry translated the Woman's Hand-book, and she has an allowance for a certain number of days and her expenses over that. Miss Barry was appointed as an assistant to the honorary lady commissioner. Miss Barry is well known in the province of Quebec as a journalist and as a writer. Her acquaintance with literature and with the Dominion of Canada qualified her eminently to appear in Paris. She has great facility in both the English and the French languages, and she was well qualified to represent Canada in those conventions which the women of the world held in Paris to discuss those things which are of special interest to the fair sex.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would ask the minister to state whether this lady, as well as the other officials, while employed in connection with the exhibition, were engaged in any other occupations such as writing for newspapers for which any of them have received remuneration in addition to that which they may have received from the government of Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Miss Barry was one of several of the staff who were asked by me to contribute to Canadian papers, articles in connection with what was going on at Paris in connection with the Paris exhibition. I told Miss Barry that she must not receive any other remuneration for work of that kind, and as far as I know neither she nor any other member of the staff did receive any remuneration from any outside source. I cannot tell what their private arrangements may have been, but their instructions were that they should not do so. Miss Barry was appointed as an assistant to Madame Dandurand, the lady commissioner to represent Canada at these gatherings of the women of the world which took place in Paris. I may say that several organizations of the ladies of this country requested that at Paris the women of Canada should be recognized and represented. I believe it was in the interest of Canada that this should be done, and therefore I took upon myself to recommend the appointment of the honorary lady commissioner Madame Dandurand, who is

well known in literary circles in Canada for her writings on many subjects, was chosen, and she represented Canada most worthily. She is a lady of not only high social position in Canada, but of literary accomplishments as well, and possessed of what the French call esprit, which we can hardly translate, and which I would not like to translate in connection with a lady.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to interrupt him a moment. Miss Barry has been allowed living allowance, and that is now a system which is carried on all through the service. It is a system which has created a breach between the Auditor General and the government of the day. I do not believe that those in the service of the government should in any sense receive mean or beggarly treatment in relation to their expenses, and I can quite understand that in certain cases it might not be wise that the accounts of persons occupying certain positions should be published to the world. I wish to point out this case, because it is becoming the habit of this government to allow living expenses which are equivalent to part of a salary. I see that Miss Barry is allowed the maximum of $6 a day. While she no doubt occupied an important position, I do not understand that she occupied a position justifying that allowance. Under the former government all accounts were rendered, and hon. gentlemen opposite were manly and courageous enough to criticise them, even to the pay of bootblacks and other incidental expenses which are no doubt included in these living allowances, and they were spread all over all the backwoods of Canada in order to discredit the government. Whether these expenses were excessive or not may be open to debate; but the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite have covered them up in living allowances is something that cannot be condoned. I think this committee should lay down a rule by which every person in the service not occupying a responsible position should render an account, so that this House might see it. I would ask the minister why $6 a day was allowed to Miss Barry as a living allowance ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is in error. The $6 covered both salary and living expenses. It was allowed to all below the rank of commissioner, except the labourers, who were employed there and paid by the day. A large number of employees were paid at the uniform rate of $6 a day, which covered all they received during the time they were in Paris. Besides that, their actual transportation charges from here to Paris and back were paid. The commissioners went into this matter very thoroughly before fixing the remuneration. In most cases the employees protested against it ; but it was felt that it would be a fair return for their labour in a foreign country, where, of course, they would be under unusual expenses. Everybody knows that on the occasion of a great exhibition like that, the cost of living is greatly increased, and we could not expect them to live in Paris as economically as in Ottawa or elsewhere in Canada. In a rough awy, I may say, this $6 a day was thought to be about equally divided between living allowance and salary. The ordinary living allowance made by the government to people of that class while travelling abroad is, I understand, $5 a day. That was before the present arrangement was made with the Auditor General by which actual disbursements were charged. But in this case the Auditor General has gone over all these accounts, and has accepted this arrangement as being a satisfactory one.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice on D—12 of the Auditor General's Report that H. C. Knowlton was paid $1,115.48. Will the minister be good enough to tell us who he is, where he is from, and what he was employed at ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. With pleasure. Perhaps I had better continue the list which the hon. leader of the opposition gave. Mr. Cusson was one of the secretaries. We first appointed Mr. Dupuis, whose experience in connection with exhibitions is well known. He was the commissioner for the province of Quebec at the Jamaica exhibition some years ago, and made a most valuable report on that exhibition. I, therefore, felt that he was a man well qualified for this position, and asked him to assume the position of secretary to the commission. He did the preliminary work here, but when the commissioners had to go to Paris and begin to receive the exhibits there, we had to send somebody over with them. As Mr. Dupuis' work was not finished here, we employed Mr. Cusson to go to Paris. Mr. Dupuis remained here till his work here was finished ; then he went to Paris, and Mr. Cusson returned home. Mr. Faribault is a member of the staff of the Geological Survey. He went to Paris in connection with the exhibit prepared under the direction of the late lamented Dr. G. M. Dawson, whose death the other day is such a great loss to this whole Dominion, and especially to the department of which he was the brilliant head, and in which he has given so much excellent and invaluable work to the Dominion of Canada. Speaking as one who has come largely into contact with his work in connection with this Paris exhibtion, I may say that if Canada made the splendid record she did with her mineral exhibit, it was largely due to the experience and wide knowledge exercised by Dr. Dawson in the preparation and management of that exhibit. Mr. Gillmor was one of the commissioners who was asked to go from the maritime provinces. During the earlier part of his commissionership he was unfortunately laid

up at home, and was not able to travel about and secure exhibits from the maritime provinces ; but he asked that his son, Mr. P. H. Gillmor, might do that work while he was laid up, and the payments made to him are payments which would have been made to the commissioner if he had not been confined to his bed.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In what position was Mr. A. H. Gillmor before he was appointed commissioner ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. His name is well known in this House, and in the whole Dominion of Canada. I need not give the record of the former member for Charlotte county, and now senator of the Dominion. Col. Gourdeau is the well known deputy minister of the Marine and Fisheries Department. I do not know that we could have chosen a man better qualified to prepare the marine and fisheries exhibit than Col. Gourdeau. Mr. Gelinas, whose name was brought forward, is the private secretary of the hon. Minister of Public Works, and he was taken over in that capacity. Andrew Halkett is an official of the Marine and Fisheries Department, an expert in mounting fish and game, who went over to see that the exhibits were properly mounted and displayed. Robert Hamilton is a well-known fruit-grower of the province of Quebec, coming from the town of St. Andrews, in the county of Argenteuil. He is one of the best known writers on fruit-growing in the Dominion of Canada. He went in charge of the fruit-growing exhibit. When he was obliged to return to Canada, Mr. A. McD. Allan, one of the best known fruit-growers in Ontario, went over in his place. Mr. W. H. Hay is the accountant of the Experimental Farm. Those gentlemen who know the exhibits made by the Experimental Farm at the exhibitions at Ottawa, Toronto, and other places, know his work. He is an expert in agricultural exhibits, in decoration, and in working up specimens of grain and fruit and other things into an artistic display which will attract attention. Mr. Jardine was one of the commissioners appointed from the province of Ontario, and spent a large amount of time and money travelling about to secure exhibits.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What were his personal qualifications ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He has a large acquaintance with business in Toronto and formerly in Montreal, and had been in the leather and boot and shoe trade.

Mr. CLANCY. What class of exhibits was he expected to select ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He did not select the exhibits but went to the manufacturers and gave them the information necessary, and afterwards in Paris he was in charge of the manufactured exhibits and did other general work as a commissioner.

Mr. CLANCY. He was selected to take a sort of holiday trip.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. On the contrary, he was one of the hardest working men during the last year and a half that lived in Canada.

Mr. BENNETT. Upon whose recommendation was he appointed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not remember exactly, but I think I consulted my colleagues from Ontario.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the hon. gentleman know that Mr. Jardine has been a very active politician in Ontario—part and parcel of the machine moving from one riding to another.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not know that he was an active politician, but that would be no disability.

Mr. BENNETT. Many gentlemen here can testify that he was used in the by-elections in Ontario to work the machine. As far as the statement of the minister that he was in the boot and shoe business is concerned, that is a little off colour.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That statement is the exact truth. I do not know whether Mr. Jardine was active in politics or not, but I have heard that he met the hon. gentleman on the public platform and took the change out of him. That would not be a disability in my opinion.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Jardine is now on the floor of the House, and I presume he communicated to the hon. gentleman the statement just made. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that if Mr. Jardine told him that he ever met me on the public platform, he made a statement that is utterly and deliberatively false and maliciously untrue, and that the company which that man consorted in the elections was not the company to be found on the public platform, but of a vastly different nature.

Mr. McGOWAN. He went through Wellington riding and kept track of the machine there.

Mr. COCHRANE. Along with Cap Sullivan.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must call the hon. gentleman to order. We are not discussing the character of Mr. Jardine or of Cap Sullivan. The hon. member for Wellington introduced the name of Cap Sullivan.

Mr. McGOWAN. I did not say anything about Cap Sullivan.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman to have done so. Hon. gentlemen have no right to discuss the characters of men not mentioned in the item before the House.

Mr. WALLACE. Are we to understand that we can discuss as long as we please the antecedents and the qualifications of Mr. Jardine, but if we connect his name with Mr. Sullivan, then we must stop. But, Mr. Sullivan may be somewhat of a divine, and the presence of Mr. Jardine in company with Mr. Sullivan might be a testimonial as to the holiness of Mr. Jardine's character. Therefore I must protest against the ruling that we are not to bring in the name of the Evangelist Sullivan in connection with that of Mr. Jardine. If Mr. Jardine, who is accused of doing shady things, can prove that he is a friend and colleague and ally of Cap Sullivan, the Evangelist, that in itself might dispose of the accusation.

Mr. CLANCY. I think it would be unfair to attack a man who is not in this House to defend himself. But it is quite as unseemly to import here a man whose name appears in the public accounts in order that he may protect and coach the minister. No more unseemly thing has ever happened in this House. I do not know anything about Mr. Jardine, but it is reported that he has taken very active part in the elections.

Man after man in Canada, good officials, have been dismissed, their moneys that were paid into the public treasury taken from them, faith not kept with them—and for what? Because it has been charged, but never proved in a single instance, that they had taken part in elections. Yet, a gentleman is on the floor of this House this evening, prompting the minister, who has earned his position by political activity —as has been stated unblushingly by the Minister of Agriculture that that was his special qualification to be appointed to this office. If we hope to get these estimates through, and I do for one, we must not have the unseemly conduct of the Minister of Agriculture. We have a good deal too much of this by-play. The hon. gentleman has done a good deal of acting, a good deal too much, for it was bad acting. His deportment has not contributed very much, I will not say to increase his reputation, but to maintain the traditions of the high place he occupies. The hon. gentleman challenges any on this side to bring forward a single administrative act that was not clean or that will not bear the search-light of inquiry. And yet he declares, backed up by the Minister of Public Works, that there was an open swindle upon the people of Canada, and that nobody is responsible for it. No hon. minister can shelter himself behind the High Commissioner. If the hon. minister is in a position in which he has no redress, it must be because he failed to take the necessary precautions that should be taken by one acting for the country in a case of that kind. But the hon. gentleman came here with a statement that he has been told by the High Commissioner to pay the bill, and say nothing about it. Why? Is it because there is a reflection upon the High Commissioner as a member of the Imperial commission? I will not reflect upon Lord Strathcona, but, as the hon. leader of the opposition says, this is a matter of business concerning which the people's representatives should know the facts. If there are reasons why we should pay the bill and ask no questions, the hon. minister should be able to give those reasons.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentlemen opposite have asked with regard to a number of others than those I have already mentioned——

Mr. CLANCY. Before the hon. minister proceeds, I will ask him to explain why it was that no action was taken beyond the writing of the letter of Lord Strathcona, of which he speaks, to inquire into that swindle and to get the reparation to which Canada is entitled.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) was probably absent from the Chamber when I answered that question, when asked by the leader of the opposition. I explained that the control of the building was in the hands of the Imperial commission, on which Lord Strathcona was our representative. They felt that we ought to pay, and insisted on our paying. We could look to them, but we have no recourse elsewhere. We had undertaken to make an exhibit at Paris under the condition, which was stated in the first place, that we should deal through the Imperial authorities. When my hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Public Works went to France, he succeeded in obtaining for us a superior position to that which had been accorded before, and this fact, I have no doubt contributed largely to the success of our exhibit. I would have been glad could that have been the case from the commencement; but it was not. The building referred to was not a Canadian, but a Colonial building, in which we had only part of the space; and we and the other colonies entrusted the management of the building entirely to the Imperial commission, through whom we did all our work.

Mr. CLANCY. I was in when the hon. minister (Mr. Fisher) made his previous statement, and he has told me nothing new. But when this swindle was discovered—and that is a mild term to apply to it—was there any correspondence to show that the High Commissioner, who was one of the Imperial commissioners, protested or made this a subject of inquiry into the fraud perpetrated upon Canada? If there is any

point of that kind on which the hon. gentleman has correspondence or is prepared to make an authoritative statement, we would like to hear from him.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman has already been informed that the hon. Minister of Public Works, when he went to Paris, protested——

Mr. CLANCY. Permit me—I am asking if the High Commissioner representing Canada protested against Canada being compelled to pay an undue sum for services she did not receive, and if the High Commissioner, both as High Commissioner for Canada and as a member of the Imperial commission, endeavoured to make this a subject of inquiry.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps I can give a word of explanation. As my hon. friend and colleague said, I protested as soon as I found that the specifications had not been followed. The architect admitted that they had not been followed. With that admission I immediately wrote to Lord Strathcona, and after negotiating, Sir Montague Ommany, Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, came to Paris. We discussed the question. I represented that the building was not worth what was contracted for. After giving all the attention we could to the question, Sir Montague Ommany, who is a lawyer and a man of long experience, said that we were altogether without any recourse because the architect had given certificates to Messrs. Humphreys & Co., the builders. We withheld for some time a larger amount of money than was agreed for, so as to oblige the builders to make repairs if any accident happened.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand it was the High Commissioner's special business as representing Canada, and one in a position to examine, to know whether the architect was justified in giving the contractor a certificate. Again, I ask the question if the hon. gentleman is aware that the High Commissioner made any attempt to make this a subject of inquiry ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sure that the High Commissioner used his best endeavours to settle that difficulty. But it was found that the architect had given certificates against which we could not rebel. My colleague had nothing to do but to pay it. The bottom of the whole difficulty lay in the fact that we were not masters of the situation, the Royal Commission were the masters of the situation. Mr. Clewes, the architect, was recommended to Lord Strathcona as a reliable man, and he was very much surprised, and the Royal Commission were very much surprised, when they found that the building was not what it should have been.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman aware by personal knowledge that the High Commissioner, at any stage, protested or made this a subject of inquiry ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, he did.

Mr. CLANCY. By correspondence ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I know he has communicated with my colleague, and I will produce the correspondence in a day or two, all that is in my hands.

Mr. CLANCY. And the correspondence, as I understand, will show that the High Commissioner not only entered his protest but also made it a subject of inquiry ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, so much so that Sir Montague Ommaney came to Paris on purpose to investigate the difficulty.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman a report of the investigation ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. Sir Montague Ommaney did not make a written report, as he was not bound to do so. The Royal Commission were the masters of the situation, we complained, but more than that we could not do. The building was nearly completed when I reached Paris, and I was astonished at the character of the building. I called the attention of Mr. Clewes and of the contractors to the state of the building, and I forced from Mr. Clewes the admission that the specification had not been followed. He said that he vainly endeavoured to oblige Humphries & Co. to carry out their work in the way it should be done. Then I asked him if he had notified the Royal Commission, and he said that he had not. Then I told him that he had not done his duty, and I wrote to Lord Strathcona and to the Royal Commission stating all these facts. My letters will be found in the correspondence that will be brought down. Lord Strathcona then interfered and Sir Montague Ommaney came to Paris.

Mr. CLANCY. At whose instance ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He was sent by the Royal Commission. I made a mistake when I said that he was a lawyer, he is an engineer, as he told me himself. Sir Montague told me that from a legal standpoint our hands were tied, that we could not do anything, that the architect had got several letters that were binding. The architect was responsible to the Royal Commission, he was not appointed by us.

Mr. SPROULE. When the hon. gentleman found the building unsatisfactory and not what was required, why did he pay the money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not pay the money. The Imperial government had exacted from this government that we should take part in the exhibition in a certain way. In pursuance of the agreement that was made between the Imperial government and ourselves, the building in Paris was erected without our having any control over it. Indeed, incredible as it may appear, the contractors were left in possession of the building during the whole time of the exhibition, we could not even get possession of the building. I had never before read of specifications or a contract like that, but we could do nothing, we could not close the doors, and we had to go on.

Mr. SPROULE. Does it not show all through a want of business intelligence and attention? We have already voted $315,000 for the Paris exhibition, and it will probably reach a good deal higher sum. Now, the country expects the ministers in charge to look after these things, to look after the expenditure of that money and to get full value for it. Yet they are obliged to come here and, in a humiliating way, admit that we did not get value for the money, that we in fact had been swindled, and they say nobody is to blame.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that.

Mr. SPROULE. Whom should we hold responsible for it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Royal Commission is responsible for it.

Mr. SPROULE. Do we not hold responsible the ministers of the Crown under whose charge the money is spent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Imperial government insisted on my hon. friend giving to them the control of the erection of the building. Was it possible for the Minister of Agriculture to foresee that the Royal Commission would commit a blunder like this ? I could not believe my eyes when I saw the building, I could not believe that such a contract could have been given. The Royal Commission trusted their architect, he was the architect not only for our building but for all the Imperial and colonial buildings. I do not want to make any accusation against him, but it seems to me clear that as soon as he found out that he could not bring Messrs. Humphrey & Co. to alter the contract, he should have notified the Royal Commission in London, which he did not do. He admitted to me that he did not do anything of the kind. He was wrong there, but it is for the Royal Commission to deal with him, we are helpless.

Mr. SPROULE. But will not the country hold responsible for it the minister of the Crown under whom the money was paid ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The country will hold us responsible to this extent, that we should not have given over the entire control to the Imperial authorities. We are a self-governing country, and we should have gone there and conducted our own business in our own way. We have given up the control of our own building, and to that extent we are guilty. I think it is a fault that we should not be accused of after all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did the architect ever give an explanation why he passed that building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that I could not get any satisfactory explanation from him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems almost incredible that he should have done that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is just as well that this parliament should know all about it. There is nothing to hide.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not suggesting——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am just stating the facts as I know them. The building is not what it should have been, and there has been a miscarriage of justice somewhere. More than that I do not know.

Mr. SPROULE. It is quite clear that the Imperial Commission trusted the architect, that the architect did not do his duty, that we trusted the Imperial Commission, and that we paid our money and got no return for it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Do not say that.

Mr. SPROULE. How does that correspond with the statement of the hon. Minister of Agriculture a few minutes ago, that the most conclusive inquiry could be made and that nothing would be found wrong ? And now, we are told that the correspondence, which has not been placed on the Table of the House although it ought to be in the possession of the committee, to enable it to go into this inquiry, has been carried on between the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the High Commissioner, and between the hon. minister and some one else. All this is withheld from the House, although the papers should have been put upon the Table of the House before this inquiry commenced. Certainly the House is entitled to these papers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the motion for the papers was only passed the day before yesterday.

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. minister knew that this estimate was coming up today, and how is the committee intelligently to deal with it in the absence of this cor-

respondence ? It could not be expected to do it. The hon. Minister of Agriculture has been justifying himself in regard to everything that has been done, and the whole tenor of his remarks seems to be very much as if he said : Thank God, I am not like other men. The hon. Minister of Agriculture did everything right. He read us certificates of character, and when we asked him whom these statements were from, we found that they were from his own guests, who were invited to write their autographs in his album, with a little puff, after they had probably been wined and entertained. They were written at his request, and in addition, the puffery bureau, like that which has been established in Ottawa, supplied complimentary allusions to himself, and these puffs were sent all over the counry. He says that Miss Barry was one of those so employed. He says: We allowed her to write certain papers, she was under our care, receiving our money. As a consequence she would not be likely to write in a critical strain. In my judgment, we could not expect anything from these persons which would enable us to arrive at a proper conclusion as to whether matters were well conducted or otherwise. The hon. Minister of Agriculture referred to a letter which I read from a gentleman who was in Paris, and he said that it was not in accordance practically with the truth. Well, at least, it was from an independent source, it was from a party who had no interest in either belittling the Canadian exhibit on the one side or of eulogizing it on the other. It is evidence from an independent source, and I need only mention the fact that where there was a creditable exhibit he said so and made full acknowledgment of the merits of those features of the exhibit which were deserving. I instanced the mineral display, and the hon. Minister of Agriculture told us how many diplomas and awards had been obtained in that line. The gentleman whom I quoted did not complain in regard to that. He said that there was a fairly good display of minerals, but there was no person in connection with it to give that information which should have been available so as to induce capitalists to come to Canada and invest their money in mines. We have no evidence that any such information was given, but the minister says : See the magnificent results we have achieved ! What results did he give us ? Did he tell us how many orders had been given to Canada for goods as the result of the exhibits, or how much had been sold on account of the display we made ? Not at all ; he did not say a word about that, but he went on to read the certificates of character which had come from this questionable source. If the hon. gentleman had told us that a great many orders had been given for the manufactured articles or the raw products of Canada, I would have said that the information was much more valuable than that which he gave us. These complimentary puffs are all right, but they have been well paid for, and the people of the country will know how to appreciate the importance of them. But, there is the undeniable fact that Canada's money has been squandered without any adequate return, and that the ministers admit. They found a building unsuitable for the requirements, but the money had to be paid for it. That is the sum and substance of it.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not propose to detain the committee further than to make a remark in regard to the responsibility of ministers, and of the government, in regard to this transaction. Surely, neither the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte), nor the government of which he is such a distinguished member, can hope to escape that proper ministerial responsibility that attaches to every act and transaction, no matter how remotely they should be connected with it. In the first place the hon. gentleman gives as an excuse and as a reason that it was a mistake to surrender entirely this whole matter into the hands of the Imperial Commission.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did he do it ?

Mr. CLANCY. That is a matter that involves responsibility, but I am not going to discuss that phase of it. The point I desire to make is, that when they surrendered this matter entirely into the hands of the Imperial commissioners, they did it knowing perfectly well that Canada had a representative who was also a member of the Imperial Commission. Now, the government of the day is responsible for every act that the representative of Canada does, either as a member of the Imperial Commission, or as High Commissioner, and the hon. gentleman has as much responsibility as if he did it himself, if it were done through the High Commissioner of Canada, especially as High Commissioner, or as a member of the Imperial Commission. But the hon. gentleman says that there was an inquiry that a Mr. So-and-so came to Paris after this matter had been stirred up, and that the Imperial commissioners, including the representative of Canada, all agreed that nothing could be done. It was the business of the government of Canada, through the Imperial Commission and the High Commissioner, to have made an inquiry and to have punished the offenders. There is absolutely no escape from the ministerial responsibility that attaches to the hon. gentleman and the government of which he is a member. It is perfectly idle for the minister to say it was a mistake to place the authority there. The hon. gentleman knew that he must have trusted some person, and he is responsible for having misplaced his trust.

Mr. BENNETT. The country will not be surprised at this vast unpardonable expenditure, because it was expected that the Paris exposition would be a grand carnival for a number of the Liberals and their

friends. I think the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was too generous in excusing his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, nor does the fault lie altogether on the shoulders of the Minister of Agriculture, but must be shared in by the Postmaster General, who forced him to appoint this Mr. Jardine, who is utterly unfit for the position of commissioner. I think it is time now for the Minister of Agriculture, in view of my denial, should retract his statement as to the castigation this Mr. Jardine gave me on the public platform, because if that statement does not emanate from his own fertile brain—and that is quite a strain on his brain power—it must be traced to this Mr. Jardine. Who is this Mr. Jardine anyway ? Neither the Minister of Agriculture nor the Minister of Public Works knew anything about his fitness for the job, because he was forced on them by the Postmaster General. The minister told us that Mr. Jardine was selected for his knowledge of trade and commerce. Well, I have the public accounts of the province of Ontario before me, and year after year this gentleman who is so well versed in trade and commerce, occupied the position of what is called a sessional clerk in Toronto, which up there is a happy medium between a page boy and something else. It is a notorious fact that this gentleman for years has been figuring in the Ontario public accounts as a second edition of W. T. R. Preston, the local government hack, and on page after page of the public accounts appears the name of 'Jardine,' 'Jardine,' 'Jardine,' the very same gentleman who figured as a commissioner at Paris.

An hon. MEMBER. Sardine.

Mr. BENNETT. An hon. gentleman suggests 'sardine,' and he may have been that too, because I have known him to be in a pretty close box several times. I do not know who authorized this vast expenditure for furniture in Paris, but I am bound to say it was not the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I had nothing to do with that.

Mr. BENNETT. I now ask the Minister of Agriculture if it was he who authorized this huge expenditure for furniture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When I was in Paris the Canadian commissioner, Mr. Fabre, showed me his office, and I found it to be utterly inadequate for what I was sure would be the demands upon it for the exhibition. I authorized Mr. Fabre to secure another office and to furnish it, and he did so. He sent in the accounts and I was told by the commissioners that these accounts were correct, and that the goods were delivered in the manner in which the accounts showed they were.

Mr. BENNETT. If the purchases were made upon the recommendation of Mr. Fabre, then Mr. Fabre got too large a limit altogether. To pay $80 each for sofas and $27 each for chairs is an indecent expenditure of the public money. We have the startling admission made to-night that the government spent $315,000 upon the exhibition, with the result that from the very day of the opening Canada was black-eyed as to the exhibit she made, and to-night both of the ministers who went to Paris at the expense of the country, are forced to admit that thousands of dollars of this expenditure were entirely uncalled for. Let this be a warning. The Buffalo exhibition is coming on next year, and it is to be hoped that Canada will have a proper exhibition there, and that due economy will be practised. If not, the blame will be upon the head of the Minister of Agriculture much more than in the present case. Once again I repeat that the minister made a great mistake when he appointed this Mr. Jardine, who was utterly unfitted for the position he occupied. Just as Mr. Preston of Ontario was dumped on the Minister of the Interior, so Mr. Jardine was dumped on the Minister of Agriculture, and both ministers are entitled to sympathy. I suppose that after all that has been said this item might as well pass.

Mr. CLANCY. Does Mr. Fabre occupy these six rooms at the present time ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Fabre is occupying the same rooms that he and I occupied during the Paris exhibition. They are just comfortable rooms and no more. I know that the expenditure on the furniture may look a little high, but during the exhibition we had to put on airs a little.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is it necessary to keep up all that style now when the minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is not there to represent Canada ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When one has fallen into decent habits it is difficult to get out of them. The rooms are still there and the furniture is there. The price was a little high, I grant, but at the same time we received thousands and thousands of callers in these rooms, and two or three thousand dollars more or less in a great advertisement of this kind does not amount to much after all. My personal opinion, apart from all party feeling, is, that the rooms were furnished in a proper way and only in a proper way.

Mr. BARKER. Was that furniture made in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Surely not.

Mr. BARKER. Why not ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It was made in 'gay Paree.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. Speaking of furniture, I think we ought to be able to establish a large market for our furniture in France. I know that orders have already been placed as a result of the exhibition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If we had sent our own furniture there, would it not have been an excellent advertisement ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I wish we had done so. I wish we had done what Australia did. They found their building in the same inferior condition as ours, and they imported wood from Western Australia, and rebuilt the entire inside of the building. We talk about spending money for Canada, but the small colony of Western Australia with a population of 150,000 people spent a vast sum of money in rebuilding their building. They imported their own architect, their lumber and their furniture, and if I had been there two months before, I think I would have asked my colleague to do the same thing. But it was too late when I arrived there, and we did the best we could. In my opinion we should give more attention to that Paris agency. I believe we could establish a large trade with France and Belgium in fruit, timber, furniture, pulp, paper and other articles. So far we have not perhaps given the Paris agency all the attention we should give it. This exhibition has been a great advertisement for Canada. The Massey-Harris Company will tell you that they are to-day selling agricultural implements in France to the value of millions of francs. I say again, if we only follow up that Paris exhibition, there is a great opening for us. It seems to me hon. gentlemen are going a little too far in criticising my hon. colleague the Minister of Agriculture for things for which after all he is not responsible.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask the Minister of Interior if he intends to keep up the magnificent apartments in the city of Paris for the immigration agent there. It seems to me that for all the people we are getting from France, it is hardly worth while to maintain that agency; the money could be better spent in other places. It is certainly not necessary to keep up those extravagant apartments simply for an immigration agent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far this House has voted only $2,500 a year for the Paris agency. It is not enough. My hon. friend is altogether mistaken in his views. There is no use of being so much afraid of France ; it is not a bad country.

Mr. WILSON. I am not afraid of France, but how many immigrants a year are we getting from there ? This gentleman has been there for many years at a very large outlay, and what has he done for his money?

If you are going to establish an agency there for trade and commerce, that is another thing; but if you are simply going to have him as an immigrant agent, it is not necessary to give him such extravagant quarters.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister of Agriculture did not answer the question of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) as to what Mr. H. C. Knowlton had done for the $1,115.45 which was paid to him; also what his occupation was, and where he lived.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was answering all these question when I was interrupted. Mr. Knowlton lives in my own county. He is a fruit-grower, a business man and a farmer. I appointed him on the Paris staff in consequence of the excellent work which I found he had done at the Omaha exhibition the year before.

Mr. TAYLOR. You sent him to Omaha the year before ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did. I appointed one man from my county on the whole staff in connection with the Paris exhibition.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then I see on page D—13, of the Auditor General's Report that $3,000 was paid to J. I. Tarte on account of travelling expenses. I would like to know what trips he made for the $3,000, and what he was paid besides for living expenses ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Minister of Public Works was paid altogether $6,000 for his trip and expenses in connection with the Paris exhibition. The $3,000 which is put down for travelling expenses ought to be for general expenses, as should the other amount which is given for living expenses. There was no requirement that part should be paid for travelling and part for living.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) asked the Minister of Public Works if it was the intention of the government that Mr. Fabre should retain the large office which was obtained for the Paris exhibition, which was probably quite a proper thing to do. His duties in connection with the exhibition have now entirely ceased, and my hon. friend asked if it was the intention that he should still retain those offices, seeing that his duties will be now entirely different from those for which the offices were obtained. I have some hesitation in asking this question, because the hon. Minister of Public Works intimated that if a gentleman from this side of the House asked a question of that kind, he was striking at France. The sooner the hon. gentleman drops that kind of language the better for the country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was joking, as my hon. friend knows.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid the hon. gentleman's remarks do not go to the country as a joke; but even as a joke, they are not very happy, in view of a good many things which I do not care to resuscitate or discuss to-night. I ask the hon. gentleman to answer that question.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Fabre is in the same rooms which he occupied during the exhibition. These rooms are one story higher than those he occupied under the late administration for years. There are only two rooms additional. It was found necessary for the exhibition to have the higher flat because there were two rooms additional.

Mr. WILSON. The rent and taxes are over $1,300 a year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But the apartments are in a fine location.

Mr. WILSON. It is money spent for nothing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman should weigh a little more carefully his words. The thousands of English and French Canadians who visit Paris every year will tell him that that agency has been most useful. I admit that we have not received from France as many immigrants as we should like, but we have spent very little money there. This House has voted every year only $2,000, and the vote was originated by the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it the intention to keep on these apartments ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That I do not know. This question will have to be decided later.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman should know, because he is the one who suggested the leasing of them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I am not. When I reached Paris I found the rooms occupied and furnished. I simply took possession of one of them.

Mr. WILSON. The Minister of the Interior brought down a return showing that from France and Belgium we only got 483 immigrants, and it does not show how many stayed here. In view of that fact, these seem very extravagant offices.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I had with me two days ago the representative of a large French syndicate, who have settled in the Yukon, and are conducting large operations there. How have we attracted these men to this country ? By advertising this country and by having an agency in Paris. There is a large amount of French and Belgium capital that could be brought here, and French, English, Belgium and German money is good money.

Mr. TAYLOR. Were the travelling expenses of the Hon. S. A. Fisher, $526 on page D—5, in conection with the Paris exhibition ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, they are not.

Mr. CLANCY. Is Mrs. Turcotte, who had $276 for living allowance, employed in any other capacity ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. She was employed two or three years in the Railway Department and came to my department in 1899 as a typewriter and to prepare the index of my private correspondence. I took her to Paris with my private secretary, Mr. Haines, in the same capacity as that in which she was working with me in Ottawa, namely, as a typewriter and stenographer.

Mr. CLANCY. Was she a permanent employee ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, she was not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think the hon. gentleman got through the explanation of the duties of the different persons which I asked him to give.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think I got down as far as Col. Gourdeau when I was interrupted. Miss LeBouthillier was one of the ladies with Miss Galbraith, sent out in charge of the ladies' room and as typewriters to the commissioners. Mr. A. P. Lowe is one of the officers of the Geological Survey. He was on leave of absence in Europe and went to Paris in the place of Mr. Fallardeau, who was returning here. Mr. Macoun is an officer of the Geological Survey and well known for his scientific attainments, and especially his knowledge in connection with forestry. He took charge of the forestry exhibit in Paris. Mr. McKenna was employed under Prof. Robertson to take charge of the food products exhibit in connection with the cold storage. Mr. Perrault is the commissioner appointed from the province of Quebec. He was the first to go over to Paris to receive the goods sent from here. Mr. Scott, another commissioner, was a resident of Winnipeg and represented specially the west. He had been for a number of years representative of Manitoba in Toronto, specially engaged in showing the products and exhibits of Manitoba in the Ontario local exhibitions. I found him a most efficient business-like commissioner, and have appointed him in charge of the Glasgow exhibition. Mr. J. Otis Turcotte is a gentleman from Quebec recommended by Mr. Parent, at the request of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to be the chief of the caretakers and the employees there, to keep their time and

see that they kept the building and exhibits in proper order. Mr. Perrault is a well-known fruit-grower from the village Des Aulnats, employed by Mr. Dupuis, and he had charge of the fruit exhibit. Mr. Wilmot, of the Geological Survey, had special qualifications for the setting up of the exhibits. He packed the geological exhibits and unpacked and set them up. Mr. Small went over to set up the honey and maple sugar exhibits. The honey had to be all taken and worked over before being exhibited. It was prepared a year before and was crystallized and not in fit condition to be exhibited. Anybody who understands the exhibiting of honey products knows that they have to be prepared immediately before being put on exhibition in warm weather. Mr. Small was an expert in bee culture, and he went to look after that exhibit. Mr. Angus R. Stuart went from British Columbia practically as the representative of that province. He has been living there a good many years and is well known in connection with newspaper work there and was engaged somewhat in mining. He was recommended to me by my late colleague in the House, Mr. Bostock, as a gentleman well acquainted with the industry and resources of British Columbia. He was found very satisfactory, and I have appointed him to the Glasgow staff for the coming season.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And as to Mrs. Turcotte ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mrs. Turcotte is stenographer and typewriter, and went in that capacity.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is an item in the Auditor General's Report, page D—14: 'Services and expenses re women's department, $1,749.41.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was largely expenses in connection with the preparation of the women's book, a publication prepared and compiled by a number of ladies well known in connection with the charitable and other work done by the Women's Council, and other women's work done in the country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as that work in Canada was concerned, it was entirely voluntary, was it not ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There were some travelling expenses, printing, typewriting and editorial work. Allowances were also made to quite a number of the ladies who were not in a position, owing to financial circumstances, to devote their time to the work gratuitously. Much of the work was gratuitously done, and the general management was gratuitous.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not finding fault with the gratuities to the ladies, but, speaking under correction, the work in my own province was done gratuitously.

Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not say who received gratuities or who did not. A good deal of the work was done by Miss Wilson, who is secretary to the Women's Council, and who acted as editor and compiler. She was paid for her services.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. The hon. minister stated that the work done by Mr. Stuart was satisfactory. I am sorry to say that Mr. Stuart did not seem to think that the action of the hon. minister's colleague (the Minister of Public Works) was very satisfactory to him. I remember that a few months ago Mr. Stuart complained very bitterly about the treatment he received from the Minister of Public Works, stating to friends, and also to correspondents, that he had been behaved to most shabbily, and asked to do work derogatory to a man in his position. Does the hon. gentleman know of any complaints of Mr. Stuart, or was there any truth in the statements made to me ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was just saying to my colleague that I never had more trouble with a staff than with this one in Paris. A good many of the employees, not all, but a certain number, seemed to think that they nad gone to Paris on a holiday.

Mr. TAYLOR. Correct.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is not correct ; because there was a great deal of work to do. I do not wish to apply these remarks to Mr. Stuart. I do not remember treating him or any other employee in an improper way. I made them work as I worked myself. I know some of them did not like it, and I was obliged to send some of them home. I felt that Canada had a right to be represented by men who would keep sober and work, and would be on the spot when explanations were asked for.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Stuart certainly made no complaint to me, when I saw him on his return ; he expressed himself as well pleased, and was extremely glad to get the appointment to go to Glasgow.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to ask the minister a question with reference to an article appearing in to-day's Montreal Gazette, which reads :

The Hon. Sidney Fisher, Minister of Agriculture, is having a unique map of the province of Quebec prepared for the Pan-American exposition. It will contain the physical features, forests, possible canoe trips, routes by the early missionaries, and by Champlain, and by other early French explorers, Hudson Bay forts, ancient Indian village sites, modern Indian reserves, regions of fish and game preserves——

—and so on. Is it the intention that Quebec shall be the only province mapped out in

that way for the Buffalo exposition, or may we expect that for the whole Dominion we shall have similar information furnished ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have been requested, in connection with the ethnological exhibit at Buffalo, to assist to the extent of preparing a map for Quebec, as the Ontario government is preparing a map for that province in the same way. No arrangements have yet been made, and I have not given any orders in regard to the matter.

Mr. HENDERSON. I certainly think that what is done for one province ought to be done for another.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—VISIT OF THE DUKE AND DUCHESS OF CORNWALL AND YORK.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I wish to draw the attention of the government to an item which appears in the government's organ, the Globe, of Toronto :

> It is learned to-night from an official source that the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall have consented to go as far as Vancouver, but their trip west must necessarily be hurried, as their Royal Highnesses will be able to spend only a month in Canada.

The item says that their Highnesses will go as far as Vancouver. It is noticeable that the press all over this country, when speaking of British Columbia, always mention Vancouver as the most westerly city of the Dominion I wish to say that there is another city further west than Vancouver and of just as much importance, and more, for it is the capital of British Columbia and the seat of the greatest wealth by far of any city in the province. But it was not that point I rose to speak about. I desire to ask whether the government have any official information as to whether their Royal Highnesses had agreed to go to the Pacific coast or not, and whether they would go to Victoria.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would prefer that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Prior) should put that question to-morrow, when the Prime Minister is in his place.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I merely brought it up because it says it is from an official source.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 6, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

GAME PRESERVATION, UNORGANIZED TERRITORY.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 46) to amend the Unorganized Territories Games Preservation Act, 1894. He said: The object of the Act is to amend a certain clause providing that the articles confiscated might belong to the convicting magistrate. That is not in accordance with good policy.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

BINDER TWINE—CHANGE OF PRICES.

On the question :

Mr. Blain—At what dates were the changes made in the prices of binder twine during 1900, and what were the changed prices?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. Chas. Fitzpatrick). We are getting some information from Kingston to enable us to give the information my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) asks for. I shall probably be able to answer the question to-morrow.

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF—GOODS OF FOREIGN ORIGIN.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. Has the government taken any, and if so, what steps, to ascertain the percentage of value of the goods of foreign origin which have been imported into the United Kingdom, and thence exported to Canada, to which the preferential tariff has applied?
2. What percentage of value of goods entered under the preferential tariff is of foreign origin?
3. In what foreign countries did goods or material originate which have been enhanced in value by British workmanship so as to be entitled to the advantage of our preferential tariff?
4. What are the names of such countries, and the value of the goods coming from each?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). I do not know whether I have fully apprehended the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Clarke's) question, but I think the answer I am about to give will convey the information he desires to have. Under the regulations and practice governing the preferential tariff, manufactured goods entitled to be admitted under such tariff, must be finally manufactured in Great Britain or her colonies and possessions entitled to the preference, and there must have entered into the production of such articles British labour to the extent of at least 25 per cent of the value of the articles in each case. Exporters of such articles to Canada are re-

quired to subscribe to the following certificate :

I, (1) ..... the exporter of the articles included in this invoice, have the means of knowing, and do hereby certify that said invoice being from myself to (2) ..... and amounting to (3)..... .... is true and correct; that all the articles included in the said invoice are bona fide the produce or manufacture of one or more of the following countries, viz.:—(4) .... and that a substantial portion of the labour of one or more of such countries has entered into the production of every manufactured article included in said invoice to the extent in each article of not less than one-fourth of the value of every such article in its present condition ready for export to Canada.

Signed.....

Dated at .....this .....189....

In certain cases where doubt has arisen regarding the right of preferential entry, inquiry has been made through the High Commissioner's office, and by correspondence with the exporters as to the proportions of British labour or material, and foreign material represented in the article exported to Canada.

There is no record of the amount of foreign material which, in some cases, enters into British manufactured articles entitled to the preference, nor is there any record of the countries where such foreign material originates. Quite a number of manufactured articles imported under the preference are, of course, entirely British, both in respect to material and workmanship.

IMPORTATION OF TOMATOES.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth) asked :

What was the quantity and value, each week, of tomatoes imported during July and August, 1900?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). The hon. gentleman's question asks for a return of the quantity and value of each week. I can only give the hon. gentleman that information by a special return from all the ports, which would entail a length of time, and perhaps I would not be able to secure it for the hon. gentleman during the session. However, if he wishes, I will do so. But I can give him the imports by the month, and perhaps that would answer the purpose that he has in view. The quantity and value of tomatoes imported into Canada as entered at the custom-house during July and August, 1900, are as follows :—

	Quantity.	Value.
July	9,409 bushels	$8,569
August	4,458 bushels	3,758

STAFF IN RAILWAY SHOPS AT MONCTON.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. How many mechanics have been dismissed from the railway shops at Moncton since the 7th day of November last?

2. For what reasons have these men been dismissed?

3. At whose instance were they dismissed?

4. Were charges preferred against them, or any of them, and if so, by whom, and were investigations held?

5. Have their places in the shops been filled by new appointments?

6. What are the names of the men dismissed and of the new appointments?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Changes to the number of thirty-one have been made in the railway shops since November last.

2. These changes were made by the officers at Moncton, under general authority, but without individual instructions as to any men in the employ, the superintendent exercising his own discretion in such cases. The changes were made in order to improve the organization and to secure more efficient service.

3. The department takes the entire responsibility of the changes made.

4. No charges were preferred, nor investigations held. It has not been customary to do so in the past.

5. Others have been taken on in the shops, and are on trial as to their competency.

6. The names of the men whose services were dispensed with will be furnished by a return, if the hon. member will move for the same.

REQUEST FOR BI-LINGUAL COMMISSIONER.

Mr. GAUVREAU—by Mr. Pope—asked :

Whether the hon. Minister of Railways is aware that in making investigations in cases of damage to property on the line of the Intercolonial Railway, between Montreal and Ste. Flavie, the commissioner sent from Moncton was an official who neither spoke nor understood the language spoken by those living in the province of Quebec, and who had suffered such damage?

If so, is it the intention of the department to remedy this faulty and expensive mode of proceeding; and how does the department propose to attain that end?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Yes, I have learned that such was the case in one instance, and I propose to remedy the difficulty by assigning a clerk for the claims agent who speaks and understands the French language.

SCHEDULING OF CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. BICKERDIKE asked :

Has the government taken any steps to secure the repeal of the Imperial statute scheduling Canadian cattle imported into the United

Kingdom? Is it the intention of the government to press this very important question on the Imperial authorities at an early date?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that, as representing the government, I have taken every opportunity for a number of years back to urge this question upon the Imperial authorities, through Lord Strathcona chiefly. When I was in England myself I interviewed the Minister of Agriculture and the veterinary authorities of that department. I may say that I hope to proceed to England again this spring, and I shall make it my business to urge this matter with the utmost insistence upon the Imperial authorities, as I have continued to do ever since I have been in office.

HONORARY DECORATIONS AT PARIS EXPOSITION.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked :

1. Is the government aware that no honorary decorations have been granted to members of the Canadian commission, or to exhibitors, at the late Paris exposition, in which Canada participated officially?

2. Were such honorary decorations awarded to Canadians in connection with the previous expositions at Paris, in 1855, 1867 and 1878?

3. If so, how many, and to whom?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). The government is aware that no honorary decorations have been granted to members of the Canadian commission, and no orders were conferred by the French government on any of the colonial attachés at the request of the Imperial authorities. In 1878 Mr. J. X. Perrault, Dr. May, and others, received the Legion of Honour. I have no means of finding out what was done in 1855 or 1867, there being no records of it in the department.

PURCHASE BY GOVERNMENT OF PROPERTIES AT SYDNEY.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. Has the government or the Department of Railways and Canals purchased within the past ten months any properties at Sydney, North Sydney, North Sydney Junction, and other places from Sydney to Grand Narrows Bridge, for Intercolonial Railway purposes?

2. From whom have such properties been purchased?

3. What is the area of each property respectively?

4. What price has been or is to be paid to each person from whom each property was purchased?

5. In what way was the price fixed or determined?

6. Will the Minister of Railways lay upon the Table a sketch plan showing the properties purchased or arranged to be purchased?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Answering the first five questions together, properties have been purchased within the past ten months as follows :—

At Sydney—6,480 square feet of land from Henry Lecras. Price paid $1,500. Offer reasonable from owner, accepted by Railway Department.

10 2-10 acres of land from heirs of Birchall. Price paid $10,000. Offer reasonable, accepted by Railway Department.

3 84-100 acres expropriated from Nelson E. Muggah, June 14, 1900. Valuator recommends $33,300. Amount not tendered. Considered excessive.

7,314 square feet expropriated from Edward C. Leahy, June 14, 1900. Valuator recommends $2,000. Amount not yet tendered, but may be offered.

Two lots, total 48,906 square feet expropriated from Henry Mitchell. Valuator recommends $11,320 for land and $4,000 for damage to six lots at rear. Amounts not tendered.

At North Sydney Junction—5 5-10 acres from Edward J. Johnson. Price paid $200. Reasonable offer from owner accepted by Railway Department.

75-100 acre from William H. Johnson for $40. Reasonable offer of owner accepted by department.

No land has been purchased within time mentioned at North Sydney, or between North Sydney Junction and Grand Narrows.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I call the minister's attention to number six, and ask whether there will be any trouble in preparing a small sketch plan to indicate these properties concerned ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not imagine there will be. On the other hand, of course, the lands in Sydney are not lying together, but we will be able to make a plan.

RETURNING OFFICER FOR WEST PRINCE.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Was Mr. Benjamin Gallant, returning officer for the riding of West Prince, P.E.I., at the election held on the 7th November, 1900, paid all amounts asked by him to defray expenses in connection with said election?

2. If he has not been supplied with money to pay said expenses, on what grounds were the payments withheld?

3. Has he been forwarded money to pay the fees of each of the deputy returning officers at the twenty-seven polling divisions in West Prince, opened, and at which votes were polled at said election?

4. If he has not paid all such deputy returning officers, why not, and what are their names?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) :

1. Mr. Gallant has not been paid all amounts asked by him in connection with the election in West Prince. The accompanying statement shows the accounts paid and unpaid.

2. The notes on the statement referred to above show the grounds on which payment has been withheld in each case.

3. He has received money to pay the fees of the deputy returning officers, but in some cases the total mileage claimed has not been allowed for the reasons given on the statement.

4. As Mr. Gallant has not yet reported the distribution of the amount placed in his hands to pay the fees and allowances, it is impossible to say whether he has paid all the deputy returning officers or not.

The Auditor General has accompanied this with a memorandum which I will send across the floor for the hon. gentleman's information.

PRINTING OUTSIDE GOVERNMENT BUREAU.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. In what printing office was the official catalogue of Canadian exhibitors at the Paris exposition, last year, printed?
2. What was the total issue of said volume?
3. What was the average cost per volume?
4. Who supplied the paper for the work?
5. If printed in any establishment other than the Government Printing Bureau, why was this done?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher) :

1. The Herald Publishing Company of Montreal.
2. 5,000 copies.
3. 38½ cents per copy.
4. Herald Publishing Company.
5. Owing to pressure of work in Printing Bureau.

TRANSPORTATION OF GRAIN.

Mr. WM. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe) moved :

That in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when a fixed and definite line of action should be undertaken on the question of the transportation of the grain and other commodities of the North-west Territories, Manitoba and the western states, with a view of centreing the same to the greatest possible extent in Canadian channels.

He said : Last year I had the honour of making a motion in the same terms as the one which I have just read. At that time it attracted the attention of a large number of gentlemen on either side of the House, and it also excited a considerable amount of attention and caused a large amount of discussion throughout the country by the public press, showing that the public are greatly interested in the question of transportation. The question of transportation is doubtless one of the largest questions in the public eye of Canada at the present time. That is shown by the fact that the Dominion government is from time to time expending large sums of money in the improvement of the canal service and in the construction of railways, either directly or by granting large subsidies for that purpose. And beyond that, private capitalists are from time to time investing in railways in this country, or constructing railways, showing, as it does, the great interest in the work. To the farmer of the western prairies the question of transportation is to-day probably the largest one before his view, because, the cheapening of grain transportation or carriage from the west to the east must result, in some part, in his participating in the cheapening of that transportation, and with the development of the northern part of Ontario, rich in mineral and timber resources, a great deal of interest centres in the fact that transportation may be cheapened from the west to the seaboard. The question also is of great importance in the province of Ontario and in other provinces in this that we are hoping to build up in the older provinces a large manufacturing trade and if we are to have customers for the manufactured products of these provinces we must after all expect to find them on our western prairies. The people of the older provinces, burdened as they have been for a great many years by raising large sums of money for the construction of railways in the west, and particularly the Canadian Pacific Railway, are anxious to see any plan of transportation adopted that can result in their being able to place manufactured goods in the west at cheaper rates than they can now be placed there. Now, in regard to the question of the policy of past governments a most striking point doubtless is the large expenditure on the canal system, and I presume that I am within the mark when making the statement that $75,000,000, or even more, has been expended on the construction of the St. Lawrence and Welland canal systems, and according to the signs of the times large sums of money are to be expended by this government in still furthering these projects. While we are spending these large sums of money there is something which is withdrawn from the public to-day, and it is the idea of stability on the part of the government because members of the government are from time to time speaking of going farther in this, and of the possibility and chance that the government will take up other plans and projects with the view of ending this transportation question. So long as the government dangle before different sections of the provinces and the Dominion these gigantic projects, there can never be the possibility that the public will be assured that any plan is to be a permanent or lasting one for the future. I am quite well aware of the fact that political considerations may in the past have weighed in some of these projects, but has the time not arrived when political considerations should be dropped, and even at the risk of offending the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) in this debate, I must say this, and say it at the outset, that I fear and I think the public believe too, that too much heed is at present being paid to political considerations in the expenditures and in the expected expendi-

tures of vast sums of money in this country. We have in all lines of business a guiding star to lead people on and that is the success that others have attained in any particular project or enterprise of a similar kind, and looking to-day at the question of transportation, it must be plainly manifest to the world that the Americans in their route by way of Buffalo and New York by water from different points on the great lakes have seemingly achieved the solution of the transportation question. It is to be regretted that, while we in Canada have spent and are spending millions of dollars on the St. Lawrence canal system year by year, we see with mortification that less grain is being shipped down this canal system upon which such large sums of money are being spent. Let me say, so far as this government are concerned, that if the St. Lawrence canal system is a failure, comparatively speaking, no blame is to be attached to the present government, because these gentlemen came into power finding a well-defined line of policy on the part of the late administration, and the present administration would have been blameable, I believe, and would have been blamed by the country and by the press, had they not done exactly as they did, finding the work uncompleted and under tender, had they not gone on with the contracts that were then pending and completed the work as the work has been completed to-day. It is true that the government have claimed a great deal of credit in the past for the construction of this St. Lawrence canal system, while, as a matter of fact, they have simply carried on the lines of policy laid down by the late administration and whether it is a failure or success no blame can attach to the present administration, because the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals simply followed out the line of policy formulated by the late government. Last year this question was under discussion ; last year the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals had warning notes thrown out to him not only from this side of the House, but by his own political friends, but despite the warning notes then thrown out to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and the hon. Minister of Public Works, because, in their departments occur these great expenditures in this regard, these hon. gentlemen have still kept the public in a vacillating and doubtful frame of mind wondering what possible move is next to be made on the transportation checker board, so to speak, by this administration. While speaking from his place in this House the hon. member from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who is not present to-day, made these remarks :

> Whether the building of the St. Lawrence canals was a mistake or not, and whether or not a heavy expenditure at Port Colborne is necessary, I think we have gone far enough in that direction until we have more reliable data as to effect of improvements in railways and reductions in cost of transportation by railways in Canada and the United States.

If that word of warning from the hon. member for North Norfolk was timely last year, how much more so is it to-day, in view of the fact that the government have a great many plans and projects before the public asking for commendation and in due time I have no doubt parliament will be asked to sanction the expenditure not of hundreds of thousands of dollars but of millions. At the outset, I think there is a sort of mistaken idea in the minds of the people as to the extent of the trade which is to be assured to the Canadian system of transportation. At first sight it would seem that it is not a question of our reaching out simply for the Canadian trade or reaching out for a large portion of the trade of the United States. A glance at the map will show hon. gentlemen the fact that there is a certain area of the United States export trade which we in Canada may successfully bid for. We may, in Canada, hope, in time, to ensure this to our Canadian facilities and this has been demonstrated for two or three years beyond the possibility of a doubt. In this connection some figures may be interesting, which are compiled from the public reports to show the extent of the trade from certain American ports which we in Canada have a fair means of reaching out for by way of our Canadian schemes of transportation. At the port of New York I find from the figures of 1899 that there were exported no less a quantity than 93,830,352 bushels of grain. At the port of Boston there were exported 28,905,095 bushels of grain, and at the port of Baltimore 56,335,397 bushels. I have not the figures of the other American ports because I think that these are the only exporting points which we may hope to compete with to a certain extent.

Let us look for a moment at the vast trade that is done at the port of Buffalo. In the year 1899, the immense quantity of 153,393,184 bushels of grain passed through that port, and in addition to that there was handled at Buffalo, 40,899,928 bushels of grain in flour, or in all nearly 200,000,000 bushels. I have before referred to the superiority of the Buffalo system as shown by the immense trade that port does, compared with the relatively small quantity of grain passing through the St. Lawrence canal system, and which I regret to say is lessening year after year, compared with what is known as the Grand Trunk Railway and Canada Atlantic systems. The trade of Buffalo has largely increased in the last few years, owing to the fact that the railway and the shipping interests have worked hand in hand in modern improvements. There was a time on the great lakes, when a vessel carrying 20,000 or 25,000 bushels of grain was supposed to be of very considerable size, but that day has gone past, and the grain freighter of the present time is a vessel carrying a quarter million bushels. Last year a vessel was launched at Cleveland, with a capacity of carrying 300,000

bushels of grain. A little consideration will show that that class of vessel is the one which has come to stay on the great lakes. These large vessels can be run at a comparatively less cost than the smaller ones, because the crew carried by the large vessels is not very much larger than that of the small vessels, while the expense of the higher class of officers is practically the same on both. I have seen on the lakes between Port Arthur, Chicago and Midland, a rate of five cents a bushel; so that a vessel carrying 300,000 bushels will earn $15,000 in freight, while the smaller vessel carrying 20,000 bushels will only earn the trifling sum of $1,000. It stands to reason that the demand should be for the large vessels, and the large vessels alone. I know that in the debate last year, there was a difference of opinion on that point between the hon. member for Quebec West (Hon. Mr. Dobell), and the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). I am not here to decide between these two gentlemen, but in my humble opinion the signs of the times go to show that the hon. member for Quebec West was wrong in his contention. I believe that the time has not yet arrived for what may be termed canal freighters, but the day has certainly come for the larger class of vessels on the great lakes.

And, while they have been increasing the size of the vessels on the great lakes, the railways have not been idle by any means. There was a time when the railways between Buffalo and New York ran comparatively small trains, and with cars capable of carrying only 600 bushels; but I am credibly informed that to-day, there are cars on this railway system carrying 1,500 bushels, and locomotives which can each haul thirty of these large cars. A comparison can easily be drawn as to the very great saving which will be effected by the present railway system of doing business as against that of former days. There are many indications that the Buffalo grain trade is likely to increase. One reason is that there is always to be had cheap freight by boat between Buffalo, Duluth and Chicago. By reason of what are known as the coasting regulations, only these large American vessels can ply between Buffalo and Chicago, or any other American port on the great lakes. A Canadian vessel cannot trade between Buffalo and any American port, and so she is restricted to carrying between Buffalo and Port Arthur, or some other Canadian point. The result of that is that these American vessels are able to enter the ore carrying trade, which is now a very considerable factor in the United States, when the heavy grain trade of the spring is over. They leave the grain trade in the spring, and engage in the ore carrying trade during the summer months, and again in the fall they enter the grain carrying business. From time to time they are constructing more boats on the American side, in view of the guarantee which they have that they will not only be able to engage in the grain trade in the spring and fall, but that they can carry ore during the summer months. There is another factor which militates against the grain carrying trade of Canada, and that is that ocean freight rates have been much cheaper from American ports than they have been from the ports of Montreal, St. John or Halifax. The reason is that there are always to be found a large number of ocean steamers in these American cities plying to European countries. In that respect the Buffalo grain trade has had a decided advantage in the past. The receipts of grain at Buffalo during the past year amounted to 57,000,000 bushels, from Chicago; 50,000,000 bushels from Duluth; 17,000,000 bushels from Milwaukee; 3,500,000 bushels from the Canadian port of Fort William, and the balance of 26,000,000 bushels from other points, mainly on Lake Michigan. These figures show that the American people have been able to attract the bulk of the trade of the western states to the port of Buffalo, and not only that, but that they have been able to encroach on the Canadian trade from Port Arthur or Fort William to the extent of 3,500,000 bushels. This certainly should not be the case. With this condition of things staring us in the face, is it not time that we should take some measures to endeavour to cope with the enterprise of the American people, and to direct the current of trade into Canadian channels. We in this country, are to-day, largely relying on the canal system for this trade as the Americans relied on it in the past, but the Americans have changed their principle of doing business, and we can see for ourselves that the canal system is a failure.

Surely the time has arrived when this parliament, before it plunges into an expenditure of millions of dollars more through the government of the day, should adopt some fixed and definite policy, so that for a few years to come we may know where we are at. The grain trade of the west is going through Buffalo to the tune of nearly 200,000,000 bushels per year, while the grain trade at Montreal year after year is lessening. In the year 1898, 38,710,259 bushels of grain passed through the port of Montreal; in 1899, 30,541,702 bushels passed through; and in 1900, according to a computation which one must make, as the report of the Montreal Board of Trade does not show exactly what was carried in grain and what was carried in flour, only some 22,000,000 bushels must have passed through. Unfortunately, we are not able to ascertain whether that grain went down the St. Lawrence canal system; but, from all I can learn, instead of that quantity going down the canal system, less than 10,000,000 bushels actually passed down the St. Lawrence canals. The figures of the Canada At-

lantic show that that line handled some 13,000,000 bushels from Parry Sound to Montreal, which would leave only 9,000,000 bushels to go down by the St. Lawrence canals ; and the facts point to this being the case. While at Prescott and Kingston a large grain-handling trade has been done in past years, it is a regrettable fact that at Prescott no trade at all was done last year, and the trade of Kingston has diminished to a very appreciable extent. We have been attempting to build up the port of Montreal ; yet, after the large expenditure which we have incurred with that object, the truth must dawn on us that year by year, in spite of the deepening of the canal system from 10 feet to 14 feet, the grain trade of that port is very greatly diminishing.

It may be said that there are many reasons why the trade of the port of Montreal has not been built up. I am free to admit that that is so. In discussing this question with marine men and men conversant with the shipping trade, one hears that there is a great shortage of Canadian vessels. There will always be a shortage of Canadian vessels so long as the government continue to play fast and loose with this transportation question. What inducement is there for a man to-day to engage in Canadian shipping ? If he builds a Canadian bottom, he is restricted to the trade between Port Arthur and the port of Montreal, or Georgian Bay ports, whereas if he builds a vessel in the United States, he has not only the grain trade between Buffalo and any point in the northern lakes to rely upon, but he has during the summer months recourse to the vast ore trade, which is even a more profitable carrying trade than the grain trade. While the government are vacillating in their policy, vessel men hardly know what kind of vessel to build, if they are inclined to build a Canadian craft. They are told that the government intend to have the St. Lawrence canals so constructed as to accommodate vessels going all the way from Port Arthur to Montreal. If you are going to have on that trade vessels with a capacity of 50,000 bushels, these are a class of vessels which cannot possibly compete with the larger vessels on the great lakes. In the same breath hon. gentlemen bespeak for use in Canada a class of vessels to carry grain from Port Arthur to Port Colborne—vessels which are very much larger than those which have been projected.

There are some other points in Canada to which we have been attempting to attract trade ; and in this connection I am going to refer to Halifax and St. John. It must be remembered that every one of these plans of transportation that have been projected contemplate the expenditure of hundreds of thousands and even millions of dollars. What did we see last year ? The government of Canada had at Halifax a large grain elevator. The construction of that elevator, from all I can learn, had been demonstrated to be practically a failure ; yet, in the face of that, the Minister of Railways and Canals saw fit in his wisdom, last year, to construct at St. John a large elevator, which, with the docks and wharfs and approaches, has involved an expenditure of half or three-quarters of a million dollars ; and I am sorry to say that one may fairly attribute to the hon. gentleman political reasons for his action. What happened at that port last year ? The minister had his elevators and canals completed ; he had his railway system established to that point ; yet, with that elevator standing there a monument, I will not say to his folly, but to his lack of business judgment, the Minister of Railways and Canals, in order to please the people of St. John, brings to that port, over the Canada Atlantic Railway to Montreal, and from there by the Intercolonial to St. John, 300,000 bushels of grain, to demonstrate that grain could be carried over that system of railways ; and the demonstration meant a loss to the revenue of Canada of $10,000. It is all very well to be patriotic ; it is all very well to build up a trade in the interest of the port of St. John ; but, surely the people of Canada are not to be asked to spend money at this rate simply to prove that the elevator at St. John has an adequate carrying capacity.

Now, looking at the canal system of the Dominion, we find from the experience of the past season, that the largest boat that passed from the upper lakes and went through to Montreal carried 45,000 bushels of grain ; and it is the opinion of practical vessel men to-day that it is utterly impossible to carry at a profit so small a quantity of grain so great a distance. What was the opinion of the hon. Minister of Railways last year on this question ? Speaking in this House, the hon. gentleman said :

> We will see that with Montreal properly equipped, there is no reason in the world why we should not be able to offer sufficient inducements to shippers of grain in the west to prefer the St. Lawrence to any other route.

After a number of years, we find that the grain shipments at the port of Montreal have decreased to a most visible extent. Therefore, the opinion of the Minister of Railways last year was, I regret to say, rather a mistaken one. That hon. gentleman considered that one of the most desirable things in our canal system was this, that we would be able to carry through from points on the upper lakes heavy freight to Montreal, and to-day, with the deepening of the canal system, we find that last year the largest vessel that went down carried some 45,000 bushels. I am free to admit that the Welland canal to-day is only 14 feet deep, and that no doubt larger vessels should pass down that canal than those carrying 45,000 bushels. But there is this fact to be borne in mind. The Welland canal system is still water, and freighters

will not take the risk of carrying vessels deeply laden down the St. Lawrence that they would through the still water of the canal. But whether there are 14 feet or not in the St. Lawrence system, I am informed that experience will prove that even with 14 feet, you can never hope to carry through vessels with much more than 50,000 bushels capacity. If you take vessels with 50,000 bushels from Fort William through to Montreal, you will find that they must of necessity return unloaded. There is no freight for vessels from Montreal to Toronto, or other points, to any appreciable extent. True, you may have freight for some of them, but not to any great extent, and the result is that boats are going back up the St. Lawrence system with comparatively little freight, and the more boats there are employed in that service the less quantity of return freight will there be for each.

It was demonstrated in the past year by the Algoma Central Railway Company, that it will not pay to send vessels right through from points on the lakes to the old country. They sent some boats over to the old country laden with steel billets, and the result was that these boats carried at a much less sum than paid their expenses, and the company were considerably out on the deal.

I need not go into the question of vessels leaving Fort William, and going clear to the old country. This proposition is so absurd that it does not require to be refuted. If you were to secure vessels capable even of carrying 60,000 bushels from Fort William to Liverpool, you would be brought into competition with the large first-class freighters at Montreal; and could not compete against the mixed cargoes and passenger lists on the ocean passenger vessels from the port of Montreal, so that transportation from the head of the great lakes through to Liverpool is a matter altogether out of the question.

Might I call the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has not been able to carry out the pledges he made last year as to the deepening of the St. Lawrence canal system. That is not a matter anybody can find fault with. We can only regret it, but we can hold the minister to this, that he ventured a prophecy, with all the information at his hand as chief of the department, and so did the hon. member for Quebec West (Hon. Mr. Dobell), as a member of the administration, concerning trade that would accrue to the St. Lawrence canal system this year, and despite that prophecy we find that the St. Lawrence canal system is going behind in grain receipts. The hon. member for Quebec West said last year :

> We only got 8 per cent in the past year, and in the year 1901, we would obtain no less than 20 per cent of the grain-carrying trade.

If 8 per cent was the correct figure last year, we have fallen far short of that, and have not come up to his expectation of 20 per cent.

I am not here to complain of the action of the government in going on with this St. Lawrence canal system. The government and the Minister of Railways came into office and found this fixed line of policy adopted by the late administration, the policy of deepening the St. Lawrence canal system, and if it has been a failure, the government cannot be held to account, nor can the late government be considered responsible, because the changes on the American side in the improvement of transportation, have militated against the interests of the St. Lawrence canal.

Hon. gentlemen may say that it is all very well to offer criticism, but some solution should be suggested, and he who simply stands and complains ought not to be listened to. But, I do not pretend to be voicing my opinions on this question, because I have no practical ideas. I am simply stating what I learn from vessel owners and others interested in the shipping trade, and what I have learned by the experience of the past. That experience has taught us that the people of the United States have laid down a definite line of policy. Their shipping interests, both by rail and water, have laid down the policy that you must construct on the great lakes the largest possible freighters, and have the most complete and modern means of railway communication. Carry that grain by vessel to the nearest point of navigation on the great lakes, and then on to the seaboard by the most modern means known to railway enterprise. Keeping in view the fact that we have been spending millions of dollars on our canal system, and that the more money we have been spending the poorer results we get, surely it is time to call a halt, and before all our grain goes into American channels let us see if we cannot improve upon the present canal system by some other means. The government could do this. They should at once as a whole, bind themselves to a fixed line of policy, and not have each individual member of the government formulating different lines of policy on the question of transportation. That they should stop at once and for ever, and adopt as a body a fixed and definite line of policy.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What does the hon. gentleman mean by that. I would really like little light thrown on that question.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not intend to refer to that at present, but will do so. The hon. Minister of Railways last year told the country that the St. Lawrence canal system was to be the system of the country. The hon. member for Quebec West (Hon. Mr. Dobell) said that we were only doing 8 per cent of the trade, and that next year, when we had 14 feet of water in the canal, we would do 20 per cent of the trade. How

has that prophecy been fulfilled ? The trade has fallen far short of his expectation, and I regret that such has been the case. And while you were endeavouring to build up our transportation trade by the St. Lawrence canals—and you can only build up any successful means of transportation by engaging capital in the business—you are frightening every man who may wish to engage in the vessel business——

Mr. GERMAN. What proposition does the hon. gentleman make as a remedy ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like my hon. friend to answer my question. He alleged that the government were split up and divided in their policy, that one member of the cabinet had one view and another another. Will the hon. gentleman give his justification for this statement.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, I will deal now with that point which the minister has raised. I recall the circumstance that two or three years ago the Minister of Railways spoke in the city of Halifax at a meeting of the board of trade, and he drew there what I believe was a truthful picture of the position of the transportation question in the country. He said : It is true, against the wishes of our political opponents, but in accordance with what we thought was the proper idea, we have now a means of communication from Lévis, which had hitherto been the termination of the Intercolonial Railway, clear through to the city of Montreal ; we have now a railway system from St. John and from Halifax to the port of Montreal, still I am free to confess, said the minister, we are in a very handicapped position. Our cars arrive at the city of Montreal and we find them empty. These cars we wish to take down to build up the trade of St. John and Halifax. As soon as we arrive at Montreal we are confronted with the fact that there are loaded cars there belonging to the Canadian Pacific Railway and to the Grand Trunk Railway. In our dilemma, he said, we approached the Grand Trunk Railway people and said to them : You have grain at Montreal, we wish to take that grain over the Intercolonial Railway system down to St. John or Halifax. The Grand Trunk Railway replied at once : We can carry our grain to Portland, which is some 300 miles shorter—I believe that was the distance—than the Grand Trunk Railway haul to St. John. As a result of that, he said, we are not able to secure from the Grand Trunk Railway Company a bushel of grain to carry down to the ocean. Now, he said, in our dilemma, we turned to the Canadian Pacific Railway and we asked them to give us the grain brought from the west to the port of Montreal, and the Canadian Pacific Railway replied to us : We have a shorter route to St. John than you have by the Intercolonial Railway, by some 300 miles. The result is, said the hon. gentleman, that we have our empty cars at Montreal, and we are not able to get freight from the Grand Trunk Railway or from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and therefore we had nothing but failure staring us in the face.

Now, I think I have correctly stated the gist of the hon. gentleman's remarks in the city of Halifax on that occasion. But he went further at that time and outlined a policy on the part of the government, and that is the question which is to-day before the public. He said, there is a line of railway known as the Canada Atlantic Railway which runs from Montreal to a point on the Georgian Bay, to Depot Harbour. Now, he says, the policy of the government might be to acquire this line, and if we acquired that line we would have uninterrupted railway communication from a point on the Georgian Bay, by the Booth system, clear through to St. John or to Halifax, and then we would be in a position to bid for the grain trade ourselves. I think the minister will give me credit for stating correctly what he said on that occasion. But a sign of the times appeared later on. An hon. member who has the honour of representing the county of Hants (Mr. Russell) in this House, and who is accredited with holding a pretty prominent position in the House on the government side, came shortly afterwards to the rescue of the government and of the minister's line of policy, because there appeared from him in one of the Halifax newspapers a strong letter favouring the purchase of this Booth railway system. Now, I do not know whether the hon. member for Hants had the authority of the minister for formulating that policy for the government ; but I do know that neither the Minister of Public Works nor the Minister of Railways and Canals will to-day stand up in the House and say that the government has not discussed, and that the government has not contemplated, the acquisition of what is known as the Booth line. Let me tell the Minister of Railways and Canals this, that it is in the mouths of the people east and west that that line is to be purchased by the government. Let me tell him more than this, that last winter when there was a good deal of discussion over the purchase of this road, a prominent personal friend who has the honour of sitting in this House, who is a gentleman of wealth, paid a flying visit to the town of Parry Sound and was looking around for real estate in that quarter. Surely that gentleman must have had an idea that the government were about to acquire the Booth line. So the minister is blowing both hot and cold. At one moment his government is going to buy out the Booth railway and throw the St. Lawrence system to the winds, and going to secure an uninterrupted railway communication clear through from a point on the Georgian Bay to a point on the Atlantic.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will permit an interruption. I understand that to be the ground upon which he made the statement a few moments ago. Now, at the risk of disturbing the completeness of his argument, I may say to the hon. gentleman that down to this moment, so far as I am aware, there never has been a word, not one syllable of a discussion in council on the subject of the purchase of the Parry Sound Railway, nor, so far as I am aware, has there been among the members of the council.

Mr. BENNETT. Of course I accept the statement of the Minister of Railways that in council the question has not been discussed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no hesitation in making that statement.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, I must say the hon. gentleman puts himself in a very odd position. He goes before the public in the province of Nova Scotia as a responsible minister of this government, and he there lays down a line of policy for the acquisition of this railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg your pardon.

Mr. BENNETT. Then the hon. gentleman was not sincere at Halifax, he was humbugging.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I never made such a statement. The hon. gentleman will find it difficult to find, even in a hostile newspaper or from any other source, a report that I stated the government was to purchase the Canada Atlantic Railway or the Parry Sound Railway. I think that the hon. gentleman is confusing two things. As I recollect the speech I delivered then, the idea I had in my mind was that arrangements could be made whereby an interchange of traffic could take place between the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Intercolonial Railway. I had no idea of purchasing the Canada Atlantic Railway.

Mr. BENNETT. Then I will take the minister's word.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. gentleman will find that to be the case if he will read the speech.

Mr. BENNETT. Unfortunately, I have not the speech under my hand. Then the position of the minister is this, that at Halifax on that occasion he outlined, not the purchase of the railway, but the securing of running rights over that road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, not that either. The hon. gentleman does not understand the meaning of the English language.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand an interchange of traffic to mean a participation in profits between the Intercolonial Railway and the Booth system. That is correct, I think.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not understand that.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, what I understand by an interchange of traffic is that both parties to the contract would like to have some of the profits—or it may be that the minister was prepared to concede to the Booth people all the profits. But I will accept, and ask the House to accept, the hon. gentleman's own word that an arrangement was to be made between the two companies by which there would be an interchange of traffic. In other words, that the trade down the Booth line would be diverted over the Intercolonial Railway to the interest and to the benefit of the Intercolonial Railway. Now, mark what the hon. gentleman was doing. He was giving the public of Canada, who might be favourable to the transportation by way of the St. Lawrence route, fair notice that he was going to fight them with another arrangement, and that arrangement was the Booth line. That is the position into which he has brought himself to-day. He has got the carrying trade of this country into this position, that they have no faith in the stability of the government as to their line of policy. And to-day they have this additional fact, that the Minister of Railways and Canals has had in his mind—and no doubt, because he is an active man, he may spring it on the council soon—that this plan must be carried out of a trade arrangement with the Booth line, and if that is done, then it follows that it must be at the cost of the St. Lawrence canal system. Now, I think there are proofs, outside of any statements made by the hon. gentleman opposite, that the government is about to acquire the Booth system. If they are not going to acquire it, I can only say that they are proceeding very strangely with the expenditure of public money. This government has been advertising for tenders for the construction of large works at Depot Harbour, the terminus of the Booth line. And, may I ask the Minister of Railways and Canals—for the time has gone past for that contract—if the information is correct that comes to me that these works are to cost $150,000 or $200,000 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are no works being carried on in my department of that kind. I do not know what progress has been made by the Department of Public Works in connection with the matter. Some aid, I think, was granted by parliament last year toward piers there, the same as for other harbours. But that has nothing to do with any proposition to acquire the Canada Atlantic, so

far as I ever heard, or so far as it has been discussed by the government.

Mr. BENNETT. I have been informed—and I asked the question so as not to mislead the House—that the contemplated public works are to cost the country upwards of $200,000. That is to say, at the terminus of the Booth system they are expending $200,000 for works in which the public will have no real interest, and which will be a benefit only to the Booth system of railway. It is openly stated in that section that it is the intention of the Booth system to construct an elevator on those docks, or rather the intention of the government, for it is expected that the government are about to take over the railway system. Now, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says that these ideas are not going forth by the authority of members of the cabinet. Where is the hon. member for Quebec West (Hon. Mr. Dobell), and the hon. Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick), who has an important place in this government? He has been telling us, and the Quebec press are all the time assuring the public, that the whole scheme of the St. Lawrence canal system is practically at an end, that it is to be revolutionized in its entirety, that the Booth system is to be purchased, that the Great Northern road, which connects, I believe, at Hawkesbury, is to be taken over and used to carry the grain from Parry Sound direct to Quebec, there to be transhipped to vessels and to be taken out of the country.

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) to say that that is what I have been saying in Quebec?

Mr. BENNETT. If I attributed the words to the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Dobell), I should not have done so, because I have not read any speeches of his. But I have seen it stated in the public press, and it has been a matter of current comment, that the government intend to acquire the so-called Great Northern Railway, and then the connection will be made through from Parry Sound to Quebec.

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. Quite right.

Mr. BENNETT. And the hon. gentleman agrees with that?

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. That is not the statement that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) made, but I shall be pleased to say a few words when the hon. gentleman has finished his speech.

Mr. BENNETT. And I will be bound to say that the hon. member for Quebec West will be too loyal to the interests of his constituents to oppose such a scheme. The papers are full of it. And I think the Solicitor General told us the other day that he would speak on the transportation question. I think he will say the solution of the whole question is a system of railways through to Quebec, and if you can keep Quebec open in the winter months——

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman must understand that the House will not be surprised to know that there are differences of opinion in the cabinet. That is quite usual. We shall see a difference of opinion in the cabinet inside of a week. One section, probably a large section, will contend for the entrance of American railways into the southern portion of British Columbia, and a small section will oppose it. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals remembers that, a few years ago, on the question of the Kettle River Railway, he announced in the Railway Committee, with all the authority of his position, that the government's position was that that railway should have entrance——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Bennett's) pardon.

Mr. BENNETT. All I can say is that for many days, in the Railway Committee at that time, there was weary watching and waiting to see what was the stand to be taken by the government on that question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was no watching and waiting to see what was my position on that question.

Mr. BENNETT. But there was waiting a good many days before the Minister did speak—and I think he was sorry afterwards that he had spoken at all. His position as Minister of Railways and Canals should carry a good deal of weight on a question of railway policy; and he must have felt humiliated, to see the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) kill the proposition to which he (Hon. Mr. Blair) has announced himself as favourable. And it was a question of vital import to that country, and to the whole carrying trade. There was a clear line of cleavage in the council; and we all remember the cheerful countenance of the Minister of Public Works when the division showed that he had carried more votes than had the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Now we have the question of the Great Northern and transportation by way of Quebec. I do not see my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works here. But he steps into the arena and announces what the policy of the government on the transportation question will be. And, remembering the fact that the Minister of Public Works had his own way in the Kettle River Railway matter, it is fair to assume that he will have his own way on the transportation question. He says that the solution of the question is to open up the French River and make a system of water carriage through to North Bay, and from there bring the grain down on the Canadian Pacific. It is intimated to the

hon. gentleman that that means an expenditure of millions. But, in his 'airy fairy Lillian' way, he treats that matter lightly. Surely the government's supporter from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) will not be pleased, but will be much disappointed if he realizes that the government is going to throw the Ottawa and Georgian Bay ship canal overboard. That also is a bantling of this government that they are keeping before the people all the time. The hon. gentleman who represented West York last session, Mr. Campbell——

Mr. COCHRANE. Kent.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, he hoped to represent West York in this parliament—is a warm advocate of a line of policy endorsed by the government, or, at least, by the bulk of its members. He declares that the time has arrived for a railway from Collingwood to Toronto, all the grain to be carried that way. And if the hon. Minister of Public Works were here to-day, he would tell you, Mr. Speaker, that, in furtherance of that scheme, he has been spending thousands and tens of thousands of dollars in fitting the harbour of Collingwood for the trade that must follow when that line of railway—which is to be assisted by very liberal grants from this government—is constructed.

Now, the ministers, while they have all these plans before the public which are only discussable ones, are lending their aid to other projects. When the deal was made with what is known as the Drummond Counties Railway, this government went deliberately to work to steal away the trade from Montreal by paying the Grand Trunk handsomely to carry it to Portland instead. The people of Montreal now cry out that the Grand Trunk have announced that they will give Montreal the go-by, and carry their grain to Portland. But the government, in their laudable endeavour, if it may be called laudable, have bonused the Grand Trunk to the tune of half a million dollars to improve the bridge at Montreal, thus facilitating the carrying of the trade to Portland. Now, I think I have mentioned a few reasons, and some very substantial ones——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has given no explanation of the statement he made a short time ago; he has not even touched it yet.

Mr. BENNETT. All I can say is that when the hon. minister makes the statement that he did at Halifax, if he thinks that the public disregard him, I think they take him at his word.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What has that to do with the canal system?

Mr. BENNETT. It has everything to do with the hon. minister building up rival systems to the canals. He has given the public notice of that, and given them fair notice, that in his opinion he does not think the canal system is a proper one to be carried out.

Mr. GERMAN. Where has the government built up a rival system to the canal system in this country?

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. German) does not hear me, perhaps, if he comes closer he will hear. I have been pointing out what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said in reference to making trade arrangements with the Booth line. I have pointed to the line of policy announced by the government press of the acquisition of the Booth line and the Great Northern line, and to every word of that the member for Quebec West (Hon. Mr. Dobell) says amen, and the Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) will too when he comes in. I have also pointed out that the hon. Minister of Public Works is to-day announcing that a proper line of policy would be to act in conjunction with the Canadian Pacific Railway in building a canal system to North Bay on Lake Nipissing, and then hand over to the Canadian Pacific Railway the carrying trade of the west to Montreal and the seaboard. Surely these are schemes gigantic enough even for the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German). They are sufficient to cause the public to stop and think, and to ask if the time has not arrived for the government to come down and enunciate a line of policy, particularly in view of the fact that so long as you dangle all these schemes before the public, so long are you going to hamper the usefulness and injure the interests of the St. Lawrence canal system. What are the government going to do in this dilemma? Is the canal system to be thrown up? Fourteen feet of water has been reached, I believe, the department having so announced. If there are any drawbacks to that it is to be hoped that parliament will be asked to make a sufficient grant of money for fourteen feet of water, but, while the government are going to provide fourteen feet of water, and while they are going to attract all the freight they can, in the name of the public, and in the name of the public treasury, let these hon. gentleman individually, and as members of the cabinet, stop formulating these different lines of policy, let the public breathe easy, let them know what is to be the transportation system of the future or the solution of it. The hon. member for Welland asked me what I would suggest. I am not here to say: This is my opinion. I am not going to be so egotistical as to say: This is my opinion. I am simply referring to what is advocated by railway companies, by men prominent in public life, and backed up by men who are investing their money in these enterprises. We find

that despite the fact that you have increased the depth of the canals to fourteen feet, you are carrying a lessened quantity of grain through them, that you have almost ruined Prescott's carrying trade, that you have almost ruined Kingston's carrying trade, that you are ruining the ship building industry of this country, and I am also here to argue that when this vast sum of money which you propose to spend is spent at Port Colborne, you are not going to have a system superior to the system that is now in vogue.

Coming down to the Port Colborne expenditure, let us pay some attention for a moment to that. Last year the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and the Department of Public Works came to the House with a proposition. They said: We find that owing to the fact that we cannot carry large vessels through to Kingston because the Welland canal intervenes we must make, at Port Colborne on Lake Erie, very large and very great improvements. Those who were here at the time will recollect that the hon. Minister of Public Works came down from his department and laid on the Table of the House a proposition that involved an expenditure of $5,000,000 at Port Colborne. The government said: We are prepared to spend $5,000,000 at Port Colborne, and by referring to the debate of last year, it will be seen that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said that the expenditure would not reach that amount. He said: The works that we have contemplated and the works that we have tendered for will involve an expenditure of about $2,000,000. I think I can find in 'Hansard' that reference. We are spending $2,000,000 at Port Colborne on what the hon. minister himself must admit is an experiment simply in anticipation, and when the House realizes that the results of trade through the St. Lawrence canals fall far short of the anticipations of hon. members of the government, it is fair to say that such a large expenditure should not be made without a good deal of foresight and looking into. What is the hon. minister going to do at Port Colborne? He is spending $2,000,000 in constructing large public works, in deepening the water, in the construction of docks upon which elevators can be built at any time, and in connection with the breakwater there. I do not know if it is the intention to proceed with the construction of elevators at Port Colborne.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No steps have been taken in that direction.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says that he does not intend to construct them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) asks me a question and I give him an answer, he might at all events correctly quote what I have said.

Mr. BENNETT. Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No steps have been taken in that direction.

Mr. BENNETT. I will quote from the report of the hon. gentleman for this year:

> The improvements comprise the deepening of the approaches to the canal to twenty-two feet and the construction of two docks, with piers 200 feet wide, upon which grain elevators will be erected to transfer grain to fourteen-feet draught canal boats when required.

Of course, there is the saving proviso 'when required.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That does not say that the government are going to erect elevators upon them if it were decided to erect elevators.

Mr. BENNETT. If the government are not going to construct elevators at that point, then why have the government built these very large piers or breakwater which would serve the same purpose?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The breakwater would not serve the same purpose.

Mr. BENNETT. The breakwater would serve the purpose of erecting elevators.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The breakwater is a mile away from where the elevators could properly and usefully be placed. What is the use of talking about erecting an elevator on the breakwater?

Mr. BENNETT. I have not seen the plan. But, here is the fact that the hon. gentleman is spending $2,000,000. I think I am within the mark in that statement—at Port Colborne—and what are you going to gain by that expenditure? Without this expenditure of $2,000,000, more grain has gone down to Montreal in former years than went last year. You will have to increase the depth of water at Port Colborne, and you will be able to carry larger freighters to Port Colborne than the freighters employed in the past, but when you carry these freighters to Port Colborne you will kill the trade at Kingston and Prescott. You will transfer at Port Colborne into small boats which will be capable of carrying 50,000 bushels at the outside, and carry the grain on down to Montreal. What benefit are you getting by the proposed system over the present system? The present system is that you have vessels carrying 75,000 bushels of grain to Kingston where the grain is transferred to a canal barge carrying 50,000 bushels. The only difference possible is that you are transferring at Port Colborne instead of at Kingston

from a 250,000 bushel boat, instead of a 75,000 bushel boat. Does not the minister see that at Kingston you can bring into requisition a comparatively cheap class of vessels. At Kingston you can load into a barge carrying 50,000 bushels, and you can tow four or five of them down to Montreal, but you cannot put that same cheap class of vessel into Port Colborne. The vessels in the Port Colborne trade must be expensive vessels.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why cannot you put it into smaller vessels if you want to.

Mr. BENNETT. The whole contention of the hon. gentleman is to deepen the canals so that we can have larger vessels.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly, but you can use smaller vessels if you want to.

Mr. BENNETT. I grant that, but you must get the maximum size. The point is that the vessel which you take from Port Colborne to Montreal, must be a high priced vessel, because you cannot use canal boats on that route.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why cannot you ?

Mr. BENNETT. Does not the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) know that Lake Ontario is one of the roughest of the great lakes, and that the principal part of the grain trade is done in the fall of the year, when that lake is at its roughest ?

Mr. GERMAN. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) suggest that tow barges are not used from Port Colborne to Montreal ? If he does, he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. BENNETT. The reputation of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) for lack of courtesy has preceded him here, and he need not make a display of it now. Let me tell him that I do know something about it.

Mr. GERMAN. Will the hon. gentleman suggest that tow barges are not used from Port Colborne, to Montreal and Kingston and Prescott ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not from Port Colborne. The hon. member knows nothing about it if he talks that way.

Mr. GERMAN. They are used from Port Colborne and Port Dalhousie.

Mr. HAGGART. There are no canal barges towed through Lake Ontario.

Mr. BENNETT. There are no canal barges towed through Lake Ontario. You have a class of vessels that can be towed from Kingston to Montreal, but no man would embark upon them in Lake Ontario or in Lake Superior in the fall of the year.

The vessels that are to-day towed from Port Colborne, and that will ever be towed from Port Colborne, must of necessity be expensively built vessels, in order that the lives of the men who sail them may be protected. From Kingston down, where you are in smooth water, there is a comparatively cheap class of vessel which I am informed by men in the trade will not cost one-third of what the other expensive vessels cost. I know well that the vessels which to-day ply in Lake Superior and through Lake Ontario, vessels like the Rosedale, are large and expensive vessels, and the barges which they tow are expensively built barges which must be equipped with canvas, because no mariner with a regard for the safety of the lives of his men on the consorts would ever put vessels on Lake Superior without masts, similar to canal barges. From Port Colborne down, you must have expensive and well-built vessels, whether these vessels contain their own propelling power or whether they are vessels in tow. The result is that on this expensive class of vessels between Port Colborne and Montreal, the rates will be higher in comparison than the rates from Kingston.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How was the grain got down in times past from the Welland canal ?

Mr. BENNETT. I have just been telling the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair). It comes down in first-class boats like the Rosedale, the Algonquin boats, iron built boats that cost $125,000, or well-built wooden boats that cost a large sum of money, and, as my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Calvin) knows, they are not towing cheaply-built boats on the great lakes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will there be anything to prevent these vessels continuing to go down in the future, if people want to use them ?

Mr. BENNETT. The point I make is, that these canal barges cannot be used between Port Colborne and Montreal, because you will have to navigate the rough waters of Lake Ontario in the fall, when stiff gales are to be met with.

Now, Sir, what is being done by the government to-day ? Here is the minister spending $2,000,000 at Port Colborne, and all that is to be brought about by this large expenditure will be simply that you will be able to transfer from a large boat into an expensive freighter on to Montreal; while if the minister had permitted affairs to go on as they have been going on, you might transfer at Kingston into cheaper boats, and the result would have been—as I am told by vessel men it will work out in the long run—that it would have been much better to go on with the old state of affairs. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) asked me what could be done under the circumstances ? In the first place, the gov-

ernment of the day through the Minister of Railways, told the people of Quebec, and told all these other people who had those baits held out before them, that the policy of the government is to adopt the St. Lawrence canal route system——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would the hon. gentleman please tell me what he means by 'bait' being held out before them ?

Mr. BENNETT. Having baits held out before them. All I can say is that the minister, when he spoke at Halifax, told them the only advantage they ever could get in the carrying trade would be by the acquirement of the roads in the Booth system——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) venture to make such a statement as that seriously in this House ?

Mr. BENNETT. I will say 'traffic arrangement' if that suits.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I defy the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) to produce any statement that I ever made that will bear out his statement. I absolutely defy him.

Mr. BENNETT. Why, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) has said within a few minutes——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg your pardon.

Mr. BENNETT. You have not heard what I am going to attribute to you and you cannot know what it is——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know why the hon. gentleman should think that it is any advantage to him or to his party to misrepresent what I said. The hon. gentleman professed to give a statement which I made. I did not say that the only hope was to acquire the Booth system, but what I did say was : That one of the directions in which we hoped to get more business for the Intercolonial Railway was by having a traffic arrangement with the Booth lines, whereby we could exchange traffic. That is what I did say, but the hon. gentleman now puts it forward that I affirmed in Halifax that the only hope was to acquire the Booth system. I made no such statement at all.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) held out to the people of Halifax the idea of a business arrangement—if that term will suit him—with the Canada Atlantic system. I state here that any business arrangement with the Canada Atlantic system by which you have to carry grain via the Georgian Bay, must be at the expense of the St. Lawrence canal system.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see that.

Mr. BENNETT. I will refer to some facts that will perhaps convince the minister that the Booth system and the Grand Trunk Railway system from Midland have had the effect of diverting trade from the St. Lawrence canal system. We find that there are two well-defined lines of transportation in Canada, as against the St. Lawrence route. First, there is the Grand Trunk Railway system, which carries grain from its terminus at Midland on the Georgian Bay through to Montreal, and now, (thanks to the generous aid the government gave the Grand Trunk Railway in the matter of the Victoria bridge), on to Portland. The Grand Trunk Railway Company have been building up that trade, and they have been building it up successfully, and we find that in the past season, there was carried from Midland over their lines to Portland and to Montreal no less a quantity than 10,214,841 bushels.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Was there a bushel of that sent to Portland ?

Mr. BENNETT. I think probably there was a portion of it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you know it ? Have you any statement to that effect ?

Mr. BENNETT. I am not in a position to know from the return whether a portion of that went to Portland or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then why drag in the imputation that because we helped the Grand Trunk, therefore they got this business ?

Mr. BENNETT. I am here to say that by reason of the fact that the government contributed so handsomely to the Grand Trunk to enable it to carry trade past Montreal, the Grand Trunk to-day are building up Portland, and I leave it to the hon. members from Montreal to say whether or not that is at the expense of Montreal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is altogether a different statement from that which the hon. gentleman made. The statement he made was that by reason of the assistance which the government had given the Grand Trunk for the bridge, they were carrying the grain which they received from the Parry Sound Railway, to Portland. Now, my information is that there is not a bushel of grain received by the Grand Trunk from the Canada Atlantic Railway and taken to Portland.

Mr. BENNETT. If the minister makes the statement that none of the grain from Midland goes to Portland——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not talking about that. I am talking about grain received from the Parry Sound road.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister misunderstood me. The grain taken to Portland is from Midland, not from Parry Sound.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then I was in error.

Mr. BENNETT. The Grand Trunk bridge, by means of the half million dollars contributed by the government, has been so improved and strengthened that the Grand Trunk are to-day building at Portland an elevator with 2,000,000 bushels capacity. More than that, I know that the company which owns one of the large elevators at Midland is constructing at Chicago an elevator of 1,000,000 bushels capacity. My argument from that is that the Grand Trunk have every confidence that the carrying trade of this Dominion, not only from our own North-west, but from western points in the United States on the great lakes, will in future be done by way of Midland to Portland, with any trade which may incidentally enure to the port of Montreal; and the result, I believe, will justify that confidence. It is, I believe, expected by the Grand Trunk Railway people that they will succeed in building up a very large trade.

Now, it is a fair question to ask, why can grain be successfully carried from Midland to Portland as against from Buffalo to New York? There are many advantages in favour of the Midland-Portland system as against the Buffalo-New York system. One of the first advantages is this, that you can make three trips from any point on the great lakes to Midland as against two trips to Buffalo, which is a very decided advantage, especially in the fall of the year; so that a large vessel, with a capacity of from 200,000 to 300,000 bushels, would earn on that route from $10,000 to $15,000 more on three trips than if she went to Buffalo. That is the reason, I believe, why the Grand Trunk people are making preparations at Portland and at Chicago for a large carrying trade. The line of the Grand Trunk from Midland to Belleville or Port Hope is poorly equipped; they can only haul fourteen or fifteen cars, and those not of the largest size. When the day does arrive that the Grand Trunk has as complete a system of railways from Midland to Portland as there is from Buffalo to New York, there will be seen carried on that line, not 12,000,000 bushels of grain, but twice and probably three times that quantity.

I am not going to say anything in reference to the Parry Sound route. That route has asserted itself in the past year, and has shown that it is capable of carrying 13,000,000 bushels in a season. The other places on the lakes—Sarnia, Goderich and Collingwood—carried comparatively trifling quantities as compared with the systems from Parry Sound to Montreal and from Midland to Portland.

Now, what is to be done under the circumstances? First, I say, in the very words of this motion, a halt should be called on public expenditures. The government should at once drop the propositions which have been discussed before the public, by giving an official and authoritative denial of the statement that they have in contemplation the taking up of any of those propositions, and announcing that they intend in the future to pin their faith alone to the St. Lawrence canal system. When they do that, we shall have the satisfaction of seeing the vesselmen of the country embarking in the shipping interests of Canada.

If these railway systems, both the Grand Trunk and the Canada Atlantic, are able to compete with the Buffalo system, we may be sure that we can attract trade from Buffalo through Canada, which will be to the advantage of the Canadian public; because every bushel of grain carried by vessel or by rail through Canada must be to the advantage of the Dominion as a whole, and more particularly to the advantage of the province of Ontario through which it will pass; and it is a debatable question to-day whether it would not be well for the government even to pay these people a bounty of so much a bushel for the grain carried through Canadian channels for a year or so. The effect of giving such a bounty would be this, that they would be able to improve their roadbeds to such an extent that, I believe, they would cut appreciably into the Buffalo trade.

In conclusion, I have only to say that I have introduced this resolution, as I did last year, hoping that it would evoke some little discussion—hoping that any views thrown out in the debate—not any poor views of mine—would be taken up by the press and discussed, and that the gentlemen sitting behind the government and retaining them in their position would be moved, in a spirit of patriotism, to ask themselves: Is there any means that can be adopted for increasing the grain trade through Canada—not only our own trade, but by taking part of the trade now going through the United States? I believe the solution of the whole question rests on this—that some encouragement should be given both to the Canada Atlantic system and to the Grand Trunk system, provided they carry a largely increased quantity of grain over what they are now carrying. But, above all things, here and now is the place and time for the Minister of Railways and Canals, before this debate closes, to announce that the government intend for the future, at least for a fixed period of five or six years, to pin their faith to the St. Lawrence canal system, and not introduce any of the side schemes or projects which are now before the public.

Hon. R. R. DOBELL (Quebec West). Mr. Speaker, I must offer my congratulations to the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) for having so fully drawn the

attention of the House to this important question. I do not think there has been a matter brought before the House this session of more importance than this question of transportation; and in congratulating the hon. gentleman upon having brought it to our attention, I wish I could also compliment him upon the accuracy of his statement of the case. But, I regret to say, he made many grievous mistakes. There were many causes operating against the removal of grain to Montreal last year on which he did not even touch. And I am quite sure that when these exceptional causes are brought before the House, hon. members will at once understand why there was not more grain brought down the St. Lawrence last year.

I confess that I read the motion of the hon. gentleman with some degree of doubt, because I could not quite see what it was intended to cover. He says that it is now time this government should state its policy in this matter. But I do not think that the government has ever withheld from this House the policy it was intending to pursue. The government has acted upon the policy that every possible avenue that could be utilized for the transportation of grain and other produce, not only from our own great North-west, but also from the north-western states, should be taken advantage of and improved, and I do not care whether those improvements are confined to water navigation alone or extended to a combination of water and rail. We all know that if we depend simply on our water navigation, we will be shut off during the winter months from a very large supply of grain, and, therefore, it is desirable that we should make provision ahead by establishing large storehouses at different points. My hon. colleague, the Minister of Railways and Canals, was fully justified in the large expenditure he undertook at Port Colborne. To use the hon. gentleman's own argument, we will be able to bring to Port Colborne steamers drawing 20 feet of water and carrying grain to the extent of 200,000 bushels, and certainly 150,000 bushels, and that grain can be transhipped thence in barges and steamers, not merely carrying 45,000 bushels, as mentioned by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), but 200,000 bushels, for I maintain that a steamer and two consorts can bring down from Port Colborne 200,000 bushels, and even more. As I figure it out, two barges and a steamer would be able to bring 210,000 bushels from Port Colborne, and we have been told by a most reputable and trustworthy shipbuilder in the west, that that will prove the most economical way of moving grain from Port Colborne or Port Arthur or Duluth or any other point to the seaboard.

The hon. member for East Simcoe dwelt at considerable length on what the port of Buffalo has done. But how has Buffalo managed to do what it has accomplished? That port obtained command of the grain trade simply through our supineness in years gone by. While we made the Sault Ste. Marie canal 20 to 22 feet deep, and the Welland canal 14 feet deep, when the grain got into Lake Ontario it was shut out from the St. Lawrence canal, because our locks and canals there would not carry vessels drawing 10 feet of water. The greatest draught that could get through the St. Lawrence canals was about 6, 7 or 8 feet, and, under the most favourable conditions, never more than 8 feet. What, therefore, are we doing? We passed through our 'Soo' canal 4,000,000 tons of American shipping the year before last entirely free of toll, and then gave it to Buffalo. Why? Because there was no other place to receive it. Therefore, the government took in hand the work at Port Colborne, in order that that port might accommodate these large steamers, even as large as 6,000 tons, and from there the grain would be reshipped to Montreal, or Quebec or elsewhere. The hon. gentleman laid great stress on the probability of our killing the trade of Kingston and Prescott and other places by these improvements at Port Colborne. But he is not able to see far enough. If we are to get any proportion of our western trade, we shall have a trade not only for our Welland canal and our water navigation—which, I believe, will in the main be the most economical way of moving our crops—but it is probable that our railways will be utilized in order to bring the grain through much quicker, even though it cost a little more. But, as regards the bulk of the grain, I believe there are no advantages on the American side over our St. Lawrence and great lakes. We should not belittle our advantages, but should instead show to the people of the whole continent that our ports of Montreal and Quebec will not only be national ports, but great international ports for the transhipment of grain in ocean steamers, and also for the transhipment of products from England to the far west.

The hon. gentleman also laid some stress upon the quantity of grain that could be carried through our canals to Montreal, and very much underrated it. He said that no vessel had brought more than 45,000 bushels through last yaer.

Mr. BENNETT. I must say this, that that was in reply to a question I asked the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. I am not saying that the hon. gentleman was not correct in his statement of quantity, but what was the cause of that? It was simply this, that there were so many detractors of the work of deepening the St. Lawrence canals to 14 feet that the report was circulated broadcast that such work had not been accomplished, and to-day you will find some people arguing that it is not possible to bring vessels drawing 14 feet of water through the

St. Lawrence canals. But my hon. colleague, the Minister of Railways and Canals, gave us the assurance a few days ago that there is not the slightest risk or danger to barges or steamers going through our St. Lawrence canals drawing 14 feet of water. The hon. gentleman also forgot entirely the very abnormal state of things which existed last year. We could not get steamers to go up the St. Lawrence. I pointed out two years ago the discrimination that existed in our insurance rates, and if those rates cannot be amended, the Grand Trunk Railway have acted wisely in taking their grain to Portland, where they ship at less than one-third the insurance rates charged from the St. Lawrence. This is far more serious than people imagine.

I believe it is the duty of the government and of every member of this House to do all they can to have that remedied. I do not believe that there is any good cause for the discrimination that has taken place. If the hon. member for East Simcoe had really thought out the subject carefully and wanted to put a fair case before the country, he should have given the government his assistance by pointing out what steps should be taken to have this insurance matter put right. I believe that for all these years we have been debarred from using the St. Lawrence in the winter or as early in the spring as we might. I believe, for my part, in absolute winter navigation, that we have nothing like the difficulties that Russia is now combatting, both in the Black Sea and in the Baltic, in the matter of ice. There may be a time in the middle of March, and perhaps up to the early part of April, when in the gulf the northern ice blocks the channel between Cape Ray and the Bird Rocks. But that happens only once in three or four years, perhaps not so often. But the matter of snow storms is very much exaggerated. It is true we have snow storms on the lower St. Lawrence, and all along the valley of that river as well. But, you have snow storms in the English channel, which render navigation there very dangerous because of the number of steamers navigating those waters. But we have good anchorage in the St. Lawrence, for from the time you enter the river up to Quebec, there is no difficulty when a storm comes on in anchoring and waiting until it is over. A snow storm does not last, ordinarily, for more than twenty-four hours. So, there is no such reason for this discrimination against the St. Lawrence as is alleged. If we could establish winter navigation in Quebec, and make Quebec a great emporium for trade by building large elevators, a great step in advance would be taken. And I believe that the Grand Trunk will find that they have made a serious mistake in going to Portland, because you can carry grain from Montreal to Quebec for less than half what you can carry it for from Montreal to Portland. So, if this insurance question is challenged and remedied, as I believe it will be by the government, we shall do more for St. Lawrence navigation than has ever been done before. The hon. member for East Simcoe said that I had told the House that the proportion of the grain trade carried through the St. Lawrence river never exceeded 8 per cent. I am not quite sure that it ever reached 8 per cent, but that is very near it. The hon. gentleman says I said that in 1901 it would be 25 per cent. I have not had the opportunity of consulting 'Hansard,' but my recollection is that I said that we ought to have 25 per cent, and that we will get 25 per cent, but I do not think I limited the acquiring of this 25 per cent to one year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Dobell) leaves the question of insurance, which is a very important one, and one on which, I am sure, the House desires to be informed, can he give me the figures of the amounts paid to the underwriters for insurance on the St. Lawrence and the losses to those same underwriters.

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. It is impossible to get those figures. I tried to get them when I was in London, and it is impossible. But I can give one or two examples of the way this insurance system is worked. I will repeat what was told us to-day by Mr. Clergue. He sent four of his steamers across last fall, leaving Montreal as late as the 4th of December. They asked him £25,000 for insurance on these four steamers. His freight amounted to £50,000—that is, half his freight would go in insurance. He ran his own risk. But before running his own risk he had cabled to insure one of them, and the insurance was taken at Lloyd's at 60 shillings per cent. When he got to London, and looked into the matter, he found that the underwriters who had charged the 60 shillings had rewritten the risk at 20 shillings in Hamburg. That is only one example. I myself had four ships loaded late in the year at Bic, in the lower St. Lawrence. I had a cable from London saying that the lowest rates possible for insurance was 14 per cent on one, and 15 per cent on the other.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Shillings ?

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. No, pounds. I thought it over, and cabled back : 'Am prepared to take half the risk if Lloyd's will take the other at ten guineas.' And they took it. That only shows that if we had a responsible and strong insurance company in Canada, we should save at least one-third of our insurance rates ; for, it is not only the amount you have to pay on the cargo that is to be considered, but the amount you have to pay on the steamers to come up the St. Lawrence. When you

enter into a time charter with four, five or six steamers, there is a clause that if you want them to come up the St. Lawrence after the first of September, you must pay the additional insurance required. And that additional insurance is one per cent for the whole year, and, after the first of September two per cent. So, we are actually handicapped to the extent of three per cent. And, when a cargo steamer is valued at £50,000 to £100,000, you will see how it practically forbids our chartering them late in the year.

And that brings another thought to my mind, as to the desirability of trying to establish winter navigation. The underwriters now fix the date at the first of September. Now, we regard the first of September as rather a pleasant season. But if we could establish the navigation of the St. Lawrence up to the first of February, the underwriters would not begin to discriminate against us from the first September, but would probably bring the date forward to the first December. Certainly, it would have a good influence if we could only extend our navigation for even two months. I do not think that any one can speak positively as to the possibility of winter navigation, but, after carefully watching it both down the river and at Quebec, I believe there is no practical difficulty in having steamers navigate the St. Lawrence throughout the winter. If that could be secured, it would be such a benefit to Canada as never before was known. If the hon. member for East Simcoe would inquire from the Canada Atlantic Railway, he would be told that they could have taken orders for any quantity of grain if they could have got freight last fall. But they could not get freight, and they had to take the grain down to Boston. Speaking with a gentleman the other day—and I think it is not unfair to state what he told me—he said: If you could only establish winter navigation from Quebec, we will guarantee to send to Quebec between the months of December and May, 350,000 tons of cargo. The gentleman who made that statement was Mr. Shaughnessy, the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The amount of freight he named is equal to about seventy steamer-loads. But he said that this must be navigation with ordinary care and skill, and using no special steamers—because if we have to resort to special steamers for that service the work cannot be done, because if special steamers must be employed, it will cost so much that it would be cheaper to run the grain down to Portland and Boston than to send it by way of Quebec. I think a matter that we ought at once to face is the possibility of winter navigation. With winter navigation Quebec would become the emporium, not alone of Canada, but I believe of this whole continent. Grain would be shipped down to Quebec because of the perfect security which could be afforded for keeping it. It is not like Baltimore and Philadelphia where you have to keep moving it on account of the heat. The climate at Quebec is perfectly dry and cool, and when I speak of Quebec I mean, of course, Point Lévis as well, which latter place is admirably adopted for the erection of elevators and for the shipment of grain by large steamers. There is no place equal to it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What about Montreal ?

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. I would not belittle Montreal at all. Montreal has incurred very heavy expenditure in deepening Lake St. Peter and they deserve credit for it. At that time Quebec was asleep, but now we have wakened up a little, we see our advantages, and we hope to utilize them to such an extent that there will be shipped from Quebec, not merely 25 per cent of the grain which I mentioned twelve months ago, but a very much larger proportion. I believe that this government, by its policy of improving every avenue of shipment, will ultimately increase very greatly grain shipments at the port of Quebec. I do not know much about the Georgian Bay canal, but if opening it up to North Bay will give us increased advantages for getting grain down, I will go in for it. I do not think the result will be what the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) fears, that is, to rob our St. Lawrence canals of their trade, because there will be more grain to carry than the St. Lawrence canals can handle, and all the railways you can build. We are not able to realize the possibility that lies before this Canada of ours. We ought to have more faith in our future than to think that by improving Port Colborne we are going to ruin the trade at Kingston. I am sorry the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) is not in his place, because I do not think he would share in the fear of ruining Kingston. I presume there will be trade enough for all possible routes. Instead of getting forty million bushels, or fifty million bushels down the St. Lawrence canals, we want to get that two hundred millions that is going now by Buffalo, or a large share of it. Certainly, we ought to get all our Manitoba wheat. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that next year the hon. member for Simcoe will be able to change his tone a little, and have a little more faith in the government and in the St. Lawrence route.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). I shall not say much on this subject, because I do not profess to have that intimate knowledge of the internal transportation of grain which some hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have, and which every person ought to have in dealing with a subject of this nature. But I am encouraged by the remarks that have fallen from some hon. gentlemen in this

House who have made long and strong arguments containing the scantiest modicum of intelligence on the subject. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is any subject which the Liberal-Conservative party placed before the inhabitants of Nova Scotia and of the lower provinces generally, it was the prospect that by means of the railway system of Canada, and by means of the improved transportation, our ports would be made the point of shipment for immense quantities of produce from the west on the way to Europe. If I understood the argument of the hon. member for Simcoe it was that the quantity transported by water and by rail to the port of Montreal this year was very much less than in previous years, and from that fact he deduced the argument that the means which the government had provided for transporting the grain were not successful, were not proper. Now, I have been led to understand that there was less grain produced in the North-west during the past year than in previous years, and that would account for the fact that less grain was shipped from the port of Montreal, and therefore the long and laboured argument of the hon. gentleman directed against the government would fall to the ground.

Moreover, the hon. gentleman must know that the carriage by steamers of different kinds on the lakes does not cover the whole transportation question. He should be able to tell us what proportion the cost of lake carriage bears to the cost of the transportation of grain between the terminal points, that is to say, between the point of production in the west and the point of shipment in the east, wherever that may be. The small cost on a portion of the route may be balanced by advantages on the longer portion of the route, and that would destroy the value of the hon. gentleman's argument. I do not know what the exact amount of toll is between the point of production and Buffalo, or those other ports on the lakes. But there are other considerations, after the grain has reached the place of shipment, and those considerations are connected with the question of Atlantic navigation. We have heard something this afternoon about the tempestuous character of navigation on the lakes, that vessels cannot navigate the lakes with masts. Well, Sir, do modern vessels navigate the great Atlantic ocean with masts ? The great steamers on the Atlantic all dispense with their masts, they do not depend upon sails at all, but entirely upon steam power. Now, if large vessels are to be employed to carry this grain after it has reached the point of shipment, the larger the vessel employed on the longer portion of the route the greater will be the profit of the shipper. I say there is no port in Canada, there is no port in the United States, there is no port in the western world, which affords better facilities for the shipment of grain across the Atlantic than the port of Halifax.

Perhaps some hon. gentleman may think that I am an amateur on this subject, as some sceptical people thought the other day that I was an amateur on the subject of farming. I know something about the subject of navigation also. Into the port at Halifax there come the largest steamers in the world. I was on board two of the largest steamers in the world in Halifax, one the steamer Pennsylvania, of the Hamburg-American line. This, the largest ship in the world, came into Halifax without a pilot, and the captain turned her around himself, under my direction, and went out again without a pilot, showing the superior navigating facilities of that port. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is this point, and it is the solution of this question of navigation : We know that the tramp steamers, those that carry the grain in bulk, and nothing else, are the vehicles of communication which make the rates on grain. You cannot bring them up to Quebec or to Montreal in the winter time. They go to ports in the United States because the grain is collected there for them, and they go to those ports in ballast. What is the great difficulty of winter navigation ? It is that these ships have to come out from England or continental points empty, and that is the great difficulty of winter navigation, as the captains tell me. I only repeat what a number of them have told me. They say : We can get no cargo to bring out to United States ports, and we have to depend on the back freight to make the enterprise pay. Here is the solution of it : Bring out the western trade, bring out the freight from England and other ports to Halifax in these steamers and the whole question is solved. You will have back freights which will reduce the rate on grain one-third or one-half, and there is no other port in Canada to which you can bring those back freights. What about the winter navigation of the St. Lawrence ? Did they not try to run a steamer from Paspebiac to Europe, and what was the report we got ? Steamer still in sight, still in the ice ; a week later, relief steamer gone out, steamer still in the ice ; at the end of a month, steamer still in the ice, steamer in sight, and relief steamer in the ice. They will always be in the ice, and they will always remain there while the St. Lawrence goes out, while the Arctic ocean is to the north, and while the Atlantic is beyond. Hon. gentlemen may talk about intermediate points upon the lakes, about one point on Lake Erie and another point on Lake Ontario, but the only solution is to get down to deep water on the Atlantic. Political parties have been trifling with the question all along. An hon. gentleman said that there was an elevator at Halifax. There was an elevator at Halifax, and grain was shipped through that elevator, but

through the carelessness of the Conservative party the elevator was burned down. There is an elevator at Halifax now, a beautiful, capacious elevator, with every facility adapted to the movement of grain. It only requires the grain to be brought there when the superior advantages of the port of Halifax will be at once demonstrated. What keeps it back ? Why is not the experiment made ? Is it the timidity of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, or is it owing to the lack of rolling stock to transport the grain which is ready to go over the railway ? I am told it is the absence of rolling stock, the paucity of locomotives, and a great many other detrimental circumstances which prevented the experiment being tried.

In regard to insurance upon the St. Lawrence, I may say that amongst my other qualifications, I was 21 years in an insurance office, and I know that the insurance companies who want to make money very shrewdly conjecture where the risk is which calls for these high premiums, and they know that the navigation of the channel of the St. Lawrence from the month of October is very dangerous. In the summer time, with a certain depth of water, the St. Lawrence is good enough, but for all seasons of the year, for all depths of water and all sorts of tonnage, there is no port in the world, certainly not on the western hemisphere, that can compare with the port of Halifax. There is another rival springing up, and a rival with which the St. Lawrence will have to struggle, perhaps in the summer time, perhaps in the winter time. I am informed by the captains of these ships which carry grain, that desperate efforts are being made to make New Orleans the terminus of the grain-carrying trade, and that the navigation of the Mississippi is going to be the great rival of the St. Lawrence. They have prepared their elevators, they have a variety of products to give a variety of cargoes, and they believe that they can successfully compete with any means of communication possessed by us ; but, in the meantime, until the question of these rival ports is settled, we must have some outlet for the trade of Canada, and the problem will not be successfully solved except by means of back freights from Europe, which will lessen the rates of freight, coupled with the use of the free port of Halifax, with all those facilities which are necessary to enable the produce to be handled at a cheap rate, and which will prevent the trade from going by any other route.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence). Mr. Speaker, a good deal has been said by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) in support of that very valuable port, and a good deal has been said by the hon. minister without portfolio (Hon. Mr. Dobell) in favour of Quebec. Every person seems to have forgotten that there is a little place called Montreal. There have certainly been solutions offered both by the hon. minister without portfolio and by the hon. member for Halifax, but I do not think that we have quite yet arrived at the solution of the difficulty. It is a very simple one to my mind, and I think the Board of Trade of Montreal, a very important body, as well as the Board of Trade of Toronto, have made known to the government just what they think would be the solution of the difficulty. The solution of the difficulty would be a safe 14-foot channel from the west to the foot of Lachine canal, a safe 30-foot channel, 500 feet wide, from the foot of Lachine canal to the ocean, and having these channels lighted so that steamers could proceed as well by night as by day, as they do in other countries and in the ports to the south of us. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has stated that the grain export trade from Montreal and the shipping have fallen off considerably in the last few years. I think he is slightly in error about that. It is true that during 1899 there was not as much produce exported as in 1898. That, I believe, was owing to the fact that we could not get steamers last season, because many of the very best of our steamers were taken by the British government for transport service to South Africa, and that diminished the tonnage out of Montreal. There was no very serious falling off, however. In the year 1899, there were 30,000,000 bushels of grain shipped from the port of Montreal, and 39,000,000 bushels was the highest point ever reached. Last year a larger number of inland vessels arrived at the port of Montreal, but there was a falling off in the ocean steamers. In 1898, 830 ocean-going steamers arrived in Montreal, and in 1899, only 771. That falling off, as I have said, was largely due to the vessels being engaged by the British government in the war service.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have had considerable difficulties at times with the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), but I am happy to say that he had grasped the situation on the present occasion and solved the problem by affording us a thirty-foot channel, 500 feet wide in the St. Lawrence river. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) will now do his part, and have our navigable waters down there lighted and buoyed to the same extent as are the American ports, then we will certainly get the insurance rates reduced. The hon. gentleman from Quebec West (Hon. Mr. Dobell) expressed the wish that we had a responsible Canadian marine insurance company in this country. I can tell the hon. gentleman that we have such a company. We have the Western Assurance Company of Toronto, than which there is no better or more reliable assurance company in the world. I might mention that the hon. member for Toronto Centre (Mr.

Brock) is one of the directors of that company, and the Hon. Senator Cox is president. I can tell the House that the experience of that company during the last ten years has been that they have paid out three dollars for every dollar they have received. In view of that, how can we expect lower insurance. An hon. gentleman spoke about the Clergue steamers going down the St. Lawrence last fall. I remember the circumstances very well. The steamers were delayed somewhere up the lakes, and they went through from Montreal after the buoys had been moved from the channel, because the buoys must be removed from Lake St. Peter before the ice takes, or they cannot be removed at all. These four Clergue steamers went down, and one of them came to grief. I do not know whether or not that is the one the hon. gentleman referred to as being insured, but at all events some one of them came to grief and was obliged to go into dry dock at Halifax. Now, I would point out to hon. gentlemen that it will not take a very great deal of money to put our navigable waterways in first-class condition. The only fault we have to find with the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is that he does not ask for sufficient money in his estimates, and I can tell the minister, and I can tell the House, that if Canada is ever to be made commercially great, now is the time to do it. I repeat that it will not take a great deal of money to carry out this very important work, and the present is the time to do it or not at all. A great many of our friends, especially the Board of Trade of Montreal, are much exercised over the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway has made its terminus at a foreign port. Well, Sir, I am of opinion that that is not altogether an unmixed evil, because I believe the result of it will be that both political parties will be spurred on to a supreme effort to protect the trade of Canada, so that in the end good will result. The hon. members who represent the province of Manitoba will bear me out in the statement that out of the 56,000,000 bushels of grain annually shipped from the North-west, less than 15 per cent of it goes through Canada, and 85 per cent of the whole export goes through United States territory and from United States ports. There is no patriotism in business—except in a few cases at least—and if a man can ship his grain from Manitoba to Great Britain and save $8,000 or $10,000 a year by sending it through a foreign port, he is going to do it. What we have to do in this country, and what we have to do now, is to make our facilities for transportation so cheap and so good that we shall have all our grain and all other exports from Canada going through our own country and shipped from Montreal or Quebec, or from the maritime provinces in the winter.

When I mention Quebec, I do so because I know that in Montreal we are too broad-minded to have any jealousies. We recognize that what is good for Quebec is good for the rest of the country, and that if Quebec prospers, then Montreal and Toronto, and our other Canadian cities will prosper too.

In my opinion the hon. gentleman from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has not proposed the right solution of the difficulty. I believe that the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is on the right course, and if he succeeds in carrying out these improvements there will be no question but that the insurance rates will be reduced. As I see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) in his seat, I would make a suggestion to him which I consider of great importance. I do trust that he will supply a steamer next winter to keep the ice broken at Cap Rouge. It is well known to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and to the hon. member for Quebec West (Hon. Mr. Dobell) that the ice at Cap Rouge sometimes attains a thickness of forty feet.

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. Sixty feet.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I accept the hon. gentleman's amendment. Now that we have started to build the Quebec bridge at this very spot, the piers and abutments of that bridge will certainy have the effect of causing the ice to be thicker still.

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. Oh, no; the contrary.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Well, we will have to differ on that point. I believe that the effect of the bridge will be to keep the ice there longer and later in the spring. While I am not as sympathetic as my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Dobell) is towards the idea of having navigation all the year round, I do believe that if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would provide a steamer to keep the Cap Rouge ice broken we would have navigation at least ten or fifteen days earlier in Montreal, and I think the experiment would be well worth while making. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Dobell) is very strong on winter navigation, and I hope he will succeed. I trust Quebec may succeed in having winter navigation, but I have grave doubts that even if you do keep the river open between Quebec and the gulf, that you will get any one to use it. Steamers would have to come up there through severe snow storms, and I am afraid the insurance of the underwriters would be so high as to render navigation during the winter months well nigh impracticable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) sits down, I would like to ask him whether he claims that there is not a fourteen-foot channel on the St. Lawrence route down to Lachine.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The difficulty to my mind is this. I believe there is fourteen feet of water, but the impression has gone out that fourteen feet of water means a fourteen-foot channel, and that a vessel drawing fourteen feet of water could come down safely through that. That is an impossibility. Fourteen feet of water would only mean, to my mind, a thirteen-foot channel, because a vessel must have one foot of water under her keel to navigate with any degree of safety.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Fourteen feet, on the mitre sills is what is claimed.

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. That would pass a vessel drawing 13½ feet safely.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland). Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, I wish to say a few words on this question which interests to a very considerable extent a portion of the county which I have the honour to represent. The motion as it reads, strikes me as being peculiar in its terms. It says :

> That in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when a fixed and definite line of action should be undertaken on the question of transportation of the grain and other commodities of the North-west Territories, Manitoba and the western states, with a view to centreing the same to the greatest possible extent in Canadian channels.

Well, Sir, if no fixed idea had been arrived at, I would think that the time had certainly come when a fixed and definite line of action should be taken, but to my mind a fixed and definite line of action was adopted many years ago. It was adopted by the Conservative party when in power, and it has been followed up, and followed up properly and to greater advantage to the country by the present government. That fixed line of action was that we should open up the country to bring about as far as possible the transportation of the western products of Canada to the seaboard by means of our water communication. That was the policy of the Conservative party when they enlarged the Welland canal.

But, Sir, this line of action has been exceeded by the present government. They are not only carrying out the line of policy adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite when in power, but they are going further, to this extent, that they are deepening our harbours and opening every means of communication from the west to the east ; and that is the proper line of policy to pursue. Whether it may affect Midland or Port Colborne or Parry Sound has nothing whatever to do with the question. The question is, shall we open up every line of communication from the west to the east in this country, so that the products of the west shall be carried through Canadian channels to the seaboard, and not through American channels ? That is the policy which should be adopted, and that is the policy which has been adopted. If the hon. gentleman's resolution is an insinuation that such a policy has not been adopted, then, I say it should not pass this House. There should not go forth to the public the suggestion that there is not a definite line of policy with reference to the transportation of the products of this country to the seaboard.

It is said that we are not carrying the quantity of the products of the west that we should carry. It was stated by an hon. member from Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), who has had a wide experience in this line of business, that last year about 85 per cent of the wheat grown in our own North-west Territories was carried to the seaboard through American channels. That is a lamentable state of affairs, and we want to remedy it. The policy of this government is, I understand, to endeavour to remedy that state of affairs.

It is said we are not carrying to the seaboard the quantity of the products of the west which go through American channels. Is not the riddle easy to read ? Why, it is only a few years since we had a North-west. It is only a few years in the life of a country that we have had a homogeneous, united Dominion. It was only a few years ago that this Dominion was born. Prior to that time, though the Welland canal was built to some extent, there was not that united and energetic effort to acquire for the whole length and breadth of this country the mercantile supremacy to which this country is entitled. It was split up into disorganized communities—the provinces down by the sea, the North-west unexplored and unknown, Upper Canada a considerable country, Lower Canada a considerable country, but the different parts with divergent interests, and not working together along the one line of building up a great and united country. When confederation was brought about, these provinces were united, and then we began to see that what would be for the benefit of one section of this Dominion would make for the interests of the whole, whether it might be Montreal or Quebec, Midland or Port Colborne. Since then the North-west Territories have been joined to this Dominion, and now the products of that great North-west are pouring down to the seaboard to the open market in Europe. Who is to carry those products ? Are they to go through American or Canadian channels ? Are we to fill up that country with a hardy, intelligent and prosperous population, producing enormous quantities of grain and other commodities for the markets of the world, and are those supplies to go through Canadian territory ? The object of this government, I understand, and I trust to support them in carrying it out, is to develop every line of transportation which can be developed to bring those commodities through our own territory.

The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) made a very lengthy speech. He complained about everything in general, but nothing in particular. My reputation may have preceded me, though I doubt if that reputation is one of obtuseness ; but I must be exceedingly obtuse, for I could not grasp what the hon. gentleman was driving at. He gave us no suggestion of a remedy for the evils which he claims exist, if there be evils. He simply expressed the opinion that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canada Atlantic Railway should be bonused by the government in order to induce them to carry grain in competition with the very route which he says the government should pin its faith to. I failed to apprehend the argument of the hon. gentleman in any particular. He does not propose a remedy. He launches out with the statement that some member of the government made a speech in some section of the country that did not correspond with a speech made by some other member of the government in another section. I venture to say that there has not been a speech made by any member of the government in any section which has not been in the direction of developing the transportation facilities of this Canada of ours. The Welland canal has been talked of. The expenditure at Port Colborne has been talked of. Did not the Conservative party, when in power, spend millions of dollars in enlarging the Welland canal. Their policy was a mistake, for this reason, that the class of vessels now plying on the upper lakes could not go into Port Colborne, by reason of the low water there. Those vessels go to Buffalo, because they are obliged to go there. They will go to Port Colborne and tranship the products of the North-west in tow barges to Montreal as soon as the harbour is deepened to 22 feet ; and that is what the government is doing at the present time. I heard the suggestion made that the Welland canal should be enlarged to a greater depth, and that the transhipment should take place at Kingston. The hon. gentleman proposed something of that kind this afternoon. He does not propose that it should be the policy of the government, so that the larger vessels on the upper lakes could go to Kingston.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He cries a halt.

Mr. GERMAN. He cries a halt. He thinks they should go to Midland. Probably the government will enlarge the harbour at Midland. At the present time I think the policy of enlarging the Welland canal would be a mistake. Let us deepen the harbour at Port Colborne so that the same class of vessels can go there as go to Buffalo, and can tranship their cargoes at Port Colborne as they tranship their cargoes at Buffalo. The distance from Port Colborne to the seaboard is nearly 500 miles shorter than from Buffalo to the seaboard. When that is done, let us look around and see if there is not a means of bringing about the result we are striving for. There is one thing which has been to some extent a drawback, and that is the failure to get a return cargo. That is one of the drawbacks with which Canadian shipping has to contend. Ships go to Buffalo with a cargo of wheat or to Cleveland or Erie with a cargo of iron ore, and they go back with a cargo of coal. But anthracite coal is on our free list, and it can be laid down at the port of Colborne and shipped from that port just as readily as from Buffalo. It can be brought to Port Colborne just as cheaply as to Buffalo, and I believe there is sufficient enterprise in this country to bring about a condition of affairs which will give these large vessels return cargoes from Port Colborne to the west, and thus build up the great trade that should be ours.

I do not know that I have anything more to say on the question. The resolution is a peculiar one, and one hardly knows whether it should pass or not. It insinuates that the government of this country has not had, on this question, a definite line of policy. But that statement is utterly unfounded. The government has a definite line of policy, one which I approve, and one which I believe both sides of the House will be glad to see carried out—a policy which will build up this country, irrespective of whether the port of Montreal or Quebec or Port Colborne or Midland are specially benefited or not, and a policy which will aid in making this Dominion the great and glorious country we all desire it should be.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

House resumed at 8 o'clock.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 7) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Mr. MACLEAN. I shall not take up the time of the committee at any length, but wish simply to call attention to the character of his measure. It is a Bill legalizing a transaction between the Grand Trunk Railway and an American railway company, by which the Grand Trunk Railway assumes responsibility for a railway in the United States, which has been making deficits for years, that have been met by increased charges put upon the traffic in Ontario. I rise to enter my protest against this House endorsing any such arrangement between the Grand Trunk Railway and a corporation outside this country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). It is very apparent to me, from the remarks I have just heard, that facts are things which cut no material figure with the hon. gentleman.

The hon. gentleman was present at a meeting of the Railway Committee when this Bill was considered and disposed of. There was no division upon it. The statements that were made by several members of that committee made it abundantly clear that there was not sufficient ground upon which the committee could refuse to report the Bill favourably to the House. Two or three of the leading facts, I may say the strongest possible evidential facts, were those: That there was, in 1878, an Act passed by this parliament which conferred in express terms upon the Grand Trunk Railway the right to acquire or make arrangements by leasing or otherwise, or make traffic arrangements of any kind, with any railway with which it desired to be connected in the United States. There was no limitation whatever upon that power. That passed in 1878. I think it was only a year from that date when the government of this country, supported and approved by parliament, imposed as a condition upon its purchase of a portion of the Grand Trunk line—I mean the portion between Lévis and Rivière du Loup—that it should go outside of the territory of Canada and expend its resources in making railway connection between Detroit and Chicago. It imposed that charge upon the Grand Trunk Railway. Later than this, and in respect of this road which is now in question, in 1890, the Grand Trunk Railway Company made a leasing contract with that company, which leasing contract was submitted to parliament and was approved. Now, they are not making a new contract at all with the company. They are revising the terms under which the other arrangement was made, and as the facts were presented to us, it is made abundantly clear that they were making a beneficial arrangement for themselves, and that the proposals were of a nature which from a business point of view, could not be other than approved. And the only obligation, apparently that they were assuming by this arrangement which was at all different from their previous existing contract with the company was an arrangement to pay a sum as rental amounting to $43,000 a year. This was not in addition, as I would gather from the facts, to their previous obligation in respect of this road, but it put the form of a specific rental when they were taking over and re-issuing in another form, certain bonds with certain guarantees which were associated with the transaction. Now, it is said that it is wrong for the Grand Trunk Company to go to the United States and acquire any of these roads. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) puts his objection to this Bill upon that ground. It might be a very wise conclusion for parliament to arrive at to say that we will not sanction any arrangement of this kind which the Grand Trunk Company might make as respects railways outside of Canada from this time forward. I am not going to say that I would feel that there would be any public interest that parliament would serve by coming to such a conclusion; but I can understand that there might be gentlemen who have extreme views with regard to these matters who might entertain that opinion. I would not quarrel with that opinion now—the time has not come to deal with it. But it is manifestly clear that we are not in a position to treat this proposal as a new one or one that has had no legislative sanction or no reason for existence. The reverse is the fact. I can scarcely believe that the hon. gentleman has considered this matter. It seems to me that he must think that there is a little kudos, a little political prestige to be got out of jumping up and opposing, whether on tenable grounds or not, a proposition of this kind. I am sure if the hon. gentleman were called upon to take the responsibility of actually giving effect to the intention he has declared of defeating this, he would not take that responsibility. I am well assured of that. There was no member of the committee so far as I coud gather, except the hon. gentleman himself, who had any doubt that this was a proper Bill to pass. It passed in committee nem con.

Mr. MACLEAN. I have called attention to a practice which is growing and which the Minister of Railways himself, in a committee, yesterday pointed out as a dangerous one, so far as regards a similar Bill before the committee. I am well within my right in doing what I have done, the hon. minister will find other things happening that will justify what I am doing. Even if there was this general power given to the road of which the hon. minister speaks, surely parliament has retained discretionary power over any special application under that general power that may come before parliament.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 35) respecting the Mather Bridge and Power Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—Mr. La-Rivière.

Bill (No. 37) to incorporate the Bishop of Keewatin.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Hudson's Bay and North-west Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Great Northern Transit Company.'—Mr. Oliver.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS MAILS.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds). Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of

the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock), or, as he is absent, that of some of his colleagues, to a matter in connection with the mail service of this House. The mail coming here over the Canadian Pacific Railway from Brockville arrives in Ottawa at nine o'clock, and goes to the Ottawa city post office. Yet, I observe, the daily papers from Brockville never get on the file in the reading room until 2 p.m. I went to the post office to-day for letters expecting one or two important ones. I inquired if the Brockville mail was in, and I was told that it arrived at nine o'clock. This was at one o'clock. At two o'clock I got one letter. At four o'clock in the afternoon I received another letter, which happened to be an important letter from the Bank of Toronto. I have the envelope, and will send it to the proper member of the government. It will be seen that it is endorsed by the postmaster of the House, as having been received at four o'cock, though it was in the Ottawa city post office at nine. It is quite evident that there must be something seriously wrong with the arrangements for getting our mails from the general post office.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order :

House in committee on Bill (No. 2) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—Mr. Ingram.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) to allow this to stand. The Solicitor General has a Bill on the Order paper which he was to have introduced to-day, but he came too late. I am under the impression that when that Bill is before the House, my hon. friend will find that it covers the object he has in view in presenting this Bill.

Mr. INGRAM. I suppose that if I am absent, that will not prejudice my position ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No ; but I think the hon. gentleman will be satisfied.

Order allowed to stand.

THE DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton), moved the second reading of Bill (No. 9) to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would ask my hon. friend to allow this to stand. I think he will find the subject dealt with by the Solicitor General in a Bill we propose to introduce.

Mr. HENDERSON. Might I ask the First Minister if he will permit this Bill to go to a second reading in order that I may give the reasons for introducing it ? It will only take a few minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR.

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Bill I am introducing consists of only three clauses. The object of the first clause is to altar the form of oath provided in the Election Act to be taken by persons who come in and say they have a right to vote, but whose names are not on the voters' list. It was found in some constituencies in Ontario that persons came in and claimed the right to vote for a reason that was never contemplated by the Act. The Franchise Act passed in 1898 sets forth clearly the reasons to be assigned by the voter for asking for a ballot if his name is not on the list, and they are as follows :

(a) The holder of an office, or (b) any person employed in any capacity in the public service of Canada or in the province, or (c) any person belonging to or engaged in any profession, calling, employment or occupation, or (d) a person belonging to any other class of persons who, although possessed of the qualifications generally required by the provincial law, are by such law declared to be disqualified by reason of their belonging to such class.

Notwithstanding these reasons, some deputy returning officers, by mistake, I assume, permitted voters to assign other reasons than any of those I have read, as came out in the trial of the North Bruce election. One man said the reason he was left off was because he was neglected. Another man swore that the reason he was left off was of a somewhat similar character, because he was absent. Now these reasons were never contemplated by the election law. The intention was to provide for those cases that occur in the province of Nova Scotia where all Dominion officials are left off the provincial list, and, as a matter of course, off the Dominion list. The intention then of the first and third clauses is to provide against the possibility of such a practice by deputy returning officers. Instead of leaving a blank in the oath, I propose that the whole space be filled up by inserting the various reasons provided for by the Franchise Act ; and then when a voter chooses the particular reason which he will swear to, the other three reasons are to be eliminated. In this way I hope the difficulty will be got over. I may say that in drafting the Bill I inadvertently left out the latter clause of the oath, but that can easily be amended in Committee of the Whole.

The other clause of the Bill is intended to prevent errors by voters marking their ballots above the bar over the first name. In the county which I have the honour to represent that mistake occurred. Persons came in and marked their cross above the bar. Illiterate voters are frequently told to vote opposite the first name or the second name. There have been cases of that kind, and voters thinking they were properly marking their ballot by putting the cross over the bar instead of opposite the name, lost their votes. A peculiar case occurred in the election of my hon. friend from

Peel (Mr. Blain), which I will mention to show the far-reaching effect an error may have. The man who printed the ballots was named Dick, I do not know his first name; his name appeared at the top of the ballot over the bar. Now, our hon. friend who represents the county of Peel is named Richard Blain, and is familiarly known as Dick Blain amongst his friends. Some 25 electors in the county thought they were voting for Dick Blain when they actually put the cross opposite the name of Mr. Dick who printed the ballot. Now, by having no space above the bar the possibility of such a thing would not occur. The proposal is that, in the words of the Bill:

> Form P in the schedule I to the said Act is amended so that the broad black line above the first name on the ballot paper shall extend to the upper edge of the ballot paper, and the broad black line below the last name on the ballot paper shall extend to the lower edge of the ballot paper.

I propose that there shall be no space outside, either above or below the black bar, and this will prevent the possibility of a voter marking his ballot outside the space which is intended.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether, in this Bill which he proposes to bring down on behalf of the government, there will be a provision for avoiding what happened in the West Durham election. There, the gentleman who received a majority of the votes, by reason of some technicality raised by the returning officer, is not in his seat here to-day. There ought to be some provision in the law by which summary action would be secured in a case of that kind. There is a provision in the municipal law under which disputes of a similar character are referred at once to a single judge, and within a week you can get a decision. A case might arise where, if there were a dozen returning officers in the country, and they happened to be strongly partisan, and if the election proved to be very close, and those dozen returning officers declined to act or raised a technical objection, the government would be in the hands of a party that did not have the majority of the votes of the people. Not only can this serious wrong be done to an individual and to a constituency, but by the present defect in the law a great wrong could be done to the whole country; and I hope when the hon. gentleman is bringing in a Bill he will provide some kind of an appeal to a county judge, who will see that the intention of the people under the circumstances is respected and that their choice is returned to parliament. While I say this, I do not dispute the right of this House now, if it saw fit, to seat Mr. Thornton for West Durham, without any reference to the courts. I believe it is to the discredit of parliament to-day that we have not righted that wrong, and that Mr. Thornton is not sitting in the House as the representative of that riding. I am much in favour of leaving disputed election cases, as a general rule, to the judges and to the law of the land; but in this case the law is defective, and parliament would be certainly exercising its just rights, and probably the right hon. gentleman would only be doing his duty if he came down to this House and made a proposal that Mr. Thornton should be allowed to take his seat as member for West Durham.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). I wish to add a word to the remarks just made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). Mr. Thornton won his seat fairly, so far as any one knows. The right hon. gentleman will remember that when the law was amended only a few years ago, in relation to the deposit of a candidate, the intention was then to avoid the possibility of a returning officer declaring the election void or electing a candidate of his choice. The intention was clear that the receipt which the returning officer gave should be a guarantee to the candidate and all concerned that the deposit was perfectly valid. I think that if the remarks, made in the House at that time, are referred to, that will be found to have been the motive cause. I am not entering into the discussion here to-night of the question of the voiding of the seat, but I wish to suggest to the right hon. Prime Minister that when the Bill is brought before the House, the point involved in the West Durham election will be placed beyond peradventure. There is another issue. The matter has not been brought before the House so far as I know during this session. It is in relation to a case which is, I believe, before the courts, and possibly it is out of order to discuss it here upon its merits, but I am referring to it merely in order that safeguards may be put in the law to prevent a repetition of the Nipissing scandal. Here we find a returning officer hiding on the day of nomination, secreting himself, in order that the legal nomination may not be held, and having what we call an irregular nomination subsequently held. I would like to suggest to the right hon. gentleman that the law be so amended that errors of that kind, intentional or otherwise, should not be committed in future, and that no man should hold a seat in this House under such circumstances as the hon. member now representing Nipissing holds his seat here. Another point is this: We find that men who have been living for years out of the riding, but who chanced to be registered as farmers' sons, or owners, or occupants, are brought in to vote. I will not say one side does it any more than the other; but the section of the law is not clear as to how long a man may be absent. It applies to lumbermen, labourers and students who are

absent from their homes. I would suggest to the right hon. gentleman that the section should receive his attention. A hired man living in one riding moves to another one; he gets his washing done at his own home, and so on. I just bring in that one illustration. Where does that man vote? There are a great many votes lost on each side owing to this, and a great many votes improperly cast owing to the improper construction of the law. I trust the right hon. gentleman will give these suggestions his consideration.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have no objection to allowing this Bill to go to its second reading, because I find most of the provisions which are contained in it are also contained in the Bill to be introduced by the hon. Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick). My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) will be satisfied to know that the mistake which he wishes to provide against in so far as the marking of the ballot is concerned, is provided for in the Bill which is to be introduced to-morrow. There will be no space above upon which such an error may be repeated as that which occurred in the last election. In regard to the other provisions of the Bill, a provision which enacts that no one shall be permitted to vote whose name is not on the list except those who are specially provided for, I believe, is also contained in the Bill. Therefore, I will allow this Bill to go to its second reading, subject to it being taken up later on, if my hon. friend is not satisfied with the Bill which the government proposes to bring in. In regard to my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), I am happy to say that the mistake which took place in West Durham is not to be repeated either. First of all, my hon. friend must allow that there is an improvement. The man who got the minority of votes in West Durham is not in the House. In former times he would have taken his seat in this House. But, the Bill provides, I believe, that if such a mistake as took place in West Durham occurs, it will not avail, because there is a provision in the Bill to be introduced that an accepted cheque will be sufficient deposit instead of money. As to the objection of my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), I doubt whether we shall be able to meet all the requirements of his fastidious taste. We will try to do our best, but if we do not succeed it will be open for him to offer such amendments as he thinks best when the Bill comes up for consideration in the committee.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether the counterfoil of the government ballot is to be black?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, the ballot will be black.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

Mr. INGRAM. I mean the counterfoil attached to the ballot.

The PRIME MINSTER. I cannot say as to that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, in respect to what has been suggested by some hon. members of this House as to a summary mode of dealing with mistakes made by returning officers, I think the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) might well keep that suggestion in mind, notwithstanding what the Prime Minister has said. For example, there is a summary way of dealing with questions respecting the proper or improper marking of ballots that is open to a summary proceeding before the county court judge. It has occurred to me, in thinking over the West Durham case, that mistakes by the deputy returning officer or the returning officer, which brought about these very bad results in West Durham, might possibly be dealt with in the courts in some way other than by the cumbrous machinery of an election petition. I believe in having these matters dealt with by the courts. I have no doubt the House could amend the return in the West Durham case, but it did not seem desirable to bring that matter up in the House for the reason that the question had been committed to the courts, and I do not think the House should attempt to deal with it. But, while I say that, I do not think it would require a very great effort to so amend the Controverted Elections Act, that certain matters of that class might be dealt with in a summary way by some tribunal, as the question of proper or improper marking of ballots is now dealt with upon application before a county court judge. I trust that the hon. Solicitor General will take that matter into consideration, and see whether it is possible to make some additional provision in that regard. I would like to point out to the right hon. gentleman that although he amends the law in this respect, that does not obviate the possibility of a returning officer in future making mistakes of a similar character.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, that case, I should think, would be a very proper case to go before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. We have a right here to deal with it, and but for the fact that it was first taken to the courts, I think it would be proper to bring it before the Privileges and Elections Committee, and deal with it in a comparatively summary way.

Mr. MACLEAN. May I ask the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will he, under the circumstances and in view of this Bill, bring down a resolution giving Mr. Thornton the seat for West Durham?

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is a little bit of a radical, I am afraid. I

do not know that he would advise me seriously to take the case out of the courts and bring it into parliament.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, I would.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think I am prepared for that.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister if he has examined any of the ballot-voting machines. I do not mean the professional ones that have been so aptly managed by hon. gentlemen opposite, but the ordinary voting machines. There are a number before the public, and I am satisfied that they do their work perfectly and accurately.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have seen a great many of these machines, and I stand by the ballot. I think that with a little attention very few mistakes must take place in future with the form of ballot we have now.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT—SIZE OF FRUIT BASKETS.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth) moved second reading of Bill (No. 10) to amend the Weights and Measures Act.

He said: I presume it will be expected that I should briefly give the reasons for the introduction of this Bill. Many hon. members are no doubt aware that up to the present time we have had no standard size for fruit baskets. Many years ago, when fruit-growing first became an important industry, baskets were manufactured that were thought to be most suitable for different kinds of fruit, and custom established these baskets at certain standards. The largest of these is described in the Bill as a 15-quart basket, and it was used for shipping grapes by the ton. That basket still remains about the same size, and as the fruit is sold by the pound there was no inducement for any one to make a different basket. The second largest basket; the 11-quart basket was originally made a 12-quart basket which was thought to be about the right size to conveniently ship peaches, pears, plumbs, quinces, apricots and tomatoes. It was not very long, however, before some smart 'Aleck' thought he could make money by reducing the size of the basket to 11½ quarts, and as it was the same shape as the 12-quart basket, the only difference being a quarter of an inch in the depth, he found that he could sell it for the same price as a 12-quart basket. This went on for a time and then some one invented the 11-quart basket, until at the present time the basket that is called a 12-quart basket in some cases only holds 9 quarts. These baskets are all sold as 'baskets,' and not as holding any particular quantity of fruit, but the consumer believes that he is getting a basket holding 12 quarts. It may surprise some to know that the consumers do not know the difference, but experience shows that to be the case, and consequently the producer who ships his fruit in an honest 12-quart basket, or even in an 11-quart basket, is defrauded because the average basket to-day only holds about 10½ quarts. At a recent meeting a fruit-grower very happily put it when he said: The fruit producer is placed in a dilemma, because if he ships in an honest 12-quart basket he cheats himself, and if he ships in a 10-quart basket he cheats his customer, so betwixt the two he is sure to sin. In regard to the next size of basket described in the Bill as 6⅔ quarts, there are several sizes used at present containing various quantities between 6 quarts and 7½ quarts. This Bill seeks to do away with these various sizes, and to substitute one that practical men believe will fill the purpose of these different sizes. There is at present no standard. The smaller basket is called a 5-pound basket. Some ship in a basket that holds an honest 5 pounds, while others ship in baskets that hold 4 pounds and 3½ pounds. As to the fifth size which is the strawberry box, I believe a Bill was introduced in former sessions to regulate this size. The size specified in this Bill is the standard size in a large section of this country. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the need of this Bill is so great that the Ontario Fruit Growers Association, a body of men representing the best fruit men in the province, passed a resolution last December appointing a committee to draft the details and arrange for the size of baskets they thought best suitable to the trade. That committee met at Grimsby a couple of weeks ago, and in conjunction with subcommittees from various other associations all over the Niagara district, they recommended certain sizes as being suitable, and practically drafted this Bill. Some objected to making a hard and fast rule as to size because there might be times when baskets would be hard to obtain in this country, and would have to be imported from the United States. To meet that difficulty it was proposed that baskets which were different from the sizes mentioned in the Bill should be stamped in plain letters with the contents of the basket. These are the main features of the Bill. The reasons why the sizes have been adopted will, I presume, be inquired into at a later stage.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). I do not rise to oppose in any way the principle of this Bill, because I believe that a well-defined standard for fruit baskets is a very desirable thing. But, notwithstanding the fact that the hon. gentleman from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) has a thorough knowledge of the fruit business, and knows more about packing fruit than perhaps all the

members of this House put together ; yet I dare to suggest to him that possibly he has not struck the best mode of determining the size of the berry basket. This matter was very fully discussed last session, and the session before, when I had the opportunity of meeting men who are well acquainted with that line of business. The impression seemed to be then that the better way to define the size of the berry box was by making it so many inches square at the top, so many inches square at the bottom, and so many inches deep, thus fixing the size by inches, and not by measurement in the form of a quart or four-fifths of a quart. My reason for thinking that mode of determining the size of the berry basket the better one, is this : A man may go on the market in Montreal to buy a box of berries and desiring to know if he is getting a box of the standard size he has no quart measure or four-fifths of a quart measure with him, but he has a rule in his pocket with which he can determine in three seconds whether the basket is 4¾ inches square at the top, 4 inches square at the bottom, and 2⅞ inches in depth. If that is the size, he knows he has a standard box, and is getting all the berries he pays for ; but in the other way it would be very difficult for a man to know whether he was receiving the proper quantity or not. I do not wish to oppose the principle of the Bill, because in the county which I have the honour to represent, a very large quantity of small fruits are grown and shipped to the larger markets of Toronto and Montreal, and my constituents are very much interested in a measure of this kind. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press the Bill too rapidly through the House, so that we may have an opportunity of hearing from persons interested in it ; and it may be that at a later stage he will accept the suggestion as to the mode of defining the standard box instead of the one he proposes in the Bill.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). I do not rise to oppose the Bill, because I do not profess to be sufficiently familiar with the details of the business to take exception to many portions of it. I simply rise to ask that the House be very cautious in accepting this measure, on this ground, that while it may be satisfactory to the gentlemen forming the Fruit Growers' Association of Ontario, dealing as they do with a definite trade well understood by them, there is much danger that a measure covering in its operations the whole Dominion of Canada, if passed by this House, might work great hardships on many people in various portions of the country. I very much fear that this Bill, if passed in its present form, would be found oppressive and unsatisfactory in many portions of the maritime provinces; and if the measure ever reaches the committee stage, I will move that until further information can be gained, the province of Nova Scotia be exempted from its operation. Another thing: as the whole subject of weights and measures applicable to berries and fruits of all kinds as well as other things, is under the control of the Department of Inland Revenue, I would ask my hon. friend who introduced the Bill if it has ever been referred either directly or indirectly to that department to be enquired into and reported upon. It seems to me that in regard to a measure dealing with interests which are large in some places and small in other places, but in every place important, a department of the government charged with making inquiries as to the effect of new legislation of this kind should have an opportunity of examining the Bill and reporting upon it through the experts of that department. In the county which I have the honour to represent which exports annually from $30,000 to $50,000 worth of blueberries, and in which a large part of the population at a certain season of the year is interested in the picking, packing, transporting and selling of those berries, none of the dimensions given here would apply, but the provisions of the Bill would operate with peculiar hardship. Assuming that other portions of the country may have other difficulties of a cognate character, I merely rise to ask the House to be cautious in accepting a measure which, in one portion at any rate, is of a very drastic character, because it makes any violation of the law a criminal offence. I would suggest that my hon. friend, if he takes the second reading to-night, allow the Bill to stand for some time before moving it in committee, in order that gentlemen may have further opportunity of looking into it.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The suggestions of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) seem at first sight to be very good, and in many respects I think they are ; but with the baskets made as at present, they would not be practicable, because he gives the square measure top and bottom, whereas the baskets are usually round.

Mr. HENDERSON. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I think one who has handled fruit for a great many years ought to know something about it, and it is a fact that the baskets are made in that way to-day. The baskets for either peaches or grapes are round at the ends. Therefore, a square measure would not do. But for that, I would say that the suggestion was a very good one.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). My constituents are largely interested in the milk trade around Toronto, and they have long asked this parliament to give them a standard milk can. There are a lot of these questions coming up constantly, and

I would have liked to see the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) here to-night to give his views on this Bill. When it comes up again, I hope he will be here. If parliament deals with a matter of this kind, it must deal with it in a drastic way. It will have to make a lot of standards for almost every trade—an apple barrel, a flour barrel, and many other things; or we shall have to leave everything to the standard of weights and measures recognized in this country. Perhaps on the whole, that would be the best thing to do. Otherwise we shall have to provide a standard for every product raised in the country.

Mr. LOGAN. I would suggest to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) that a panacea for all these ills would be a government ownership of baskets.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is not in his seat this evening, as the duty of dealing with this Bill devolves upon me, and I must confess my utter incompetence. However, I am not very much ashamed of that, in view of the differences which exist even among members who are familiar with the subject. We have a difference as to whether the baskets used to-day are square or round. With such a difference on a question of fact, there must necessarily be differences of opinion on the measure; and I am sure that my hon. friend who has brought in the Bill will be satisfied if we take the second reading to-night, and take the committee stage at a future sitting.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

THE DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell) moved second reading of Bill (No. 15) further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.

He said: I move the second reading of this Bill on the understanding that was come to at the suggestion of the right hon. First Minister some days ago, namely, that it be allowed to pass its second reading, and that discussion takes place upon it when the whole subject matter comes up.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no objection; but, perhaps, my hon. friend would give us the reasons which led to the introduction of the Bill.

Mr. CLANCY. I stated the reasons briefly a few days ago when I introduced it. The purpose of the Bill is to prevent the worst form of intimidation, namely, persons telling voters that the mode of voting is not secret, thus placing the voters at the mercy of those who may state on the one side that the ballot is a secret one, or of others who may state that it is not. Under such circumstances, it is natural that the voter will be improperly influenced. It seems to me that there is no more insidious form of intimidation than for persons to make statements of that kind. The right hon. gentleman will see himself that it utterly destroys the secrecy of the ballot. That is shortly the object of the Bill, and I trust the right hon. gentleman will allow it to take this stage, with the undertsanding that it will be discussed when the whole subject-matter is taken up.

DRAINAGE ACROSS RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 16) respecting drainage.

He said: The object of this Bill is to give to the farmers the same privileges that are enjoyed by the railway companies. Since the country has become cleared up, the farmers are beginning to under drain their land, as it is impossible to successfully cultivate land unless the surplus water is taken out. In many cases where railways have been built, ditches have to be carried beneath the railways, and the railways are not amenable to the same laws as the farmers. This Bill will make the railway companies contribute towards the cost of those ditches the same as the farmers. The amendment to the Railway Act of last year reads as follows:

> Whenever proceedings for the drainage of lands have been taken by any landowner under the provisions of an Act of the legislature of any province in that behalf, and it appears to the Railway Committee that an outlet for such drainage works is required over, across or under the lands of the company, the Railway Committee may, upon the application of the landowner or engineer in charge of the works, or of the clerk of the municipality and on due notice to and hearing the parties, order the company to construct and provide upon its lands all necessary means of drainage, as in such order specified upon the landowner first complying with such terms as to payment as to the whole or so much of the cost of construction and maintenance of the said drainage work as the Railway Committee in such order provides.

This is the clause that stings the farmers all through Ontario. In many cases it would cost the farmer more money to apply to that Railway Committee and make the payments here required than the land would be worth. We require, consequently, that the railway companies should come under the same law as the farmer. All we have to do to accomplish this is to put in these few words into the Railway Act and take clause 14a out of it. I hope the farmers in this House will appreciate this measure and thoroughly examine it, and if they are satisfied no doubt the other hon. members will be satisfied also. If this Bill is allowed to go to committee, the farmers thoroughly understand it and will be able to convince that committee of its necessity. The farmers of this country have expressed themselves in stronger language against the Min-

ister of Railways for having put that clause in last session than for all the other sins this government committed last summer. I trust that this matter will be taken up and handled in the proper spirit.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I am very much afraid, if the hon. gentleman's view of the result of my action in this matter last session be correct, that in endeavouring to have this legislation put into the shape in which I think it ought to be, in order to fully safeguard the public interest, I will be discharging a very thankless duty. This is happily a question which does not partake of a political character, and which we can therefore deal with solely on its merits and come to the wisest conclusion at which our judgments will enable us to arrive, without being hampered in the slightest by political considerations. I am not going to suggest that this Bill should not pass through its second reading, but I would ask the hon. gentleman to have it referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways and Canals so that it may undergo discussion in that committee.

There is more in the matter, I can assure the hon. gentleman, than he and his friends and the people who are calling for this legislation imagine, a great deal more. It involves the complete and total surrender by this parliament to the local authorities which are constituted under provincial drainage Acts of the means to be taken for the protection of life and property against the possibility of casualty resulting from carelessness in the way in which roadbeds of railways may be affected by this procedure. The duty is cast upon us as a parliament of seeing that the railways of the country are operated safely, that nothing that is necessary for the protection of those who use the railways—both, as I said, as to their lives and as to their property—shall be overlooked. And it will be a matter for the Railway Committee, and, if necessary, later, for this House to see whether or not that proper and necessary protection can be secured if this Bill becomes law. I take that to be a larger and more important consideration than the one which the hon. gentleman would wish to see provided for. I do not for a moment dissent from the view that this is a very important matter for people residing in many sections of the country. I can well conceive that it would be a great advantage to them if some means could be adopted, consistent with the proper protection of life and property, which would enable them to drain their property under more favourable conditions than, it appears, by law, they are now able to do. I grant the importance of the matter which the hon. gentleman has in view; but we must not overlook the importance of the other considerations. It is the duty of parliament to weigh both and to examine both. We will do that, I trust and believe, according to our very best judgment and ability when the matter comes to be considered by the Railway Committee, to which I would suggest that the Bill be referred. Let me say one word with regard to the legislation of last session. It is open under that legislation for any landowner to give notice to the Railway Committee that he has utilized the machinery which he has at his hand at home, and the Railway Committee, being then set in motion, can work the problem out.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether the legislation of last session has resulted in any cases coming before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was just going to say that that has been done in one or two cases. I know of one case, and I am under the impression that there was another, but cannot speak with confidence as to that. The parties did not require to send a delegation to Ottawa. They were told, when the Bill was before the House last session, that a simple letter would answer all purposes. A letter was written informing my department that a case had arisen which was within the contemplation of the Act of last year. We immediately sent an engineer for the purpose, and he met the parties, and they met the railway people. There was no further complaint about it, and I understood that an understanding satisfactory to all had been reached without any serious expense to the party. That is as far as I can speak with confidence at this moment. I believe that could be worked out; I know of no reason why it could not be done. I think it is not possible for any one to say that they have endeavoured to utilize the procedure of last year and have failed. I am confident that that has not occurred, for if it had occurred, I am sure I should have known of it. I would urge that we do not deal with this matter too hastily, because we cannot conceive what the consequences might be if such a change as is proposed becomes the law of the land. There is one matter the hon. gentleman complains of which is not so easy of adjustment, and that is with regard to the expense that must be incurred when these works are required to be carried on, and the distribution which may be made by the officers of the department or by agreement between the parties as to the portion which each should bear of the cost. I can well believe that it would be somewhat burdensome, perhaps it might be found to be beyond the means of the applicants to comply with the requirements of the Act. But that is no ground of objection to the law. We can well imagine that conditions will arise that cannot possibly be remedied. But, if you are

going to insure fair treatment to all parties in such controversies, when such a question arises you must impose obligations upon each, and if the obligations appear to be heavier upon one than the other, if one of the parties is less able to bear what he justly ought to bear than the other party, that is no ground for criticism of the law. We cannot prevent these conditions from existing; we must take things as they are. And, therefore, I can see that it might be almost impossible to remedy the complaint which the hon. gentleman has dwelt upon with respect to the probable cost which may be imposed upon the landowner who would secure the right of making a drain or constructing works through or under the road-bed of a railway. I am content, as I said, that every opportunity should be afforded the hon. gentleman, and those who think with him, to thresh the question out again before the Railway Committee. Or, after it reaches there, should it be deemed wise to take that course, I would favour it being referred to a sub-committee for, perhaps, a closer and more thorough inquiry than would be possible before the whole committee.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 9.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 7, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved:

That the papers covered by the return to the Order of the House of Commons, dated 12th February, 1901, Reference No. 3, with supplementary return of said Order, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

He said: That is the itemized statement of the gallons of spirituous and malt liquors sent into the Yukon. The Minister of the Interior knows the return, and the subject is referred to in the Auditor General's Report. Some inquiry will be made into that, and these papers would be useful.

Motion agreed to.

ALIEN ACT AMENDMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 47) to amend the Act to restrict the importation and employment of aliens. He said: The leading feature of the first amendment which is proposed by this Bill concerns the third section of the present Act, which provides for a penalty for a violation of this Act of $1,000, no more and no less. The object of the amendment is to make the penalty not more than $1,000 and not less than $50, giving to the judge discretion to apply the penalty according to the offence. Then, it is stated in the Act that the penalty is to be recovered only by the consent of the Attorney General. We propose to modify that section, and to provide that the penalty shall be recovered with the consent, either of the Attorney General of the province, or of the judge of any court in which the penalty is sued for.

The second amendment concerns section 5 of the Act. I have not the Act before me, but section 5 provides that a settler, that is to say, an intending settler, may bring with him a relative or a personal friend. It has been found in practice that this word 'personal friend' is too elastic for practical purposes, and that it may be made an occasion for evading the law; therefore, we propose to strike out the words 'personal friend.'

Section 6 of the said Act provides that if there has been a violation of the Act, the party who has been introduced into the country illegally shall be sent back at the expense of the person previously contracting for the services. It is proposed to strike out these words, and to substitute in lieu thereof:

At the expense of the person, partnership, company or corporation violating any of the provisions of section 1 of this Act.

Then, it is proposed to repeal section 8 of the Act altogether, and to substitute the following section therefor:

That it shall be deemed a violation of this Act for any person, partnership, company or corporation to assist or encourage the importation or immigration of any alien or foreigner who resides in, or is a citizen of any foreign country to which this Act shall apply, by promise of employment through advertisements, printed or published in such foreign country, and any such alien or foreigner, coming to this country in consequence of such an advertisement, shall be treated as coming under a contract as contemplated by this Act, and the penalties by this Act imposed shall be applicable in such case. Nothing in this Act contained shall be held to affect or control the government of Canada or of any provision of the Territories in respect of promoting immigration.

This last amendment has been inserted at the suggestion of the labour organizations, who have strongly pressed for its adoption.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

LONG SERVICE DECORATION.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. When did the authority to distribute the long service decoration and long service medals reach the Department of Militia and Defence?
2. Have the forms of applications for either been issued to district officers commanding; and, if not, when will they be forthcoming?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. Approved regulations to govern the issue were received at the Department of Militia and Defence, February 4, 1901.
2. No. The regulations will be promulgated in General Order of March 1, 1901—the first orders submitted for the approval of His Excellency in Council since the receipt of the approved regulations. Application forms will be printed and distributed without delay.

LICENSES FOR PACKING LOBSTERS.

Mr. BELL (Pictou) asked :

1. How many licenses have been granted for packing lobsters on the shores of the island of Anticosti?
2. If any, to whom have such licenses been granted?
3. What fees have been paid for such licenses?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). Assuming that the hon. gentleman's question refers to the coming year :

1. One.
2. M. G. Daggett.
3. $100.

LACHINE CANAL LOCK.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the contract for the Lachine canal lock been awarded? If so, to whom and at what figure?
2. Who were the other tenderers, and at what figures did they tender?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The contract for the Lachine canal lock has not been awarded.
2. Until the contract is awarded it is not in the public interest to make known the names and figures of tenderers.

SOREL HARBOUR WORKS.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the contract for the Sorel harbour works been awarded? If so, to whom, and what was the amount of tender?
2. Who were the other tenderers, and at what figures did they tender?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). The contract has not been awarded.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has not answered the second part of the question. Who were the tenderers ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Until the contract is awarded, I have nothing more to say. The contract is not awarded. That covers the whole case.

MONTREAL HARBOUR WORKS.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Who was the successful tenderer for the harbour works in the city of Montreal, awarded by the Public Works Department?
2. What was the amount of the accepted tender?
3. Who were the other tenderers, and at what figures did they tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte) :

1. James C. Malone.
2. $631,033.33.
3. James C. Malone, Three Rivers, Que., $631,033.33 ; N. K. & M. Connolly, Quebec, $886,606 ; M. A. Pigott, Hamilton, Ont., $827,000 ; W. H. Davis, Ottawa, $936,570 ; F. B. McNamee, W. Strachan, J. Quinlan, Montreal, $1,019,000 ; R. Macdonald, Coteau Landing, Que., $1,185,000.

CONTRACT WITH THE CANADIAN LOCOMOTIVE CO., KINGSTON.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. What was the nature of the contract made between the government and the Kingston Locomotive Works, or with private parties at Kingston, or elsewhere, for the supply of locomotives for the Intercolonial Railway?
2. How many engines were ordered, and when were they to be delivered?
3. What price is being paid for each engine?
4. Are the government making advances to the contractors on account before the delivery of the engines, and if so, on what basis?
5. Were tenders asked for the supply of the engines?
6. What was the date upon which the contract was entered into?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. There is a contract with the Canadian Locomotive Company of Kingston for single expansion consolidated freight engines with four pairs of coupled wheels.
2. Twenty engines were ordered, and they are to be delivered in the following manner, viz.: The first engine on the first day of May, 1901, and an additional engine every ten days thereafter until all the said twenty engines shall have been delivered.
3. $19,000 each.

4. 80 per cent is allowed the contractors on each progress estimate.

5. No, upon a submission to the Governor in Council, it was ordered that as the department had obtained prices for similar engines from United States manufacturers, the government would be justified in paying this price with duty added, less $500 each.

6. The agreement originally made was with Messrs. William Harty and others on the 22nd December, 1900, and transferred to the corporation formed by the original contractors under the name of the Canadian Locomotive Company.

YUKON DISTRICT—LIQUOR REGULATIONS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. Will the government lay on the Table of the House ' The departmental regulations with reference to liquors for personal use ' referred to in letter of Deputy Minister of Interior to Mr. Turenne, January 11, 1901, (return to Order of the House, Ref. No. 3, 1901)?

2. Will the government lay on the Table the departmental regulations with reference to liquors for the Yukon district?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Yes, I will lay the regulations on the Table to-morrow.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—RECRUITING IN CANADA.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to put a question to the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). According to the notice that was given some days ago that the government were to take Thursday, I expected to-day that the government would go into Supply, and that I would be able to bring up the motion of which I gave notice some days ago. The government did not take Thursday, and to-morrow being Friday, and some hon. members desiring to be present, who will be absent, I would like to give notice to the House that I will bring the motion up on Tuesday, unless there is a special reason why I should not do so.

VISIT OF THE DUKE AND DUCHESS OF CORNWALL AND YORK.

Hon. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.). Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the right hon. leader of the House to the fact that two nights ago I asked a question in the House when the right hon. gentleman was not present, and that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) intimated that he would rather I should wait until the Prime Minister was in his place. It was in regard to the visit of the Duke of Cornwall and York. There is a notice in the Globe, quoting it as from official sources, that their Royal Highnesses are going to Vancouver, and I would ask the Prime Minister if he can give any official information ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I stated some time ago to my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Prior) that we are corresponding at this moment with the Colonial Office upon the subject of the visit of their Royal Highnesses, that the correspondence is not concluded, and that I would not like to make any statement until the correspondence has been concluded. But, in the meantime, I think without divulging any secret, I may assume to say that it would be, I think, quite fitting and proper that their Royal Highnesses should visit Vancouver, B.C.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I presume Victoria at the same time.

The PRIME MINISTER. I should say so.

THE BUDGET.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, I said that I would make an announcement as respects the time at which the budget will be presented. Our present intention is that the budget speech shall be delivered on Thursday of next week unless something should occur to postpone it, of which, of course, due notice will be given.

TRAINING OF OFFICERS AND MILITIAMEN.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). Mr. Speaker, I do not for a moment wish to interfere with the budget or with the motion of my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), but I would say that I also gave notice of motion on going into Committee of Supply. I would not think of intruding upon the privileges of the hon. member for Labelle, but I would say that my notice has precedence over his, and that it was held over at the request of one of the ministers who was ill.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) The motion of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) also concerns the Transvaal, and perhaps we can agree to compromise.

TRANSPORTATION OF GRAIN.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Bennett :

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when a fixed and definite line of action should be undertaken on the question of the transportation of the grain and other com-

modities of the North-west Territories, Manitoba and the western states, with a view to centreing the same to the greatest possible extent in Canadian channels.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, this motion was before the House yesterday, and the debate was cut short at six o'clock. I had intended saying something then, but was prevented by that fact. I just wish to say a little more in regard to the transportation problem and something in regard to the features of it that were brought up in the House yesterday. I would like to take a strictly non-partisan position in regard to this transportation problem, but when I remember how the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) treated me last night, and has treated me on several occasions, I do not think I would be discharging my duty unless I pointed out some of the mistakes that he has made in the past in connection with this question. The other day, the recognized organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, the Globe, in Toronto, was discussing the railway question as it affected the people of Manitoba, and as it affects them to-day in relation to a certain proposition that is now before them in connection with the Canadian Northern Railway. The Globe, said that there is an element of resentment in the attitude of the people and their representatives in the matter. What gave rise to this element of resentment in the minds of the people of Manitoba ? It is because this government failed in 1898 to do what they should have done for the protection of the people in connection with certain transportation problems then before the parliament of Canada. In 1898, when we had this matter up in the House, I directed the attention of both sides of the House to the fact that a great railway proposition and a new proposition was being brought to their attention. I quoted from the Globe newspaper of that day outlining the scheme of Mann and Mackenzie, having in view the establishment of a new transportation route, and I said that this is the opportunity when so much money is being expended to protect the people of Manitoba, and to protect the whole people of Canada. I will quote from the Globe newspaper a statement of what was done in 1898 in this House, in the legislature in Toronto, and in the legislature in Manitoba, in three legislatures that were controlled absolutely by the Liberal party. The Ontario and Rainy River Railway has 286 miles in the province of Ontario, and that province gave it $1,110,000 without a single condition being imposed. The Dominion government gave $960,000 in connection with the same railway without conditions, and the province of Manitoba guaranteed bonds to the extent of $5,800,000 on the portion of the road both within the province and without it. On the whole there was granted to that road $27,000 a mile of public money for 290 miles in Ontario ; $8,000 a mile guaranteed by Manitoba for the Minnesota section and the section in Manitoba ; and the Dominion government in 1898 gave 6,400 acres a mile. The Manitoba government guaranteed $10,000 a mile bonds which, with the land grants, made a donation of $20,000 a mile to that concern. In 1898 three Liberal legislatures in this country : the legislature of Ontario, the legislature of Manitoba, and this parliament controlled by the Liberal party, gave the equivalent of $20,000 a mile for this road. I called the attention of parliament and the Minister of Railways to these facts when the measure was going through here, and I said : Now is the time to protect the people of Manitoba. But the minister replied : You are wandering far afield ; you are trying to pose before the country, and he made all kinds of charges of that kind against me when my only desire was to get him to protect the interests of the people. What was the defence that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) set up then ? He said : This is not a great continental project ; it is only a little railway and does not involve any great interest. That statement of the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) is on record, and when I divided the House, the right hon. the First Minister rushed the measure through and he neglected to seize the opportunity which would have protected the people of Manitoba to-day. The people of Manitoba are now seeking to right the wrong that was perpetrated upon them by three legislatures controlled by the Liberal party. The province of Ontario is to blame for not taking some sort of satisfactory guarantee from the Rainy River road ; the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) is to blame in the same way, and the Greenway government is most of all to blame. If what I proposed had been done, namely, to unite and make that road a national road, there would be no grievance in Manitoba to-day, but on the contrary, the Rainy River Railway would have been a link in the new national system. It would in a short time have been connected with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway and with the Intercolonial system, and for the money that Canada has expended on these railways we would have practically had a national system across the continent without costing us an additional cent. The Minister of Railways on that occasion failed to protect the interests of the country ; he failed to protect the interests of Manitoba, and the same charge applies to the Liberal governments of Ontario and Manitoba.

I want to pass, Mr. Speaker, from that partial view of the case. I am sorry to have to say of hon. gentlemen opposite that they failed in their duty. Now, with what the hon. gentleman from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has said in regard to transportation of Lake Superior, I agree to some extent, but I do not agree with all he said, for if his argu-

ment means anything it means that the Grand Trunk Railway system from Midland to Montreal is the system best adapted to solve the transportation problem, and that after we are finished with the canals we should do nothing more. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) in that respect. On the contrary, I agree with hon. gentlemen opposite. I say that there is or will be enough traffic for every system of transportation which we have got, and the thing for us to do is to find that system will give us the best and most immediate results. The Grand Trunk Railway has a good harbour at Midland and a good system to Montreal, but just when it reaches Montreal it does the worst thing possible for Canada, because it deflects that traffic to Portland. That should not be, nor should the Grand Trunk Railway be allowed to continue that practice. The best way to stop that and to afford a remedy is to do just what the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) said we should not do. I believe we should nationalize the Booth lines and nationalize the Ross line, and from all I can gather to-day Quebec is the natural port for a great deal of that trade. At very small cost Quebec can be made a splendid shipping port, and can be developed and put in running order this year, and extended every year in the future. I believe that there is something in winter navigation, but I do not intend to enter upon that subject to-day. Be that as it may, Quebec is the most available port we have in Canada for the greatest length of time during the year, and it can be equipped with the least expense. I believe that the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Great Northern Railway would make a first-class extension of the Intercolonial Railway. I do not believe that our national line, the Intercolonial Railway, should end at Montreal. I believe in its extension to the great lakes where the traffic originates and where it will find a feeder. If these ports are to be built up ; if the 200 million bushels of grain —which I believe will be 400 millions before a great while—which comes to the great lakes and which will come to Midland and to Parry Sound are to be handled in Canada, I want to see the Grand Trunk Railway get a share of it and I want to see the Canadian national railway getting its share of it and taking it to Quebec in the summer time and to St. John, Halifax or Sydney in the winter time, or if need be, all the year around. I am applying my system of nationalizing the railways as a solution of the problem submitted to us yesterday by the hon. member (Mr. Bennett). I believe that the people of Canada are in favour of nationalizing the Booth system and the Ross system and making them part of the Intercolonial Railway. I believe that if the government had in 1898 secured a proper control over the Rainy River road, Canada would have a national system of railways in a short while right into the city of Winnipeg, and in that way we would have been able to discipline all the other railways in this country. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) said that we had spent enough money on the canals and that we should now let the railways have a show. I do not agree with him there. My opinion is that for twenty years the railways have done their best to prevent the deepening and enlarging of our canals, and now that our canal system is coming into vogue I would like to see it largely improved and extended.

We in Toronto also believe that probably one great solution of the transportation problem is to make a national road somewhere between the Georgian Bay and Toronto, by which we could use the canal and river system from that city down to the sea.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the idea.

Mr. MACLEAN. That may be the cheapest and best way out of it ; that may be the complement of what the government is to-day doing in the harbour of Collingwood. They are making great improvements there, and we would like to know if they are making them with the idea that they will have a railway between Toronto and Collingwood, or Toronto and Midland or wherever the port may be. The port may be Penetanguishene. But that is a proposition which must be in the government's mind, and it may be one that will go a great way in solving the transportation problem. The only satisfactory solution of the transportation problem of this country, however, is by the parliament and government taking over the railways, and making them a complement of our canal system. When you control the railways and the canals, you can use the one or the other or the two in combination; they will work in harmony in the best interests of the country.

I wish briefly to enumerate some of the positive advantages of the nationalization of railways. It will secure the absolute control of our own lines, and absolute equality of treatment to all, rich and poor, individual and corporation. Government ownership will restore the land grants to the people, and some of the money the people put into these roads. Government ownership will make the canals and our water navigation, and all the improvements thereof, and the railway system of the country, complementary one of the other. Government ownership will necessitate the ocean terminals of our railways being at Canadian ports and in that way make our railways patriotic. The only way you can make Canadian roads patriotic is by compelling them to have their terminals at Canadian ports. Government ownership will build up a British Canadian ocean service on the Atlantic and the Pacific. It will secure the fullest use of all trains for a greatly im-

proved postal service. It will secure the control and extension of the parcel express business, and will allow of the railway telegraph service being consolidated with a national telegraph system; and all this will be secured at a much less cost than now for administration, and at a much less cost to the people who use the service. Government ownership means that a national policy with regard to railways can be made complementary to the national fiscal policy, and one will greatly aid and reinforce the other. Government ownership means lower freight rates for the producers, whether farmers, miners, lumbermen, stockmen, or fishermen. Government ownership means cheaper passenger rates, with a greatly improved passenger service. Government ownership means the opening up of new country with the money now sunk in unnecessary roads in older sections. Government ownership means that the entire energy of the management of such a national system will be devoted to the service of the people, and to solving the problem how best to handle the traffic of the country at the lowest cost to the producer or consumer, instead of wasting the best part of that energy, as is done to-day, in fighting rival roads at the expense of people along the lines or the country at large.

What are the things which the nationalization of railways will prevent or render unnecessary ? It will prevent the creation of a railway commission. If we can avoid the creation of an expensive railway commission, it will be a great point in favour of the nationalization of railways. Government ownership will prevent the everlasting war between such a commission and the railways which is sure to occur after the commission is created. Government ownership will prevent the unpatriotic conduct of private railways like the Grand Trunk going to Portland, and the Canadian Pacific Railway going to Boston. Government ownership will wipe out the frightful corruption in politics by the great corporations. Government ownership will do away with the extravagant and unnecessary extension of the present national system of railways. Government ownership will do away with the duplication of existing roads by unnecessary lines. Government ownership will avoid the expensive and extravagant system of competition for business, involving many unnecessary officials, offices, advertising, solicitors, commissions, &c. Government ownership will prevent foreign ownership and control, and the consequent unpatriotic policy that might emanate therefrom. Government ownership will prevent the hostile attitude that existing roads show to new roads coming into and getting into cities, and will put an end to all unnecessary and expensive entrances into cities and ports. Do you know what happens in a city like Toronto or Montreal when a new road wants to come in ? It involves the expenditure of millions of money, a great fight, and the waste of a tremendous amount of energy. With government ownership there will be a national entry into each city, and none of the fighting and expense now indulged in by competing roads. That alone will be an enormous saving. The more you look at this railway question in all its aspects, the more evident it becomes that the only way to avoid the troubles ahead is through government ownership. The more we do to build up rival roads, the more we complicate the problem. When you stop giving to railways, subsidies of money and lands, and gradually get control of them, you will be in a position to give the people transportation at the lowest cost.

Just one other feature of this transportation problem I want to refer to, that is, the Atlantic service. This country has made no progress in getting an Atlantic service since this government came into power. We are rather worse off than we were before. We find our Canadian ports becoming deserted. My idea is that the government should run an Atlantic service in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. I believe that the coming Atlantic port is Sydney. The government could make the experiment with two moderate-sized steamships, which would give a service once a week; and if it were found to pay, it would do more to advertise this country, and build up the Intercolonial and the Canadian national system of railways than anything else. The traffic would have to pass over the national railway of Canada. Not only the people of New York and Boston would use the service, but all the west would use it; and I believe that before ten years were over, we would have a fast Atlantic service running from an Intercolonial terminal, which would send a steamer across the ocean every day in the year. I believe that a fast Atlantic service is coming, and as a Canadian I would like to see it quick. The way to secure it is to hold the national system of railways which we have to-day, and gradually extend that system, and not to be afraid to go ahead and take over the other systems, which can be done at a very small expense.

As I have said before, the people of Canada to-day, are paying all the cost of these railways. It is not the companies or the shareholders who are paying for them; it is the traffic, and the greater burden you put upon the traffic by establishing unnecessary lines, the harder it is for the people to bear. There is no getting rid of the difficulties of the situation other than by coming to a straight national system of railways.

I hope that the government will yet see its way to come out in favour of the nationalization of railways, and extend the national system to the upper lakes. We have only got a portion of the way. While I agree with a great deal that my hon. friend from Sim-

coe (Mr. Bennett) has said in criticism of the government, I do not agree in his policy of making the Grand Trunk Railway the line over which this traffic will pass, but would prefer a line owned and controlled by the people, and which would be an extension of the Intercolonial Railway. I trust that hon. gentlemen opposite will not charge me with posing before this House, because the very policy I am advocating to-day I drew attention to three sessions ago in this House; but I do make this charge to-day, and am sorry to have to make it—that if the government had maintained control of those roads, and the money they gave the Rainy River Railway in 1898, there would not be the trouble in Manitoba which exists there to-day. I believe, however, that the Manitobans are a self-relying people, and that they will work out a solution which will not impose any great burden on them in this connection. They are making a step in the direction of government ownership, and the province of Ontario proposes hereafter to maintain some kind of control of the railways, so that we can fairly say that government ownership is in the air; and those politicians who first tried to impress that policy on the public and have it carried out, will be those whom the people will recognize as having had the courage of their convictions, and as having advocated a policy which cannot fail to be beneficial in the public interest.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Peter Macdonald, East Huron). I rise to express my views upon the transportation question irrespective of any route. The transportation question, in my opinion, is one of the most important engaging public attention. I do not regard it as a party question at all. Nor is it a local question, for we are all desirous of establishing the very best system of conveying from one part of the country to the other the products of the energies of the Canadian people. It is not to be supposed for one moment, that any one route will carry all the products of the country. Some will go by the waterways, and some partially by waterways and partially by railways; but it is undoubted that the most effective way of controlling railway rates is to put our waterways in the very best condition. It has been the experience everywhere that a waterway has a very strong controlling influence upon railway rates owing to the cheapness with which a waterway can carry the freight and traffic of the country, and the time has come when we must devise the best means of meeting the extraordinary expansion of trade we are now experiencing. Our trade is happily increasing by leaps and bounds. It would probably surprise many who have not given attention to the figures, that in 1888, 9,000 vessels passed through the Sault Ste. Marie canal, south and west, the average tonnage of which was 600 tons, and the amount of tonnage carried through was 5,495,000, and the value $79,000,000. That will give an idea of the extraordinary trade which passed through the Sault canal in 1888. Twelve years have elapsed, and I find, on looking over the figures, that instead of 9,000 vessels having passed through last year, 20,000 vessels passed through, with an average tonnage of 1,000 tons; and these vessels carried, not five and a half million tons, but twenty-five million tons. And instead of the value being $79,000,000, the freight carried amounted to $218,000,000 in value. That shows the expansion of trade in Lake Superior during the past twelve years, and impresses upon us the importance of providing increased facilities for that trade, so as to prevent its being handled by a foreign country. Our government have been doing what they could to improve the greatest waterway in the world. Canada's waterway extends from the Atlantic into the very heart of the continent, a distance of no less than 2,700 miles, but nature, in giving us that unrivalled waterway, left some obstacles which we are in duty bound to remove as far as possible. A portion of that waterway belongs to us, and a portion is common to us and the United States. We have spent no less than $75,000,000 to $80,000,000 in constructing canals, which, I think, was a wise policy. But we must remember that there are other things to be done. We have canals now 14 feet deep, which will accommodate vessels carrying from 60,000 to 100,000 bushels of wheat, but we require also deep harbours and better terminals. We sometimes lament that we are not getting more trade, but the reason is because we cannot handle satisfactorily the trade we are now receiving. The large vessels that come down laden with wheat pass in sight of Port Colborne and sail into the port of Buffalo, and one of the most important things Canada has to do is to make that Port Colborne sufficiently deep to enable large vessels to come in and send the wheat in our direction. There is another thing required, and that is a guard pier; and I am glad that the parliament of Canada voted money last year for the purpose of providing it. Without that guard pier, particularly when the wind is blowing from the south and south-west, the waters become so disturbed that the elevating of wheat becomes very difficult.

Now, I wish to show that the particular attention of parliament should be directed, not for the purpose of constructing railways, but for the purpose of putting the waterways in the very best condition. It is well known to those who have given consideration to this question that the waterway, no matter how inefficient, has a very large control over the rates charged by the railways during the open season. The lowest rates in the world for carrying wheat to-day are the charges from Chicago to New York. And what is the reason of

that ? The reason is that the lowest charges by waterway are the charges by water from Chicago to New York. The best equipped railways in the world to-day are the railways from Chicago to New York, the reason being that the waterway adjoining has forced the railways to improve in this respect. Twenty years ago the curves on these roads were much more numerous and much more difficult than at the present time. The railways saw that, in competing with the waterways, they would be obliged to improve their means and methods. They straightened their curves, they lowered their grades, they increased the size and capacity of their cars, they increased the capacity of their engines ; and the consequence is that where, a few years ago, they could carry only from twenty-five to thirty cars, now they draw forty, and even fifty cars. This is owing to the improvements that I have spoken of. And, as I say, these improvements have been forced by the proximity of the waterway upon whose bosom floats the vessels of commerce. This shows us the importance of putting our waterways in a condition to control the railway rates in our own country. Another thing that we must bear in mind is that the western states, in order to control the railway rates, seek an outlet at some place on the waterway. And as soon as they strike that point they can control the railway rates, because they can say to the railway : We will take the waterway unless you give us reasonable rates. The very best authorities in the United States who have investigated this matter agree on these points. No doubt hon. members will recollect, that in 1885, the Senate of the United States appointed a commission to investigate the transportation question. This is known in history as the Cullom Commission. Before this commission sat to hear evidence, they formulated questions which they sent out to men who were particularly well informed on this business, and one of these questions I will read to you. This question was sent out to ninety different individuals, for the purpose of ascertaining their opinion as to the controlling power of waterways over railway rates :

> In making provision for securing cheap transportation, is it or is it not important that the government should develop and maintain a system of water routes ?

The parties to whom this was sent included expert railroad men, steamboat men, engineers and others who had paid attention to these matters for many years. And of the ninety to whom the question was sent, seventy-three sent an answer to the following effect :

> That a national system of water communication is the most certain and effective method of regulating railway rates and of insuring to the people the advantages of cheaper transportation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Hon. members will probably remember reading the history of this committee and its report to the Senate. As a result of the findings of this committee, and based upon its report, a Bill was introduced and carried under which the Inter-state Railway Commission was appointed. I find in that report the following, which gives the opinion of the committee on this point of water communication, and shows the important effect of waterways upon railway rates in that country :

> The evidence before the committee accords with the experience of all nations in recognizing the waterways as the most efficient cheapeners and regulators of railway rates. Their influence is not confined within the limits immediately accessible to water communication, but extends further and controls railroad rates at such remote and interior points as have not competing lines and the means of transport by water. Competition between railways, sooner or later, leads to combination or consolidation, but neither can prevail to secure unreasonable rates in the face of direct competition with free natural or artificial water routes. The conclusion of the committee is, therefore, that natural or artificial channels of communication by water——

Now, note this :—

> —when favourably located, adequately improved and properly maintained, offer the cheapest method of long-distance transportation now known, and they must continue to exercise in the future, as they have invariably exercised in the past, an absolutely controlling and beneficial regulating influence upon the charges made upon any and all means of transit.

Now, you will notice that there are three things as specified in this report as necessary. One is that the waterway shall be favourably located. We have a favourable location ; we have a far more favourable location than the United States. The United States waterway is not to be compared with the Canadian waterway. For instance, they have one mile of canal for every four miles of open water ; we have only one mile of canal for every sixteen miles of open water. They have only the Erie canal with its depth of seven feet, we have our canals with their depth of fourteen feet. We have rapid transit from Port Colborne to Montreal practically. It takes a barge on the Erie canal one month to make the round trip ; it does not take a week to make the round trip by our methods of transit. We are as near Liverpool at Hamilton as they are to Liverpool at New York. Montreal is 158 miles nearer to Chicago than New York is to Chicago. These are the advantages we possess. But they have a few advantages which we have not. They have no tolls upon the Erie canal, we have some tolls upon the Canadian canals. There is another advantage that we possess. The Welland canal, on an average of twenty years, is open nineteen days longer in the season than the Erie canal. The Lachine canal is on an average open four days

longer than the Erie canal. Now from these facts you can see that our advantages are far in excess of those offered by the Erie route; therefore, other things being equal, we should be more than able to compete with the other route running through Buffalo to New York.

But there are disadvantages. They have better terminal facilities than we have. We have no facilities of any importance at Colborne compared with those at Buffalo. We have no elevators at Colborne elevating 40,000 or 50,000 an hour, as they have at Buffalo; therefore we cannot reasonably expect to handle the trade. They have elevators at Buffalo with a capacity of 21,000,000 bushels. They elevate grain at the small price of one-eighth of a cent per bushel. We have never done that, we have not been able to do it. It costs our people four times as much as that to elevate either at Colborne, or at Montreal; and can any reasonable man expect that shippers and exporters, knowing these facts and these difficulties, will send their produce our way when they can get so much better facilities by other routes?

Now let me point out the disadvantages under which the port of Montreal labours. Montreal is not a first-class harbour, it is not a second-class harbour, it is not a fifth-class harbour. It is entirely deficient in facilities for handling the trade that might centre in Montreal. Therefore, it will be impossible for shippers and exporters to take advantage of that route when Montreal is in such a bad condition. I do not say that for the purpose of throwing cold water upon Montreal, because I consider that Montreal, if it had the proper equipment and apparatus, could handle the trade of this country, and that in less than twenty years its present population would be doubled or trebled. It is the gateway standing between the eastern and western trade. Our import trade must of necessity, if it comes by Canada at all, come through that door, and our export trade converging from the different points of the west must pass through the city of Montreal. Therefore, I have been of the opinion, that instead of waiting for private enterprise to put Montreal in a proper condition, it should be made a national port, the government should provide proper equipments at Montreal for that port to handle the trade of Canada. If that is done, rest assured that the trade will be largely diverted from other routes to Montreal on account of the natural facilities and advantages which that port possesses, and a large proportion of the trade now handled by the Americans will be handled by the Canadian people, and we will get the advantages of it.

Now, I want to give some facts showing the lack of facilities at the port of Montreal. The way that cattle are handled in the port of Montreal has largely driven the export of cattle to the port of Boston. Boston is one of those ports thoroughly equipped and prepared for handling the export of cattle. Let me give you an idea of how they use cattle in the city of Montreal when farmers send their cattle by that way. The cattle come in, say, on the Canadian Pacific Railway. They are run down to Hochelega where they are untrucked, and where they are fed, watered and rested, and that is proper. Then when the ship upon which they are to be sent across is ready, they are retrucked and run back to the point nearest to the ship, and that very frequently is 100 or 150 yards away from the ship. Then they are run down a steep gangway on to the platform of the wharf, thence they are urged along a narrow way between merchandise on the right and merchandise on the left, till they get to the gates of the sheds. Then they are urged through the narrow doors of the sheds on the front, and out of the narrow doors at the back, and then forced by twisting their tails, by goading and whipping, on board the steamer. When the cattle get on board the steamer, they are excited, they are heated, they are bruised, and consequently they enter upon the voyage in that condition. Cattle exporters in this country, who have given the matter consideration, tell me that this treatment depreciates the value of each animal from $2 to $5. Taking the lowest figure, last year we exported 115,000 head of cattle, a loss of $2 each would mean $230,000 lost to the farmers of this country by the poor means which are afforded them to handle the cattle, and to put them on board vessels in the city of Montreal. Now, $230,000 would pay the interest on six or seven million dollars. It would be cheaper for the farmers of this country to borrow five or six million dollars to equip the port of Montreal for the proper export of cattle.

Then again, Montreal is not a good port to ship flour from, and that is one of the reasons why the Grand Trunk Railway carries nearly all its flour to Portland. Mr. Lond, who was a prominent official in the Grand Trunk Railway service, has stated that the cost of shipping flour in Montreal is so high that they are seeking another way of shipping. He says this: We come into the city of Montreal with a train load of flour, we have no place to put that flour. There are not sufficient storehouses, and consequently we have to allow our freight to lie upon the track until we get an opportunity of loading it directly from the train. The cars are so far away from the edge of the wharf that we have to employ drays and carts, and the consequence is that it costs us about $4 a car for unloading, whereas if we had proper facilities and a proper place we could unload for at least $2 a car. That probably comes out of the exporters' pockets in Montreal. But, do not hon. gentlemen see that the profit of the farmer is lessened in proportion to the expense which it takes to remove these diffi-

culties and to overcome them? All that comes ultimately out of the pockets of the farmers of this country.

Now, let us take another article, that of lumber. We export lumber from the city of Montreal very largely. I think last year we exported about 336 million feet board measure. When a ship is expected by the agents of shippers in the city of Montreal, they telegraph to the lumber exporters up the river, and other places, to send their lumber forward because they expect the ship on a certain day. The lumbermen send down their lumber, some in barges and some by rail. Very frequently it occurs that when the lumber arrives at Montreal something has detained the ship, the ship is not in the harbour; and consequently they have no piling wharfs there, and the cars have to remain there with the lumber on board until the ship arrives, it may be one, two, three or four days, in some instances. On the other hand, the barges which come down have to remain with the lumber on board until the ship arrives. Well, the railway charges $2 demurrage every day that the car remains, and the barges charge $10 a day demurrage for their retention in the canal or harbour. The steamboat company has to pay that in Montreal, but of course ultimately the expense all comes out of the freight. If they had not to pay this expense the cost of the freight would be less, and that amount ultimately comes out of the pocket of the producer. Therefore, it is a loss to the producers to have this condition of things prevail in the city of Montreal.

Now, how do they do in Boston in loading cattle? Cars run right down to the sheds on the edge of the wharf. The ship is lying in her berth. There are level tramways running from the floor of the cars right to the hold of the ship. The cattle are urged along quietly and put into their stalls. In that way the city of Boston has been known all over the continent; in fact one-third of the cattle imported into Liverpool two years ago came from the city of Boston. Until we, as Canadians, put the port of Montreal in such a condition as that it is impossible for us to expect the trade to go there. Now, there is another point; how about the elevating capacity in the city of Montreal? There is one elevator owned by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or, at least, used by the Grand Trunk Railway. It is situated upon the canal where it cannot be reached by an ocean vessel at all. The other is operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I think, together, their capacity is 2,000,000 bushels. Now, how do they load ships? Just let us look at that for a moment. They load the ships exactly as they did twenty-five years ago. They load the ships just as if the world were not moving forward at all. They have the same equipment in the city of Montreal to-day as they had twenty-five years ago. They have the old exploded system of floating elevators. A barge goes to the elevator, gets a load then floats down to the vessel, and the load is transferred to the vessel at the rate of 4,000 bushels per hour. The best business that they ever did in the city of Montreal was loading the steamer Montcalm with 100,000 bushels in twenty-six hours. In the first year of the twentieth century, think of them loading in the city of Montreal at the rate of 4,000 bushels per hour, while at Duluth last year, they loaded a vessel at the rate of 195,000 bushels in 153 minutes. Do you really suppose that you can expect trade to go to the city of Montreal and wait to be loaded at the rate of 4,000 bushels per hour, and when we are so far behind in adopting the most recent inventions for expediting the transfer of freight to vessels? It is impossible that any reasonable man can expect it. If we expect to do business in Montreal we must equip that port for the purpose of doing business as well as other ports are equipped. If not, do you expect to get trade? How could you expect that the trade of Buffalo could be diverted to Montreal when shippers know the conditions existing at one port and at the other? At Buffalo 50,000 bushels of grain are elevated in an hour, and at Montreal 4,000 bushels are elevated in an hour. Do you suppose the shippers would be foolish enough to send their grain down to Montreal and pay half a cent a bushel for elevating it there, when they can get it elevated in Buffalo for one-eighth of a cent a bushel? Let us make our port a fraction of a cent cheaper than any other, and we will have the trade just as sure as we are existing, because the other conditions in Canada are far superior to those elsewhere. Now, I am going to give another instance. One of the Hamburg-American vessels came into Portland two years ago to be loaded from Grand Trunk Railway cars. From the time the vessel came in, was unloaded, and was reloaded with 265,000 bushels of grain and ten car-loads of other freight, only three days elapsed. Do you really suppose that the Grand Trunk Railway Company are wrong in seeking a port where their goods can be handled with such despatch allowing their trains to return to do business again? If we want to get the Grand Trunk Railway business in Montreal, we will have to do better than we have been doing. Let me give a few figures which will probably astonish some hon. gentlemen. These figures are authentic. They are in regard to the congestion of trade in the port of Montreal during the season of 1897-8. On October 11, 1897, there were 447 cars lying on the sidings in the city of Montreal waiting for accommodation to be unloaded; on November 2, 1897, there were 473 cars; November 9, 451 cars; November 10, 438 cars; November 15, 427 cars; or an average during these months of 464 cars

standing idle waiting for the accommodation which should be there to receive their freight as soon as they come in. Do you really suppose in ordinary business that if there were such congestion of trade as that, or that if any of you hon. gentlemen were wishing to transport your products, knowing these conditions to exist, you would send your goods forward to be exported from that congested centre ? I do not think you would. Taking the whole season from the opening of navigation in the spring until the closing in the fall, there were 315 cars on a daily average lying in that city waiting to be accommodated at the elevators, or on the wharfs. Let me give you a few more figures to show that the figures I have already quoted do not have reference to a special season or to special conditions. In May and June, 1898, the Grand Trunk Railway had more than 1,000 cars upon the tracks waiting for accommodation, and the Canadian Pacific Railway about 500. On May 12, 1898, there were 439 cars waiting for accommodation ; on May 18, 314 cars ; on May 30, 532 cars ; on June 15, 446 cars ; and on June 17, 181 cars at Point St. Charles, and 423 were standing around the elevators without receiving the accommodation they desired. Now, I think I have said enough to show the House that while we express surprise that after all we have done we are not getting the trade for the port of Montreal, we can see the reason for this. We have deep canals and deep water, but this is a link in the same transportation route. The strongest part of the chain is the weakest link in it, and the strongest part of this transportation chain is the city of Montreal, which is a very weak link indeed. What do I propose to do ? I am not speaking for the government, but I think I am speaking for a large proportion of the people of the west, and I think I am speaking for the whole country when I say that parliament should direct the government to assume the port of Montreal, and make it a national harbour. They should have plans drawn by the most expert engineers in the country upon a magnificent scale, and let them go on with a portion of the plan as we can find the money. Let them go on for five, ten, fifteen or twenty years with the improvement of the port of Montreal, and then we shall have a port there of which Canadians may be proud. By that time trade will be very largely diverted along the lines to which we now look, and our trade will have reaped the advantages it can never have unless such things are done. We cannot leave the improvement of such a large harbour as that to private enterprise, and therefore, it is the duty of the government, in my opinion, to spend money, if it requires $5,000,000 or $10,000,000 to complete that work. Ten million dollars of an expenditure simply means about $300,000 a year, and I have shown that on cattle alone there was a loss of $230,000, and the loss coming from lumber, the shipment of flour and a hundred and one other things would be three times covered by the $300,000 which I believe the government will be called upon to pay annually for the equipment of that harbour. There is another thing about the city of Montreal, and perhaps I should not say so much in regard to Montreal in the presence of an hon. gentleman who is a representative of that city. I am sure that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) will endorse every word I say with regard to the condition of the Montreal harbour. The wharfs in Montreal are on too low a level. It is impossible to erect permanent sheds on them, because the sheds would be carried away when the ice moves, and the result is that the sheds along the docks are temporary structures, which have to be taken away in the fall, stored during the winter, and replaced when navigation opens. You will see there is a great loss of labour and of money in all this. If the wharfs were built on a higher level the freight sheds could be permanent structures and they could be enlarged to meet the requirements of the trade. In Boston and New York the trains move down along the centre of the sheds on the wharfs, and the merchandise is unloaded into different sections ; one section for Liverpool, one for Glasgow, one for London, and so on. Then, when a vessel comes to port her loading is quite a simple thing. We have no such arrangement at Montreal, and consequently the railway cars have to unload in the night time. According to the rules of the harbour commissioners, trains cannot unload from 7 o'clock in the morning until 7 o'clock at night, because the general traffic occupies the space during the daytime. The consequence is that at 7 o'clock in the morning if a ship is not loaded and the cars are not unloaded, the train has to draw out and remain there for 12 hours before they can resume their work. It can very well be seen, therefore, that, as I said in my opening remarks, Montreal is not a first-class harbour, nor even a fifth-class harbour. I do not believe that you will find on the Atlantic coast any harbour worthy of the name which is so much behind the age as is the harbour of Montreal. Another reason why importers do not do their business through Montreal is this : When a vessel arrives, there is very frequently no cover for the merchandise she brings, and cement and tin and wire, and such goods are exposed to the weather and very often injured, notwithstanding that sometimes tarpaulins are used for covering. The importers who bring such goods into the country, and whose goods have been damaged will certainly not use that port again, but will seek some other, where the accommodation is better. In view of all this, would it not be wise for us all, irrespective of political parties ; would it not be judicious for us as Canadians to put the

port of Montreal in such first-class shape that it will accommodate the trade that we are soliciting. The federal government of the United States consider New York as a national harbour. They look upon it as the centre towards which a large portion of the western trade converges, and they have given about $10,000,000 towards the construction of piers, warehouses, and other works at that port. In like manner the United States federal government recognizes Boston as a national harbour, and they have made a grant of $5,000,000 to it, and so with Galveston, and so with many other ports on the Atlantic coast. Look at the port of Liverpool. One hundred years ago the annual trade of that port was only 500,000 tons, but the yearly trade of Liverpool today is over 11,000,000 tons. What is the reason for this vast increase in the trade of that port ? I will tell you. Liverpool, during the last 100 years has spent $100,000,000 on its port, or at the rate of $1,000,000 a year. Hamburg has spent $34,000,000 during the last twelve years, and many other cities in the old country as well as the new, have been spending large sums upon their harbours. Indeed, we might say that this is not an expenditure at all, but it should be viewed in the light of being simply an investment of money in the interest of the people. In Canada we would pay 3 per cent for the money expended on our harbours, and we would realize not 3 per cent but five times 3 per cent, which comes back to the people ; maybe not in the form of a few cents which we can see, but in the form of increased trade, increased credit, and increased development of our country in the various avenues of our greatness. I, therefore, believe that the government should make Montreal one of the best harbours on the continent. Montreal cannot be considered as being a competing port unless we make such improvements as will enable us to compete. We cannot to-day handle the traffic as quickly or as cheaply as can other ports that have modern equipment. We must have such facilities as will enable a vessel carrying 80,000 or 100,000 bushels to have her cargo elevated in two hours and the vessel ready to resume her return journey. It has been said that a great difficulty is that we cannot get sufficient return cargoes for Canadian ports. Well, Sir, my opinion is that when we have our transportation system in proper shape and when exporters find it profitable to send their goods from our Canadian ports, then the merchants in Chicago, Duluth, Superior City, Winnipeg and other places west will import their goods through Canadian ports. The time will come when our trade will increase in the import line as well as in the export line, and when we have modern facilities in Canada the goods that now come to New York and Boston will come through Montreal or Quebec or Halifax or St. John, and be handled by the Canadian people to their advantage.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Now, there is also the question of the navigation below Montreal which must be attended to. My hon. friend from West Quebec (Hon. Mr. Dobell) pointed out the weaknesses there. We have an artificial ship channel, and that channel is not sufficiently wide, nor are there a sufficient number of navigation lights. There are jutting rocks which have to be removed and there are curves which have to be straightened, and with all these improvements made the insurance would be less and a large proportion of our trade would find its outlet by the St. Lawrence. I do not know of any other subject which could better or more profitably be discussed by the members of this parliament. There is no question more interesting to the people of Canada, because our great fertile plains are so far removed from the seaboard that the question of cheap transportation to the markets of the world must ever be one of great concern to us. We cannot increase the price of our products, but we can so lower the rates of transportation that the producer will get the benefit, which will enchance the value of his products to him. I have deemed it my duty to place these facts before the House, because I have taken considerable pains to obtain them. I twice went to Montreal and I examined the port that I might be able to deal with this question intelligently, and for that reason I thought it advisable to present my views on this question in a non-political light. I say that both political parties are deeply interested in accomplishing this great aim in the interest of our country, and I trust we will all be able to move hand and hand towards success in that direction.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) tell the House how much money the government has spent in improving the harbour of Montreal in the past ?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. Up to last year, I believe, there has not been one single dollar spent by the Dominion government. True, they loaned money to the harbour commissioners for which they receive interest ; but they have never spent independently on the port of Montreal one dollar, so far as I know, unless they have spent it since the last session of parliament.

Mr. ALBERT E. KEMP (East Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with very much interest to the discussion which went on yesterday afternoon in this House, and the discussion which has been going on this afternoon, on the transportation question. The proper solution of that question will result in great benefits to the people of this country. I am a great believer in water transportation, in regard to which we have advantages in Canada which no other country in the world possesses. We have a natural system of water communication ex-

tending into the very heart of this continent, 2,000 miles from the Straits of Belle Isle ; and what the government of days gone by, as well as the present government, have been trying to do is to make that whole system navigable for vessels of 14 feet draught, of 22 feet draught, of 28 feet draught. Therefore, I have no hesitation in saying that I support the policy of the present government in going ahead and deepening the St. Lawrence canals to 14 feet. In the discussion of this question, I fear that it will be impossible for me to avoid criticising the government for some things which they have done in connection with what I may term their transportation policy ; but I desire to say at the outset, that it is not a studied criticism, and I am sure they will receive it in the spirit in which I give it.

On the motion which is before the House, I suppose we may reasonably consider the transportation question not only as it affects the great railways of this country, but as it affects the fresh water navigation and the salt water navigation. I was very much interested yesterday, or the day before, in the Railway Committee, in hearing a note of alarm sounded by the hon. Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) in reference to the action of the Grand Trunk Railway in transferring its terminus to Portland from a Canadian port, in which we had all taken great interest, which we had been trying to build up in the hope that it would ultimately rival the port of New York. Some years ago the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) said he hoped to make Montreal the Buffalo of Canada. I also recall a letter which the hon. Minister of Public Works wrote a few days ago to the president of the Montreal Board of Trade, in which he expressed alarm at the position in which we found ourselves owing to the Grand Trunk having transferred its terminus from Montreal to Portland. The government of the last four years have made rather loud professions in regard to their transportation policy, and, therefore, I think it is fair to criticise what they have accomplished.

What we have been trying to accomplish in the last few years has been to secure for Canadian channels the carrying of the products of Canada and their delivery at Canadian ports at the lowest possible cost. The question is, how far have we succeeded in accomplishing this ? In connection with the transfer of the terminus of the Grand Trunk to Portland and the diversion of the business which should go to Montreal, I desire to refer to a matter which has already been very thoroughly discussed in this House ; that is, the agreement which the government made with the Grand Trunk Railway for bringing the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. I would like to point out that Mr. Hays, who was at that time the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, stated plainly and publicly, before the agreement was consummated, that it was his intention to carry out the policy which the Grand Trunk are now about to put into effect, of making Portland their terminus in the summer as well as winter seasons instead of Montreal. In a speech which he delivered in Portland in the year 1898, and which was reported in the public press, he made that statement. In this connection I would also direct the attention of the House to the following figures. The total amount contributed by the present government towards the reconstruction of the Victoria bridge was $500,000. The amount paid annually by the government for the use of the bridge is $40,000 ; the amount paid annually for the use of the track from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert is $37,000 ; and the amount paid annually for the use of the Grand Trunk terminals at Montreal is $62,000. I have come to believe that owing to the great liberality of this government to the Grand Trunk Railway, that company have been enabled to use the money paid by the government for these purposes, in obtaining communication with Portland all the year round ; and my contention is that as this agreement was not consummated at that time, it would have been fair for the government to have said to the Grand Trunk : If you intend to do what your general manager says, the people of this country will not put up with it, and we must insert in the agreement a clause prohibiting you from going to Portland, and passing by the port of Montreal in the summer season.

A good deal has been said here this afternoon about the difficulties of transferring freight from railways to steamships at Montreal, and there is a good deal of truth in what has been said. At the same time, we must not forget that the Grand Trunk Railway Company have spent an enormous sum of money at Portland in the last few years ; and I think it would have been fair to have said to the Grand Trunk Railway, as a business proposition : You spend so much and we will spend so much on Montreal harbour ; you are the great gatherers of freight in the country, and especially in Ontario ; you are the people who control the commercial arteries of this country; you control the lines of traffic which carry the produce, and we cannot and will not submit to your making Portland your terminus to the detriment of a Canadian port during the season of open navigation of the St. Lawrence.

In this connection I would like to draw the attention of the House to the number of miles of railway which the Grand Trunk own in this country. They own 3,194 miles, of which 2,600 miles, or about 80 per cent, are in the province of Ontario. As this House knows, the province of Ontario is gridironed with lines of the Grand Trunk Railway, and the exports of this country

are gathered by this railway and are taken to the various ports for export.

It cannot be denied that the rates of freight which the Grand Trunk Railway collect for the transportation of this business are of a character sometimes described as burdensome to the producer, and I think that in consideration of the great favours which the Grand Trunk Railway have received at the hands of this administration and of previous administrations, and the great amount of Canadian traffic they carry, they are not treating the country fairly. The government, I think, could have prevented this. It is a cold and heartless proposition to come from the Grand Trunk Railway. This company practically say: We will pass through the city limits of Montreal and carry freight to Portland, a greater distance by 300 miles, at the same rate as to Montreal. I hope that the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Public Works will not content themselves with merely protesting against this but find some way of effectively checking it. For what does it mean? It means that by the great influence which this corporation can wield over steamship companies, steamship after steamship will be driven away from Montreal, and we find that although last year the great Dominion Steamship Company declined to make Portland its port, in the summer season, this year it has had to bow to the inevitable. What now is the policy of the Grand Trunk Railway? In 1899, they made arrangements with the Reford line for a service to London from Portland; in 1900, they made arrangements with the Thomson line for a similar service; and in 1901, they have arranged with the Thomson line for a service to London from Portland. In 1901 also they will have taken the whole fleet of the Dominion Steamship Company from Montreal, and I am informed on good authority that they are engaging with a company which now runs to Montreal, to run a steamship service from Portland to Glasgow. I am further informed that it is likely that, in 1902, they will have a Bristol summer service from Portland, and expect to have a service to Antwerp and Hamburg also during the summer. Where are the steamships to be engaged in those services to be taken from? From Montreal, and instead of the St. Lawrence route becoming more popular, instead of our building up business over that route, and utilizing the great expenditure on our canals, we will find business being diverted to Portland, and we will have to spend enormous sums to get the steamship companies to come back again. We ought to deal with this question very soon before any more steamship companies are engaged to go to Portland and give up the port of Montreal.

I wish to refer to our canal system. I believe that the government was justified in spending sufficient money to give fourteen feet draught to the St. Lawrence canals. I put a question a few days ago upon the Order paper with reference to the depth of water in the St. Lawrence channels and canals between Lake Ontario and Montreal, and the reply of the Minister of Railways seemed to indicate that some transportation companies have been trying to depreciate our canals in the eyes of the public. I am not in sympathy with any such tactics. I believe that the railway companies perhaps in years gone by tried to curtail the expenditure on those canals. The question I asked was: When does the government expect that vessels of fourteen feet draught will be able to pass from Lake Ontario through the canals and St. Lawrence channels to Montreal without lightering? And the reply of the minister seemed to indicate that we had that depth of water last season. We had the assurance of the Minister of Railways and Canals that there is fourteen feet depth of water on the mitre sills in the canals, but the information which I had previously, and which I have obtained since, is that you cannot get fourteen feet of water in the St. Lawrence channels except when the wind blows in a favourable direction. If the wind blows from the east, you cannot get more than twelve feet or eleven feet and one-half. This is a matter which ought to be looked into. I am not stating this for the purpose of criticising the government, but simply to assure the government that if it be necessary to spend more money in order to complete the channels, I will support it in that expenditure.

I noticed a report a few days ago that four large steamers were being prepared in Chicago to go to Europe by the St. Lawrence straight through without transhipment. These steamers are intended to take perishable products in cold storage and also lumber and iron, and steel manufactures, and they prefer the northern route rather than that via New York. This is an experiment and is based on the belief that there is a depth of fourteen feet of water along the St. Lawrence route. Would we not be in a peculiar position, if, when those vessels reach the canals, after passing through the first canal, they should find the wind blowing from the east and have a wait over in the channel until the water rose?

Let me draw the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to an article which appeared in the press on this subject, written by a very reputable gentleman, Captain Thomas Donnelly. I shall not take up time by reading the letter, but he stakes his reputation on the facts and accuracy of of statements he makes.

If these steamers can go straight through to Europe with the produce of the United States, it is fair to assume that we might reasonably hope to work up a through service from Canadian points on the upper lakes. This problem of transportation is of immense interest to the people of our great North-west, from which we hope, in a few

years, to have a greatly increased export trade, and are therefore bound to open every avenue that will prove profitable to our farmers. But the province of Ontario is our great producing province, and it is in the interests of that province that the canals should be deepened to fourteen feet, and that we should encourage the building on the lakes of ships under the British flag, in which we are now very deficient.

We have discussed this question as regards the railways and the St. Lawrence canals, but I would like to draw attention to the fact that while a very large amount of money has been spent by the government on small harbours on the lakes, and while we have spent millions of dollars on improvements in Halifax and St. John——

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) There have been no improvements by the government in the harbour of Halifax because none are required.

Mr. KEMP. I refer to the statements made in this House with regard to the amount of money spent for an elevator in Halifax and for improvements at St. John. Now, Sir, it may be an astonishing fact to the members of this House, but still the fact remains, that when the canals were eight feet deep the vessels that traversed them could come into Toronto harbour ; but, for years we have been trying to get a sum of money voted to take out of Toronto harbour the silt, the deposit of clay that has been flowing down a river from the country at the back and filling up that harbour. We have not been able to get that vote from the government. I hope, from the pressure that has been brought to bear and the explanations that have been laid before the government, that they will make an adequate grant at this session of parliament in order to make Toronto harbour in depth the same standard as the St. Lawrence canals. Toronto is a great gathering point, it is the point in Ontario to which the freight comes from all directions; and we want to be placed in a position to take that freight down the St. Lawrence and out to the sea and deliver it at Montreal or Quebec if necessary, and so enable the farmers of Ontario to get cheap transportation. I would like to draw the attention of the House while I am on my feet, to the importance of the shipments of freight from the city of Toronto. In the year 1898, there was occasion to get some facts made public, and these facts were then made public by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. They involve comparisons in freight traffic between Toronto and Montreal. I have no doubt that it will be surprising to this House to learn that Toronto is a greater shipping centre, notwithstanding that Montreal is a sea port, than Montreal is. In the month of January, 1898, the freight on the Grand Trunk Railway system from Toronto was 103,754 tons, against 58,091 tons for Montreal. In the month of September, 1897, at a season when, it will be observed, Montreal has the benefit of ocean steamship traffic, the freight handled in Toronto was 105,000 tons, as against 96,000 in Montreal, while the passenger receipts for Toronto far exceeded those of Montreal. I would like my hon. friends from Montreal to understand that I give these figures, not to disparage Montreal, but to show how important it is to keep open this water communication and to equip Toronto harbour in a suitable way for this traffic. Something has been said about the various schemes that the government has in hand with regard to the transportation question. I think it was the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) who stated that there were so many schemes on hand in connection with this matter that the public were somewhat confused. There is the Parry Sound Railway matter to which that hon. gentleman referred. I do not know that I can say that I ever heard the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) state that it was his intention to purchase the road on behalf of the government, but I think there was a discussion a year or two ago with respect to some remarks on that subject that fell from the lips of the hon. Minister of Public Works. Then there is the question, which has recently been resurrected, about the Georgian Bay canal, or the initiation of a project to improve the French river. Then, a year or two ago, the people of Port Hope sent a deputation here to interview the government and try to convince them that $8,500,000 could be save to the country in the Trent Valley canal scheme, if the terminus were made at Port Hope, instead of at the point intended on Lake Ontario. Then, there is the matter of Port Colborne to which I do not intend to give any time ; but I would like to have some one rise in this House and explain if it is not a fact that the improvement of Port Colborne was initiated to a great extent on account of a gentleman of the name of Conner, who expected to erect elevators at that point, and also had a scheme to improve the equipment of the harbour at Montreal. Were not the plans adopted largely under his supervision, and approved by him ? And now that this Conner syndicate is not materializing, I would like to know if it is the intention of the government to go on and develop that scheme also. We have also another difficult question before us, and that is the matter of a Canadian marine on the lakes. We are at present, to some extent, in an experimental stage ; and the great difficulty is that we have not Canadian bottoms on the lakes, but the ships are all mainly those under the American flag. I would like to have the government propound some policy whereby we might encourage the building of a Canadian marine on the lakes. I believe it will bring great prosperity to this country. And, in considering the trans-

portation question, and all these various routes, I hope the government of the day will take into consideration this fact, that we cannot bring influence to bear in regard to water transportation to the same extent that influence can be brought to bear through the transportation companies who own and run railways, companies that represent an existing and fully established interest. If we could get more capital invested in a lake marine, we should be able to start the ball rolling, and should have a constant influence in the direction of improvements in water transportation, and the question would be raised to a position of importance equal with that which it holds in the United States. And further—in considering all these questions, I hope the government will not forget the part of the country (the province of Ontario) where the great volume of our exports is produced, and will not forget the importance, in any scheme they may have of interesting centres of population, for instance, Toronto, Kingston, Montreal and Quebec. If you can get these centres of population interested in any project, in the nature of things, that project will attain all the greater importance. I have to thank the House for the very kind attention with which they have listened to my remarks.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). It will be expected, I presume, that, as the minister chiefly responsible for the canal system and its operation, I should have a word or two, at least, to say upon this subject before the conclusion of the debate, and I choose the present as likely to be the only opportunity that may offer, in the event of the debate concluding this evening. At the outset I wish to express to you, Mr. Speaker (Mr. Macdonald, Huron), the obligation which, I think is generally felt in the House, and which I certainly feel, for the very interesting contribution that you have made to the present discussion. We certainy got from you information, which, no doubt, had been collected with a very great deal of labour, information exceedingly valuable in itself, and tending to raise the discussion upon this occasion to a distinctly higher plane than that upon which, I am sorry to say, it had been placed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say that because both the hon. gentleman who made this motion (Mr. Bennett) and the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), while disclaiming the slightest intention of giving the discussion any party political character, and while declaring that the question was one of a non-partisan character and should be so treated, did not fail to devote a very considerable portion of the time they occupied to criticising from a party point of view and censuring in a party political sense, not only my own acts and my own alleged omissions, but the acts and the alleged omissions of my colleagues. And I am sorry to have to acknowledge that my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Kemp), who has just taken his seat, has also sinned very notably in this direction. Let me refer at the very outset to what my hon. friend from Toronto has just spoken of. As I say, I am compelled to make reference to these matters, but would have very much preferred if we could have dealt with this question upon general principles, and dealt with it in something of a broad way, rather than that I should be compelled to answer statements and criticisms which are really beside the question, and which are practically of no interest or importance to the people of this country.

Now, one of these sinners is my hon. friend who has just resumed his seat. He thought it would be appropriate to drag in the arrangement that was made between the government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company when we took over the Drummond line and arranged for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal. I cannot, Mr. Speaker, for the life of me, understand how the carrying of the business of the Grand Trunk Railway to Montreal was either encouraged, or promoted, or could have been prevented in any way by that transaction. The acquisition of the rights which were obtained by the government in the interest of the Intercolonial Railway from the Grand Trunk Railway, was an acquisition of interests and rights which were secured, because it was felt that they would be immensely to the advantage of the government railway. We paid no more than we believed they were worth; we paid no more than we are sure the experience of the future will show that they are worth. We treated with them upon a distinctly business basis; and I think we would have been laughed to scorn, I know we would have been ridiculed by the Grand Trunk Railway people if, when we were offering to give them less than they were claiming, and no more than the privileges were worth, we should have attempted to annex some condition such as the hon. gentleman suggests; if, when we acquired from them the right of running our railway over their line from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, and using their terminals, paying, I say, no more than those privileges were worth, they should have been asked to contract on their part to withdraw from the port of Portland.

Mr. COCHRANE. I think you paid them less than they asked.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Now, my hon. friend will not deflect me from the course of my argument by making so entirely an immature and so inappropriate a suggestion as that. My hon. friend is an intelligent gentleman, one of the most intelligent on that side of the House, and he knows that there is nothing

in the suggestion that he now makes. My hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) asks this House to believe and to credit him with believing that in making a business transaction with the Grand Trunk Railway Company—when we were making no gift to them understand, when we were giving them no bonus, but simply paying them a moderate and reasonable price for valuable concessions—we should have attempted to make it a condition that they should withdraw from the harbour of Portland, and cease to make Portland a terminus of their line. Why, Sir, Portland has been a terminus of the Grand Trunk Railway since the line was first completed.

Mr. KEMP. I referred to the summer traffic, not to the winter traffic taken to Portland.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend says he refers to the summer traffic. Well, if we had attached any such condition as respects traffic in any portion of the year, the Grand Trunk Railway would never have entertained the proposition, and as a result we would not have been able to have made any arrangement with them for securing an entrance into the city of Montreal, and we would not have been able to make that arrangement which, outside of a few red hot and extreme opponents, is approved by the judgment and common sense of the people of this whole country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman makes it a ground of criticism against us that we did not do as he suggests we might have done. If the hon. gentleman wants to make a political question out of it, I would ask him to consider the conduct of his own party and of his own government whose policy he has uniformly sustained. I would ask him to carry back his recollection to 1884, when the government of Canada was making, not a business arrangement, but practically giving a bonus of thirty million dollars to the great Canadian Pacific Railway corporation. A modest suggestion was made to the government and to parliament at that time, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in consideration of their receiving so munificent a grant from the exchequer of this country, should bind themselves not to expend any portion of the money that they were receiving as a gratuity from the people of Canada, in building up or creating a terminus or termini for their railway in any foreign country. How was that proposition received by the gentlemen whom my hon. friend is associated with, and by the government which he, during its life, continued to support ? It was treated with absolute contempt, the proposition was voted down, received no sort of favour from the friends of the hon. member. I think when he compares the two propositions, the proposition which he says I ought to have entertained, and the proposition which was submitted to parliament at that time, it will not be open to my hon. friend to make any great amount of political capital against this government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will my hon. friend permit me ? He referred to what he calls a gift of thirty million dollars to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I had always understood that that was a loan, and that it was repaid before it was due.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is the amendment which was proposed at that time :

> That all the words after the word 'that' in the said motion be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof : The said resolutions be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with power to provide as a condition of the proposed advance, that so long as any part of such advances or interest thereon remains unpaid, none of the resources of the company shall be expended towards acquiring interests in railways or railway securities in the United States, with a view to an Atlantic ocean terminus in the United States territory.

I think you could not put anything more clear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I merely wanted to understand the hon. gentleman, it was not merely a grant in aid of the Canadian Pacific Railway construction that he was referring to, but a loan.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was referring to the thirty million dollars which was procured by the Canadian Pacific Railway from the government of this country in 1884, and which was not given to them in consideration of any rights that we were acquiring from them, though, no doubt, the grant was secured by the obligation of the company who promised to return the money; but it was all the same a practical gratuity to them, given to them at the time, though it enabled the company to attain a very laudable object, no doubt. The company was receiving this enormous, this splendid grant, from the government of this country, and they declined to entertain the proposition that no portion of this grant should be expended outside of Canada in building up a terminus in a foreign country.

Now, so much for the political bearing of this question. The hon. gentleman then proceeded to refer to a subject which I am glad he has taken up, because it justifies me in taking up some little time of the House in speaking upon it in order that I may, if possible, remove any impressions there may be in parliament, or in the country, with regard to the condition of the canal waterway. The hon. gentleman has convinced himself that we have not what might be called a fourteen-foot waterway; he does not believe that we have more than twelve or twelve and a half feet, possibly we may have twelve and a half feet, he says,

but when the wind blows from certain directions we surely have not a fourteen-foot waterway. Now, let me state to the House exactly what endeavours have been made, what means have been adopted in order that we might convince ourselves, and that I might be in a position to make a positive statement on the subject to parliament concerning this waterway. As soon as doubts began to be thrown upon the actual existence of this depth of waterway, and that was immediately after the announcement being made that we had a fourteen-foot channel, certain statements appeared in one of the New York papers, and a letter which the hon. gentleman has referred to, was published. They came very shortly after to my notice, and upon my seeing the statement which was made by Mr. Donnelly, I called the attention of the officers of my department to it. I quite agree with what the hon. member from Toronto (Mr. Kemp) has said, that Mr. Donnelly is a gentleman of the very highest reputation and standing. I do not believe that Mr. Donnelly would make such a statement unless he was convinced that it was true. But, all the same, Mr. Donnelly, I am satisfied, from information which has been given to me by my officers, and who must know whether they are right or whether they are wrong, is entirely mistaken in the facts upon which he relied. Mr. Donnelly specifically mentions the particular parts of the canal system which he says are defective, and upon which he grounds his statement. He put us in a position in which we were able to ascertain whether or not what he said was or was not correct. He did not confine himself—and that was very fair and honourable conduct on Mr. Donnelly's part—to a mere general statement, but gave us particulars, and furnished us with the facts, or what he believes to be the facts, which justified him in criticising the correctness of our assurance. Immediately upon that coming to my notice, we asked the superintending engineers of the three different districts into which the St. Lawrence canal system is divided for the purpose of superintendence, to come to Ottawa. They came here, and we asked as to what their knowledge was, and they were asked to tell us whether or not all or any of the statements that Mr. Donnelly made were correct. They were informed that the information which was being sought from them was being sought for the purpose of giving a reliable and authoritative statement to the public and parliament upon the question, and they were charged, therefore, that they should be accurate to the utmost degree in the answers which they gave. These gentlemen have made their reports to us. I have, in my hand and which I will now read to the House, the compilation from these reports and statements, which the deputy minister gives me in an official manner, so that it may appear upon what authority these statements have been made. I imagine that no person supposes that the Minister of Railways can, himself, of his own personal knowledge, know whether there are ten, or five, or more feet of waterway along these routes. All that he can do is to convey to parliament the information which is furnished him by his responsible officers; but, at the same time, taking care that these officers are charged that the information which they furnish shall be absolutely reliable in every particular. Now, this is what the deputy minister has prepared, and what I would ask permission to read in reference to this subject.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) will lay it on the Table of the House?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I will lay it on the Table of the House. He says:

In order to avoid any misconception as to the depth of water afforded by the new works of enlargement, generally termed a fourteen-foot navigation, it must be clearly understood that the scheme as devised and carried out is based on the construction of locks of such depth that there shall be fourteen feet of water on their mitre sills.

I apprehend that no person has imagined that anything that has been said, either before this government took charge, or since, that there would be anything more than 14 feet, or that we engaged that there should be anything more than 14 feet of water on the mitre sill. Whatever draught of water the water over the mitre sill shall afford shall be the draught which the canal system shall afford to the shipping of the lakes.

Allegations have been made, however, that vessels drawing no more than 12½ feet have struck in the intermediate channel ways of the River St. Lawrence and doubt has been suggested as to the full efficiency of the works executed. These allegations are most practically met by the fact that the new system has been safely navigated last season by lake vessels drawing from 12 to 13 feet 6 inches of water, an instance being the steamer Arabian, which passed down safely on the 1st December, 1900, drawing 13 feet 6 inches of water. Mr. Wolvin, of the American Shipbuilding Company, Cleveland, has stated that he can answer absolutely for a depth of 13 feet, as one of their steamers had gone through drawing that depth of water.

Mr. BRODER. Would the hon. member allow me to ask him a question? That does not state what time of the year is referred to. The water varies considerably in depth at different times in the year, and when the wind blows from one direction or the other, and it is very important that we should know whether this was in the spring of the year or later in the season.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was on December 1 that this particular vessel passed through drawing 13 feet. My impression is that there were

no vessels which went through the canal, throughout the entire length, until the season was well advanced. Hon. members may rely upon it that we have 14 feet of water on the mitre sill as we assume we have. We have a depth of channel all the way through deep enough to enable you to navigate a vessel which can cross the mitre sill of these canals. There has been no close limit in the dredging of the channel in order that it should just fit 14 feet and stop there. There has been a foot of leeway in the dredging from one end to the other. There has not been a contract that has been executed which has not had 15 feet. That is what the engineers say, and with absolute confidence, so that hon. members will see that the question does not admit of doubt from the standpoint of the men who are charged with the serious and grave responsibility of seeing that this work is properly done, of a particle of doubt. It does not appear, to me at all events, that any doubt can arise in the minds of hon. members of this parliament with advice from this authoritative quarter.

Mr. KEMP. May I ask the hon. minister if the reports which we have say anything in reference to the depth of water when the wind blows from the east? It might vary a foot and 6 inches or 2 feet in depth.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Our officers are thoroughly familiar with the effect of the winds, and they would not be justified in stating that we could furnish a 14-foot channel of water unless we were able to furnish 14 feet of water, and they say that this was at low water. I was going to say, speaking of Mr. Wolvin, that he was here the other day and had a conversation with the deputy minister upon this subject. I asked, when I heard of this conversation, if the deputy minister had procured from him a written statement, because it would be of interest and value to the members of parliament to have a statement made from such a reliable source upon this subject. He said that he had omitted to do that, but he telegraphed and received a reply from Mr. Wolvin. He is a very large shipper, and the head of the American Shipbuilding Company of Cleveland. He wired on March 5 to Mr. Schreiber:

> Your telegram of the 4th reached me here today. I remember stating to you that I am satisfied there was deeper water through the St. Lawrence canals and river than many people claim, as one of our steamers went through this route drawing thirteen feet. You made the statement that you had fourteen feet of water, and I replied by saying I felt there was that draught, but could answer absolutely for only thirteen feet.
>
> (Sgd.) A. B. WOLVIN.

That is Mr. Wolvin's statement. It is unfair and unjust to the canals to say that we only have twelve feet or that we only have thirteen feet, when we are able to submit a statement to this House that a steamer went through the entire length of the canals drawing thirteen feet six inches without meeting the slightest obstacle at any point of the route. Writing under date of June 30, 1900, Mr. Rubidge, the superintending engineer of the Soulanges canals, says:

> I again desire to state most positively that there is a practical fourteen foot navigation between Prescott and Coteau Landing at low water and during the season of navigation.

That is from Mr. Rubidge, who has been in charge of that portion of these canals for a long term of years, and than whom no one is better acquainted with the condition of the canals. He is not a person whose report to me might be doubted by hon. gentlemen opposite. I found him in the department and he has been in the same position he now occupies for many years. What right has any one to discount that statement of Mr. Rubidge? Mr. Schreiber further says:

> As to the existence of certain shoals which were referred to in a letter of the 3rd December from Mr. Donnelly, the inspector of the Canadian Lake Underwriters Association, published in the Montreal Star, the superintending engineer states, in regard to the shoal at the upper entrance of the Galops canal, that it is entirely outside of the new channel, and is located between the old and the new channels.

Those who may have read Mr. Donnelly's statement will recall that Mr. Donnelly speaks of this particular shoal at the upper entrance of the Galops canal as having been the place where some vessel went ashore, and he has given that as one of the reasons upon which he bases his condemnation of our channel. Now, when I show that that shoal is entirely outside of the new channel altogether and is located between the old and the new channel, the value of that statement as leading to such a conclusion becomes abundantly clear. Capt. Donnelly referred to the shoal at Sparrow Hawks and to the shoal at Rapide Plat, and Mr. Schreiber states:

> There is a deep channel at the west of the shoal; and at Rapide Plat, vessels have the option of using the canal at low water, in which there is a fourteen foot waterway, instead of the river channel. In order to straighten the channel, however, the shoal spurs will be cut off next season, and indeed, even though at the present time there is a safe channel for fourteen foot navigation various features of improvement may, and no doubt will, from time to time, present themselves in the practical operation of the system, and the public may rest sure that the department will not fail to carry out such further minor works as experience may show to be desirable.

Mr. Schreiber goes on to say:

> In March, 1900, the superintending engineer notified vessel-men that they should proceed with caution in traversing the new channels, as

they would have a great deal to learn as to entrances and exits to and from the canals, and as to the varying currents of the river reaches, and generally as to the behaviour of large vessels in the currents, and that masters and pilots should be urged to understand and appreciate the tremendous difference existing between a nine-foot and a fourteen-foot navigation. Again, there was a statement in one of the papers that the vessel Eureka had touched bottom last season with 11 feet 4 inches draught in the new channel in Lake St. Louis.

This is another one of the alleged facts which goes to discredit our channel, and as to that the deputy minister states :

On investigation it appears that the place where the bottom was touched was not in the new channel at all, but in the old channel.

My officers tell me that the difficulty we have had is in prevailing upon or inducing the navigators to adhere to the new channel and leave the old route. They think they know so much about the business that they take upon themselves to disregard the warnings and the instructions they have received from our officers. Stubborn, unwilling to allow it to be assumed they do not know all about where they are going, and do not know better than the officers who seek to advise them ; they plunge ahead, disregard the buoys, disregard the signals, disregard the warnings, and as a result they run ashore—but outside of the channel. That is what occurred in Lake St. Louis.

Again, the whaleback, the A. D. Thompson, was reported to have struck bottom in the Williamsburg section of the canal, and a statement to that effect was made in the newspapers. It turned out upon inquiry that this report was false. As to the Soulanges canal and its approaches, the superintending engineer, Mr. Munro, reports :

'A depth of fifteen feet of water on the mitre sills of the locks at low water and a depth of from twenty to sixty feet in the channel from the foot of lock No. 1 at the easterly end of the canal to Lake St. Louis.'

Mr. Munro observes : 'As a matter of fact, barges are continually passing down it drawing twelve to thirteen feet, and the Arabian went out some time ago drawing 13½ feet.

The superintending engineer of the Quebec canals, and these comprise the whole series of the Soulanges system, says :

As ascertained by myself.

He did not take the statement of any one else, but he ascertained for himself in the way in which these things can only be properly ascertained without running vessels over them.

Mr. Schreiber reports :

The superintending engineer of the Quebec canals reports that, as ascertained by himself, there was a full depth for a fourteen-foot navigation from Montreal to the foot of Ile Perrot, and from that point to the Soulanges canal entrance old plans show depths of from fifty to seventy feet.

The department has, of course—the question being one of vital interest—taken all possible precaution to ensure that the full depth of the enlargement should be utilized with perfect safety, and it remains confident that the necessary channel ways in the waters lying between the several canals have been formed as required for that purpose, and, further, that such channels have been indicated with care, leaving to pilots and others the necessary mastery of the details of this, as of any other similar navigation in which they may be employed, and adhesion to the rules laid down for their guidance. So important a change as is implied by this enlargement will, naturally, tend to create in some quarters a desire that it should fail of its objects, rather than it should be successfully operated, and possibly this attitude may for some little time act to its prejudice. It stands, however, as an accomplished fact, and must be so regarded.

(Sgd.) COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER,
Chief Engineer.

That is the official statement furnished me by the chief engineer for the purpose of communicating it to the House. I do not know of any other way or by what other means I could give the House more positive assurance.

I ask hon. members to dismiss from their minds any such idea that we are deficient in respect of our St. Lawrence channel. I am not going to say, I never have said, the officers have not said, that many things cannot be done to greatly improve the channel —to straighten it probably, or to widen it ; but we have everything which it was stated we had. We have enough if the people who navigate the channel will use proper care and diligence. We have a good channel, and I think it is only fair and just to the men who have done this work that I should take the present opportunity of saying that in various quarters and from men who are fully competent to form a judgment on the question, the very highest testimony has been freely offered to me as to the skill and ability with which this great work has been carried to completion. The men whom I found in the department in charge of the work have continued, and have about finished what was proposed to be done ; at all events, in connection with the main works. They have been indefatigable in their efforts and have exhibited a great deal of skill ; and people who have made a study of these matters and who have such information as to qualify them to express an opinion, do not form the same inferior judgment as to the character of our channel or our canals or our works generally that some of our own people seem to do. I have reason to believe that the people who are engaged in transportation in the United States look upon what we have achieved and at the present condition of our canals, as a matter of grave anxiety and alarm to them. They think we have provided a very adequate and efficient waterway. They recognize, as we do ourselves, that there are some things to be done at the two extremes which do not, however, affect the sufficiency of a 14-foot channel. They recognize that

we have not all the details perfected ; but they do acknowledge that the government of Canada has made a most thorough and efficient channel throughout the whole St. Lawrence route, and they look upon it as a most grave and serious rival of their various transportation routes.

My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) who has made this motion—I am sorry I shall have only a very few moments to devote to his address—starts out by affirming that the time has arrived when we should stop and ask ourselves what we are doing—or, as he expressed himself in the course of his speech, where we are at—before we spend another dollar. My hon. friend asks us to come to a decision as to what the policy of the government is, because, as he affirmed, not once, but many times, not with any qualification, but in the most unhesitating language, the Canadian canal system had proved itself a failure. Now, why does the hon. gentleman say that ? He is a member of the Canadian parliament, entrusted by his constituents to represent them here in an important capacity. What he says is published in the newspaper press ; headlines can be read this morning in all the opposition papers : 'Canadian canal system a failure—killing the traffic.' That will be read not only at home but abroad, and is it going to tend to our advantage for my hon. friend to utilize the prominent position he holds as a member of parliament to give currency to such a statement, and particularly to do so on the insufficient grounds on which he supported it ? What were those grounds ? What was his reason for asserting that the canal system had been found a failure ? He says that I made a prediction last year in parliament, that I held out great hopes and expectations that we were going to have an enormously increased business this year, and that my hon. friend from Quebec West (Hon. Mr. Dobell) made a similar prophecy. What was the language I did employ ? In another portion of his speech he quoted from 'Hansard' what I said last year, and I leave the House to judge how far that quotation bears out, not the pessimistic, but the absolutely hopeless view which he has taken of this matter, and which he is seeking to impress on parliament and the country. This is what I am supposed to have said, and no doubt did say :

> We will see that with Montreal properly equipped, there is no reason in the world why we should not be able to offer sufficient inducements to shippers of grain in the west to prefer the St. Lawrence to any other route.

Well, it strikes me that that is a very conservative, very modest, and very cautious statement. Made in July, 1900, it was by no means to be taken as an assurance that in that year with the season nearly gone, the business was going to be so much greater than it had ever been before. We have not yet got into the year 1901, and do not know what the business of 1901 will be. It may be better than that of 1900, or it may be worse. If worse, it proves nothing ; it does not prove that the canal system of Canada is a failure—no, a thousand miles away from establishing such a proposition. It proves that we are not yet in adequate condition to compete successfully with the Buffalo route ; and is that a very unreasonable or unexpected thing ? Why, Sir, you cannot change the character of our canals in a day. You cannot expect shippers to equip themselves with barges and other facilities and adapt themselves to the deeper channel in a year or in two years or possibly in more. If our business seems declining on the canals, we can find sufficient explanation in the fact that probably the largest steamers are continuing, and continuing in a greater measure, to absorb the traffic on the lakes, and are necessarily taking away from us a portion of the traffic which we would otherwise have, and which we will have when we are in a position to receive those large ships in our harbours connected with our own canals. It may be three or four or five years before we get into full swing, but there is no doubt, in my mind, that the improvements which are in contemplation at Port Colborne, properly and efficiently carried out, and in the harbour of Montreal and the route perhaps below, will make the St. Lawrence superior to any other route. Why should my hon. friend use the language of despair ? What object is to be served by telling us that the canals are a failure ? I do not think that he reasoned this matter out. I do not think he could have informed himself as to the superior advantages of water over all rail communication or the superior advantages of our lake and canal system over the joint lake and railway system on which the shippers from New York, Boston and other American ports have to absolutely rely. These shippers will undoubtedly give us a hard fight, but as was stated by Mr. Deputy Speaker (Mr. Macdonald) if we can get down the cost of transportation by the fraction of a cent below the cost by any other route, we will have the advantage, and we surely can do this.

My hon. friend made a number of assertions, and very extraordinary assertions they were. He asked : Why, he asked, do you not stand by the St. Lawrence route ? Why is not that your policy ?

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If that is not our policy, what is or what has been our policy ? That is what I am curious to have my hon. friend inform me upon. Not once but several times did he tell us that the late government had a fixed and definite policy of making the St. Lawrence canals the Canadian water route. Well, what did they do more than we have done ? If what they

did convinced my hon. friend that they had a fixed and definite policy, why should he withhold from us a similar acknowledgment? He seems to think that because some men of this government expressed the view that it would be an advantage to make traffic arrangements between the Intercolonial Railway and some other system, we were turning our back on our canal route. But I do not apprehend that any traffic arrangements between any two railways is going to fill up the channel we have got or will have the effect of tearing down the locks and rendering it impossible for vessels to navigate our canals. Because, in the city of Halifax, I made a speech in which I spoke of getting something from the railways as well as the canals to increase the business of the Intercolonial Railway, my hon. friend takes alarm. And because the Minister of Public Works refers to some other railway undertaking as a means of increasing our carrying trade from the west, my hon. friend is again alarmed. He puts these three statements together, and says you are going around the country holding out terrors to the people; you are going to favour some other means of carrying grain than the St. Lawrence canals. I must say that I think my hon. friend has not done his superior intelligence justice in constructing an argument of that kind. I am aware that he knows better. I would not speak slightingly at all of my hon. friend's mental capacity and powers, because I know they are very considerable, and he has also had the training of a professional man. And I am sure he knows that you could not put these three facts together and draw the logical inference from them that our canals were to be prejudicially affected in the remotest degree.

We are not going to hurt the canal, if, as a matter of policy, we took a dozen other means of getting into the western country. Our canals are there. We are proceeding with all possible despatch to put them in perfect shape; we intend to complete the works at Port Colborne. But my hon. friend does not want to see the canals equipped and finished in a proper way. He does not want to see the steamers that are now going to Buffalo invited to Port Colborne. What he does want, I cannot say. I can only draw the conclusion that he is looking for a grievance against the government and the Minister of Railways and thinks he has found one. We are not going to hurt the canals. They will run, I hope, for all time and will be maintained. And if we can maintain those canals and control the business, what harm to Canada or the canals will accrue if the railway companies could, by any process, reduce their cost of transport to a figure which would enable them to induce traders to ship a portion of their traffic over these lines. That will not hurt anybody and may help the railways.

Mr. BLAIR.

My hon. friend, drawing a conclusion, told us—and I am going to quote his words because they are the concluding words of a very lengthy address, prepared by my hon. friend with very great care, possessed as he was, of very elaborate notes, and after he had devoted, no doubt, a good deal of time to the collection of these facts, as far as they were facts, which he submitted to the House. This is the conclusion which he draws:

> In conclusion, I have only to say that I have introduced this resolution, as I did last year, hoping that it would evoke some little discussion—hoping that any views thrown out in the debate—not any poor views of mine—would be taken up by the press and discussed, and that the gentlemen sitting behind the government and retaining them in their position, would be moved, in a spirit of patriotism, to ask themselves: Is there any means that can be adopted for increasing the grain trade through Canada—not only our own trade, but by taking part of the trade now going through the United States? I believe the solution of the whole question rests on this—that some encouragement should be given both to the Canada Atlantic system and to the Grand Trunk system.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) looks with displeasure upon the idea of a member of the government suggesting that some traffic arrangements might be made with some one of these railways, and has nothing but condemnation for the conduct of the hon. member for Quebec West (Hon. Mr. Dobell), because he thought that the Great Northern Railway would be a useful feeder for the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec, and for my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, because of what he said with regard to transportation on Georgian Bay. But, though he condemns all this, and says that we are floundering and blowing hot and cold, that we do not know what we are about, that we ought to come to our senses and fix our minds upon something, and have a definite policy—yet, after all this, he winds up his entire address by suggesting that a bonus should be given to the two railways, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canada Atlantic Railway. Why, is my hon. friend serious when he talks, as he did in the few words that he spoke afterwards about our want of fixed policy, and our want of judgment? He says:

> But, above all things, here and now is the place and time for the Minister of Railways and Canals, before this debate closes, to announce that the government intend for the future, at least for a fixed period of five or six years, to pin their faith to the St. Lawrence canal system, and not introduce any of the side schemes or projects which are now before the public.

That is my hon. friend's serious conclusion to his very lengthy address. I answer to my hon. friend, I say that we are as deeply interested in the success of the St. Lawrence canal system as he or any other member of this House. We require no stir or stimulus to induce us to do anything and every-

thing which we may regard as reasonable, and which is in our power, and in which we are satisfied we shall be supported by opinion in this House and in this country, to raise our transportation system to the greatest possible degree of efficiency. We have committed ourselves to it. Whether it was wise or not, it is too late to say. Looking over the field, one might be inclined to think that, with the expenditure of less money, the canalization of the Ottawa river to twenty feet or thereabouts, would, beyond all peradventure, have given us the absolute control of the western traffic. But we are not discussing that question now. We have laid out our money on the St. Lawrence. As a result of the fixed policy of both Houses of parliament, and of all parliaments, and as the result of united opinion in this country, that money has been expended. I decline to yield to the hon. gentleman and stop in our expenditure till we have perfected that system, in a way which will put us in a position to achieve the best results.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at 8.10.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). Just prior to the rising of the House at six o'clock, we were treated to an address from the Minister of Railways and Canals upon this all-important question introduced by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). I am sure that I was not alone in being surprised at the unusual weakness of the minister in reply. The time at his disposal was largely occupied in seeking to prove that certain officers in his department had not found any channel in the St. Lawrence that was less than 14 feet deep. The minister did not reply to the arguments advanced by the hon. member for East Simcoe, by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), and by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp). I was more than surprised also at one of the breaks made by that hon. gentleman. We all admire his ability, and as a rule we look for the fairest of fair-play from the Minister of Railways. But his treatment of the loan of 30 million dollars made by the former government in this country to the Canadian Pacific Railway, his insistence on retaining the expression that the Conservative government had made a 'gift' of 30 million dollars to the road, when the records and data of every description show that it was a loan, and so intended from the outset, every dollar of which was repaid to this country, placed that hon. gentleman in a very unenviable light before the House. Now, what was the effect of that loan ? The effect of that loan was to save the Canadian Pacific Railway to this country and to make it a success. It gave this country a highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific, every foot of it on Canadian soil. It opened up our prairies and the great mining districts of British Columbia. Without that loan of 30 million dollars we would not to-day have the north shores of Lakes Huron and Superior opened up as they are, and attracting capital in large volume, as is the case at the present moment. The inexhaustible resources of this country are only at present being disclosed and beginning to be utilized. In short, we may say the Canadian Pacific Railway has made Canada a nation.

The hon. member for East York, in the course of his remarks, made reference to the Canada Northern Railway, or that portion of it locally known as the Ontario and Rainy River Railway. In order that any misconception in the minds of hon. members or among the people regarding the construction of that road, may be removed, I will take the liberty of pointing out here that the Manitoba government, up to 1897, had for some years been aiming at a line from the city of Winnipeg to the city of Duluth. The Manitoba government were going to assist that road with enormous subsidies, and were merely going to take a guarantee from the company that the grain should be carried from the city of Winnipeg at the rate of 10 cents a bushel. There was no provision at all about controlling rates at other points on the Northern Pacific line in the province of Manitoba. But that was the policy of the then Liberal government of Manitoba. I may say that my own efforts at upbuilding Canadian ports and Canadian trade have not been confined to the last few years. On that occasion, having the interest of Canada at heart, I visited the city of Winnipeg. I need not go into details, suffice it to say that the Liberal-Conservative friends in that province took up the project of having, instead of an American road, an all-Canadian road from Winnipeg to a Canadian port on Lake Superior. That was the beginning of the present line between the city of Winnipeg and the town of Port Arthur. I find in the Manitoba Free Press of November 17, 1897, an interview with myself which I will read to the House. I was asked a question as to how the plan of the Manitoba government to assist a line from Winnipeg to Duluth, with a guarantee of reduced rates for the carriage of grain, would take in the eastern part of Canada, and with my usual frankness——

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). For I have never found, in any avenue of life, any advantage in hyprocrisy or in trying to play Machiavellian policy, and I find that I have done fairly well in pursuing a policy of frankness. I had no reason to change the policy on that occasion, and I said this :

The Dominion government will not be able to support financially Mr. Greenway's railway

scheme, because nine-tenths of the people are opposed to a road terminating in the United States territory. They have had experience in that line, for in the east we have built up the United States cities, Boston and Portland, and starved our own seaboard cities, Halifax, St. John, Quebec and Montreal. If they must have a railroad let it be to some point on the Canadian lake, Port Arthur or Fort William being much preferable. And then what assurance have the people that the bond required by the Manitoba government re the Duluth route will be fulfilled? Positively none.

Some hon. gentlemen here will bear me out in saying that ten sessions ago I drew the attention of this House and country to the fact that we had upon our seaboard some magnificent cities. The hon. member for Halifax rightly stated in this debate that at the port of Halifax we had a harbour that required no money to be expended on it to make it fit for any vessels to enter it. The city of St. John is also possessed of a magnificent harbour. In the Straits of Canso and along that shore there are numerous excellent harbours. Louisbourg and Sydney are historic. These are Canadian harbours that merely require to be developed to attract to their wharfs the trade of the vessels that rightly belong to them. It has been my policy and the policy of my friends of the great Liberal-Conservative party for many years to develop as far as possible, from a government view point, the harbours I have already named. Why should we not? We are frequently told by the advocates of railways, those who favour railways in preference to canals, or to water-hauls, and experience also teaches the same thing, that the improvements in railways, in the road-beds, in low grades, in powerful engines and large cars, have reduced the haulage of grain to a minimum. I am told that the New York Central has volunteered that, if the state of New York, in case it retains control of the canal, will hand over to the New York Central Railway the sums of money that it will take to enlarge the Erie canal, they will guarantee to haul to New York all the grain that will ever present itself at Buffalo, at cheaper rates than they now haul grain through the Erie canal. I am not saying these statements are true, but if they are true, why should we not set ourselves to work to develop our own seaboard ports? Why should we not improve the grades of our railways? The superintendent of the Grand Trunk Railway, Mr. McGuigan, has worked a revolution in the Grand Trunk Railway that is not known to the general public. On many of the American roads they can haul, from the city of Chicago to the seaboard, 1,900 tons of freight with an engine of a certain power. A similar engine on the Grand Trunk Railway from Chicago to the seaboard can only haul 800 tons of freight. You can see at once how our Canadian ports and railways are handicapped. Fully alive to their own interests, as well as the interests of the country, I believe both the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway are reducing the grades and putting their roads in such a condition that, in the course of a very few years, they will be able to haul from the west to the seaboard as heavily loaded trains as the American roads.

The question now is: Why should we not develop and have on our own seaboard winter and summer ports? Why should we not develop the city of Quebec, and why should we not also develop the city of Montreal? I maintain that while we are criticising the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway for going to Portland and Boston, we have ourselves largely to blame for that state of affairs. If we had taken proper precautions and had provided approaches to our own ports at Montreal and Quebec, and had provided proper accommodation, I think these roads would have undoubtedly preferred shipping from Canadian ports rather than from American ports. But, inasmuch as they have already established themselves at these other ports, it now becomes the duty of Canada, irrespective of party, to develop some plan that will recall this trade to our own ports, that will bring shipping again to Canadian harbours, and upbuild our own country instead of upbuilding foreign nations.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I presume that hon. gentlemen have exhausted themselves on the subject. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) made his reply this afternoon, and I regret he is not in his place this evening. One would have thought that with the matter that had been introduced on both sides of the House the subject would be considered of such importance that it deserved a little more in the form of a reply than the hon. gentleman gave it, because the hon. minister simply contented himself with a very extravagant amount of scolding in answer to the questions brought up in the debate. One would have expected, that, when the hon. minister's department and his own method of doing business in relation to large enterprises had been brought into the question, the hon. minister would have attempted to defend his administration, but from the minister came not one word in explanation as to the erection of a large elevator, at a very considerable cost, in the city of St. John, and the minister did not vouchsafe to the House the information whether or not he intended, during the coming season, to attempt to do business by way of St. John. The statement goes today, and is not contradicted by the hon. gentleman, that he, last year, at the city of St. John, for purposes best known to himself, attempted the experiment of freighting grain in that direction at a cost, for 300,000 bushels, of some $10,000 to the country. It may not be a matter of interest

to hon. gentlemen opposite, but I think it will be to the country, to know whether this government is going on with that principle of business year after year, whether we are going to see freighted down to St. John large quantities of grain, at a great loss, simply to place the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in the position that he has been able to justify, in the city of St. John and before the country, the construction of an elevator at that point. Now, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals waxed very indignant at my statement, that the question was in contemplation of the purchase of the Booth system of railway. I would have thought, when the hon. gentleman gave the very stiff denial he did to the statement I attributed to him, knowing as he did the time when such address was delivered by him in Halifax, that he would have produced files of the newspaper published on that occasion, which, I regret, I have been unable to locate as to the date. I think if the hon. minister had produced that paper it would have borne out the fact that the minister held out to the people of Halifax on that occasion what the hon. minister was apparently afraid to place before the House and the country ; that is, that he had the idea in his mind, and that idea prevailed, not only in the city of Halifax, but also in Montreal, that the government would acquire that railway. Now, Sir, extrinsically, I introduce this matter as evidence of the fact that the government contemplate the purchase of the railway ; I introduce the fact that the government have, for some time, advertised for tenders for the construction of a large public work at Depot Harbour. I make this statement on the authority of people who live in the neighbourhood of this place, who have seen the plan, who know what the contemplated work is, and the government have closed a contract, I believe, for the expenditure of a large sum of money, some $200,000, for the construction of docks at Depot Harbour. The government stands in this position, and the Department of Railways and Canals, and the Department of Public Works are in this position, that if they are not spending that $200,000 at Depot Harbour with the view of the government's taking over that railway and the docks, which will be a complement to the railway, they are taking $200,000 of the people's money to construct docks for Mr. Booth at Depot Harbour, which will be exclusively his own, which will be altogether his, and do not constitute a work of public necessity or benefit. I think this afternoon that the statement which was made, that $200,000 is to be expended by the government on large public works of interest to no person else except to the proprietors of that railway, should have been met by the hon. minister, or explained in some manner or other. Now, coming down to the question of our transportation facilities, let me say that the words put into my mouth by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals this afternoon, of wholesale denunciation and condemnation of the canal system, were not borne out by anything I did say. I say that every man must regret that after such a large expenditure of public money on the canal system, it is not bearing better fruits. I regret, as much as any man regrets, that our trade has not increased, and is not increasing by way of that system. The hon. minister attempted to make merry, and it was a sorry exhibition, but I must say that I regret he is not here tonight to express his view as to my idea, that there should be a proposition made to these railway systems, to the Grand Trunk Railway from Midland to Portland, or Midland to Montreal, and to the system from Parry Sound or Depot Harbour to Montreal, or Boston, by way of bonus or bounty for the carrying of grain. Hon. gentlemen are fond admirers of the principle of bounty. These hon. gentlemen, after years of decrying the principle of bounties in this country, at the very first opportunity embraced the proposition that they had denounced for years, and went in for the principle of giving bounties on iron. I say it would be in the interest of the country, in place of seeing the grain of the western states and a large proportion of the grain of our Northwest Territories carried by way of New York, Boston, Baltimore and other American ports, and by American railway systems, that we should endeavour to secure that trade for our own channels at the cost of giving some bounties or assistance. How might that be done ? While on both of these systems from 12,000,000 to 15,000,000 bushels of grain are now being carried, the proposition might be made, that having carried 25,000,000 bushels in a season, all that is carried in excess of 25,000,000 bushels should be paid for at so much a bushel by way of bounty. The result would be, in the first place, that the fact that we were going to carry such a large quantity of grain in a season would tend to the making of contracts far in advance, and the result of making these contracts would be cheaper rates, which would enure to the benefit of those in the west who had produce to transport. Another great advantage would be that if you once attracted trade so that through these two systems there would be an annual carriage of from 50,000,000 to 75,000,000 bushels of grain, the chances would be that trade, once attracted in that direction, would in all probability remain there in the future.

Further, these railway systems, benefited by the cash concessions which would be made by the government would be in a better position to equip and maintain their roads for the increased trade. Every one knows that in the transportation of all kinds of merchandise through the country large sums of money are spent by the railways and by the shipping interests, which of

course is a great advantage to the country as a whole. The minister (Hon. Mr. Blair), spoke of the grant to the Grand Trunk Railway, which enabled them to greatly improve the Victoria bridge, and as a result of which they are now carrying the grain beyond Montreal to Portland. This is a matter to be regretted by all Canadians. The minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) does not admit, as he should, that this was bad policy, and that there was lack of foresight on the part of himself and his colleagues in reference to it. His defence now is, to say to us : Why you did exactly the same thing with the Canadian Pacific Railway, when you gave them large concessions, and you did not restrict them to carrying freight to a Canadian port. Well, one would think that time and experience would teach the Minister of Railways something, and the government having had before them the example of the Canadian Pacific Railway in this respect, we would naturally expect that the aggregation of wisdom which composes the present cabinet, would have learned something, and that their Minister of Railways would not be forced to come here to-day with an idle tu quoque argument. I made this motion partly with the idea that the government would state to the House and to the country, that their policy was that they were going to be bound for a number of years at all events by the St. Lawrence canal system, so that those interested in maritime business might feel a sense of security in investing in vessels in Canada. Unfortunately any one who takes what the minister has said and scans it carefully, will not find a single word to show that the government stands pledged even for the next five years not to acquire the Booth system or the Great Northern Railway. It must be remembered that freighters that would be restricted by their construction to the canal trade between Port Colborne and Montreal, would on account of their limited capacity not be able to compete with the larger vessels for the trade of the great lakes, and of course if the government acquire this railway system it would to a large extent put them out of the business. Therefore, those interested in the trade in Canada are afraid to invest their money in such vessels. I presume the public are to be kept in suspense for some years to come, and that the newspapers in the meantime will be filled with statements to the effect that the government intends to purchase the railways I have referred to. So long as the ministers will go from one end of the country to the other giving their individual opinions as to what the future transportation system of the country will be, there will be uncertainty in the public mind as to the policy of the government. I expected when I moved this resolution that there would be a profitable discussion upon it, and in that I am not disappointed. I regret, however, that the government did not give a complete denial to the statements made throughout the country that they intend to purchase the Booth system, and the Great Northern Railway system. At least some good purpose has been served by the motion, and I now beg leave to withdraw it.

Motion withdrawn.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LAND GRANTS.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar) moved second reading of Bill (No. 17) respecting the Land Grant of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

He said : The Bill which I have before the House is similar to one which I introduced a year ago for the purpose of interpreting a clause in the charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the brief explanation I gave when I introduced the Bill, I did not go over the ground so fully as I should like to, and if the House will bear with me I shall now go into the particulars a little more minutely. When the charter under which the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed was made with the syndicate, and ratified by parliament on the 15th of February, 1881, the land grant to the company (comprising about 25,000,000 acres) was under clause 16 exempted from taxation. That clause 16 is known as the 'exemption clause' of the charter and it exempts the tracks, rolling stock, road-bed, stations, ground and appurtenances for all time, and the clause concludes thus :

> And the lands of the company in the North-west, until they are either sold or occupied, shall be free from taxation for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown.

Now, Sir, the twenty year period contemplated by this clause expired on the 15th of last February. Various constructions have been placed upon the wording of the clause. It is contended by a number of persons, including the right hon. the Prime minister, that 'the grant thereof from the Crown' means the issue of the patents for the land. Although the twenty year period of exemption has expired, the company has not applied for the patents for these lands. The government has been questioned from time to time during the last five years on this matter, and we find from the answers given that only a small portion of the entire lands granted—I think less than 2,000,000 acres—have been patented up to the present time. The company state that they have not even selected all their land grant. The position seems to be somewhat like this. The company have indicated to the government certain districts throughout the North-west Territories where they are willing to select their lands, but no definite selection has been made of a large portion of these lands up to the present time. I was looking up the other day the speech of the right hon. premier, delivered last session, and his con-

tention seemed to be, and I may say it was also the view held by the late leader of the opposition, Sir Charles Tupper—that the exemption runs from the date of the issue of the patents. If that contention is correct, then inasmuch as the patents have not been issued for this vast land grant up to the present time, the exemption period will extend for another twenty years ; and if the delay in issuing the patents is continued, the exemption will go on indefinitely.

Now, I think I shall be able to convince reasonable men, from quotations which I will give to the House, that it was the clear intention of parliament that the twenty years period began when the contract was ratified on the 15th of February, 1881. If that is true, the twenty years period expired on the evening of the 15th of last month. If there is any doubt on that point at the present time, I claim that it is the clear duty of parliament to say now what that clause meant.

I have no doubt that I shall be told that this is a remarkable proposition ; I shall probably be charged, as I have been on other occasions, with being a socialist because I ask parliament to determine what that means. I bow very often to the views held by the leader of the government in many matters ; but when he says that we would be interfering with vested rights if we were to interpret this clause, I judge from a perusal of his speech of last year that the vested rights he is afraid of interfering with, are those of the bondholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Without assuming to criticise the position which the right hon. gentleman takes upon this question, let me, as one who has lived in the North-west for nearly twenty years, who has witnessed the development of that country, who has seen the people there bear the burden and heat of the day, who has witnessed the hardships of those people, and has always felt a great deal of sympathy with them—let me say that I think they have vested rights, and it is their vested rights that ought to be respected. When those people settled in that country and took up land, they doubtless had read this contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and doubtless had clearly understood that at the expiration of the twenty years period they would not be obliged, as they are to-day, to bear a double burden of taxes. When a settler in that country takes up his quarter section, he is obliged to pay taxes for schools, for roads, and for local improvements ; and inasmuch as the section adjoining his belongs to the railway company, and is included in this land grant, and is therefore exempted from taxation, the burden that falls on the settler is just double what it should be. And I want to appeal to members of this House and ask them, what must be the feelings of those settlers when they discover that though the twenty years period is now up, yet, by the interpretation placed upon this clause by leading members of this House, they are obliged to go on and pay taxes for another twenty years ? I want to appeal to the members of this House in the name of these settlers ; I want to speak of the vested rights which they have ; and I think that notwithstanding the views which many may hold, and honestly hold, on this question, those who consider the hardships which those settlers have endured must recognize that the first duty of parliament is to the people who settle on the land, and to whom that country practically belongs.

I said that I would endeavour to show, by the position which parliament took upon that question some twenty years ago, that it was clearly and definitely understood that the twenty years period began when the contract with the company was ratified. Let me first, however, make a slight reference to the fact that when parliament grants a title, it may be what is known as a title by statute. Title by statute is recognized in Great Britain as being quite as good as title by patent. I claim that it is not necessary that patents should issue in order that the title to these lands should be vested in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. When the contract was ratified on the 15th of February, 1881, to all intents and purposes the land became the property of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

I shall be told, no doubt, and correctly, that the land was not at that time all set aside for the use of the company, and this section will, no doubt, be quoted to me—and I may just as well deal with it now :

> Section 9. Upon the construction of any portion of the railway hereby contracted for, not less than twenty miles in length, and the completion thereof so as to admit of the running of regular trains thereon, together with such equipment thereof as shall be required for the traffic thereon, the government shall pay and grant to the company the money and land subsidies applicable thereto.

I admit that that is quite a strong section, and will be used against my argument with considerable effect ; but for the last four or five years, I have endeavoured to obtain from parliament information as to when this land or any portion of it was set aside for the use of the company, and I must confess that I have been absolutely unable to get that information.

As I said at the outset, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, seeing the strength of their position, seemed to get the government to fall into line with their view, and not to issue patents to them ; so that they will claim that the land has not been set aside or made available for them up to the present time. If I were able to find out exactly when this land was set aside, it might make some difference to my argument.

But the point is this, that the Canadian Pacific Railway have had as much use of

that land grant as if they actually had it in their possession from the first moment, and I will show you how. In addition to the vast subsidies which we gave that company, in round cash, completed railways, exemption from taxation, exemption from duty on the materials that entered in the construction of the road—in addition to all these subsidies, we exempted their lands from taxation. And, in my opinion, inasmuch as they have not chosen to take up that land, but still have had the benefit of them, the time has come when they should pay their share of taxation. Let me point out that no sooner was the ink dry on the contract than the Canadian Pacific Railway raised $25,000,000 in land on land grant bonds. They mortgaged their entire land grant and raised the money required to go on with their work. Therefore, I say they had the use of these lands just as much as if they had taken possession of them at once. That being the case, why should not parliament interpret that Act as it should be interpreted, taking all the circumstances into consideration, and declare that twenty years' term of exemption at an end.

The right hon. gentleman who leads the House told us last year that it was a question for reference to the courts, and he said: Let the municipalities take out a writ against the company and sue for the taxes. But I would point out that as these lands are up to the present unpatented, it is legally impossible for any municipality to take any action. Had the government issued the patents, as it should have, at least after 1885-6 when the road was completed, the exemption would have expired in 1906, and there would not be such a serious grievance. But the patents never having been issued, these municipalities are not in a position to effectually or satisfactorily collect the taxes.

Further, I do not think it would be quite fair to expect any municipality to undertake a lawsuit with the Canadian Pacific Railway. These municipalities are not wealthy and have not the resources to enter into litigation with that powerful company, which litigation would be very costly, as it would be carried to the last court of resort. Why should not the government itself, if it is bound to have it that way, obtain a legal opinion and relieve the municipalities from that task?

But I say that we ought not to take the risk of referring it to the courts. I have discussed this question with lawyers. Of course, the committee of the Privy Council might take a different view. They might look at the political aspect, they might read the speeches delivered at the time the contract went through, and give a decision according to what they thought was the understanding of parliament. But I am informed that the courts are apt to rely upon the wording of the Act and the technical construction of the clauses, and that being the case there would be extreme danger, if this matter were referred to the courts, of its being decided against the people. This is a case in which the interests of the people suffer to such an extent and in which the meaning of parliament is so clear that no risk ought to be taken. Why should this idea of vested interests be held up to terrify us on every occasion? If the wording of the contract were clear and distinct, if there could be no doubt that the exemption should date twenty years from the issuing of the patents, I would not ask parliament to place any interpretation on the Act. But the wording may appear to some minds slightly ambiguous. I think that to any one who reads the clause in connection with the debate which took place in parliament, what was meant is perfectly clear. If that be true—and I think I shall be able to satisfy almost any one by quotations from 'Hansard' that it is—why should parliament not now say what its intent was on the 15th of February, 1881?

Parliament is supreme. What do the people of Canada send a representative to parliament for if not to see that they are justly dealt by? Why should we think of the bondholders in Holland or any other country.

Mr. MACLEAN. We must weep for them.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). We may, but there are people who have lived on the plains all those years, who have borne the burden and the heat of the day, who have paid double taxes all these years, and it is they who, if they are to be told that they must go on paying double taxes in perpetuity, will have just cause to weep. They have vested rights in this matter too.

I wish to give the House some little idea of the views of members of the government and the opposition when that contract went through on the 15th February, 1881. I may first say that the word 'granting,' that is the granting of the lands—'after the grant thereof from the Crown'— is used frequently through the contract, and I would infer that parliament intended that the grant meant the bestowal of the land when that vote went through in 1881. The first speech to which I shall refer is that of Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways, and who was the chief force in putting this contract through. He did not say in so many words that the granting thereof from the Crown meant twenty years from that time, but he made a comparison to show that the contract was a very favourable one compared with those put through in the United States. He pointed out that the exemption period in the United States was generally 25 years, and in this contract it was only 20 years, and he emphasized this point, that the land grant, until either sold or occupied, should be exempt for 20 years. Sir John Macdonald made the estimate that in ten years half that land grant would be sold and

would have passed into the hands of settlers and become taxable, so that the bonus given by the country would not be so large. Sir Charles Tupper emphasized the point that in view of the development of that country the land grant, until sold or occupied, would be free from taxation for 20 years, and made the point that the contract was better than the American contract because it had that saving clause, that until sold or occupied, the land grant was free of taxation, but that once it became the property of the farmers and settlers it was taxable.

So much for the speech of the late leader of the opposition. Now, I wish to refer to the speech of one of the greatest Liberals this country has known. I think my hon. friend the leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will consider the testimony of the Hon. Edward Blake pretty good authority with regard to this matter. Hon. Edward Blake is a tribune of the people. I remember sitting in the press gallery when he fought that contract. I think he used to occupy the seat where the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) now sits. I remember how Mr. Blake battled for the interests of the settlers in the western country. And, in this connection, let me pay a tribute to the right hon. leader of this government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I spent nearly a week going through the debates that then occurred, and I found that the right hon. gentleman took very strong ground on that question. The Liberal party did noble work for the country in those days. Amendment after amendment was moved—I think twenty or twenty-five amendments in all—affecting every clause in this contract. Even the matter of this tax exemption was referred to by many leaders of the Liberal party at that time. And I think, as a Liberal, that I can appeal to the Liberals to stand by the position which they took in 1881 in regard to this matter. This is what Hon. Edward Blake said :

> They have freedom to reject land they deem not fairly fit for settlement and to choose the best land elsewhere. They have perpetual exemption from taxation of their enormous property, a most monstrous provision, in my opinion. Why, this monstrosity is not to last merely twenty years, which is to be the period of bondage in other respects, but it is to last for ever.

Can any man with a mind doubt what Hon. Edward Blake had in his mind when he made that declaration ? The period of bondage, he says, is perpetual, with regard to the road-bed, and rolling stock, and that is a monstrous thing; but the other exemption, he says, is for a period of twenty years. Surely that is plain language. Twenty years must mean twenty years. If that was the position Hon. Edward Blake took that time, surely I shall not appeal in vain to Liberals to take the same position now, notwithstanding there may be repeated to us the talk about the vested rights of the bondholders. I could read from Hon. Edward Blake's speeches many passages which would be excellent reading as showing the interest he took in the settlers of that western country, in whose behalf he, assisted by the right hon. leader of this government, made at that time such a magnificent fight. But, let me read another sentence :

> That, on a gigantic scale, will be the effect of the exemption on the syndicate, who can hold their lands from year to year for twenty years without any drawback in the way of taxes.

Here are two quotations from that great Liberal tribune of the people to show that he understood that twenty years was intended when the contract went through. Now, I will quote an authority which, I should think, must satisfy the Conservatives in this House as to what view the Conservative government, and the Conservative party, took of that clause at that time ; I will quote from no less an authority than Sir Hector Langevin, the Minister of Public Works in the Conservative government of that time, and a colleague of Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper. At the close of his speech he says :

> Therefore, in a very short time, the parish or municipality will be settled, and the exemption of taxation on these lands will not be felt, because really the lands remaining to be sold will remain there only until the settlement can be extended in this direction.

Now, mark these words :

> So that, after these twenty years, what will remain exempt from taxation will be just the 100 feet in width the length of the municipality.

Could you desire stronger testimony with regard to the position the government of that time took on this question ? After twenty years from that time, said Sir Hector Langevin, all that will remain exempt from taxation will be the 100 feet—merely the road-bed, because, as you know, road-beds are 100 feet wide. Surely, I need not appeal to any hon. member who sits to your left, Sir, in view of the statement I have read, and surely none will hesitate to support the Bill I have the honour to place before the House to-night. Surely every Conservative will support this Bill without hesitation, on the ground that it is the duty of parliament to interpret that clause more particularly in view of the testimony I am now able to produce. Let me now quote from the speech made by Mr. Rinfret, who was a Liberal member from Quebec, and a man of considerable promise in the councils of the Liberal party at that time.

> The exemption of the syndicate's lands from all taxation, whether municipal, school, federal or local, can be estimated at half a million dollars a year, making for the twenty years a sum of $10,000,000.

So, there could be no doubt about the position Mr. Rinfret took. At that time ela-

borate calculations were made as to what this tax exemption would amount to. There were various estimates, but the estimate generally adopted by the Liberal party at that time was that the subvention of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was increased by this exemption by a sum of not less than $10,000,000. We had given them $25,000,000 in cash, $35,000,000 of completed road, and 25,000,000 acres of land—which was estimated by a number of hon. gentlemen the other day to be worth at least $75,000,000. The Liberal party of that time, as represented by its leading men, held up its hands in protest and said: You are going to give another $10,000,000 by this exemption from taxation. According to the interpretation of the right hon. leader of the government, we are bound now to give them exemption of another twenty years, which would be more than an additional $10,000,000, for that land has vastly increased in value, and the value of this exemption from taxation is increased in proportion. The argument I make with regard to Mr. Rinfret's utterance is that he said the exemption would be worth $500,000 a year, and he estimated that the total at $10,000,000, showing clearly that he meant exactly what he said when he stated that that exemption would be for twenty years. Now, let me quote a few words from another great Liberal. I refer to Hon. G. W. Ross, the present Prime Minister of the great province of Ontario. He was then a member of this House for Middlesex, sitting with the Liberals and taking a prominent part in their discussions and in their councils. I shall abbreviate this quotation, as I have abbreviated the others, because I am anxious not to delay the House :

> Every man that settles on a section of government land in the North-west will be a hewer of wood and a drawer of water to these great corporations.

You see he was prophetic. The people up there have been hewers of wood and drawers of water to these great corporations, and unless parliament to-night does its duty in this matter, we are going to relegate these people to another twenty years, probably for perpetuity, to the position of hewers of wood and drawers of water to these identical corporations.

> Every road he makes, every bridge he builds to span a little stream or rivulet will be clear gain to this syndicate. Every dollar he invests in the improvement of communication between the back parts of the government lands and the front will benefit the syndicate. Moreover, if the settlers wish to levy rates to secure the construction of roads or erection of school-houses, instead of levying a single rate, which they would do under other circumstances, they will have to levy two rates on their own properties, because the syndicate property is free.

Just exactly what I said myself a few moments ago. Settlers are obliged to levy two rates on themselves for a school-house, two rates for a road, and two rates for any other improvement, and unless parliament decides to do its duty to-night, the settlers will be obliged to levy two rates for another twenty years at least, and probably for all time.

> I believe this would be a practical bar to the settlement of the lands in the North-west.

It has been a practical bar.

> It is tantamount to telling every man we invite from the other side of the Atlantic that the moment he settles on our lands in the North-west, instead of contributing of his means for his own advantage and comfort of his family, every dollar he invests for the benefit of himself and neighbours will be so much to the advantage of the company that contributes not one dollar itself.

And, Sir, it has continued to be. The company sells a quarter section of land to a settler, that moment the land becomes taxable, and the settler is obliged to pay taxes on it. But the company does not have a patent issue lest that settler should fail in his payments, and the land might revert to the company, and should it revert to the company, as it has done in many cases, the land becomes non-taxable. It is always the case with the company of 'heads I win, tails you lose.' Under no circumstances must they be called upon to pay taxes, because parliament in the past has been protecting these railway companies instead of protecting the interest of the settler, of the men who form the brawn and sinew of this country, who contribute the taxes that help to carry on the affairs of the country. Now, Mr. Ross, speaking at another point, said this :

> The hon. member has been reading the Railway Acts of the United States. He will find that some of the railway lands of the United States were taxed 14 cents an acre, and some 11 cents an acre, and the hon. gentleman knows that lands in Manitoba, held by non-residents, are taxed from 5 cents to 6 cents an acre. Put that same rate——

Now, I would like that each member should see what the Hon. Mr. Ross had to say on this point :

> —on 25,000,000 acres for twenty years, and it will amount to $10,000,000,——

You see, the present Premier of Ontario at that time had it clearly in his mind that it was to be twenty years from that date, because he makes an estimate of half a million a year for twenty years, and that gives $10,000,000.

> —an enormous sum, which shows the immense gain which this tax is to the company. It not only relieves them from a regular payment of, say $50,000 a year, but enables them to hold their lands in order that they may increase in value.

That is just what has happened in the North-west Territories. The company does not appear to be anxious to sell their lands, they simply leave them there, and by the work which the settlers put upon their

lands, by their improvements in fencing and in cultivation, the value of these railway lands is enhanced, sometimes doubled; therefore, by the work of these very settlers, the railway companies are enabled to make enormous sums of money. Now, let me quote briefly from a speech which my honoured friend—because I always take pleasure in referring to the Minister of Customs as my friend—a speech which he made upon that occasion:

He was cognizant of the evils of exemption in the case of the Canada Company in days gone by, and he told the House that he had given power to the resident settlers to tax the lands of the non-resident, and therefore, those non-residents must either pay the taxes or sell out. He thus qualified that clause himself, and yet the same gentleman has since become a party to a contract wiping out that exemption clause and giving the company freedom from taxation for twenty years——

He was chiding, I think, some gentleman on the opposition side. He says that the gentlemen on the opposition side had even gone so far as to give an exemption to the company, or to give freedom to the company from taxation for twenty years.

—so that the settler will have an unsettled mile on the east, west, north and south, exempt from taxation. He will have to bear the whole burden, build churches and make road improvements, and the hon. Minister of Railways asks parliament to adopt that clause.

I think, anyway, I have got one friend sitting at your right, Sir, to-night; I feel satisfied the Minister of Customs will, at least, stand up and fight for this Bill. He chided a member of the opposition for daring to support that clause, and I honour him for doing it. He spoke, as did the other gentlemen from whom I have quoted, about compelling these settlers to pay double taxes, even for churches—the hon. gentleman introduced the church—and for schools and other such improvements. I am sure I will not appeal to him in vain to-night to stand by the position he took then, and to support this Bill. If this Bill passes, then these poor settlers will not be obliged to pay double taxes for churches, schools, roads, and so forth. Now, I want to quote, because it comes in here consecutively, what the Globe said at that time. I feel satisfied that the Globe would not go back on the position it then took.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What! Oh, oh.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I remember when this question was up last year, the Globe quoted the speech of the Hon. Edward Blake, from which I have quoted to-night, and while it did not commend me for the position which I was taking, neither did it say I was wrong, and I felt that was at least a point gained. The Globe said this:

This land grant is infinitely more valuable than that of the Union Pacific. Therefore, the least value that can be put upon the exemption from taxation of the Canadian Pacific land grant is twenty times $835,023, or $16,700,460.

That was the estimate the Globe placed on the value of this exemption. Now, suppose we to-night, by defeating this Bill, agree that this exemption should be extended for another twenty years, you make a subvention, in exemption from taxation, to the Canadian Pacific Railway of something like $33,000,000. That is a vast sum, almost half enough to build the entire Canadian Pacific Railway, taking the company's own estimate of the cost of construction. The Globe continued:

The exemption from taxes of the railway itself is worth at least as much to the company as the liability to taxes costs the Union Pacific, namely, $279,158 per annum. Capitalizing that sum at 4 per cent, we arrive at the value of the exemption from taxes of the railways—it is $6,978,950. Add value of twenty years' exemption from taxes on land grant, $16,700,460. Total value of exemption from taxes, $23,679,410.

So you see the great Globe at that time was perfectly clear, no doubt whatever, as to what that meant; and we all recollect how unalterably hostile the Globe was to the then government. If the Globe could have interpreted that by any stretch of imagination to mean that it should be twenty years more, or in perpetuity, how it would have wrung its hands and declaimed against the government. I am not so sure but that it might even have succeeded in defeating the government had they attempted to make that exemption in perpetuity. Yet the twenty years are gone, and here we are to-day face to face with a proposition for another twenty years, if this exemption is to go on. I think we will certainly rely upon the Globe to stand by us in this fight and advocate the interpretation of that clause as I say it should be interpreted. Now, I will quote from the speech of another prominent Conservative of that period, Mr. Charles Rykert. He was a man of scrap-book fame, and a man who was great at going into calculations. I find that he entered into most elaborate calculations in reference to this land grant. He speaks as follows:

Now, I go still further. I will give them the benefit of last year's taxation. Mr. Poor says——

He is referring to the American railway statistician.

Mr. Poor says that the taxes last year were $108,437. I will double that, which will make $216,874 a year, multiply that by 20, allowing one-third off for sales only, and I find the total amount would be $2,891,654, or a difference of $13,808,806. It does seem to me that the hon. gentleman ought certainly to withdraw that statement upon the floor of this House or admit that the organ——

He is referring to the Globe.

—was incorrect or misinformed. It is an unfortunate thing that these statements should go about the country in order to mislead the public mind with a view of getting a snap verdict against the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

What would Mr. Rykert himself have thought, what would he have said if he had been face to face with the proposition that we have to face to-night that this exemption is for quite a number of years, if not in perpetuity. Let me read next a brief sentence from a speech delivered by the Hon. Timothy Anglin, a distinguished predecessor of yourself, Sir, in the chair. Mr. Anglin said :

It was very extraordinary. There was a very remarkable fact in reference to the lands. Eleven million acres would furnish 10,000 acres per mile for 900 miles, making a total of 9,000,000, and furnish about 2,000,000 acres more for the three-tenths of the road of the eastern section, which the company were required to build within the first three years. So that within three years, the company should have acquired and obtained possession of the two twenty-four mile belts in the prairie section.

Now, I do not propose to go any further into the speeches delivered at that time upon the contract, but I want to place in the witness-box another very important witness, and I am satisfied that the testimony of that witness will be accepted as being very important by the House to-night. I want to put the Canadian Pacific Railway Company into the witness-box, and find out what they thought in regard to this land grant. I took the troube last year to borrow from the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals the reports printed by the Canadian Pacific Railway, from the time of the inception of the syndicate. I went very carefully through all these reports, and I found some important statements made therein. The first report of the company was dated the 12th of December, 1882. Mark the date, Sir, December 12, 1882, shortly after the ratification of the contract :

The proceeds of the $20,000,000 of land grant bonds, as sold, are deposited with the government, which pays interest on such deposits at the rate of 4 per cent per annum.

I started out with the proposition that this 25,000,000 acre land grant was available to the company from the date of the ratification of that contract. To-day we find that on the 12th December, 1882, they had sold land grant bonds, and that they had raised $20,000,000 on mortgage. Surely we are not to be met with the argument of vested rights when we find that the company have had all the use of the land grant that they could possibly desire. Then the statement proceeds :

These proceeds are paid to the company in agreed mileage proportions (in the same manner as the government cash subsidy), as construction progresses ; and the balance of these proceeds and of cash subsidy coming to the company amounts to about $31,500,000.

I will now read from the report published by the company on the 31st December, 1883 :

A statement of land sales from the commencement of the company's operations, is also submitted.

It will be observed that a considerable reduction is shown in the acreage sold, as compared with the statement published in the official memorandum, dated December 12, 1882.

This has been caused, mainly, by a reduction of the acreage originally sold to the Canada North-west Land Company, from 5,000,000 acres to 2,200,000 acres.

The point I wish to make is that before the 31st December, 1883, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had sold to the Canada North-west Land Company some 5,000,000 acres of land. Although you will find by the public records that the company did not have that amount of land set apart for them, at that time they seemed to have been able to transfer any portion that they desired whether it had been set apart or not. Let me quote briefly from the Canadian Pacific Railway report of 1884, signed by George Stephen. He was asking for certain legislation from parliament to enable the company to do certain things, and he says :

Should this measure become law the position the company will occupy on the opening of the through line next spring may be summed up as follows :—

It will have a cash deposit in the hands of the Dominion government sufficient to pay semi-annual dividends at the rate of 3 per cent per annum on its $65,000,000 capital stock for seven and a half years, or until the end of the year 1893. It will own 3,299 miles, and will hold under lease 695 miles, of fully completed and thoroughly equipped railway, forming a total mileage of 3,994 miles. It will own more than 21,000,000 acres of agricultural lands.

We have the statement of President Stephen himself, that the company will then have 21,000,000 acres of agricultural lands. In the report for 1885, we find this :

It will own three fine steel steamships on the great lakes, and an extensive and well-appointed telegraph system, with power to extend its telegraph lines to all parts of the country.

All this property, together with certain outside assets, in all valued at $230,960,585, will be represented by a total indebtedness of $53,892,545, bearing an unusually low rate of interest ; and by $65,000,000 capital stock, for which dividends for seven and one-half years will be in hand.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you will allow a diversion, I would like to refer to that matter. According to the president's own statement at that time they had set apart sufficient money to pay interest on the $65,000,000 of capital stock which the company had issued. You will find in the sessional papers a return made to parliament, in obedience to a request of the Hon. Edward Blake, in regard to that $65,000,000 of stock. That $65,000,000, in the then state of affairs of the company, they pretty generally admit was an unnecessary over-capitalization. The members of the syndicate distributed the stock among themselves at the rate of 25 cents on the dollar. They reserved a large quantity of the proceeds which were set aside to pay themselves dividends on this

stock, and they actually paid themselves dividends at the rate of 6 per cent par value, or 24 per cent on the amount of money they had paid in.

Instead of turning the money in for the purpose of constructing the railway, they set it aside for the purpose of paying dividends on their stock at the rate of 24 per cent, so that in five years they had paid themselves more than they originally paid for the stock, and they owned the stock besides, and it was recently quoted at 102. Yet, Sir, we will probably be asked to-night to protect the vested interest of these stockholders. Well, when the House understands that these people pay themselves 24 per cent on this stock there will not be much sympathy felt for the vested interests of these gentlemen. I quote from the report of 1886 :

To represent this capital liability, the company has a well-equipped railway system of 4,651 miles, a thoroughly efficient commercial telegraph system, and nearly 15,000,000 acres of selected agricultural lands.

In 1886 they had nearly 15,000,000 acres and that was about the time the railway was completed. I think there is no hon. gentleman here who will not take the view that all the land became taxable at least at the time the railway was completed. I do not propose to weary the House with more than one other quotation, and that is the report of the company, dated the 8th May, 1889, which says :

In addition to the lands embraced in the foregoing statement, the company holds 1,389,424 acres of land in southern Manitoba, which came to it from the purchase of the Manitoba South-western Railway. These lands are among the best and most available in the North-west. At the average of the sales last year, $4.64 per acre, their value is $5,944,785. They are subject only to a lien of $884,773 in favour of the province of Manitoba. Your directors believe that they will yield at least $5 over and above the amount due to the province, and, as they are not liable to any other mortgage or lien, the surplus will be available to the general purposes of the company.

Therefore, according to the statement prepared on the authority of President Van Horne, the price the company received for their lands was $4.64 an acre, and he added that they would be worth and would sell for $5 an acre. But, take the price at $4.64, and we find that the subvention of lands to that company at 6,400 acres per mile was worth $32,100 per mile. I do not think that prairie roads cost more than $10,000 a mile, so that we practically gave to the company in lands alone three times the cost of the road, and yet we will be told that if we ask parliament to declare what parliament clearly meant, will be interfering with vested rights. I could give further quotations from the statements submitted by the company, but I do not propose to go further into any technical argument on the question. I wish before concluding to point out that the request which is made in this Bill is a reasonable and a just request. I remember that Mr. Blake in his speech quoted the statement of Sir John Macdonald when he was justifying the contract to parliament and where Sir John said : That by virtue of the vast subsidies which Canada was giving to this company it would be able to carry freight for at least one-quarter the cost that a road built out of private funds would be able to carry it for. In view of the fact that we gave that company $25,000,000 in cash, $35,000,000 worth of completed road, and $75,000,000 worth of land, it is only fair and reasonable to ask that that land grant should not be exempted from taxation in perpetuity. The greatest curse the North-west labours under at the present time is the exemption from taxation of these vast tracts of land, and the Minister of the Interior told us the other day that some 60,000,000 acres of land had been given as subventions to railways in this country. I should think that at least 90 per cent of these lands are exempt from taxation, and parliament must see that it is handicapping that country for all time to come to continue this exemption. We have now a chance to set free about 20,000,000 acres of land and hon. gentlemen would understand what an immense relief this would be to the country. If parliament does its duty with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway lands it will surely be expected to do its duty with regard to lands belonging to other railway companies. The Bill sets out in brief form some of the considerations I have mentioned, and it concludes with the following :—

Clause 16 of the contract mentioned in the preamble, between Her Majesty and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, is hereby interpreted to mean that the period of exemption from taxation of the said land grant terminated twenty years after the date of the ratification of the said contract.

I beg to move the second reading of the Bill, seconded by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver).

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This is a question which has already more than once engaged the attention of the House, and my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) has just reminded us that last session we threshed it out at greater length than I care to do on this occasion. The hon. gentleman knows that the legislation against which he protests is contained in the original contract which the Liberal party of 20 years ago fought with all its might.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I said so.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Blake, who was then the leader of the party, opposed that contract with such vigour and ability as has never been equalled in this House. All the arguments which the hon. gentleman

(Mr. Richardson) has quoted to-day fell from the lips of Mr. Blake and Mr. Ross and the other leaders of the Liberal party, upon a deaf House, and against the protests of those Liberal leaders this clause was put on the statute-book. It was decreed that the lands conveyed to the Canadian Pacific Railway should be for 20 years exempted from taxation. There may be a difference of opinion as to the interpretation of the clause, but there can be no misinterpretation as to the meaning of 'twenty years.' The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) has truly said that '20 years' means '20 years,' but the question is as to what date that 20 years should run. My hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) says that the 20 years should run from the date the contract was ratified, namely, when the Bill was passed, and he has quoted from the speeches made on that occasion to prove that such should be the interpretation of the contract. I wish it were so ; but, unfortunately, the language of the statute is very different from the language which was used in debate. The statute does not say, as my hon. frined will have it say, that the exemption of the said land grant shall terminate 20 years after the ratification of the said contract. If such had been the intention of parliament, it would have been very easy for parliament to have said so ; but that was not what parliament said. What parliament said was that these lands should be free from such taxation for 20 years after the grant thereof from the Crown. I am sorry that it is so ; I wish it were otherwise ; but it cannot be argued seriously that the grant from the Crown was made at the time of the ratification of the contract. That is one reason.

But there is another reason which my hon. friend has not alluded to, and which is very conclusive on this point. There was a contract entered into in 1880, between Her Majesty, represented by the government of Canada, and certain gentlemen—Canadian, Americans, Englishmen, Hollanders, and Frenchmen—who undertook to build a railway on Canadian soil. For this undertaking on their part the people of Canada agreed to give them $25,000,000 in cash and 25,000,000 acres in land. Did that grant operate and become valid so as to be exacted by the company on the day of ratification of the contract ? Quite the reverse. If on that day the Canadian Pacific Railway Company could have claimed their $25,000,000 of money and their 25,000,000 acres of land, there would be some reason for the contention of my hon. friend. But, on the contrary, the Act said positively, in so many words, that the grant would be available, not on that day, but at the time the subsidy would be earned by the building of the railway. Here is the clause :

> In consideration of the premises, the government agree to grant to the company a subsidy in money of $25,000,000 and in land of 25,000,000 acres, for which subsidies the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be completed and the same shall be equipped, maintained and operated.

My hon. friend agrees with me, I am sure, that under the terms of this clause, the subsidy could not be paid to the company except as the construction of the road proceeded. It seems to me that is quite clear without further argument.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). It could not with regard to the money ; but so far as the land is concerned, they borrowed money on it instantly.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not instantly, but later on ; and if my hon. friend were to contend that the twenty-year period were to run from the day the company mortgaged the land, there would be some argument for that.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Would the right hon. gentleman support me if I modified my Bill to that effect ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I will not support the hon. gentleman when he asks parliament to interpret its own Acts. I said last year that my hon. friend could take the matter before the courts. He says that last year, when he made his argument, I called him a socialist. I said that his argument smacked of socialism, if it were not the pure article itself. In what other way could I characterize it ? Why should a contract be sacred, why care for the bondholders, why not make the bondholders weep ? Because we are in a British country, and if there is anything held sacred in a British country, it is a contract. My hon. friend says, do not leave the courts to interpret the contract, but put on it such interpretation as you hold. My hon. friend asks us to do something which has never yet been done in a British parliament. If there is anything which the British parliament has a horror of, it is to interfere with contracts. I regret that provision of this contract as much as my hon. friend does. He has argued that it is a serious blot on our statute-book, that it is an injury to the settlement of the North-west. I agree with him that it is so ; yet, for my part, I am not prepared to say that the bondholders must bleed or weep, or to take away their property and their security from them. My hon. friend should not bring such a proposition before this House. I suggested to my hon. friend last year that he should go before the courts and get their interpretation of this contract. How, my hon. friend asks, can this be done ?—the lands have not been patented. Well there are many thousands of acres which have been patented, on which the matter can be tested in the courts.

My hon. friend made another argument : he said that these municipalities are poor, and that this government might do this. If I understood the hon. gentleman's argu-

ment aright, he did not want any judicial interpretation. He said the meaning was too clear—we could interpret it ourselves.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). That is my position.

The PRIME MINISTER. If that is my hon. friend's position, it is a position against which I contend with all my might. If my hon. friend is sincere and earnest in this matter and wants to have it tested in the courts, I am here to tell him that the government will back him with all their might in so doing ; but, if my hon. friend says, I do not want a judicial interpretation, but I want parliament to say that the exemption started on such a day, whether we would rob the bondholders or not, I am not prepared to assent to anything of the kind. The proposition I make to my hon. friend is a very reasonable one—to have a judicial interpretation, and we will give the poor men of those municipalities all the assistance we can in order to have their rights, whatever they are, established. If my hon. friend is satisfied with that, the government will assist him with all their power to have this contract judicially interpreted. But if he is not willing to accept that, and says there is nothing to do but to have parliament interfere and say whether it is right or wrong, whether it is according to the truth or not, that the twenty years must run from a certain day, then, I hope that such a monstrous proposition, such a socialistic proposition, will receive no countenance in this parliament ; and the only position I have to take is to move that the Bill be not now read a second time, but be read a second time this day six months.

Mr. SPROULE. I would ask the right hon. First Minister if the government would not state a case for the Supreme Court, and have the contract interpreted themselves ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have just said that if it be the wish of the settlers of the North-west to have it interpreted, I will do so.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). You said you would assist me in the matter. I ought not to be placed in the positon of having to take the initiative.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). We have heard a lawyer's argument from the leader of the government and the great exponent of Liberalism in this House. Is there no other course than to refer this matter to the courts ? I say there is. We have had grievances of the people of the North-west brought before this House time after time. The greatest grievance the people of the North-west had was the monopoly clause in that contract, which prevented any other road than the Canadian Pacific Railway building to the American frontier. That grievance was aired in this parliament, and eventually the Conservative party, which put that monopoly on the country, found a way of removing that grievance. When the Canadian Pacific Railway came here for further concessions, it got them, but only on condition that it removed this grievance. The Canadian Pacific Railway has come to this House session after session, since hon. gentlemen opposite have been in office, asking for favours, and I have always contended that we should take advantage of these applications to make terms on behalf of the North-west people.

The hon. Minister of Railways gave the Canadian Pacific Railway great concessions in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and he obtained in return reduced freight rates for which he claimed great credit. Two years ago the Canadian Pacific Railway demanded further concessions, and got a blanket charter over the whole of the North-west. I then protested that then was the time to get rid of some of these monopolistic clauses in the contract, particularly the 10 per cent clause, which prevents this government from interfering with the freight rates until the company earns 10 per cent over its expenses, but I protested in vain. The Canadian Pacific Railway is asking again this session for further concessions, and hon. gentlemen opposite will, no doubt, be as supine as they were in the past. They have not the courage to insist on the removal of these monopolistic clauses. There are two such clauses remaining. One is the clause granting exemption from taxes, and the other is the 10 per cent clause. Time and again attention has been drawn to these grievances by gentlemen from the North-west, but all we can get is a lecture from the right hon. the Prime Minister on vested rights and the iniquity of interfering with them. But that is a lawyer's plea, and not that of a statesman. A statesman is a man who can take advantage of opportunities and always find a way to remedy grievances, but here we have Liberals going about the country before elections weeping for the farmers, and in parliament weeping for the bondholders.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sure my hon. friend does not want to give any more to the Canadian Pacific Railway than we have given. According to his contention, this monopoly is at an end, and the twenty years exemption have expired. If the courts maintain his view, why need we grant any further favours to the Canadian Pacific Railway in order to obtain this concession ?

Mr. MACLEAN. The right hon. gentleman has given a great many concessions to the Canadian Pacific Railway since he came into office, without obtaining any corresponding benefit from that company. The Canadian Pacific Railway is here this session asking further concessions, and the right hon. gentleman will have his opportunity of settling this disputed point and

obtaining something for the people in return for what he will give the company. But he will not take advantage of the opportunity. Instead we will have the lawyer's plea that vested rights are sacred, that contracts must be upheld, and not a word will we hear about the grievances of the people. But a statesman can find a way to remedy the grievances of the people, and at the same time do no injustice to vested rights.

Mr. DAVIS. Give us a way out of it.

Mr. MACLEAN. I have two cures for it. The Canadian Pacific Railway came here some years ago and got a most valuable blanket franchise over the whole of Manitoba that had not already been pre-empted. Let us impose on them some conditions this year in return for the favours they ask. The hon. the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) laid down last session the doctrine—and so did the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), who is not here this evening—that the present administration was composed of statesmen who would get something for the people from great corporations in return for anything they gave. That was the whole justification advanced for the Crow's Nest Pass deal. The only justification was that the Canadian Pacific Railway was compelled to give up something in the way of monopoly.

I have another cure for the situation, and that is government ownership. We can get that railway into our hands for a very small consideration, and we will get all these lands back.

Mr. DAVIS. Will you buy the lands back ?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, if you buy the road you will get the land with it.

Mr. DAVIS. Not necessarily.

Mr. MACLEAN. If you buy the shares you get everything the railway owns, and you get the lands back. There are very few lands left in the North-west now to give to the settlers, and the easiest remedy would be to acquire the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. DAVIS. How much would it take to buy it ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Shaughnessy has told you that you can get it absolutely for $30,000,000. I believe you can get the control for less than $25,000,000, and there is enough land there to pay for all that. You can get that land back into the hands of the country. You could give it to the settler free. Or you could devote the proceeds of sales to paying the taxes and helping the settlers. Instead of spending our time talking about the great corporations, we should be doing something for the people. We should do away with this most unfair system of exemptions under which the poor man has to pay the piper. The poor man in Toronto and every little hamlet in Ontario, and all over Canada to-day, is paying the municipal taxes, while great corporations go scot free, which would not be the case much longer if Liberals would stand by their pledges. But they have gone back on their pledges, and to-day are defending the corporations and weeping for the bondholders. They only weep for the farmers when out in the country looking for their votes.

I believe that this wrong can be made right. As soon as I can get away from here, I intend going up to the North-west and telling the people there how this parliament regards a question of this kind, and I will let them know that the little Napoleon was not in his seat to-night when this question was being discussed, and that the young bucks from the plains, who talk so much about the people's rights on the public platform, are out to-night at some kind of a sun dance or corn dance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACLEAN. That no doubt is great sport for hon. gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. SCOTT. Which one of the young bucks is at a sun dance ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I see that some of them have come back from the sun dance.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the hon. gentleman name one who was absent ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Now, it is very fine to hear these interruptions from the North-west whenever a proposition in their interest is before the House. But, I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite and to tell the Premier that there is a way to cure such evils as we complain of. He has availed himself of it once; he has failed to avail himself of it several times. He had better avail himself of it hereafter. For the people do see that parliament in this country is supreme, that parliament can rectify every wrong. And parliament does not rise to its responsibility if it does not find a way to right a known wrong. Law, we are told, is for the purpose of righting wrong; and, if there is no law, or if it is found that the law cannot right the wrong, this parliament can if it will but find a way. And some of us will find the way, and some of us will stake our reputations and our future on the finding of a way. I am one of those who will consecrate what strength I have and what effort I can put forth to that end. It is a strange thing to hear a Prime Minister of this country, a man who professes always to be a Liberal, throwing out some kind of insinuation against those of whom he speaks as socialists. I am something of a Socialist, and something of a Tory.

Mr. DAVIS. That is a bad mixture.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, it is not. I am one of those who do not regard socialism as a crime. Somehow, the world is suffering under great grievances, and the men who profess to be socialists are men who are trying to do something for humanity. I belong to two or three clubs in this country, and some are rather exclusive. And when I go into those clubs, I hear the members talking about these socialist fellows on the hill here. I wish these gentlemen, and some hon. gentlemen opposite, who speak in this manner could be in some of the London clubs to-day. They should hear what is said in those clubs by men of great family connections, leaders in the universities of England, men high in the service of the state—and nine-tenths of these men are socialists, if you call them such. And the great city of London has set an example to the world in the last two or three days of what socialism on good lines means. The London County Council is taking over the control of the great utilities which, until now have been in the hands of private corporations who have been robbing the citizens of London right and left. Of all the robbing corporations, some of the very worst were the water companies that controlled the water supply. They are going out of existence. The city of London is taking over every tramway there. The state owns the telegraph and telephone services. The gas works and electric light works of the city of London are owned by the public. That is the kind of socialism I believe in, and I am not afraid to say so, even though I am opposed by gentlemen who profess to be Liberals. But, I hope that this is the last time that a Liberal Prime Minister in this country will say a word against socialism of that kind. Before I finish, let me say again that the responsibility rests upon parliament of righting this wrong of the North-west settlers. That wrong may have been inflicted upon them by the Tory party. For that, the Tory party is responsible. But equally does the responsibility rest upon members of the other side as well as upon members on this side to right what is a wrong and to find a cure for what is a grievance.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). In 1880, a contract was entered into between the government of the Dominion of Canada and a certain corporation, under which the corporation undertook to build a railway extending from central Canada to the Pacific ocean. As a result of the making of that contract, certain grievances, apparently, have resulted to the people of the North-west Territories and Manitoba. Now, these grievances were pointed out by the Liberal party at that time as being the necessary and inevitable result of that contract. Since that time, this parliament has been asked, by means of the Bill now before the House for consideration, to remedy that grievance—that is to say, the hon. gentleman who presents this measure asks that the remedy be applied in this way. He says: The contract was made between the people of this country and a firm of contractors or a railway corporation, and we now ask you to undertake to construe that contract, and practically to set the contract at defiance. The government now in power says: We do not think it proper to consider the contract in that way. We do not think it proper that one of the parties to the contract should take it upon himself to construe the contract as against the other party, but this contract once made, should be left to the courts for judicial interpretation. And the hon. gentleman from East York (Mr. Maclean), who now leaves the House, says, the course adopted by the government is an improper course. He says: It is all right for lawyers to talk about the sanctity of contract and about respecting their obligations contracted under such conditions as those under which this contract was made, but we statesmen deal otherwise with these things. We statesmen, he says, take out our knives and put them through these contracts and put an end to them. It is all right for mere lawyers to talk about keeping sacred their covenants, but we statesmen deal otherwise.

Mr. MACLEAN. Now, did I say that?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, having stated the position taken by the hon. gentleman and by the government, the matter is at an end. We say: The contract is made: in consequence or as a result of this contract, certain obligations were entered into by the people of Canada towards the bondholders who made the advances necessary for the purpose of enabling this road to be built; and, if there is any doubt about the terms of this contract, let the courts settle it and put it at an end; but it is not proper for us to interfere and to construe this contract ourselves, violating obligations we have entered into towards these bondholders. Let me go one step further. What are the facts? When this contract was entered into, it was provided that the road was to be built by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. To enable the company to build that road certain grants of lands were to be made to the company as the road progressed. The company was authorized to use the land grant for the purpose of borrowing money, not only upon the land granted, but the lands to be granted under this agreement. These bonds were sold, and the money for which they were sold was taken by the company and put into this road. And now we are asked to take that land grant which was made at that time and given to the bondholders as security for their advances, and to say that we are going to alter the con-

ditions under which the grant was made. Now, is that common honesty, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Would the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) allow me to ask him whether he would be willing to have this interpreted to mean that these lands shall be taxed twenty years from the date they were earned ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not going to say how I should be willing to have this contract interpreted. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) will try to understand the position the government takes, I am sure we shall be at one in a moment. The government say : The contract is made providing that these lands shall be exempt from taxation for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown. All that is necessary is to ask the courts to construe the words ' grant thereof from the Crown.'

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Yes, but you have not issued the patents up to the present time.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Now let me go on. Are these words to be construed as of the date of the making of the contract, as my hon. friend wishes them to be construed ? Are they to be construed as of the date of the earning of the lands, or are they to be construed as of the dates when the patents issued ? These are the three constructions that may be put upon these terms ; and what we say is that as these terms are vague and indefinite, and are possible of any one of these three constructions, let us refer the matter to the courts and let the courts construe them. If the court says that when this contract was made the meaning of these words was of the date of the making of the contract, then we have no responsibility. If the court decides that the grant is to be understood as of the date when the land grant was earned, we have no responsibility. If they say it is of the date when the patent issued, we are equally without responsibility.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Yes, you are responsible, because you have allowed five years to elapse, and you have not issued the patents.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is for the courts to say the date from which that grant is to run. Now, my hon. friend takes this position, he is endeavouring to tax the government with responsibility for not having granted patents during these five years. Why does he not bring in a Bill to discuss that question ? What we are dealing with now is the hon. gentleman's Bill ; I presume he drew it, and if he drew it, I presume he understands it. What the hon. gentleman wants to do is to say that this grant is to be construed as dating from the date of the ratification of the contract. That is what he asks us to do ; and I submit respectfully, Mr. Speaker, that we should not by an act of this parliament say that such is the meaning of that contract and the Act that was based upon it ; and if there was a possibility of construing the contract in that way, then we must not forget that the land never passed out of the possession of the Crown until such time as the road was constructed and the grant earned.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). It has not passed out of the possession of the Crown yet.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. So the position is this : My hon. friend, if he is sincere about this matter——

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Do you suppose I would be doing it if I were not sincere ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. ——if he is sincere about that matter, as sincere as the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) was when he spoke on this subject last year, he would adopt the suggestion thrown out by the government, that is to say, he would have the contract referred to the courts and the courts would judicially construe it. Then the people of the North-west would benefit by it, and no individual would succeed in obtaining some political benefit out of it. I say the position of the government takes is one which will commend itself to the House. Let there be a judicial construction put upon this contract, that is all any member can ask, then we will know where we are, and how far this evil complained of can be remedied.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) deserves credit for the anxiety he displays on behalf of the people he represents. There is no doubt, people in Manitoba are labouring under a grievance, under a hardship, and there is no doubt they desire and deserve a remedy, no matter from what quarter it may come. The hon. member brought this question up last year, and, if I remember right, he brought it up before that ; but he has always aimed at redressing the grievance under which the people of Manitoba labour. But I regret to say, personally, that I cannot agree with him in the remedy he proposes. If there is one thing more than another that ought to be held sacred by parliament, it is the contracts that we make with corporations or individuals ; and there is no doubt that this was a contract that parliament entered into seriously and intentionally, whether it was a wise one or not. We are one of the contracting parties, and to violate that contract by an arbitrary declaration, to make that Act mean what we desire it to mean, I think, would be entirely out of keeping with the principles usually obtaining in all constitutionally-governed countries under the British Empire. The

hon. member for Lisgar quoted from several members of the Reform party, giving their interpretation of that Act when it was being passed, and amongst them he quoted from the Hon. Edward Blake. Now, it seems to me that Mr. Blake thought at that time that the twenty years were to run from the time when the agreement was entered into. That being the case, I respectfully submit that it justifies any person in holding a similar view, and the hon. member for Lisgar is not so much to blame if he comes to the same conclusion and desires to act on it. That was Mr. Blake's opinion, and that was the opinion of several members of the Reform party, but it does not happen to be the opinion of those who constitute the other contracting party.

When this question was up last year I made a suggestion which the First Minister has intimated he is willing to act upon tonight. I suggested that the government should state a case for the court to decide, instead of leaving it to any private individual to prosecute a case in court in order to secure the rights of the people interested. I understand the First Minister to say tonight that he is willing to join with the hon. member for Lisgar, and to have a case stated for decision by the court in order to ascertain the correct interpretation of the law. It seems to me the hon. member for Lisgar should accept that offer. I do not think it is possible for him to secure any remedy that will redress this grievance at an earlier date ; and since the government have assumed responsibility and given their solemn pledge in the House that they will act in this manner, I think that ought to be acceptable. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), I regret to say, stated some propositions that I cannot agree with. I cannot agree with him in the conclusion he reaches in regard to this and many other cases of a cognate character. He gave us an example of remedying a grievance suffered by the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories some years ago with regard to the monopoly clause ; but he evidently forgot that we did not arbitrarily interpret that clause, but we entered into negotiations with the contracting parties that were controlling the situation, and induced them to abandon their rights.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is my proposal exactly, negotiate now respecting the rights in order to get rid of the grievance.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, if the hon. gentleman had only gone that far I should have been glad to support him ; but to say that we should arbitrarily interpret a law in a manner to suit our own side of the question, is going much too far.

Mr. MACLEAN. I did not say that for a moment.

Mr. SPROULE. On the other hand, to say that parliament is above the people and above the contracts, and that we should violate a solemn obligation we entered into with a corporation, I think is also going entirely too far. Now, had the government acted on this suggestion last year, they would have done right. They have agreed to what is, in my opinion, the only remedy, and I am sure the House will sustain the First Minister in that suggestion. Therefore, I think it will be the part of discretion, and it will be the honest way of securing a remedy, if the hon. member for Lisgar, who is entitled to great credit for the perseverance he has displayed in the interest of the people, would accept that suggestion and withdraw his Bill.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). It seems to me this is a very simple question, and there has been a great deal of discussion wide of the mark by one or two hon. gentlemen who made long speeches. A great many matters that are not pertinent to the question were brought in. I think the House understood the hon. member for East York in the same way as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) understood him. He, as an old parliamentarian, must know that he was entirely out of order, because his argument would have nothing to do with the question before the House. I am glad to hear that he did not mean anything like as drastic as he said and as we understood him.

Mr. MACLEAN. Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. That is the way we all understood him. I will now leave it and say nothing more about it. The whole question is rather broader than the statement of it by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), in my opinion. The whole question is not the interpretation of the contract, but it is that we shall not interpret it at all. We have no business, as a House, or as a legislature, to put a construction on a contract that has been entered into.

Mr. MACLEAN. I agree with that.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. If you do agree with it, I do not think it is wise or fair in discussion to bring these other matters into contention for the reason that those hon. gentlemen who stick closely to the question, and who argue it upon that line are placed in an unfair position, because in arguing a lot of other matters it would look as if those of us who are strong on this question are not standing up for the rights of the people. I am one of those that willingly will never consent to one tittle of that sort of legislation, because it is the bulwark of the poor man. The poor man is the man who most often requires the law to protect him within his rights. I grant there is no socialism about me as I understand socialism. There is no socialism about Conservatism, as I understand it ;

otherwise, I would be beginning to think of becoming a Liberal, because I am glad to say that as far as I have observed the legislation of this country, there is no record of the Liberal party being socialistic in their actions in parliament. We all, I think, agree upon that; at all events, excepting the new members in the House, we all agree because we voted upon it last year. I was going to read a few words from the speech of Sir Charles Tupper, our then leader on this side of the House, but I do not think it is necessary. He endorsed entirely, I think, the words of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), as he expressed himself last year, and I think all of the members of this side of the House endorsed him also. To-night, I believe that nearly all of us, I think probably every one would do the same, if the question came to a vote. As the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) quoted from some of the speeches and transactions which occurred at the time of the passing of this contract, there are one or two quotations that I will detain the House by referring to, for a minute or two, because I do not see the pertinency of the hon. gentleman's quotations any more than the pertinency of some of the things the hon. gentleman said. He quoted what Liberal members said in opposition to this contract at that time. He did not quote, as the Prime Minister has remarked, from these discussions one thing pertinent to the question, or that would help us in the consideration of it. As great a lawyer as Edward Blake would seem to have been satisfied with it. He left us in this dilemma as to what the contract does mean, because, I agree with the hon. Solicitor General and with the right hon. Prime Minister that it is doubtful what the construction is. But, the hon. member for Lisgar went on to speak as if the Liberals were all against the proposition. He forgets that the Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, while endeavouring to grapple with this question, made a much larger offer, an offer of 50,000,000 acres of land, $25,000,000 cash, and 4 per cent on whatever it might require beyond that, and asked for tenders upon that basis. So that the House will know that all the difficulties and all the extravagances, if there were extravagances in regard to the terms given by the Canadian Pacific Railway, were not upon our side of the House. The hon. gentleman read from the speech of the present Prime Minister of Ontario, but he forgot to read the recantation of that hon. gentleman. I will read it for his edification, because he ought to read what he said then, and what he says now. He was then dealing with a matter which was surrounded with difficulties, and which awaited the test of the future. He was in opposition to the proposition, because he then took the Liberal view of it. Mr. Ross, speaking in one of the constituencies in Ontario within a year past, said:

I remember when the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed, we thought Sir John Macdonald was undertaking a herculean enterprise, one which would crush the country. I think, perhaps, he was right, and we were wrong. I think, perhaps, he builded more wisely than he knew. No one will say to-day that the building of the railway was a mistake. Canada to-day would be a very small country, would be weaker in the councils of the empire, would scarcely be a confederated Domiaion, as it is, were it not for the Pacific Railway.

In discussing a matter such as this I would prefer that we should bring no party politics into it. I merely make reference to these two statements because the hon. gentleman saw fit to bring before the House, and to the attention of the Prime Minister, portions of the discussion which took place then, that seemed to be, from his standpoint, evidence that the action of the Conservative party in reference to this great enterprise, this herculean task, which was undertaken by the great man who is here no more to give us his counsel, has not verified the anticipations of those who projected it. I wanted to give the views of one of the strongest men who existed at that time, and who still gives his counsel, wisdom and best efforts to the province of Ontario. I would prefer, and I always endeavour to carry out that view in discussing matters like this, where there are no party politics, that we should deal with them simply on their merits as the right hon. gentleman has done to-night. In his speech a year ago he went into some other subjects. This is not a matter of party politics. It is one of those things where both parties should feel some of the difficulties and responsibilities, and unless it is a matter in which party politics are concerned, I think the wiser and better plan is to deal with the subject just as we have with this, and pitch into each other on party questions.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to go very far afield in the short remarks which I desire to make in regard to this subject, and I would not delay the House by participating in the debate at all, were it not that I think it is an extremely important subject, and it affects particularly that part of the country which I am supposed to represent in the cabinet. It is not by any means a new subject, as we all know, and it does not seem to me that it is a subject upon which there can be very much difference of opinion. I would be surprised if any member of the House of Commons of Canada would be found to take the position that this parliament would be justified in altering a contract which has been deliberately entered into. What certain members of parliament thought and said when this contract was passed, has absolutely nothing to do with the question. What this man or that man said as to the

intention of an Act of parliament has nothing whatever to do with the Act when it is passed. When a contract is made by this parliament with a corporation or individual, it makes no difference whether that corporation or individual turns out to be unpopular or not, that contract must stand absolutely. We have no more rights as a parliament to pass an Act interpreting that contract than you would have, Mr. Speaker, to place your own interpretation upon a contract that you might make with me in private life. For my part, I take most emphatic issue with the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) when he says that the House of Commons is supreme in the sense that it has a right to break its contracts or violate public faith.

Mr. MACLEAN. The member for East York did not say that, nor did not advocate it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think he spoke for the Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN. I did not speak for the Bill.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) is very unfortunate then in the language he used.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, he is not.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman told us, with great vigour, that parliament is supreme, and that parliament has the right and the power. We all know it has the legal power.

Mr. MACLEAN. By concession for concession.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman did not mean that parliament had the power rightfully to alter contracts, then his remarks were totally irrelevant, and could not convey any intelligent idea to those who listened to him. The question was well and clearly put by my hon. friend the Solicitor General, and by my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale). It is not a question as to what interpretation should be put on this contract. Parliament has no right to put any interpretation on this contract. The interpretation of a contract made betwen two parties must be decided by a judicial tribunal, independent of both parties. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) said truly that if this course were taken, it is not so much the large corporations that would suffer in this country as the poorer classes, because the trend of legislation in all countries shows that injury to the public credit, injury to confidence in contracts, injury to confidence in investments, brings its misfortune first upon the poor classes, and particularly upon the labouring men. We have had many discussions in this House as to the benefit conferred upon the country by large sums of money being brought in here for investment. I fancy there is no man who has given careful consideration to the affairs of Canada who will not agree, that there is perhaps no country in the world which is in a position to profit so largely as Canada would, by the investment of capital from other countries where it has accumulated and where it cannot be as profitably used as it can be here. I can conceive of no more fatal blow that we could strike at that confidence, which we are happy to say has always been displayed in regard to Canadian securities, than that we should deliberately assume the power to alter to even the extent of one letter a contract that has been deliberately entered into by the parliament of Canada. As has been well said, the Liberal party has no reason to be apologists for this contract in any sense whatever. But, Sir, the Liberal party called upon to administer the affairs of this country must administer them with absolute honour and good faith, so far as the public contracts are concerned.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have had occasion to experience some difficulties in connection with this question. I have addressed public audiences when it would have been more popular for me to use such language as was used by the hon. member for East York, even though I did not wish to be responsible for the meaning of the words I used, as he did not wish to be responsible. I have been called upon to address many audiences where it would have been more popular for me to assume the attitude taken by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) and endeavour to confuse the minds of the people, so as to lead them in some way, directly or indirectly, to suppose that there was a way in which this contract could be got around which would relieve them from its effect. I am here to say, that never upon any occasion have I ever taken any other stand than that which I take to-night upon this question. I have expressed the opinion, and I express the opinion now, that I hope and trust there will never be a government in Canada that will be prepared to take the responsibility of introducing legislation to vary or change contracts which have been fairly and honestly entered into by the parliament of this country. So far as my view of the matter is concerned, it is entirely a question of law. I have been asked a number of times as to what position the government would take in regard to this matter, and I have always said, that so far as I was concerned, my view was that the interpretation of the contract must be made by a judicial tribunal, and I further said, that so soon as the twenty years had expired from the date of the ratification of the contract, then, so soon as any municipality was

in a position to bring about a state of circumstances that would give rise to a test case, we would be quite prepared to have that test case carried to court at the expense of the government. I have no doubt that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister is quite in accord with that view, and I believe that nine-tenths of the members of the House will also be in accord with it.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gnetleman (Hon. Mr. Sifton) has charged me with not stating my views intelligently. I think I did make myself intelligent, and I received an approving nod from the leader of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. I protest.

Mr. MACLEAN. I received an approving nod from the leader of the House when I said that he claimed as one of the great credits to his party, that he had negotiated with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the abandonment of some of their monopolies and the reduction of their rates. These gentlemen opposite have gone up and down the country making stump speeches to the same effect.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order.

Mr. MACLEAN. What ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Spoken.

Mr. MACLEAN. There is an amendment moved, and I have a perfect right to speak to the amendment. One reason why this Bill should not be hoisted for six months is, that parliament can maintain the sanctity of contracts and still right the wrongs of the settlers of the North-west. That is what this parliament can do, and that is what I advocate here to-night. It may be by compensation, and even if it has to be by compensation let it be done. Whatever way it be done, the Liberal party, in doing it, will only be vindicating the policy they announced twenty years ago, when they denounced this contract as an injustice to the settler. Even at this late date it is incumbent on the Liberal party to rectify that wrong. My argument was wholly on the line of the Crow's Nest Pass deal, namely, that when the Canadian Pacific Railway next comes to the government they can say to them : We will entertain the proposition you are making, but we want you to surrender that monopoly clause, which is a grievance to the people of the North-west Territories. That is what I argued, and if that is socialism, I am sorry to hear that the Minister of the Interior is not a believer in that kind of socialism, and that he tells the public of Canada and the settlers in the North-west that there is nothing else for the members of this House to do than to maintain the syndicate contract. They have more than that to do. Their duty is to rectify the wrongs of the settlers. These wrongs can be rectified, and the duty and responsibility of rectifying them is upon hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see that the House has apparently taken the position—judging from what most of the speakers have said—that it does not intend to interfere in this matter. I am afraid that a good deal of the indifference of members of the House is due to the feeling that it is not their ox that is gored. As long as it is only a North-west matter, and does not affect the rest of Canada, it is a question for the courts. But if it were a matter which concerned Eastern Canada, and concerned it very deeply, I think ways and means would be found for seeing that if we went to the courts, the play would not be with loaded dice at any rate. We are willing to go to the courts, but we want the law straight to go to the courts on.

Let me give the House a few figures to show what the present condition of affairs means to the North-west. There is at the present time a law of the North-west assembly taxing every quarter section of land under ownership within a statute labour district at the rate of $2.50. Under the law for the organization of school districts, lands owned by homesteaders are taxed at an average rate of $3.50 per quarter section. There are thirty-six sections in a township, sixteen of these belonging to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The company's exemption from taxation in each statute labour township amounts to $160, and there are in the North-west I think not less than 300 statute labour districts; so that the total exemption of the company from taxation in statute labour districts amounts to nearly $50,000 a year. There are about 500 school districts in the Territories. The country school districts are allowed to be five miles square. That would give at least twelve sections of Canadian Pacific Railway land in each school district. The average taxation is about $3.50 per quarter section. Taking for the purposes of calculation 300 as the number of school districts in the Territories, and not 500, we find that the company's exemptions from taxation in school districts amount to about another $50,000 a year. The point I want to make is this, that there is a tax of $6 on every quarter section of land owned by a settler or homesteader, and we claim that the adjoining section owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should pay an equal amount. What I want to impress on this House is that that means something to the people of the east. Ever since the North-west Territories were organized, the support of the schools and the improvement of the roads

have been carried on by means of a subsidy supplied out of the Dominion treasury, and year after year the plea has been made to this government by the government of the Territories that, because of this exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway lands from taxation the Dominion treasury should supply the deficiency, and it has been supplying the deficiency and will have to continue to supply it as long as the deficiency exists. Do not make the mistake that this eastern country is not interested in the question of the taxation of the Canadian Pacific Railway lands. This eastern country is paying every year out of the general treasury because of that exemption. The people of the North-west are bearing part of the unjust burden, and you are paying the other part; and it is your question as well as ours whether you are going to continue to bear that burden or make the Canadian Pacific Railway Company bear its share.

The House is instructed that it has no right to interpret its own contract, and that if we touch this contract we break the good faith of this country, and do ourselves a great deal of injury. I hope we will never want to break an honest contract, but I trust that we will never submit to be buncoed by the misinterpretation of a statute. The right hon. the First Minister said that he agreed with the understanding of the House at the time, as that understanding was explained by the hon. member who moved the Bill, but unfortunately that was not what was embodied in the contract. If that be the case, I say that the understanding of the House at the time was our side of the contract, and it is our business to see that that understanding is maintained, and we are not acting fairly by the people if we do not. This House is not an ordinary party to a contract. When, in the course of debate, questions are addressed to ministers, the positions taken by ministers with regard to those questions, as taken down by 'Hansard,' are accepted as interpreting the law. That should be so, and is so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not so.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I will have to accept the correction, for I certainly am not in a position to give instances to the contrary, but I know of instances in which such statements have been accepted as interpreting the law. I say that the bargain made at the time was understood by this country and parliament as having a certain effect, namely, that on the 14th February, now passed, the exemption from taxation terminated, and I say it is the duty of this House to see that the people are not robbed of $50,000 or $100,000 a year through a misinterpretation of the contract.

For my part, I do not admit that there is properly any necessity for the introduction of this Bill. I do not admit that there is any necessity for any interpretation of the contract, or any room for any misinterpretation of it. The necessity for the Bill has arisen from the doubts thrown upon the meaning of the contract by members of the government, as stated in the preamble. I am at the disadvantage of not being learned in the law, and of taking a position entirely opposite to that taken by some members who are learned in the law, but I say that the words in this Act can have only one meaning, according to my understanding of the English language. The words in dispute, as mentioned by the Solicitor General, are :

> Shall also be free from such taxation for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown.

I say that the word 'grant' means 'gift.' That is the dictionary meaning of the word, and it is not right to import into that word the technical legal meaning of 'patent.' I say that the land was given when the Act was assented to, and that the twenty years exemption has to run from that time. Do you tell me that the ownership did not begin until certain acts had been done ? But does not the homesteader, who makes a homestead entry, become in law the proprietor of his land at that moment, although he has not completed the homestead duties, and need not complete them for three years afterwards ? And is he not taxable for that land, as soon as he enters it as a homestead. And if he does not pay his taxes until he gets his patent, the land is then sold, and the back taxes are collected out of the proceeds.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no such law. The land cannot be sold for the taxes.

Mr. OLIVER. When a homesteader enters for his land, that land thereupon becomes assessable, and is assessed. An assessment is placed against that land each succeeding year, and if the taxes are not paid until the patent is secured, then the land can be and is sold for the taxes. Of course it cannot be sold until the patent is secured, but those taxes stand against it until it is patented.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. The taxes assessed against the land before it is patented cannot be collected from that land. No title can be conveyed in the case of land sold for taxes assessed before the patent is issued.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I have seen hundreds of cases of lands advertised for sale for taxes, and no doubt so has the

hon. the Minister of the Interior, and you will find printed at the end of the list 'unpatented.'

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They cannot give a title for these lands.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). They may not, but they are sold for taxes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No one who goes to a sale for taxes and knows anything of the subject will buy any land that is unpatented. Time and again in the courts of Manitoba such sales have been set aside, and the most emphatic declarations made by the courts that lands cannot be sold or titles conveyed in respect of taxes assessed before the patent is issued. The provincial legislature can make the debt a personal one, but cannot convey the lands.

Mr. OLIVER. As regards the point whether land that is homesteaded can be taxed before it is patented, I cannot tell you what the law is, as I am not a lawyer. I can only tell you what is done. There is another case. Land is purchased sometimes under an agreement of sale. In such case, who has the ownership of that land, and who is taxed for it up to the time the agreement is completed and the last money paid ?

I say that the ownership of the land for the purposes of this Act commenced when the Act was assented to. As the company could negotiate its business on the strength of the money grant that was given by the Act, just so it could negotiate its business on the strength of the land grants given by the Act. It was given then, and the company proceeded forthwith to do business on it, because it was given. I am astonished to hear the contention that this land grant is not taxable until twenty years after it is patented. I understand that there are members who make that contention. If there are, do they understand the position in which it places them ? Do they understand the position in which it places this country ? Do they know that if that contention is admitted, so far from this exemption having expired at the time this whole country expected it to expire, inasmuch as not an acre of that land has been patented the twenty years exemption has not begun to run; and this country is robbed —I say robbed—for at least twenty years to come of whatever taxes they should have received, but for that exemption. Surely, the Prime Minister is not going to take that position ? Then, is he going to leave it to the chance of a judicial decision on a bunco Act as to whether we shall be robbed for that twenty years or not ? I cannot agree with him, that that is the duty of parliament or of this government. I cannot agree with him that we can afford to stand aside and let ourselves be robbed to any such tune as that ; because, whatever may be the strict legal interpretation of that Act, neither he nor any other man can contend that it was in the mind of parliament—can contend that it was not furthest away from the mind of parliament at the passing of this Act—that any such contingency should arise. Would any man argue for a moment that, if it had been presented to parliament that that exemption was liable to extend for forty years it would have been granted ? Nobody would contend such a thing.

Mr. MACLEAN. Oh, yes, they do.

Mr. OLIVER. No one.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, I have heard it tonight.

Mr. OLIVER. Not with the cold facts before them ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) means that the Tories would have given it for fifty years if they had been asked.

Mr. OLIVER. I say that if there had been any such idea in the mind of parliament at the time, it would have been brought out in the debate. But there was no such idea brought out in debate, nor was there any such idea in the mind of the country at that time. Those who desire, then, to take the position that this country is liable to the chance of a judicial decision on an Act which they themselves say they do not understand, may say that that is their duty ; but, so far as I am concerned, it is not my duty as a member of this House, as I understand it. I claim that the position of the members of this House is not the same as that of a private individual. It is the business of this House to see that justice is done to the people of this country ; it is the business of this House to see that Acts which are faulty when they are passed are amended and made right, so that there shall be justice and substantial justice to the people of this country. This House is taking too great a responsibility when it says : We will do nothing in the matter ; we will throw it into the courts and let the people take chances on a judicial decision on an Act which we do not pretend to understand, though we know and every man knows, what was meant when the Act was passed by the parliament who passed it. It has not been shown that there was anything different in the mind of parliament when the Act was passed than I have stated. If it can be shown that parliament had any other idea, that parliament thought exemption would extend for twenty-five or thirty or forty or fifty years, it was competent for any hon. member to show that. But it cannot be shown. There is no doubt that the country and parliament, on behalf of the country, made that bargain with the full belief that the exemption from taxation would terminate on the 15th February, 1901. Then, if the understanding of parliament is not distinctly and clearly provided for in the Act,

it is the duty, as it is the right—and as it is admitted to be the right—of this parliament to make the Act as parliament understood it to be, and thereby protect the interests of the people of the western country and protect the treasury in which both east and west are interested.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I ventured to express dissent to a remark of my hon. friend from Alberta, and I only rise for the purpose of explaining why I did so. Like him, I have not the good fortune or misfortune, that being a matter of opinion, of being a member of the legal profession. But I think that the principle involved in the Bill now before the House is so simple that even a layman could understand it and find reasons for voting against it. I understand my hon. friend to lay down the principle that the intention of parliament respecting an Act is to be learned from the discussions which took place in parliament. To that I said 'no.' Now, I venture to say that it is not necessary that one should be a member of the legal profession to reach the conclusion that the meaning of an Act of parliament must be gathered from within the four corners of the Act itself. As to coming to the reports of the debates of parliament and finding out what A, B, or C said he meant by that Act, I think no court would entertain that idea. I can give one or two notable instances in which that point had to be considered. One case, if I mistake not, arose in connection with this very contract. I remember, though I need hardly say I was not a member of this parliament at that time, that the question came up as to the meaning of the clause which has been referred to by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), providing that within a certain period no lines of railway should be constructed south of the Canadian Pacific Railway. When the matter was before parliament, the question was asked what that meant. I think I am correct in saying that a very prominent man who occupied an independent position in this House, Hon. Wm. McDougall, said he attached great importance to that and wanted an explanation of it. Then Sir John Macdonald, replying, said that that clause could only affect the North-west Territories, which were subject to the government and under the control of this parliament, but could not affect the organized province of Manitoba; and he used the very famous expression, 'You cannot check Manitoba.' Yet, when, a few years afterwards, the province of Manitoba, under that interpretation, tried to exercise the right to charter lines running to the United States, we were told, nothwithstanding the assurance of Sir John Macdonald, that that was not the meaning of the contract, and it must be interpreted as it was, and not as Sir John Macdonald or anybody else said it should be.

Mr. OLIVER. Might I interrupt to suggest a correction, and that is that the action of the government of Sir John Macdonald in disallowing the Manitoba railway charters was not come to on a point of law, but was a matter of policy.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And I believe that the government of Sir John Macdonald determined that they could not allow the claim of Manitoba until they had obtained the consent of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is the way out of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That confirms my statement that not what Sir John Macdonald said but what the Act of parliament said must be the law of the land. I can give the hon. gentleman another illustration in a matter with which he is not familiar, because it arose in the history of my own province. It arose at a time when the office of Attorney General was occupied by an able lawyer, who afterwards became Prime Minister of this Dominion, the late lamented Sir John Thompson. The contract was made with a railway company, that is the class of contract in which these troubles arise chiefly. A question arose as to the meaning of a certain clause. Sir John Thompson gave his opinion, offhand, that it meant a certain thing. The House accepted that, and the country accepted it. Not many weeks afterwards Sir John Thompson, in his capacity as Attorney General, was called upon to interpret that contract, and he interpreted it to mean, not what he had said it was, but what, in his judgment as a lawyer, the written Act of parliament meant. But nobody ever assumed that because Sir John Thompson said in parliament it meant something else, therefore it must be held to mean something else. Now, I think that is so simple a matter that even I, as a layman, may properly come to a conclusion at once. We are not called upon to discuss whether the Canadian Pacific Railway contract is a good or a bad contract; we are not called upon even to discuss, however much we may sympathise with the hon. member for Alberta as to the grievance of the North-west, we are not called upon to consider that to-night.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). Does not the hon. minister sympathize with the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) also?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, the hon. member for Lisgar was said by somebody to-night to be a socialist; and my right hon. friend said something about socialism which gave offence to the distinguished socialist from East York (Mr. Maclean), who said he was a socialist of a certain kind. The right hon. premier did not

object to socialism of a good kind. There may be a wholesome socialism; but the kind of socialism the Prime Minister objected to was the socialism of this Bill, which proposes that we, one of the parties to a contract, should interpret it in our own interest against the other party. That is a kind of socialism which this parliament has never adopted.

Mr. KENDALL. It is not socialism.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend from Cape Breton, who, I believe, represents a good kind of socialism, dissents at once from that. Now, I want to say again that we are not called upon to consider to-night whether this was a good or a bad contract, or what Mr. Blake said, or what anybody else said; and we are not called upon to consider whether the North-west has a grievance to-day in this matter. The only thing that we are called upon to consider is whether this is a matter for parliament, or whether this is a matter for the courts of the country, to deal with. I think the hon. member for Alberta made a pretty good argument to show what this means. I think if I were chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada I might be disposed to agree with him; but we are none of us here exercising the functions of the Supreme Court. If there is one thing more than another which we all recognize, it is that the interpretation of contracts shall be determined by the courts and not by parliament. That would be true, even if we had no contract interest ourselves. But when we have, the very fact that we are ourselves a party to a contract, and that we propose to interpret it against the other party—surely, I think the hon. member for Lisgar will not press that matter any further. I agree with all that was said by my colleague, the Minister of the Interior, as to the sacredness of these contracts. Let the idea once get abroad that the parliament of Canada is going to undertake to interpret its contracts for itself rather than submit them to the judicial tribunals of the country, and I venture to say from that time forward there would not be the slightest faith in anything this parliament might do upon which a dollar might be required for any public purpose in Canada.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I think the hon. gentleman has furnished, in his brief speech, the strongest possible reason why this Bill should be passed. He has laid down the proposition that the courts shall take no cognizance whatever of a debate that may have occurred, or of the understanding that prevailed when a contract was made. Now, this is not a verbal understanding, let me remind the Minister of Finance. There were not certain words passed verbally between members of both sides of the House and the syndicate; but the understanding was taken down in black and white by 'Hansard,' and remains in 'Hansard' up to the present time. I do not think even the hon. gentleman himself will contend that there is not some doubt at least in that clause itself. He will not contend that it is absolutely sure that the twenty years does not run from the date of the contract. I think the Solicitor General was willing to go that far, and he is the only one, so far as I know, who ever made that admission.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. What admission?

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). That the language cannot be interpreted to mean that the twenty years began with the ratification of the contract.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Undoubtedly.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I claim that you can read into that clause easily, any layman, at least, can read into that clause, what it did mean; and certainly the many able members on both sides of the House who spoke when that contract went through, understood what it meant. Is the Solicitor General, or is any legal man to-day, able to say that they did not so understand it, or can he say that his opinion or the opinion of any other man at present, is better than the opinion of the members who sat on both sides of the House when that contract went through, and who clearly declared—because I quoted their utterances—that they understood that the twenty years would date from the ratification of that contract?

If, therefore, the proposition of the Minister of Finance is correct, that the courts must take no cognizance whatever of the understanding, not a verbal understanding, but a distinct printed understanding at that time, then why should we not pass an Act to-night and declare what parliament did intend? I do not propose, so far as I am concerned, as a representative of the North-west, to take any risk in the matter; I do not propose to agree to a reference of this point to the courts. I claim, with the hon. member for Alberta, that it is perfectly clear what parliament intended. Parliament is supreme, far above any superior court, or even any judicial committee of the Privy Council, and let parliament say to-night what was intended. Let parliament protect the vested interests of the people. Why, we hear about 'the monstrous proposition of interfering with vested interests of these stockholders.' Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that when these bonds were sold, the men who bought them had the right to investigate that contract, and if they were honest men, if they were shrewd men, they had the very clauses of that contract before them, and having bought their bonds after reading the clauses of the contract, then, on their own heads let the consequences rest. The duty of this House is not to pro-

tect the bondholders of Holland and other countries, but the interests of the people, and it is for their interest that we stand up to-night.

I am not afraid of being called a socialist to-night, I am proud to be a socialist, if socialism is standing up for the interests of the people. I do not think, from what we see here, that many people understand what socialism is. What is socialism? It is serving the interests of the people as against private or corporate interests; it is taking hold of public franchises and running them in the interests of the people. Is that a crime? Is it anything for which any man need be ashamed? I do not think it is. So far as I am concerned to-night, I am proud to stand here and allow the Prime Minister to call me a socialist, because I stand up for the interests of the people as against corporate interests. The point, however, is this: Why should not these patents be issued at once?

Mr. MACLEAN. That is the point.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I have a resolution in my desk, written a week ago, that I propose to bring up when the House is moved into Supply, declaring that the patents issue at once. I want these patents issued. I listened with pride to my hon. friend from Alberta when he said that the proposition of the right hon. premier was a monstrous one, that the twenty years period must date from the issue of the patents.

The PRIME MINISTER. I never said that.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I will read from the hon. gentleman's speech of last session.

> I am not prepared to say that the argument of my hon. friend is right or that it is wrong. It may be right, I do not think it is. I think it is only from the date of the issue of the patents from the Crown that the grant is to be construed.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). The patents have not been issued up to the present time, and it may go on for ever.

The PRIME MINISTER. I said I would not undertake an expression of opinion. I did not say my own view was clear, that is a question for the courts.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I would not put the Premier in any position that he does not occupy, but surely the English language is plain and understandable. He said it was his own opinion that the twenty years period would date from the issue of the patents. Up to the present time not one patent for a single acre of land which has not been sold by the company has been issued. What position is the hon. gentleman in, according to the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver)? The government have been in power for five years, and these patents have not been issued. Even, if you accept the explanation of the Prime Minister they have allowed five years to go, and if the patents are issued, now at least five years have been added to the burdens of the people in that country. That is the consideration that I want to place before parliament. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is not disposed to sympathize with me, and the hon. Solicitor General intimates that he thinks I am not sincere. I say that the hon. Minister of Finance is not disposed to sympathize with me, because I have been designated as a socialist.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I found no fault with you.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I think I am entitled to this credit, that I have stood up here session after session in this House and have done what I could. What personal axe can I have to grind? Is my position right or is it wrong? When the fact exists that the taxpayers in that country are paying (and if the interpretation of the Prime Minister is allowed to go and if they are not to issue these patents, they will be obliged to pay for all time to come) double taxes that they should not pay for school-houses, roads, bridges and other considerations, is it right that such a condition of things should be permitted to continue? I want to say it now, and I am glad the House is listening to me, that this is a question which we cannot afford to dally with. The people are not going to be fooled any longer. It is idle to say that it shall be referred to the courts. I am not willing to agree that it shall be referred to the courts. I suppose that makes no difference, as the government will do as it likes anyway. I am here as the representative of 50,000 or 60,000 constituents, and a representative man from Manitoba and the North-west Territories, to say that the people are watching the government and watching parliament very closely on this matter, that they will hold this parliament responsible if they are going to be obliged to pay double taxes for all time to come in order that this great corporation, into whose lap we have poured our millions, into whose lap we have poured $75,000,000 worth of land, in order that they shall go on for all time to come to take toll from the people of the country as they have been tolling the people, and as they will continue to toll the people unless parliament does something. This is a serious question, and I most earnestly hope the government will reconsider the proposition to give this Bill the six months' hoist.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I am fully in accord with the Bill before the House. If it is understood, here, to-night, that the people of the North-west Territories settle and perform the duties of settlement while the rich corpora-

tions which own railways and lands around them escaped taxation, I think the best thing we can do is to recall our immigration agents in Europe, because I am satisfied that we will get very few emigrants to come in and settle, and perform all the statute labour and all the settlement duties in that country while allowing the wealthy corporations to get the benefit of it. I think it is time that this was fully understood. I think the government, instead of throwing this question over by giving it the six months' hoist, ought to take it into their serious consideration and see whether there is not something in the Bill. I think there is, and I shall therefore support the Bill.

Mr. LEIGHTON G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, owing to the heated deliverances of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), I feel it necessary that I should make some remarks in regard to this Bill. If the subject before the House had been to the effect that freight rates should be lowered, that some grievance which existed in the North-west Territories should be remedied as against the Canadian Pacific Railway, I would be inclined to agree with what the hon. gentleman has said, but, how, in the name of common sense, applying the ordinary interpretation of the English language to the Bill which he has introduced, he can apply his last remarks made in this House, I am entirely at a loss to understand. The question is whether we, as the parliament of Canada, shall interpret an Act which was merely an Act of ratification and which, in effect, is not an interpretation of an Act as he and the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) would have us believe, but is in reality an interpretation of the contract which was entered into between the government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway, which contract required the ratification of parliament to make it effective and operative. Now, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), and this is the part which struck me as being the most irrelevant and erroneous, said that hon. members on both sides of the House stated what in their opinion, was the meaning of that clause in the contract. What has that got to do with the judicial, or proper, or fair interpretation of that clause? We have not before us, we cannot have before us, what took place in the negotiations between the government and the other contracting parties, which, in this case, was the Canadian Pacific Railway. Is it fair, therefore, for us to interpret the meaning of the contract pursuant to a discussion which took place in the House, when we are not in a position to know what the other contracting party has to say. It is manifestly unfair, because, they cannot be said, although perhaps it is alleged that they have representatives on the floor of parliament occasionally, that they were in that sense represented so as to say or put before the people of the country what their contentions were in arriving at the conclusion which was embodied in the words of that clause of the contract. Looking at it as an abstract proposition, as the hon. member for Lisgar put it in his last remarks, is it fair that we should sit down here and interpret that contract according to a discussion which took place between the respective leaders or members of one party or the other? I go a long way with the hon. member for Lisgar. I commend him in many instances for the effort he has made on behalf of the people of the North-west Territories. I think they have grievances, that they have grievances in regard to freight rates, and they may have a grievance in regard to this very question, which has been thrown into this discussion, that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be made to pay taxes upon these lands which were granted to them twenty-one years ago and upon which, I dare say, they may have raised money; but the question is: Is a contract which was made between these two parties, namely, the government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway, to be interpreted by one of the contracting parties without the other being present at all, on what we may call, in legal phraseology, an ex-parte application? We are not, as the hon. member for Alberta says, asked to amend a statute, because that is not the case that the hon. member for Lisgar presents, or could present. If it were the amendment of a statute it might be different. What he asks us to do is to interpret a contract which was ratified by parliament twenty years ago. That puts it in an entirely different light and makes it an entirely different case which is presented to parliament in this Bill. I therefore feel myself absolutely constrained, speaking as a lawyer, to say that I would not be one to interpret the Act, either as between a corporation and the government, or as between two parties in the absence of one.

I am furthermore constrained to that conclusion by reason of the offer which is made by the government to pay the cost of interpreting that Act in the courts. It may be said that naturally a lawyer would do that because it brings grist to his mill, but although we lawyers have to live, that is not my reason for supporting the proposition on this occasion. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) says: That may be a lawyer's position, but that is not the position of a statesman whose aim is to right the grievances of the people. I think there is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says, but is this an opportune time to do what he suggests? Can we with credit to ourselves as the parliament of Canada enact the legislation which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) proposes; can we interpret that contract to be in our favour in

the absence of the other contracting parties ? A proper tribunal is given to us before which that contract shall be construed, and if we were to assume to interfere with it ourselves, it would be something that no British legislature has ever done before. As the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has said, it makes it awkward to discuss this question when so many erroneous ideas are imported into the consideration of a plain proposition, namely : Whether or not we shall interpret a contract which was made twenty years ago and ratified by the parliament of Canada. We hear of the loss of money which has to be made up by reason of this contract, and we are told it was a bad contract and ought never to have been entered into. What has that got to do with the question at issue ? I say, Sir, that viewing the Bill as it stands and apart from all the erroneous and irrelevant discussion regarding it, I am constrained to support the motion to give the Bill the six months' hoist. I do so because I do not believe that with credit to ourselves and with respect to the country to which we belong, we can take upon ourselves to interpret any contract which has been entered into, we being one of the contracting parties.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). I am not exactly satisfied with the position that this question has assumed to-night. I do not sympathize at all with the position taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson), who has moved this Bill. I do not believe that he represents true socialism when he tries to do that which is unjust, and it is quite evident to us English speaking people and French speaking people that we cannot be the judge and the jury and the witnesses in this case. There are two sides to it, but one thing is evident, and that is that something ought to be done, and ought to be done quickly to settle this matter. This everlasting drift that appears to surround a question of such moment to a large number of the people of Canada ought to be made disappear at the very first opportunity, and therefore, it is that I say that the resolution for the six months' hoist is not going to remove the grievances that the people are subject to. While I do not think it is the duty of parliament to put its construction upon that agreement, I do think it is the duty of the government to have a legal interpretation placed upon it, and that immediately. I do not believe that the poor settler who has been induced to take up lands in the North-west should have the onus of moving in this matter until his risks were guaranteed against. If I in my individual capacity were a party to that contract, and I felt my rights were being jeopardised by delay, I would take the first opportunity that presented itself to find where I stood and to get a judicial decision upon it. It is the duty of some authority in the state to get this question settled as soon as possible. I am constrained to vote against the Bill which, in principle, is vicious, dishonest and unjust. But while we may be compelled to vote for the amendment, which puts this case out of court for six months, I trust the government will assume the responsibility which attaches to them as a party to the contract of finding out where we stand, so that justice may be done to those people who are suffering in the far west.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish for the information of the House to explain a certain point which has been in dispute.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) can make a personal explanation, but he cannot raise any question for debate.

Mr. OLIVER. I merely wish to read a section which I think would clear a certain point, and I wish to have the consent of the House for that.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can do so with the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. It is on the question as to whether land is assessable while under homestead entry, and before patent is issued. I read from section 5 of chapter 101, Revised Statutes Manitoba, 1891, Vol. 2 :

> Crown lands so occupied, whether under right of purchase or under homestead or pre-emeption entry, and unpatented land vested in or held by Her Majesty, which may be hereby hereafter or may have been heretofore sold or agreed to be sold, to any person or corporation, or which may be located as a free grant, homestead or pre-emption, shall be liable to taxation from the date of such homestead or pre-emeption entry, location, sale or grant.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). Mr. Speaker, I am too well aware of the feeling of the people of the North-west in this matter, and of the concern and fear with which they view this matter of tax exemption, to look upon the question lightly. I am sorry that a Bill of such importance as this should be introduced in such a shape that it is impossible that it can receive the endorsation of the House. It seems to me that a member of parliament to vote for the Bill must first deny the cardinal principle of responsible government. We are asked to change an Act of parliament which was passed in 1881, and which was proposed by a government which retained the confidence of the people of Canada from that time until the year 1896. In 1881 the Liberal party was in opposition, and they condemned this clause. The then opposition, now the government, still holds that this clause is an outrageous one, and we have a right to look to the government as the trustees of the people to guard the people's rights. I may say that the people

of the North-west are fearful that their rights are not being attended to. I would like to see such a course taken as would give confidence to the people of the west, and I would like to see the government say to this great corporation: You shall have all that is yours by virtue of this exemption; you shall have your pound of flesh, but not one drop of blood. I cannot understand why the socialists have been brought into this argument and referred to in connection with this Bill. I have too much faith in the socialistic tendencies of the present time to wish to see them slightingly referred to in any way, and I see nothing in the legislative progress which has been made by socialism to cause it to be connected with a Bill of this kind. Taking the most socialistic countries, taking England and New Zealand, you will find that all the measures adopted along socialistic lines have been measures that in no way denied the responsibility of the people's representatives, that did not expropriate without due recompense, that did nothing antagonistic to the well-settled ideas of British law. Some previous speakers have referred to this contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as if it were an ordinary Act of parliament that could be amended session after session; but it is not so. When it was passed it became a contract, and I can see no strength in the argument that before the matter has been referred to the courts at all, this parliament has any right to interfere in regard to the interpretation of that contract.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to give a silent vote on this question, particularly because I find my inclination in conflict with my common sense. My inclination, both natural and political, would lead me to support the Bill before the House; but my common sense prevents me accepting the premises laid down in the Bill. I read one of the clauses, which is to this effect:

> And whereas it appears from the debates which occurred when the said contract was before parliament, that the exemptions was intended to cover a period of not more than twenty years from the date of the said contract.

Now, I go very nearly the whole length with my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) on this question, and I do not find myself on the general question at all in agreement with the several members of the government who have spoken to-night, and the several other gentlemen who have laid particular stress upon the peculiar sanctity of contracts. It may be that having lived so long in the North-west and knowing so well the condition of the settlers in that country, the injustice that would be done them, should the possibility suggested by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) be realized, and the courts find that the period of exemption does not commence until the date of the issue of the patents, looms up too largely before my eyes. However, I think the Bill is unnecessary; I think the question should go before the courts. Should the courts decide that the exemption period does not commence until the date of the issue of the patents, I would be ready, should I then have a seat in this House, to vote to void that condition of the contract, because it would subject the settlers to too great an injustice, and because it would give the company profits never contemplated by parliament. Nevertheless, if the Bill before the House expressed the common-sense view that the exemption should begin at the date when the company came into possession of the lands, I would be prepared to support it.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). If you think the House would accept that proposition, I think I would be willing to so amend the Bill.

Mr. SCOTT. If the hon. gentleman can change his Bill to express that view, I will take great pleasure in supporting it. It seems to me entirely unreasonable to maintain that the period of exemption provided in the Canadian Pacific Railway contract commenced before the company could begin to enjoy the exemption; and they could certainly not begin to enjoy the exemption until they were in possession of the lands. I listened carefully to the able address made by the hon. member for Lisgar, and I have read very carefully the speech he made on this subject in this House one year ago. Those speeches would certainly lead any one to believe that the debate upon the contract which took place in this House in the year 1880-1 showed unquestionably that it was the intention of parliament that the exemption period should commence on the date of the signing of the contract on the 15th of February, 1881; and I must confess to you that I was considerably surprised, after I came down to attend this session and went to the Library and scanned the debates of that period, to find that the very opposite was the case; and I think it is very unfortunate that speeches made by responsible members of this House should mislead other members, as an admission made to-night by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) would show that he was misled. I think it is unfortunate that members of this House and the people of this country should be misled by speeches made by reputably responsible members of this House, and scattered broadcast throughout the country.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). You do not charge that I misquoted any hon. member from 'Hansard,' do you?

Mr. SCOTT. I make no charge at all, but I leave the House to judge whether the speech made by the hon. member for Lisgar last session and the speech he made to-

night would not lead any one who listened to him to believe that the portion of the debate contributed by the Hon. Edward Blake, for instance, showed that he believed that the period of exemption commenced on the 15th of February.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). The Globe quoted it last session to prove the very same thing.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, I will quote just one sentence from the speech of the Hon. Edward Blake, as I find it in that debate, and peculiarly it is one sentence which the hon. member for Lisgar happened to leave out of the excerpt from Mr. Blake's speech which he quoted in the House last session. This is the sentence :

> Then, Sir, there is freedom from taxation for the lands for the long term of twenty years, and that term of twenty years is from the day they acquire the lands, and therefore it is longer than twenty years from now. It is perhaps on the average twenty-five years.

I think that proves conclusively that the opinion of the Hon. Edward Blake was not that the exemption period dated from the signing of the contract; and one would have thought that a statement like that having been made by the leader of the opposition as a serious objection to the proposition of the government, if that statement was not a reasonable one, and if the point against the bargain was not properly taken, some member of the government would have arisen in his place to set the leader of the opposition right. Here is a statement made by a member of the Conservative party, Mr. Ives. I do not think he was at the time a member of the government, but this will show his view of the contract. He said :

> But it is said they (the company) may not take the lands from the government, even when they have the right to them, until they find an opportunity of selling them, and in this way may prolong this period of exemption indefinitely. Surely the government can compel these gentlemen to take an assignment of these lands when they become entitled to them.

These two extracts, Mr. Speaker, and in fact, the whole debate as I have read it, lead me to the belief that it was the intention of parliament that the period of exemption should commence at the time the company had earned and come into possession of the lands. That being the case, and the Bill setting out that the period commenced on the 15th of February, 1881, at a time before the company had built a mile of the road under its bargain, before it had earned an acre of land, it becomes impossible for me, if I am to be governed by my common sense, to support the Bill.

House divided on amendment of Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Archambault,	Legris,
Bazinet,	Lemieux,
Bernier,	Lennox,
Bickerdike,	Lewis,
Blain,	Logan,
Bourassa,	Lovell,
Bourbonnais,	Loy,
Broder,	Macdonald,
Bureau,	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Calvert,	MacLaren (Perth),
Cargill,	McCarthy,
Champagne,	McCoII,
Clare,	McCool,
Copp,	McCreary,
Davies (Sir Louis),	McEwen,
Davis,	McGugan,
Demers (Lévis),	McIsaac,
Demers (St. John),	Malouin,
Dugas,	Marcil (Bagot),
Dyment,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Erb,	Martineau,
Ethier,	Matheson,
Fielding,	Meigs,
Fisher,	Mignault,
Fitzpatrick,	Morin,
Flint,	Morrison,
Fortier,	Parmelee,
Fortin,	Paterson,
Gallery,	Prior,
Galliher,	Puttee,
Gauvreau,	Reid (Restigouche),
Geoffrion,	Roche (Halifax),
German,	Ross (Ontario),
Gilmour,	Ross (Victoria),
Girard,	Scott,
Gould,	Sifton,
Gourley,	Simmons,
Guthrie,	Smith (Vancouver),
Henderson,	Smith (Wentworth),
Heyd,	Sproule,
Holmes,	Stephens,
Horsey,	Talbot,
Hughes (Victoria),	Tarte,
Hyman,	Taylor,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Thompson,
Kaulbach,	Tisdale,
Kendall,	Tolmie,
Lang,	Tolton,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tucker,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Turcot,
Lavergne,	Turgeon, and
LeBlanc,	Wright.—104.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Johnston (Cardwell),	Richardson (Lisgar),
Maclean,	Robinson (Elgin),
McGowan,	Roche (Marquette),
Oliver,	Sherritt.—8.

Amendment agreed to.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 8, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Canadian Mutual Aid Society.—Mr. Sutherland (Essex).

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Clergue Iron and Nickel Steel Company of Canada.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 52) respecting the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company.—Mr. Maxwell.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Manitoba and North-west Loan Company, Limited.—Mr. Britton.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Fort Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Arnprior and Pontiac Railway Company.—Mr. Lemieux.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

MINTO :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I thank you for the dutiful Address which you have adopted in reply to the Speech with which I opened the session of parliament. I accept with gratitude your assurances that all measures submitted to you will receive your earnest consideration.

Government House,
Ottawa, 7th March, 1901.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, would the right hon. gentleman give us an idea as to the probable date when the government measures will be introduced ? I think it was announced about a week ago that several government measures were still to be introduced.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think all the measures which I mentioned the other day have been introduced. The only measure yet to be introduced is the Act concerning the mint.

SUPPLY—THE CONTRACT WITH THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that on the motion that this House resolve itself into Committee of Supply on Tuesday next, I will move the following resolution in amendment :

Resolved, that in the opinion of this House, the government should take such steps that may be open to it under the law to obtain authoritative interpretation from the Supreme Court of Canada of the meaning of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in relation to the exemption of lands from taxation; and

That the patenting of lands earned by railroad companies should be proceeded with all practicable speed.

IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES.

Mr. AULAY MORRISON (New Westminster). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, there is a matter to which I beg to call the attention of the government, and particularly the attention of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding). It is in reference to the bounties on iron and steel as contained in the statutes of 1896, 1897 and 1899. The Bounty Act of 1897 provides for a bounty on steel ingots, puddled iron bars, and pig iron manufactured in Canada, specifying the amounts per ton which the producers of steel may be entitled to. That Act was amended in 1899, and the statute sets out, with considerable detail, the extent of the bounty which may be earned by those producing iron and manufacturing steel in the Dominion of Canada. A few days ago the press of the country contained the prospectus of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, of Sydney, Cape Breton, over the signature of Mr. Moxham, the general manager of that vast industry, and among the attractions specified in that prospectus I find the following :

GOVERNMENT BOUNTY.

If the production from the company's works be as estimated, 300,000 tons of pig metal and 60.-000 tons of steel blooms in 1901, and thereafter 400,000 tons of iron and steel per annum, made from foreign (Newfoundland) ore, the bounties to be received from the Canadian government will be as follows :—

1901	$ 870,000
1902	2,075,000
1903	1,850,000
1904	1,450,000
1905	1,000,000
1906	625,000
1907	225,000
	$8,095,000

In the seven years the bounties to be paid by the government of Canada to the Dominion Iron and Steel Company would amount in the aggregate to $8,095,000. It may not be fair for me to surmise, that taking into consideration the vast resources at the disposal of this company, and the tremendous increase in the iron trade probable in the next few years, that that bounty is likely to be double the amount indicated here. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we were confined to paying bounties even to this one company, in my opinion, the matter would be sufficiently serious, but I find that the Cramp Ontario Steel Company have also issued a prospectus, in which they give us an idea of their expectations with respect to this great industry.

They also are in a position to earn and will earn a very large bounty. Then there are other large industries in the Dominion, all of which come under this Act. What I wish to draw the attention of the government to is this, that the Dominion of Canada stands to pay out a very large amount of money in the way of bounties, and I would like to know whether it is too late for the government to take such steps as may, while not invading any vested rights, at the same time prevent further vested interests growing up under the Act. There is no doubt that the principle of granting bounties to industries under certain conditions is a proper one, and one which has been adopted by governments in all civilized countries in the world ; but at the same time it strikes me that in these cases there may be an invasion of that principle. For instance, we find by the prospectus of the Dominion Iron and Steel Co. that they have a capital of some $23,000,000, and they have on their directorate some of the leading financial people of Canada, the United States and Great Britain—men of whom in no sense can it be said that they are financially in dire need of any assistance in respect to any industry or concern to which they may attach themselves. At this juncture—and it is not too early—I think the government should take into their serious consideration this question of the bounty on iron and steel. It may be that the volume of business generated, and the amount of money expended in and about these industries may be commensurate with the amount of bounty the people of this Dominion are obliged to pay to these companies. It is not my intention, in directing the attention of the government to this matter, to advocate the invasion of any vested right that may have been established by this Act. Doubtless the Act was passed with a view to helping the struggling industries of this country ; but I do not think anybody would characterize the Dominion Iron and Steel Co. or the Ontario Cramp Steel Co. as struggling industries that would require such a large amount of the money of the taxpayers of Canada to be given to them in order to earn their dividends.

I would like very much if the government would give us some assurance that the proper interests of the people will be safeguarded in this respect. I think it is a matter of very great importance, and one that interests every taxpayer in the Dominion. The amount of money which will be paid in bounties must be very large ; in the seven years it might amount to anywhere from $25,000,000 to $50,000,000. I am not an alarmist, but taking the statements of these companies themselves, and the tremendous output which is likely to attend the successful operation of their works, there is every indication that the amount of the bounty will at any rate exceed $15,000,000 within the seven years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, I should not care to give a definite answer to the statement which forms the main point of my hon. friend's question, that is to say, whether or not parliament might properly place any restrictions upon the amount which would become payable under these bounty Acts. The matter has already received some consideration, and I am not disposed to give any answer to-day which would tie the hands of the government as to their future course. Of course, there is one thing we must clearly understand, that though how far there may be vested rights is a debatable question, yet in so far as we may agree that there are any vested rights arising under these Acts, those vested rights must be respected. There have been on the statute-books of Canada for many years Acts respecting bounties on iron and steel, and in those Acts there has never been any limitation as to the quantity on which a bounty would be paid. In fact, I think the great difficulty hitherto has been that the Acts were not effective in producing a large development of the iron and steel industry. I am afraid that the inference might almost be drawn from my hon. friend's remarks, although he might object to it, that if this industry had jogged along in the old way and only made small demands on the treasury, it would be all right ; but inasmuch as is has got out of the old rut and has developed on a large scale, it is all wrong. I should not like to accept that conclusion. I think, perhaps, there is a tendency on the part of the promoter of a company, when issuing his prospectus, to put his best foot forward ; and if he has any government advantages, he is not likely to underestimate them. Therefore, I should not be very much alarmed at the statements of a very rose-coloured character made in the prospectus of any company organized under this bounty system. Still, it is well to point out that the only matter of difference between us on the two sides of the House as respects this Bounty Act was that while we were will-

ing to pay $2 a ton to this Cape Breton corporation on the iron it might produce, my hon. friend who was at that time the leader of the opposition, was quite willing to pay $3 a ton, because he thought we should treat the iron ore of the colony of Newfoundland just the same as we treat the iron ore of the Dominion itself. On that view there would be paid on all the iron produced in Cape Breton from Newfoundland ore the full bounty, whereas in reality we shall properly treat it as a foreign ore entitled to receive only the minimum bounty. I do not, however, feel very much alarmed over the matter, even if we should be called upon to pay a very large sum under this system. We may perhaps agree that if the industry was worth encouraging at all, it was worth being made successful, and on a large scale. One thing is certain, iron and steel cannot be produced in such enormous quantities, either in Cape Breton or in other parts of the Dominion, without there being an enormous development of the business of the country, from which the Dominion in one form or other will receive a very large return. There is that comfort to us in the first place. There is the further comfort that even if this system should result in the payment of large sums of money, that payment will speedily come to an end, because at the very time we provided the scale of bounties, we stated that it was regarded by us as of vital importance that the bounties should be gradually reduced by the terms of the Act itself; so that after a term of five years, beginning on the 1st of July next, the bounties will cease to exist. If, therefore, for a short time we should be called upon to pay even a large sum for the development of these industries, we would have the comfort of knowing in the meantime that as a result of that experiment there must grow up a vast amount of business in the Dominion which would not probably have grown up except for that development; and that if the bounty should be large, it can only continue for five years, when it will be wiped off the statute-book. And if at the end of that period we should find ourselves with a tremendous development of the iron and steel industry—and my hon. friend knows that it will be not only in Cape Breton, but also in the province of Ontario, where great works are projected—and if that result should be achieved at considerable cost to the public treasury, I am not sure that we would regret it; for we would have established throughout the Dominion great industries which would undoubtedly have a tremendous effect in developing the prosperity of the whole country.

Hon. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) When the hon. member for Westminster rose to draw attention to the bounty system, I was in hopes, Mr. Speaker, that instead of finding fault, he was going to urge the necessity for an extension of that system, especially in the province of British Columbia. The hon. gentleman is an old resident of that province, and knows its immense resources. He knows that the people of British Columbia look forward to a not far distant day when we shall have iron works started there ourselves, and he must know that it is impossible to get such works started without a bounty. I do not understand why he should have so much anxiety concerning the large amount Canada may have to pay. As the hon. Finance Minister has pointed out, whenever an amount is paid for bounty, there is considerably more added to the wealth of Canada, as on every ton of iron manufactured a large sum of money is paid out in wages and material. I have in my hand a newspaper clipping, giving a report of the convention of the Boards of Trade of British Columbia held at Greenwood. One of the resolutions passed is the following:

> Whereas, there is at present no lead refining works in the Dominion of Canada, and the initial cost of establishing such a plant is very great, it is the opinion of this association that the Dominion government should encourage the establishment of such a plant by a grant for a term of years of a bounty of $5 per ton upon all lead of Canadian origin smelted and refined in Canada.

That is one of the resolutions passed by the associated boards of trade at its annual convention, and it shows the feelings of the business men of that province. With that resolution I am heartily in accord, and I am sorry to see an hon. gentleman get up and endeavour to lead this House to believe that the people he represents are not in favour of the bounty system, but are in favour of its being carefully watched at least, if not entirely done away with. Let me say that even if millions be expended in bounties, we would get an ample return for our expenditure from the work done in the smelters. In British Columbia, the business interests are not only asking for a bounty on lead refining, but are looking forward to government assistance to the ship building industry in Vancouver and Victoria. In fact, we hope soon to see the day when the Pacific coast will be the great manufacturing section of the Dominion.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). Before the motion to go into Supply is adopted, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that this government, which obtained office on free trade principles, has adopted the most positive and direct form of protection that is known, namely, the system of giving bounties. I shall not say anything further than point out the inconsistency of its course in giving a bounty of $3 per ton on the pig iron manufactured from Canadian ore. I have read within two or three days the prospectus of the Dominion Steel and Iron Company, whose head quarters are at Sydney, N.S.

In this prospectus, which is issued to invite subscriptions to the stock of the company, they state that they can produce pig iron at a cost of $5.50 per ton. And this free trade government, this government which is going to bring us gradually down to free trade, this government which has free trade as its goal, keeps on the statute-books a law giving a bounty of $3 per ton on this article that can be produced for $5.50 per ton. I assume that that will bring down the cost to $2.50, and as the market quotations today are from $12 to $15 per ton, the company will make a very handsome profit, and this will be due to the fact that this government, which went before the country as free traders, has gone back on its policy and adopted the most stringent form of protection known.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to ask the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) whether we are to understand that he opposes the policy of granting a bounty for the manufacture of iron in Canada ?

Mr. WALLACE. I have always professed to be one of the most ardent protectionists in this country, and have always advocated a bounty for the protection of pig iron and steel, so that my position is different from that of hon. gentlemen opposite in that regard.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee.

Ottawa Military Buildings, Ont.—New store $25,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). This work is under contract. It is the new store on Cartier square, just behind the drill shed. The cost is $50,745.

Public Works—Chargeable to Capital—Harbours and Rivers, Quebec—River St. Lawrence ship channel $419,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This sum of money is asked to continue the work which has been going on for several years—for many years I might say—in the St. Lawrence. The depth of the water in the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal was supposed to be 27½ feet. But, in 1895, and also in 1897, the water fell. In 1895, during three days of the month of November, the water fell so low that the depth was only 25 feet 10 inches. It was then found necessary to adopt a new basis. When I took office, I may say, the department was not equipped. In 1888 the late government had taken from the harbour commissioners both the work on the channel and their equipment—their plant. Before I took office, my predecessor had built one new dredge, the Laval. Since then, we have built the Laurier, the Lady Aberdeen, and the Lady Minto, and we have another dredge in course of construction, which will be completed by the first of June. Of these four dredges, two are steel dredges. Perhaps I may be permitted to say, to the honour of our Canadian workingmen, that these four dredges last built, are, as I claim, the best dredges of their kind in America. That may be saying a good deal, but I am quite sure that I am correct in making that statement. We are now dredging the channel to a width of 450 feet, and a depth practically of 30 feet. During the last season, which is practically the first during which the work was carried on, we dredged to the depth of 30 feet, a distance of a little more than ten miles. The intention of the department is to dredge to the width and depth I have named the whole channel, so that about fifty miles remains to be dredged. Within the last fortnight, I have signed a contract with the Polson Iron Works for the construction of a suction dredge, which will have a capacity of between 30,000 and 40,000 yards a day. It seems almost incredible that a dredge could do such a quantity of work. I have seen one of these dredges myself ; in fact, the decision to build this dredge is the result of a trip I made with the deputy minister to New York to inspect machines of this kind. We expect to be able to complete the work of deepening and widening the channel within the next season. It may be that we shall be deceived by a few months ; but, if there is no accident, I fully anticipate that the whole work of deepening and widening the St. Lawrence in the way I have just pointed out, will be completed in the next season.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. What is the length ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About sixty miles—that is fifty miles to Cap a la Roche, and ten miles already done.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. On that point, could the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) give the quantities on the work already done, and on the work yet to be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think I have that information here. I would not bind myself to exact figures, but I am told by the chief engineer that the quantity in Lake St. Peter alone is 90,000,000 cubic yards.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the capacity of the dredges now working ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The capacity of the best dredges that are now working—and working night and day—would vary between 7,000 and 8,000 cubic yards a day. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart) knows very well that the capacity of a dredge depends a good deal upon the material in which it works. If you strike a boulder or a difficult spot the dredge,

powerful as it may be, cannot do the same amount of work as in soft material. In Lake St. Peter the work is in soft material, and we expect to do that work with the new suction dredge, which is to be completed by the middle of August. I may say in passing that four of the dredges that I have at work now are equipped with electric light so that they are capable of working during the night as well as by day. We intend to equip with electric light the new dredges that are now being built.

Several questions have been raised as to the work now going on. Of course, the main object of deepening and widening the St. Lawrence is to enable the largest ships to come up to Montreal. The Montreal business men have no ambition to monopoize the trade of this country, but Montreal is so located that unless the trade from the west is brought down there, it is certain, I am very much afraid, to go to American ports. Two and two make four, and cannot make five. Now, between the port of Buffalo and the Port of New York the distance by rail is 445 miles. The New York Central have made their road between these two points just as level as the floor of this Chamber. So fine is that road that they are able to attach between 75 and 100 cars to a single locomotive, and draw that immense load to their terminus in the city of New York.

Mr. COCHRANE. What has that got to do with our canals ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will try to show you what it has got to do. Now, the grain comes, as we all know, from the American and Canadian west to Canadian ports. Trade has no law, it goes where it pays best. From Port Colborne to Montreal by water is 375 miles. When the works at Port Colborne are completed we will have a harbour there, which we have not to-day. It is almost incredible that we have no harbour there yet, and how can we expect to have trade ? There is Buffalo on one side, with a magnificent harbour, with a breakwater, with about sixty elevators, a port fully equipped, giving a depth of 22 feet ; while on our side we have no harbour accommodation whatever. How can trade flow through our Welland canal to Montreal when big ships cannot load and unload, when big ships cannot enter at Port Colborne to-day ? It is out of the question for shipping to anchor there, the harbour is solid rock. The works at Port Colborne will be completed for the accommodation of trade within a short time, my department has awarded a contract for the erection of a breakwater, and the Minister of Railways and Canals is going on with the works for the canal itself ; and when we have proper accommodation there, the big carriers of grain that now go to Buffalo, and must go there because they cannot go anywhere else, will then be able to come to our Canadian ports to load and unload, and transhipment will take place at Port Colborne.

Whether we have 14 feet of water—I have every reason to believe that we have 14 feet—but whether we have that or only 13 feet, or 13½ feet, we are certainly in a better position than our American friends with their Erie canal. Then, our Canadian system of canals, with its terminal at Montreal, will be a competitor with the American railways. I do not take the Erie canal into account at all. To-day it is little more than a small ditch, if I may say so without offence it is out of date, and cannot in any respect compete with the great system of American railways, nor with the great system of Canadian canals. On the one hand we have Port Colborne and the Welland canal, 375 miles from Montreal.

On the other hand we have the Parry Sound Railway. The government has, so far, not done much to help the enterprising gentleman who has completed, at his own expense and at his own risk, the Parry Sound Railway. I have asked for tenders for the erection of a breakwater which will enable Mr. Booth, or anybody else, to erect elevators if they wish. When that elevator is completed and when Mr. Booth has completed his work, Parry Sound will be a first-class port. During the past season the Parry Sound Railway has been the principal carrier of grain to Montreal, by the aid of the St. Lawrence route. Unfortunately, that railway system has not yet reached the city of Montreal independently. To-day Mr. Booth is obliged to tranship his grain at Coteau Landing and take it in barges to the port of Montreal. In spite of that difficulty, Mr. Booth has been able to carry grain at a profit to the city of Montreal, though not a large profit. Why is he able to do this ? Because he is able to get the western trade. Not many people believed, two or three years ago, that the Parry Sound Railway would be a competitor with the American railways in getting a return trade, but it has done so. You would be surprised to learn, Mr. Chairman, the amount of return trade that Mr. Booth has been able to capture between New York and Chicago. And so the Parry Sound system is another feeder to the port of Montreal and to the St. Lawrence route.

A good deal has been said lately of the project of improving the French river. I have read speeches—I have no right, I suppose, to refer to them here—referring to that scheme. I wish the House would give its close attention to that project. The question whether the Canadian Pacific Railway will carry the trade going to North Bay will not prevent anybody from giving that scheme his favourable consideration. From the mouth of the French river on the Georgian Bay to North Bay is 50 miles. I make bold to say that with the expenditure of about $2,000,000—I cannot bind myself to any figure, of course, but I have rea-

son to believe that with an expenditure of $2,000,000, that waterway between North Bay by the French river to Georgian Bay, can be made 20 feet deep.

Mr. SPROULE. That is $2,000,000 on fifty miles.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, I have known works shorter than that which have cost more money. The Welland canal has cost us $25,000,000, I think. But I am not speaking of a canal, I am only speaking of improving the river.

Mr. SPROULE. How much nearer to Montreal are you when you are at North Bay than at Parry Sound ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was going to say that when we have deepened that waterway to North Bay, it will be 330 miles to the port of Montreal.

Mr. CLARKE. By railway ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By railway.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before leaving that subject, give us the size of the locks.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not yet reached that subject, some of my officers are making a survey to-day, and I am speaking of the project on broad lines. I have no plans made, I have not been authorized by my colleagues to go on with the work. I am addressing myself to the House and to the country, and speaking of a project that rises, I am sure, above party politics. The question is whether the St. Lawrence route will handle our Northwest trade and the American trade that we are able to get ; in other words, speaking from the standpoint of the St. Lawrence route, it is a question whether we are 'to be or not to be.' We cannot lose much more time.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If the hon. minister will allow me to interrupt him——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). He has just recently remarked that he has not the authority of his colleagues to make these statements here.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I did not say that.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Do I understand that the hon. minister has the authority of his colleagues to make these statements ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say anything of the kind. What I did say was this : My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) was asking me what was the length of the locks. I told him that I had not reached that point, that I had not been authorized by my colleagues to go on with that work at all. I am now speaking of the St. Lawrence route on broad lines.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Are we to take the hon. minister as merely airing some of his own private opinions, or is he following the principle of responsibility by speaking with the authority of the government ? Are we to hold the government responsible for the utterances of the hon. gentleman here to-day ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think my colleagues will be very glad to say that they are responsible for what I say, when I say that the distance is 330 miles between North Bay and Montreal. I am just speaking of the possibilities of the St. Lawrence route.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask the hon. minister if he will assume the responsibility of telling us what the distance by rail is from Parry Harbour to Coteau Landing ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The length of the Booth system, or of the Parry Sound Railway, between Parry Sound and Montreal, is 384 miles.

Mr. CLARKE. And the distance from Port Colborne to Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From Port Colborne to Montreal by water the distance is 375 miles. I may be mistaken by half a mile, but in the main figures I am right.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the hon. minister tell us the distance from Midland to Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot really say. Of Midland I can only remark that a large part of the trade which flows through there is not carried to Montreal, but is carried to Portland. If I had any way of making the Grand Trunk Railway take their trade to Montreal, I would certainly do it.

Mr. SPROULE. They handled 11,000,000 bushels last season.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know it, but, unfortunately, nearly all of that trade went to Portland.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. minister must not give Midland a black eye. The Grand Trunk Railway Midland system carried within a million bushels as much as the Booth system.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not to Montreal. I do not call it a crime. Money knows no law. The Grand Trunk Railway have located at Portland, and the harbour facilities at Montreal are so inadequate that I could not blame them too much for having done so. I deeply regret that they have located themselves in Portland, but the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway have a right to

expect, and to get, dividends. We have neglected our waterways. We must admit that. There is no reflection on anybody, but it is a fact that we have neglected our waterways. That cannot be disputed. Now, if we apply our minds and our attention to the St. Lawrence route, within a few years, we will have redeemed the ground that we have lost. I verily believe that the French river project, and I am speaking only on broad lines, would bring to the St. Lawrence route 50,000,000 bushels of grain a year. It cannot be anything else. The Canadian Pacific Railway between Montreal and North Bay can make their road just as good as the New York Central have made their road. Then you would have the Welland canal, 375 miles to the port of Montreal, you would have the Parry Sound Railway 384 miles to the port of Montreal, and you would have the French river in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway 330 miles to Montreal. These are three great feeders that are at our disposal, and I know that my hon. friends from Toronto proposed to have an air line between Collingwood and that city. We have an adage in French that says tout chemin mène à Rome—all roads lead to Rome. I would apply that adage to the St. Lawrence route. Every available road should lead to the St. Lawrence route. There is no reason why we should detract from any one of them. I am not advocating any ridiculous expenditure of money, but I quite share the views a gentleman was expressing this morning before the right hon. Prime Minister and some of us. He was calling our attention to the vast expenditure of money that we had made in building our railways and our canals. He was reminding us that we had expended $169,000,000 to build our railways, and that we had expended $80,000,000 in building our canals. Are we going to fold our arms, to stand idle and let the Canadian trade and such portion of the American trade as we can capture go by us, when, with an additional expenditure, a small expenditure compared with the expenditure we have made already, we can capture a vast amount of trade? What does it mean, Sir? It means cheaper rates for our farmers, for the manufacturers of this country, for everybody; it means the building of towns and cities. I do not despair of seeing half a million more population in the city of Montreal than it has today. It is necessary to spend some money on widening and deepening the St. Lawrence route to enable us to handle the large amount of trade that must inevitably come to us from the west. I expect with an expenditure of $2,000,000—I hope a little less—to complete the widening and deepening of the St. Lawrence between the sea and Montreal. Then, my hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) will have to light that magnificent highway with electric buoys or gas buoys. The amount of money spent so far on the St. Lawrence is $5,500,000. This is a small amount of money compared with the large amount that has been expended elsewhere.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). How much additional do you require?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have just stated that we expect an expenditure of $2,000,000 additional will complete the work of the St. Lawrence. Then, Sir, there is still the question of the port of Montreal. I have no desire to deal with it now, because, when my estimates on that point are before the committee, I will be asked questions, no doubt, by hon. gentlemen in the House. If any other question should be asked me, I shall be glad indeed to answer to the best of my ability.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the hon. minister the figures as to the tonnage of freight that has been moved westward by the Booth railway?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not.

Mr. CLARKE. Have you any idea as to the quantity?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The only trade point I investigated was as to the grain trade.

Mr. CLARKE. That freight is coming east.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. I will be very glad indeed to bring down that information.

Mr. CLARKE. When the minister was speaking, I understood him to refer to the gratifying fact that the Booth road was able to obtain a quantity of the traffic moving westward toward Chicago. If the hon. minister could tell us the tonnage of that traffic it would be very interesting information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I had the pleasure of a conversation with Mr. Booth a few days ago, and he told me that he had handled a very large amount of return freight, and that if he had been able to get accommodation he would have been in a position to make contracts for double the quantity.

Mr. CLARKE. Accommodation where?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He did not tell me how much it was, but I will be glad to ask him.

Mr. CLARKE. Where was the accommodation lacking?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course he lacks accommodation in Montreal, and he wants more accommodation at

Parry Sound. Mr. Booth has built a large elevator at the latter place, and I suppose he has spent nearly a million dollars of his money there.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the cost per yard of this excavation at Montreal ? When you dredge it out, do the prisms remain perfect or does it require a dredge all the time to keep it open.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have only a couple of places, and these not important, at which we are obliged to dredge occasionally. Lake St. Peter was dredged fifteen years ago, and it will be a pleasure for the House to know that the middle of the channel is deeper to-day than it was then. The St. Lawrence does not fill in. We had a little accident a couple of years ago at one point, where there had been some little filling in of sand, but not of much importance. As to the cost of dredging it varies, but I think I may say that the suction dredge we have contracted for will be able to dredge at about half a cent a yard.

Mr. CLARKE. Half a cent a yard ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, yes. The cost of dredging with our last improved dredges varies from 3 cents, 5 cents, 6 cents, to 7 cents. Of course some of the dredges cost more, for when you strike a boulder it may take a day to get it out, but with our improved dredges the cost has been reduced very greatly indeed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This information confirms the statements I made last year in the House as to the cost of dredging. I drew the attention of the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) to the cost of dredging at Liverpool and New York, and to-day the Minister of Public Works tells us that he can do dredging in the St. Lawrence at a less rate than 1 cent per cubic yard.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In soft material.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, yes, I understand that. I congratuate the minister on getting the improved style of suction dredge which has been adopted in European countries and in the United States, and it is the dredge above all others that we ought to have had long ago in the St. Lawrence. You have no harbour accommodation at Montreal suitable for the western trade, even if you do open up the St. Lawrence route. I understand from Mr. Booth and others interested in the trade, that the amount of grain deposited in Montreal is limited to the accommodation. I had hoped from the statement of the minister, made some three or four years ago, when his plan for better accommodation at Montreal was adopted, that the work would be carried out by this time, and I am sorry to say that because of force of circumstances, or deficiency in the treasury, or through being overpowered by his colleagues in the government, he has been unable to carry out what he promised. The minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte), has given us his obiter dicta without the authority of the rest of his colleagues, as to his intentions with regard to deepening the French river from the Georgian Bay to Lake Nipissing, and I congratulate him on entertaining this idea. Not only would it accommodate the trade of the west, but it will open up facilities for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Of course we must not say anything about that because if it favours a railway some people say it is an incubus on the country, but we all know that anything by which the trade of that railway will be developed at the port of Montreal will be for the benefit of the community at large. There is another point to which I wish to refer briefly. I believe that the building of the Georgian Bay canal will be in the interest of Montreal, and in the interest of all Canada, and that canal must be built in the future. The minister speaks about a twenty foot navigation, which is the navigation of Lake Superior and the upper lakes, and there is no necessity for having more than that on the mitre sills of the locks. But, let there be plenty of breadth and plenty of length in the locks, and then steamers of almost any burden can proceed to Montreal, because with twenty feet in depth you can build steamers broad enough and long enough to carry seven or eight thousand tons. These steamers could carry coal from the maritime provinces to the upper lakes and return with cargoes of grain. I predict that some day the Georgian Bay canal will be built. I agree with the minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that if not a single boat passed down the St. Lawrence canals, and if we got no direct benefit from them, yet the people of this country would receive a return for the seventy-five million dollars expended on the canals by the very fact of their being there and the influence they have in reducing freight rates generally. I trust the minister will be able to make a harbour at Port Colborne. His present proposition does not contemplate a harbour, but rather the construction of a couple of piers for the purpose of constructing elevators. If you try to make that a harbour I am afraid you will have to make an expenditure largely in excess of the amount that has been stated, for I believe it will cost three or four million dollars. And what benefit is it to the country ? It is to enable vessels of twenty-two feet draft to tranship at Port Colborne for the purpose of their freight being taken down the River St. Lawrence.

If they went fifteen miles further they could go to the port of Buffalo, tranship there, and come down the St. Lawrence as well as from Port Colborne. You will never make a port at Port Colborne that will at all

bear comparison with the port of Buffalo. It may be said that the transhipment should be made in our own country, or that the navigation laws interfere with transhipment at Buffalo. I do not think that is the case. An American vessel coming down from Chicago can tranship at Buffalo and get its freight there. A vessel from our own port of Fort William can also go to Buffalo, empty its cargoes on the elevators there, and reload just as well as it can at Port Colborne. It is true, it has to go fifteen miles further ; but in order to make a port at Port Colborne, which could be entered in all weathers, an expenditure of at least $4,000,000 would be required. However, it seems that this is to be done anyway ; we are going to have a port there, and have navigation from Port Colborne down to Montreal.

I hope the improvements which the hon. gentleman is making in Lake St. Peter will serve as a counterpoise to the heavy insurance rates on the St. Lawrence route, which his hon. colleague, the minister without portfolio (Hon. Mr. Dobell) says are almost prohibitory. I was astounded at the figures that hon. gentleman mentioned the other day as having been paid on a cargo going from Montreal to the old country. He said they often have to pay an insurance of 15 guineas on £100.

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. I did not state that that was on a cargo going from Montreal. I stated that it was on vessels leaving a point on the St. Lawrence further down—a place called Bic. I stated that on four ships going down the river 14 and 15 guineas per cent insurance had been asked, and by taking no risk we got it done for 10 shillings. That was in November.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I inquired from other gentlemen who had been in the habit of using shipping, and they confirmed literally the statement of the hon. member for Quebec West (Hon. Mr. Dobell). They stated that on cargoes going from Quebec they had paid 15 guineas on £100. But if you pay 15 guineas from Bic, what would you have to pay from Montreal ? It would probably be £2 or £3 more, which makes the statement so much worse. If these are the facts with reference to insurance, all the deepening of the St. Lawrence and all the lighting you can put upon it from one end to the other will never divert the western trade from the channels through which it at present flows, and bring it down the St. Lawrence river. I was also astonished at the statement of a gentleman who represents Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), that he had it from one of the best marine insurance companies in Canada that for every pound they had received in the shape of insurance on vessels going from Montreal to Great Britain they had lost £3. That is an alarming statement. All these things have to be taken into consideration. The men who insure vessels after all know the risks of that navigation. They know what they can possibly make from insurance ; and if you have to pay £18 on £100 going from Montreal to the old country, that means a loss of one-sixth of the vessels and one-sixth of the freight. It cannot possibly be so. There must be some remedy for such a state of affairs ; and the only possible remedy, I think, is that suggested by the hon. member for Quebec West, that our own people must be interested in the navigation of the St. Lawrence, must own the shipping, and must see that the insurance rates are moderate. I am afraid the shipowners of Montreal are, after all, a little behind the age. The transportation business, to be carried on successfully, requires modern means and modern ideas. To carry freight successfully from Montreal to the old country requires, as was stated in this House some years ago, the largest kind of freighters without masts, with as small a crew as they can possibly do with, quadruple expansion engines, and all modern appliances. But these things are not yet found on the St. Lawrence route. Our shippers there are behind the age. You will have to get a new class of men in the business ; this may as well be known from one end of the country to the other.

Now, I would suggest to the hon. minister, first, the improvement of the port of Montreal itself. The lighting of the St. Lawrence is in the hands of his colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). I forgot to ask the minister whether he had made any arrangements with the harbour commissioners of Montreal that on account of the completion of this particular work there should be any reduction of the dues, or that any portion of them be paid to the government.

This is about all I have to say on this subject. I am a firm believer in water transportation. Would all the traffic now carried on from Lake Superior down to Cleveland, Buffalo, and other lower lake ports, be done as cheaply or successfully by railroad ? Not at all. There is a marine on those lakes today doing a greater business than is done between Great Britain and America and the Orient—greater than the business which passes through the Suez canal, and I believe that our St. Lawrence route and the port of Montreal, if they are properly looked after, will in the future have a development such as we cannot contemplate at the present day. The young men of the country at any rate are willing to take the risks of the future ; and I urge upon the hon. Minister of Public Works to do all he possibly can for the purpose of developing the port of Montreal, and seeing that the St. Lawrence route is made as efficient as possible.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is very gratifying to find that on questions affecting our national security, men of both political parties generally agree. This

question of the St. Lawrence route is above party politics, and I will always be only too glad to receive suggestions from my hon. friends opposite, as well as my friends on this side. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is quite right in urging me to have the port of Montreal properly equipped. I admit that it is not equipped as it should have been long ago. But this country is large, the requirements of Canada have exacted from us the expenditure of vast sums of money, and we have not been able to do everything at once. Now, however, the hour has come when this question must be solved. The harbour commissioners are carrying out very great improvements in the port of Montreal. Large docks and basins are being erected. One of the docks is completed, another will be finished in a few months, and the third in a year or so. These are high level wharfs, upon which permanent structures can be erected.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We want something more.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know that these works are only the beginning. The government is building a wharf in the eastern portion of the city--that unfortunate eastern portion, against which so much has been said, but which should have been equipped long ago. I know that we have not the requisite facilities. Any one who has travelled over the world with his two eyes open knows that we are nowhere in the port of Montreal, but there are so many people who have not travelled as much as they should, and I am very much afraid that some of our Montreal friends belong to that class. I am happy to say, however, that there is a great improvement in this respect in that city. The young generation is asserting itself, and my hon. friends will agree with me that the ships now coming to that port have improved in size, capacity and in carrying power, but we must have something more.

The insurance question has been dealt with by my hon. friend in a way upon which I could not improve. The Lloyds, I am sorry to say, have taken us by the throat. When they say that they have incurred terrible losses, they always forget to give us the number of years during which these losses have occurred. Ten or fifteen years ago the St. Lawrence route was much more dangerous than it is to-day, and this remark may be applied to the statement made to the House a day or two ago by my hon. friend from St. Lawrence, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike). I asked him how many years the losses he gave covered, and he answered me that they covered a period of eleven years. I make bold to say that during the last three or four years there were fewer accidents in the St. Lawrence than ever before. In point of fact, the St. Lawrence is in a better condition than it has ever been. I have had built testing scows and implements, and twice a year the whole length of the St. Lawrence is swept and tested, so that the shipping community may be completely assured that there are no obstacles in the channel. Nearly the whole channel has been scraped, and the curves have been straightened and obstacles removed, and during the last four years we have done most useful and profitable work.

I must take exception to what my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has said about the work at Port Colborne. I hope that he is mistaken in his view. I have given a good deal of attention to that port. I have been there myself several times to try and understand the position better. I have asked for tenders for a breakwater from the Point on a length of 5,700 feet, and have received a tender from Hogan & McDonald, for the sum of $395,000. When that breakwater is built, any vessel drawing 20 feet of water will be able to take shelter behind it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Are they building the breakwater and deepening the harbour besides ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, they deepen a part of the harbour so that they may use the dredged material to fill the cribwork. The area to be dredged first will be small, but I may say without hesitation, that with a pretty small sum it would be possible to have sufficient area to give shelter to ships. When that breakwater is built, and when the works going on under the direction of the Minister of Railways and Canals are completed, the largest carriers on the lakes will be able to load and unload in that port. Would it be sufficient, from a national standpoint, to rely on the port of Buffalo ? Is it not clearly better that the ships carrying the trade of the St. Lawrence route should go to a Canadian port and unload there ? My hon. friend is afraid that we will be obliged to incur a large expenditure. But if, with a moderate sum, we can make ourselves independent, that will be a great deal better for us than relying on the port of Buffalo. In all these commercial and national questions, our motto should be 'Canada first.' We must be independent of anybody, we must make ourselves at home in Montreal, on the lakes and in our winter ports. We should give the best possible attention to these matters, and make Canada an independent nation from a commercial standpoint. You do not know what may happen to-morrow. You do not know what Congress may decide to-morrow. Why, a few weeks ago, the Board of Trade of New York wanted to boycott Montreal and even Portland, and I suspect that the last move of the Grand Trunk Railway in settling itself in Portland was, to a large extent, dictated by American influence. Well, Sir, I say it is

our duty, the duty of both sides of the House, to make this country at home in these large national questions.

Mr. CALVIN. I had not intended to say anything at all in this matter, but as the hon. minister has invited an expression of opinion by members on both sides, I shall say a few words. While I do not wish to find fault with the spending of money in deepening Port Colborne harbour—for I think it is necessary that the harbour should be in such a shape as to be fit to receive large vessels with a deep draught—yet, I do think that what money is spent on Port Colborne harbour should be spent with a view to having, later on, a Welland canal large enough to receive the largest class of vessels. The navigation of the great lakes is a different style of navigation from that of the River St. Lawrence. The River St. Lawrence from Kingston, or, if you prefer it, from Prescott, down, is practically a canal, that is, it is a canal with stretches of river which are the same as canals in not calling for such a staunch style of vessels as are necessary on the lakes. Practically the great lakes are small seas, and the style of craft necessary there is one that would be practically safe upon the ocean itself. From Duluth, or from Chicago, to the beginning of the St. Lawrence proper, that is, to the foot of Lake Ontario, is a chain of lake navigation. That is broken at the Welland canal now. The hon. minister should not lay out his work with the intention of having what we may call the small Welland canal—that is, a canal of a size which will accommodate the present modern size of boat. I desire to draw the hon. minister's attention to the fact that from Port Colborne to Kingston and from Port Dalhousie to Kingston, the navigation calls for the same style of vessel, so far as seaworthiness and style of navigation are concerned, so far as the class of officer and seamen are concerned, as is required on the upper lakes. Therefore, it is not wise for the hon. minister to proceed as though the Welland canal were to be made part of a chain of river navigation, because after the Welland canal is passed and Lake Ontario is entered, there is a stretch of lake navigation before the river navigation begins. As I say, the navigation of the river does not call for so staunch a style of vessel or so expensive a crew. Take, for instance, the present style of craft now navigating the St. Lawrence—with a capacity of 25,000 or 30,000 bushels and costing $8,000 or $9,000 when new, pin flats, as they are called, which carry most cheaply. Of course, if you can carry your grain in a craft that does not cost more than thirty or forty cents a bushel to build, you have an advantage over a style of vessel that costs twice as much, such vessels as are necessary for the navigation of the lakes. The point I seek to make is that there are two great chains of navigation, the lake chain to the foot of Lake Ontario, and then the river chain from the foot of Lake Ontario to Montreal. The object of the government should be to make each chain complete. As the hon. minister has asked for suggestions, I would suggest also that the tolls might be taken off the Welland canal.

Mr. CLARKE. What are the tolls ?

Mr. CALVIN. They amounted last year to something over $100,000, which is a small amount of money compared with the interest on the expenditure represented in the canal. These tolls are a direct hindrance to trade. Take the tolls on coal, for example. The toll-rate on coal on the Welland canal is twenty cents a ton. Why, coal has been carried from Buffalo to Chicago or Buffalo to Duluth, for 25 cents a ton ; so you can see what a barrier this toll of 10 cents a ton must be, and how it will restrict the carrying of merchandise through our canal system. The result has been that the carriage of coal through the Welland canal has been cut down to about half to what it was two or three years ago. So far as canals are concerned, we meet the Americans at two points, once at the Soo, where both our canal and the American canal are free, and again at Port Colborne, where we have a canal with tolls, while the Americans have a canal on which no tolls are charged. Our trade is handicapped to that extent.

Mr. SPROULE. I only wish to say a very little on this subject. It seems to me that the question resolves itself into two points, and what I regard as the important things in giving us control of the transportation of our own country are something like the following : First, we should make the channel between Montreal and Quebec what it ought to be as regards depth, and we should have it well lighted. The hon. minister is directing his attention towards that end at the present time, and I feel satisfied that both sides of the House will support him in that policy. Any reasonable expenditure looking towards that end will be in the right direction, and will be in the interests of Canadian shipping and of Canada. Following that, it seems to me, means should be devised to reduce the cost of insurance. For that is the next large item interfering with the trade by the St. Lawrence. It appears to me, from what has been written of late on the subject, that the government might well join some insurance company in sharing the risk or guaranteeing a portion of the risk for some years to come, at least until a business is built up by an insurance company, and we can be independent of outside insurance companies. In the meantime, to ascertain what risks are incurred, we ought to have better data than we have with regard to the losses that have

taken place during the last few years on that route. Surely we have the facts somewhere in connection with our returns of shipping or of trade and navigation in this country. We ought to have these facts and so be able to estimate what it would cost to insure trade by this route, and then join some company, or else the government become the insurers themselves. It must seem to most people that the insurance paid on this route at the present time is out of all proportion to the dangers incurred in carrying on the shipping by the St. Lawrence route. Then, I think, improvement ought to go on in the harbour of Montreal, because, it seems evident, from what the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart) tells us, it is very much out of date. The hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is causing expenditure to be made with the object of improving our equipment in this respect. Whether that expenditure is as rapid as it ought to be or not, I am not prepared to say ; but at least, I think, we ought to exercise greater enterprise in trying to bring it to a successful conclusion than we are doing at the present time. We should have improved means of handling freight ; the time spent by vessels in coming in and going out, in loading and unloading, should be made as short as possible. These matters might well engage the attention of the minister, because the inconveniences that now exist may be the means of driving vessels that hitherto have sought the St. Lawrence route to go to Boston or other ports for their trade. These improvements seem to be of the greatest need at the present time, and I think co-ordinate with them we might well improve the waterways above Montreal, leading to that port. The minister says he is directing his energies towards that end at the present time. and I think he is entitled to credit so far as he is doing so upon intelligent lines. But I must confess that I have felt for some time past that the proposed expenditure, especially at Port Colborne, is not likely to bring the return which the minister expects or desires, and that perhaps the same amount of money might be spent in other directions that would bring a better return. The ex-Minister of Railways stated that when Buffalo affords facilities for vessels going fifteen miles further and transhipping, it is very doubtful whether the improvements the minister is making at Port Colborne are likely to be a sufficient inducement to make vessels go there and unload instead of going to Buffalo, if they desire to transhipping there and go on down to the St. Lawrence.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Port Colborne and the Canadian system of canals will be competitors of the Buffalo route. If we were to place ourselves in the hands of our opponents, how could we fight against them ?

Mr. SPROULE. I admit there is a serious obstacle to be overcome, and one which is worthy of consideration. We practically handicap ourselves to a certain extent for that trade. If we could provide facilities for transhipment at Port Colborne by way of docks, elevators and depth of water, no doubt we would be acting largely in the right direction ; but whether that would accomplish the end we have in view must be for the future to determine. But I say that our own waterways might be improved very well at the same time.

Now, there seems to be a serious contention between people in this country as to whether we have or have not fourteen feet of water above Montreal. Many shippers say we have not. I believe some are afraid to risk a trial. Others say we have. I see that the Montreal Witness says that we have not, and I presume they would scarcely write a hap-hazard without some definite knowledge on that subject. They contended last year that we had not. It is claimed by others we have such a depth. But if we have not, the sooner we have the better, and the more urgently we should direct our endeavours towards securing that end in the interest of shipping.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What would the hon. gentleman suggest ought to be done that has not been done in order to assure owners of vessels of the existence of this fourteen foot channel ?

Mr. SPROULE. I think there ought to be soundings along the whole channel where there is supposed to be a less depth.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does not the hon. gentleman know that there is no portion of the channel that has not been sounded, no portion that has not been swept from one entrance to the other with the most improved appliances for that purpose ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may add that in some respects rivers are under the care of the Public Works Department, and I made up my mind last year to understand the whole question, and for that purpose I ordered a survey to be made. At this moment a survey is going on between Kingston and Prescott. A survey will be completed in the course of next year, not only of the channel but of the whole river ; so we will be perfectly sure of the depth, not only of the channel but of the whole volume of the river. So far as I am concerned, I have consulted with many shippers in Montreal, and they are all convinced that we have a fourteen foot channel. The Minister of Railways and Canals stated that clearly the other evening. What other means we could take, I do not see.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. gentleman has given us information himself of what they are doing, and he is doing just what I was going to suggest, that is, making soundings and then publishing charts of the soundings, so as to settle the question to the satisfaction of those who are interested in navigation. I am not contending that we have not that depth, but so long as there is uncertainty in the public mind it deters shippers from running the risk. Now, when that is done, I trust the Minister of Public Works will direct his attention towards improving the upper lake harbours. I am glad to say that he is doing it. I have no fault to find, nor do I wish to be understood as finding fault with what he has done, because I am only suggesting what should be done in this connection. But after all, it is claimed by some that we cannot get trade through our ports and down our canals. I may mention here that we are sometimes at a loss on this side of the House whether to look to the Minister of Railways and Canals or to the Minister of Public Works, because sometimes it seems that the Minister of Public Works is usurping the functions of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and vice versa. But so long as they are working in the same direction, it is all right.

But after that is all done, it seems to me that we might go further and do something more to induce shipping to come through our own channels and down to our own ports. Looking up the history of shipping in other countries some years ago—I am speaking with an indistinct recollection, and may not be accurate—I found that some countries have determined to give a bounty on shipping going through their own ports and down their own channels. It seems to me we might do something in that direction. We have our own ports and our own lake vessels. It seems to me we might give a bounty upon all vessels that will carry produce, say from the port of Montreal instead of from the port of Boston, or that will carry produce from the port of Halifax, or the port of St. John, or the port of Quebec, instead of from American ports. We might give all shippers landing goods at those ports some rebate upon their cargoes, so that vessel-owners might get some consideration for landing in our ports. It is not necessary to make it a large one, but frequently a small bounty would be a sufficient inducement to make vessel-owners land their cargoes in a Canadian port. I think this point is worthy of consideration on the part of the government. Let them look into the question carefully, and see if something could not be done in that direction. We might give a consideration to the vessels of our own country larger than we would give to the vessels belonging to a foreign country; but give some consideration to foreign vessels as well, if they will land cargoes in our own ports and take cargoes from our own ports to foreign countries. Let us give a consideration to the trade that is carried through our own channels, and through our own ports in contradistinction to the trade that goes to and from the ports of a foreign country. The government might look up what other countries have been doing in this respect, because what others have done we may do

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I was very much interested in seeing the Minister of Public Works take the stand he has taken this afternoon in his purpose of opening up, not only the routes from the west to Montreal, but the routes from Montreal to the sea. I may say that in any scheme which has merits he will have my cordial endorsation, so long as it is opening up Canadian routes to trade. I was a little surprised, however, at the proposition made by the hon. Minister of Public Works in relation to a canal twenty feet deep to North Bay.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not a canal; simply improving the river.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I know, but the hon. minister will have to construct locks.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. minister gave no intimation that he purposed continuing that waterway to Montreal down the Ottawa river, but he gave the distance as 364 miles from Montreal to North Bay. It is eighty miles from North Bay to the Georgian Bay, it is ninety miles from that to the Spanish river, it is only 151 miles from the mouth of the Spanish river to North Bay, and at the mouth of the Spanish river on the north shore of the Georgian Bay there is a most excellent port at the present time. The Canadian Pacific Railway is in there to-day, and that being the case, why spend $3,000,000, or $4,000,000, in order to construct a twenty-foot waterway from the Georgian Bay up to North Bay when it would be of no use except for a few months in the year? If the hon. minister has a project to continue the canal up to Lake Nipissing, thence to Mattawa, then down the Ottawa to Montreal, if he can find a sufficient water supply, then, being in favour of canals myself, he will have my hearty endorsation. The Canadian Pacific Railway at present runs from Montreal to the mouth of the Spanish river on the route of the Sault Ste. Marie Railway, the distance being 515 miles. It would be an easy matter for these large ships from Chicago, Fort William and the west to bring grain from any of these ports, tranship it to the Canadian Pacific Railway at Spanish river and send it thence to Montreal. There is another matter that I wish to mention to the hon. minister. Navigators on the St. Lawrence claim that not only is the navigation of the

river very imperfect and very difficult, but that it can only be utilized between Quebec and Montreal during the day time, and that even below Quebec very great improvements are necessary in the way of buoying.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I can assure the hon. Minister of Public Works that anything in his scheme that proposes to develop the St. Lawrence route will have my hearty endorsation.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. Minister of Public Works, under the appropriations in 1900-1, asked for $433,000, and this year he asked for $419,000. By a reference to the Auditor General's Report of last year it would seem that the bulk of the expenditure of $433,000, authorized last year, or so much of it as was made was expended something after this form : At the town, or city, I do not know which, of Sorel, it would seem that the government had established large workshops, and that at these workshops there is in the employ of the government, and at day's labour, a perfect army of men. I do not believe it is in keeping with the principles of government that any one minister should spend such a large sum as $90,000 a year for day's labour in the construction of dredges and tugs and other parts of the apparatus, because, I understood the hon. minister to say that some dredges were constructed at that place last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it a business deal on the part of any government to come down and ask parliament to vote moneys, and I presume he will appropriate this large amount, equally as much, to the same purpose in the coming year, upwards of $100,000, or more, for the construction of dredges, tugs or whatever he may desire. And, mark you, these are not to be constructed by public tender and contract, but the hon. minister is to go out among his party friends and ask them to send in their party friends and they are to construct these tugs. It is not fair to the city of Toronto, and I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) will be heard from on that point, where they have shipbuilding yards that they are not to be given an opportunity of tendering for the construction of these dredges. Why should the minister have the right and the privilege and why should his colleagues assent to the proposition that he should have placed at his disposal upwards of $100,000 for the construction of dredges and other craft ? It is a preposterous proposition, and if we are to have dredges build for this country there should be the open principle of public tender, and instead of the minister taking $90,000 as he did last year, and I presume he will take an equally large sum this year, or perhaps a larger sum to construct dredges, he should put the work up to public competition. It is startling that the hon. minister has such amounts of money as this at his disposal. Contrast this with other departments of the government, with the Department of Marine and Fisheries, for instance I know, that, in my riding, when that department wished to place out buoys, they openly called for tenders for the placing of these buoys. The work is ground down to the last cent. The competition is keen and the result is that this work is done at almost starvation prices. Take the Post Office Department; in Ontario, and I believe in the other provinces of the Dominion, there is the wholesome principle of tender, and the result is that people are carrying the mails at comparatively trifling prices. But, the hon. Minister of Public Works takes another ground altogether. He said last year : I want parliament to give me $400,000 with the right to spend $90,000 in constructing different kinds of craft, and it is fair to assume that he is going to take a larger amount this year for the same purpose. If he is not going to construct craft of the same kind, then, I presume, the amount should be cut lower, but, before the committee passes this item it will ask what the hon. minister proposes to do with this huge amount of $419,000. Is it in line with the policy of this government that they are going to assent to the proposition that the hon. Minister of Public Works is to have upwards of $100,000 to construct tugs, and dredges ? And, how is he going to construct them ? Is he going to ask for tenders and get the work done at the lowest figure ? Not at all; he is going down to Sorel, he is going to the representative of that riding, a party friend, and then all the friends of the government will be turned into this government shipyard to the exclusion of others, and the wholesale patronage is vested in the minister and the representative of that district. It is bad enough that upwards of $100,000 should be spent in this manner, but, we come to something worse than that, and it is the purchase of supplies. The committee will be startled when I tell them that the minister last year purchased, at Sorel, for the construction of these dredges, and other craft, no less than $235,000 worth of supplies without public tender. I would ask the hon. minister if that statement is correct ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) should not forget——

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. minister pardon me ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will answer the question. If my hon. friend will go on I will answer him altogether.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. minister if he will answer 'yes' or 'no'?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will explain the whole thing when I speak.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. minister says that these supplies were purchased by tender, no comment will be necessary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman will make his speech and I will answer him.

Mr. BENNETT. Were these $235,000 worth of supplies purchased by tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman will simply finish his speech I will pledge myself to answer every point he makes now.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, if the hon. minister wants to keep his supplies back he is going about it now in the proper way.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will not take long; I will answer the hon. gentleman in a few minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. I simply ask the hon. minister whether these supplies were purchased by tender or not. The hon. minister can answer that by saying 'yes,' or 'no.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot now. I am just looking up the memorandum.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, I will sit down and let the hon. minister answer that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend should not forget what he has apparently forgotten, that he has only to go back to past history to remember that the shipyard in Sorel was established before we took office. I found it there, and I also found the same system of days labour in vogue. Indeed, that system is the only one that can be followed at Sorel. We have a shipyard in Sorel because we have a fleet of dredges, a fleet of barges, and a fleet of tugs, and so on. In case of an accident occurring, where could we go if we had not the shipyard? The working of the whole system would be quite impossible without it. That shipyard has been in existence for many years, even when the harbour commissioners had charge of the ship channel, and in fact it is just as necessary for the government to have such a concern as it is for the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway to have shops. My hon. friend reproaches me severely for having built dredges by days' labour. Well, I take great pride for having done so, but I must pay the same compliment to the gentlemen who preceded me. I am sorry to say that I have just been informed that I cannot pay the same compliment to my predecessors, because they did not built dredges by days' labour although they built tugs and barges and so on. The best dredge they did build is the Laval, which was built at Hull, and without any attempt to discredit that dredge it is not the best of the fleet. I claim that the dredges that have been built at Sorel by Canadian skilled labour are the best dredges that are in America. I do not see why the government should be reproached for building the dredges with Canadian labour in Canada. I would go further. I have often and often pressed my colleague the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) to have workshops of his own in this country. I claim there is no reason under the sun why the Canadian people should not do their own work in their own country. All the dredges which are working to-day in the maritime provinces are imported from England, but they are not quite as good as the dredges we build ourselves, and I want to know in God's name why should we import anything that we can build here. I may have faults——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may have faults, but on that point I am a strong Canadian.

Mr. WALLACE. What about the furniture at the Paris exposition?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The furniture at the Paris exposition was bought before I went there, and when my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) goes to Paris and sees it he will agree with me that Canadian labour could have done just as well.

Mr. WALLACE. Then why did not the government do it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) is quite capable of understanding the difference there is between building a dredge in Sorel and buying furniture in Paris.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. I quite understand that the Minister of Public Works will preach protection in one place and practice the very opposite in another.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I feel there is a great difference between buying a hat in New York and building a dredge in Toronto.

Mr. CLARKE. How does the cost of constructing dredges at Sorel compare with the price paid for dredges constructed in England?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The dredge that was brought from England cost a good deal more than the dredge we are building in Sorel.

Mr. CLARKE. The same capacity?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. On that point I court the fullest investigation, and I would be very glad if some of the gentlemen on the other side

would be good enough to come to Sorel and see the work that is being done there.

Mr. CLARKE. Are we to understand that the dredges built at Sorel have cost less than dredges of the same capacity purchased in England ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The dredge St. Lawrence, which was imported from England, cost $115,000, I am informed. Her capacity is not half the capacity of our Sorel dredges, and the average cost of our Sorel dredges is $110,000.

Mr. CLARKE. That is a saving of $40,000 in favour of building them at home ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. CLARKE. I think they ought to be built at home then.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think so too, and I may say that the dredge we are building in Toronto to-day will be built cheap compared with other dredges built elsewhere.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the price of the dredge which is being constructed by the Polsons in Toronto ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For British Columbia ?

Mr. CLARKE. This suction dredge for the St. Lawrence.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The cost will be $163,000, but of course there are additions that will have to be built later on ; there are discharge pipes and the like. This is an entirely new model and nothing of the kind has been built here before, and it will cost $163,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Did the minister ask for tenders for that dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I did not, and for the excellent reason that I thought it would be a waste of time. I was very anxious that the St. Lawrence channel should be dredged as quickly as it could be. I have seen at the Paris exposition models of suction dredges, but I was very anxious to build a dredge on American lines on this side of the ocean. I went to New York and to Bridgeport, where there was a large dredge that had worked in the port of New York for Messrs. Hughes & Co. I was received by the engineer in charge at Bridgeport, and I asked him if he ever came to Montreal, and he said : Yes, I studied at the Royal Military College at Kingston. It was a great pleasure indeed to meet a Canadian engineer in charge of such a large work in the United States. That gentleman's name was Morrison. There was another engineer by the name of Robertson, who is the consulting engineer for Hughes & Co. He is a Canadian who had worked for several years for the harbour commissioners at Montreal, and since he crossed the line he has designed 116 American dredges. That man has made a plan for us. I learned since that he has also designed for the Polson Iron Works a small dredge that my department is building for British Columbia. We united Mr. Robertson and Mr. Morrison and the Polsons with the officers of my department, and we gave to the Polson Iron Works the hull and machinery of the dredge, keeping for our works in Sorel about $60,000 of the work. With regard to the supplies, we follow the same method as is followed by all the other departments. When we ask for nails or iron, we ask for quotations, as the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk, the Richelieu Co., and every other big firm in this country does, and we always get the goods at the lowest possible price. If my hon. friend would permit me, I would ask him to rise above party in matters of this kind. It would be simply impossible to ask for public tenders in such cases. We would be simply wasting three-quarters of our time without getting any better prices.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister has stated exactly his position, and it is this, that on coming into power he found that there were some workshops at Sorel where repairs were made on government dredges. I quite agree with him that there was a necessity for such workshops. It would be absurd to argue that a government which had dredges and tugs should not have a place to which recourse could be had for repairs. But the minister has gone outside of the question altogether. It is not of repairs that the complaint is made. It is because, on construction work, the minister, instead of calling for public tenders, gets the work done at Sorel, where there is an army of 450 men employed all the year round. Surely he does not say that all these men are kept employed to make repairs on dredges.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We do not always keep that many there.

Mr. BENNETT. The amount expended there, according to the Auditor General's Report, was $90,000. It is all clap-trap for the hon. gentleman to talk about employing Canadians. Any person knows that wherever these dredges might be built in Canada, they would be built by Canadians. The hon. minister has stated his position, and I congratulate him, because he is getting stronger every year and does what he likes. He undertakes the construction work on this large craft, and the result is that he has in his hands this immense patronage, consisting in the employment of 450 men. All I can say is this, that it is well for the people of this country to understand the difference in the position of these ministers. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries may have a little contract ; that has to go to tender. The Postmaster General has a little

contract ; that has to go to tender too. But, when the Minister of Public Works wants to spend $90,000 in labour, he snaps his fingers at contracts and tenders, and all such wholesome restrictions, and declares that he will do as he pleases, and spends hundreds of thousands of dollars among his party friends. Hon. gentlemen opposite were in opposition at one time, and if there was anything they ever did condemn, and condemn wrongly—that is, the old guard from Ontario, who were here at one time, but none of whom are here to-day—it was this expenditure at Sorel. They condemned it day in and day out ; but to-day nothing is heard from them, and the minister has carte blanche to spend what he likes. Coming to the expenditure for supplies, that is even more startling than the expenditure of $100,000 for labour. Would the House believe it ?—the minister last year went among his party friends at Sorel and distributed among them no less than $235,000 of public money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On machinery, engines, and all sorts of things.

Mr. BENNETT. Let us have a look at some of these items. The minister says it was utterly impossible to have tenders called for these matters. All the other departments have to ask for tenders ; but the Minister of Public Works stands up and says that when he wants $25,000 worth of hardware, he cannot call for tenders for that. I find in the Auditor General's Report that a Mr. Cavanagh, of the city of Montreal, was given no less than $25,000 on account of hardware supplies. Does the minister mean to tell me that when he wants $25,000 worth of hardware supplies, he does not ask for tenders ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I mean that the goods purchased with that sum of money were purchased, I suppose, during twelve months, and after quotations were asked for every time.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the minister if he asked for quotations from the leading hardware men in Toronto or any other place in Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, there has been a good deal bought in Ontario, and in Toronto.

Mr. CLARKE. We have in the city of Toronto some of the largest hardware firms in the Dominion. Did the hon. minister ask for tenders from those firms ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say that I asked for tenders everywhere, but I have often asked for tenders in Toronto.

Mr. BENNETT. Before I go into this matter of supplies, I find that when hon. gentlemen opposite were condemning the workshops at Sorel, there were only fifty men employed there, whereas the minister has now 450.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is a growing time.

Mr. BENNETT. It is, no doubt, and a growing time for the influence of the Minister of Public Works in the cabinet, on which I congratulate him. Now, let us take some of these items. First, Ahearn & Soper, for electric light business in connection with a tug, got nearly $3,000. Beauchemin & Co., of Sorel, got supplies to the tune of $2,253. Cameron & Co., of Ottawa, supply lumber to the tune of $8,292. The Canada Switch and Spring Company, of Montreal, received $4,407. Carrier, Laine & Co., of Lévis, received $4,955. Edward Cavanagh, of Montreal, received $25,000 ; B. J. Coghlin, of Montreal, $2,300 ; Dods & Co., of Montreal, $659 ; the Dominion Foundry at Sorel, $2,239 ; the Dominion Wire Rope Company, of Montreal, $2,810 ; T. K. Foster & Co., of Ottawa, $974 ; the Gutta Percha and Rubber Company, $1,900 ; Kingman & Co., of Montreal, $20,000 ; the Laurie Engine Company, of Montreal, $5,584 ; E. H. Lemay, of Montreal, $10,333. I would like to ask the minister if Mr. Lemay, who furnished $10,000 worth of timber, is not one of the harbour commissioners of Montreal, and one of the appointees of this government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is one of the harbour commissioners, and a very able man. All those goods were got after quotations were submitted.

Mr. BENNETT. I find the following firms down for supplies : Louis Bros., Montreal, $16,456 ; T. C. Moore & Co., $10,000 ; D. R. Macleod, Quebec, $15,600 ; McAvity & Sons, St. John, $2,000. It seems startling that the hon. gentleman had to go to St. John to purchase supplies for works at Sorel. Patenaude & Co., Sorel, $4,422 ; Robertson & Co., Montreal, $5,297 ; Robillard & Co., $1,405 ; James Shepard, Sorel, $4,010 ; Wier & Co., Montreal, $9,510.

And so on. Here are thousands and tens of thousands of dollars expended, and the hon. minister gives us fair notice that after spending last year over $400,000 in the construction of dredges, tugs and so on, at Sorel, he is asking a similar grant this year, and it is only fair to assume that he will do as he did last year, namely, construct the tugs and what else he pleases without public competition. He and his friends who were opposed to our having fifty men there some years ago, are going to employ 450 men, and in addition to spend a quarter of a million dollars among their party friends. When we taunt him with not having invited competition, his only answer is that he bought at fair prices. Surely the wholesome principles ought to prevail in the construction of dredges and tugs of inviting

public tenders. Let me give one instance, in my personal knowledge, which will show the hon. gentleman's manner of conducting business in this matter of expenditure on tugs. His department had a very old tug at the town of Midland, which had been used there in connection with dredging work. It was necessary to construct a new hull because the old one was used up. The machinery of the old hull was taken out at the town of Midand and shipped to Sorel, where a new one was built, and the new tug was brought back to Midland. The hon. gentleman could have built a tug at Midland for the amount of freight he had to pay on the machinery, and the hon. gentleman knows it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I do not.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman will look up the accounts, he will find that the cost of transporting the machinery down to Sorel, and then bringing the tug back to Midland, would have built a tug at Midland, because it was not a tug of any considerable size. If that is the kind of business method that characterizes his department in Sorel, the House should hesitate before giving him the opportunity of spending such a large sum as $400,000 in those workshops.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Our complaint in the province of Nova Scotia is that we have not sufficient dredges for the public works necessary to be done. We are quite prepared to build those dredges in that province, because, with the exception of the harbours of Yarmouth and St. John, in the province of New Brunswick, bucket dredges would not be suitable for our work. The kind we want in Nova Scotia, in the rough parts of our harbours and coasts, where there are a good many boulders on the bottom, is spoon dredges, and they can be built for $30,000 to $40,000 each. We would always have plenty of work for them. Some of those dredges have been built before in the province of Nova Scotia, and have done successful work, and I hope, therefore, that the Minister of Public Works will see that we have one or two dredges built in that province suitable for the wants. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on the influence he can exercise in this House, not only on the supporters of the government, but on hon. members opposite, and on the manner in which he looks after the requirements of the country, for whenever he finds anything important requires to be done for the improvement of trade, he is ready and willing to do it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend from East Simcoe is somewhat unfair.

Mr. BENNETT. I am not attacking the hon. gentleman, but the principle on which he acts.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He has given as an instance an old tug in Midland. Well, that was out of shape, but the machinery in it was good, and we simply took down that machinery to Sorel and put it into a new hull. Where is the crime in that? It was a business-like operation, which any ordinary firm would do. What I endeavour to do in the conduct of my department is what I would do in my own affairs, and what any ordinary business firm would do. I do not think that the business men of the country will share the views my hon. friend has expressed. The government is doing the right thing in building its dredges and tugs. My hon. friend says that that gives me patronage..

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, I reply that I wish I was delivered from patronage.

Mr. HEYD. Is it not a fundamental plank in the platform of the trades unions and labour organizations that the contract system on public work should be abolished, and the government do the work themselves?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Between that contention, which I know very well, and the other which my learned hon. friend advocates, I chose what I consider is the right policy. When I believe that a work can be better done by days' labour, I do not hesitate. And when I believe that it cannot be done as well by days' labour, I call for tenders. In this case, I believe, I am doing the right thing. In Sorel there are skilled labouring men who have been for fifty years building ships, and I am using the skill and ability of those men in building these dredges and tugs. If my hon. friend knew the people of Montreal better, he would find out that among those who have received patronage, there are some good friends of his. But I shall be very frank. I am a minister in this Liberal administration, and my duty is to give the patronage to my political friends, and my hon. friend, if he were in my place, would do the same thing. But what I do say is that when there is a manufacturer who does not share my political views, but who is the only or the best man who can supply me with what I want, then I buy from him. And when I find my own political friends who have the same article at as good a price, I deal with them.

Mr. BENNETT. But the hon. minister does not ask other people for prices.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I learned my trade with my hon. friends

on the other side, and I learned it fairly well. When I was on the other side of the House, we used to protect our friends to the best of our ability. I am on this side of the House now, and I proceed upon the very same principle.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand the minister to say that he considers it his duty to give this patronage to his political friends ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All things equal—yes. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to find that I have given one cent more to a political friend than the ordinary market price.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see by page V—34, of the Auditor General's Report, that the hon. minister purchased $25,029.17 worth of goods from the firm of Edward Cavanagh & Co., Montreal. Among the items is 514·9 gallons of boiled oil, at 87 cents per gallon. I ask the hon. minister if he will say that he has not paid one cent too much there ? I am buying boiled oil for our company, and while it is higher now than it was between June 1, 1899, and June 1, 1900, it has not reached that price even yet.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What price is it ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The price charged here is 87 cents. I leave it to any man who knows anything about the trade if that would not be an outrageous price, even at retail.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) has found fault with us often about such matters—and as he is on the other side of the House it is right for him to do so, it is his duty. The other day he told us we paid too much for onions, and now he says we pay too much for oil. I have at the head of that department at Sorel an old officer, Mr. Howdon, who was fifteen years under the late administration. I have kept him there because he is one of the most honest men I have ever known, and he knows his work well. His instructions are to buy at the best market price. There are times, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has suggested, when oil is higher than at others. But I should be surprised if Mr. Howdon, in whom I have implicit confidence, had paid too much in this case. I thank the hon. gentleman for calling my attention to the matter, and I will look into it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister has stated that he bought goods by tender after quotation. He must have those quotations, and I would ask him to give the quotations for boiled oil between June 1, 1899, and June 1, 1900.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I can I will. I have nothing to hide. Of course, I do not buy myself ; I could not do it.

Mr. TARTE.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the hon. minister say that Mr. Howdon has bought all these goods ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not mean to say that he has not instructed some of his subordinates to do the actual buying, but he is the responsible man in such matters.

Mr. McGOWAN. I think it is only just to the Minister of Public Works to say that I bought linseed oil by the car-load at 81 cents. It was very high last spring.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And, of course, we do not buy by the car-load.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like my hon. friend (Mr. McGowan) to give the prices of the year before. I am not speaking of last year, but of the year before. It is higher now. This government ought to buy as cheaply as anybody can.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I observe some purchases here which, I think, might be made better than by the method of inviting offers only from friends of the administration. There is one item under the head of Weir & Co., Montreal, from whom a boiler was bought for $4,125. There is no description given of the boiler except that it is to bear a pressure of 200 pounds. In a case like that it should be quite easy for the hon. minister, as, evidently, he does not construct boilers in the Sorel works, to ask all the manufacturers of boilers within a reasonable distance to tender. We have in different parts of the provinces large concerns whose business it is to make boilers, and I should suppose there is no doubt that the cost of these expensive boilers to the government would be reduced if tenders were asked for. That is one instance where there is a large outlay without sufficient information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know, in the case of Weir & Co., quotations were asked for. I may add that this firm ranks among the best manufacturers of boilers that we have—although, I may say, they are not, politically, friends of ours. But Mr. Howdon represented to me that, in his opinion, these men were safe, that they had done work for the government for years and years. They were the lowest in this case.

Mr. CLARKE. Were tenders called for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quotations were asked for from manufacturers—we always do that.

Mr. CLARKE. In Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And elsewhere, I think. I cannot say in this case, but we generally have quotations from many places.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). How large a boiler was that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the dimensions here, and, of course, I cannot carry these details in my memory—that would be out of the question.

Public Works—Chargeable to Capital—
Harbours and Rivers, Ontario—River Kaministiquia $10,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the ordinary appropriation every year. There is nothing special.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask if this is the only appropriation to be charged to capital for expenditure in the province of Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is the expenditure on Port Colborne harbour.

At six o'clock, the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 34) an Act to incorporate the Canadian Patriotic Fund Association.—Mr. Costigan.

Bill (No. 41) an Act respecting the Saskatchewan and Western Railway Company.—Mr. LaRivière.

Bill (No. 42) an Act respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—Mr. Fraser.

Bill (No. 43) an Act to incorporate 'The St. Lawrence Lloyds.'—Mr. Geoffrion.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Manitoba—St. Andrews Rapids improvements, Red River $100,000

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Explain please.

Mr. PUTTEE. Is this item to apply to the St. Andrews locks contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). Yes. Last year there was a sum of $125,000 placed in the estimates. This year we ask for $100,000. That work has been urged for a number of years, and as I said, last year, parliament decided that the work should be constructed and a sum of money was placed in the estimates. The object of the work is to improve the Red river in such a way as to make it navigable from Lake Winnipeg to the city of Winnipeg. West Selkirk is the point where navigation now stops. From West Selkirk to Winnipeg the distance is about twenty-three miles. Ten miles from Winnipeg there is a succession of rapids. The object of the work is to erect a dam and a lock which will flood these rapids so as to make that part of the river between West Selkirk and Winnipeg navigable for boats drawing seven feet. The work has been advertised and the lowest tender has been accepted, the contract going into the hands of Messrs. Kelly & Company for the sum of $469,000. This will not cover the whole cost of the work as the contract has been awarded only for the masonry. There will be a considerable sum of money required later on to build the upper part of the work. The work is composed of two parts—permanent masonry work 800 feet long, on which work there will be placed gates, movable walls, if I may call them that, which will be opened during the flood and which will be closed when the high waters of the flood are passed. When these gates are closed there will be seven feet of water at Winnipeg, the fall being about fifteen feet. Parliament pronounced last year on the principle of the work, and I am only carrying out the order of parliament in going on with it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Could the hon. minister say how much he expects the entire work will cost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The estimate that has been placed in my hands puts the balance of the work at $200,000 in round numbers. It will be composed of a service bridge, movable frames, lock gates and working apparatus, lockmaster's house, shed, two steam travellers for loading freight, &c. Then, there is the ordinary cost of supervision, and, in round numbers, the work will cost $200,000 additional.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That will make altogether how much ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $660,000. If my hon. friend would like to have this little plan I shall send it over to him. It is simply proposed to flood the rapids that cannot be navigated now for a distance of twenty-three miles.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Between what points will this constitute a route, and what kind of traffic will go over it ? I am merely asking for information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course my hon. friend knows that there is a large traffic in Winnipeg. Fuel is very scarce in Winnipeg itself, and the object of this work is to create navigation over the whole length of Lake Winnipeg and thence to the American frontier. The United States government have improved the Red river and made it navigable for over sixty miles. This will give access from the city of Winnipeg to Lake Winnipeg; in other words, all the district around Lake Winnipeg will have water communication with Winnipeg, while, to-day, that water communication stops twenty-three miles from Winnipeg, which is a great inconvenience indeed.

Mr. PUTTEE. The hon. minister will remember that tenders were called for this work a second time. The object of calling for tenders a second time was to provide for a contract under the minimum wage resolution which was passed by this House last year. I would like to know if the minimum wage clause was included in the contract and whether that clause has been observed, whether any progress estimates have been paid, and if so, has the contractor filed affidavits to the effect that the minimum wage clause has been observed and such wages been paid.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know very well that the work has to be carried on under the regulation respecting wages. No estimate has been paid yet. I have received from the Department of Labour a complaint that the contractors, Messrs. Kelly & Co., have not obeyed what is called the fair-wages clause. That complaint is before me. I am sorry to say that I received it only two or three days ago and have not yet had time to look into it. I intend to compel Mr. Kelly to follow those regulations, as he has bound himself to do. Every time that a complaint is brought to me I will certainly look into it carefully, and if I need the services of the Department of Labour, I shall be glad to avail myself of their services.

Mr. PUTTEE. Could the minister tell us whether the figures in the second contract are the same as those in the first tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was not here when the tenders were called for, and I do not remember the figures. But I will be glad to give the information to my hon. friend.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was the occasion of calling for tenders twice?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because the fair-wages clause had not been inserted in the first contract. There is a schedule attached to the contract which binds Kelly & Co. to pay wages up to a certain figure in virtue of that clause.

Transportation facilities—Port Colborne harbour improvements $150,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I explained this afternoon the nature of these works. I may say that a contract has been awarded for only 1,300 feet of the breakwater that we intend to erect. The whole length will be 5,700 feet. The Minister of Finance, in my absence two years ago, stated to the House that he thought the expenditure would not exceed $150,000. As the item passed through the House last year without any explanation being asked or given, we thought it only fair not to bind parliament to any expenditure of money larger than the amount already voted. But the contractors, Messrs. Hogan & McDonald, have undertaken to build the whole work for the sum of $395,000. As I have said, this breakwater is an essential and necessary work, without such we cannot do any trade at Port Colborne. At Buffalo, 20 miles from Port Colborne, which, as my hon. friend knows, is the entrance of the Canadian canal system, there are magnificent harbour works. The American government have spent large sums of money in building these works, which are not yet completed. The sweep of the wind on Lake Erie at certain times is as violent as on the Atlantic ocean. It is therefore out of the question to expect any large trade for the Welland canal unless we have harbour facilities at that point. The breakwater is the first work to be done. And I state here that I am going to ask from parliament the balance of the money—I do not require it this year, but I will ask for authority to build the whole breakwater. I would not stand in this parliament and say that 1,300 feet would be sufficient; there would remain a large gap of about 4,300 feet which, unless it was filled up, would make the harbour useless. Now, I wish to insist on this point, that Port Colborne is the first link in our system of canals between England and the west. That work is just as essential as the works in the port of Montreal, and without this improvement at Port Colborne we cannot expect any large freight carriers to come to our Canadian waters, it is out of the question. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals is performing the work that belongs to him, and I am performing the work that belongs to me. I hope that on this question we will have the support of both sides of the House.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it was two years ago, in the absence of the Minister of Public Works, a plan was laid on the Table of the House which projected an expenditure at Port Colborne of some $5,000,000. That plan embraced the building of piers and jetties, and an extensive amount of dredging. I do not think it included the construction of an elevator on any of the piers. Now, the minister has discussed at considerable length this afternoon, and more briefly this evening, the present position of Port Colborne; and if any one had heard him who was not aware of the circumstances, he would have been led to believe that never a bushel of grain or a vessel had passed Port Colborne. Now, what are the facts? Port Colborne is on the Lake Erie entrance of the Welland canal. I think I am within the mark—and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) can correct me if I am not—in saying that two or three years ago some 10 million bushels of grain passed through the Welland canal and passed Port Colborne on to Kingston and Prescott. Now, if 10 million bushels of grain went past Port Colborne through the Welland canal to Prescott and Kingston, it proves that this much-condemned place, Port Colborne, is not so bad as it has been described. Let me tell the Minister of Public Works that

for several years past vessels have gone through this entrance of Port Colborne carrying cargoes of 75,000 bushels of grain. Such vessels as the Rosemount, the Algonquin, the Rosedale, and others, have been seen from time to time in the harbour of Kingston, as the hon. member for Kingston will tell the House. Now, the minister has a proposition before the House to-night to expend $400,000. When this $400,000 is expended, he has partially completed a work which, according to the plans presented from his own department, will cost the sum of $5,000,000.

I want to ask the minister what will be the upshot of all this ? You can now carry from Fort William to Kingston a cargo of 75,000 bushels in vessels like the Rosedale and Algonquin as the hon. member (Mr. Britton) will tell you, and at Kingston that grain is placed in barges to go down the canal. As a result of this expenditure you will bring a vessel carrying one-quarter of a million bushels to Port Colborne, and you will transfer that to smaller carriers for Montreal. You will have to transfer that cargo to an elevator both at Kingston and Port Colborne if ever an elevator is built at the latter place. If you carry by large freighters to Port Colborne, you will practically close up Prescott and Kingston ; and I am informed that no grain went through Prescott this year, and a less quantity through Kingston. Can the minister tell the House what will be the saving in carrying wheat in large 200,000 bushel freighters to Port Colborne, as compared with carrying from Fort William to Kingston in 75,000 bushel boats. This difference in the cost of freight, if there be any, is the only benefit that will be derived from this expenditure. Surely the government had some data of this kind before entering on this large expenditure. I would also ask the minister what basin or area will be dredged to a depth of 23 feet at Port Colborne in consequence of this expenditure?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The point I make is this : Buffalo is 20 miles from Port Colborne, and last year over 200,000,000 bushels of grain and flour went through Buffalo, and it went there because the grain can be carried quickly and cheaply from Buffalo to New York. Between these two cities it is 450 miles by rail, and 500 miles by the Erie canal, which, however, carries a very small quantity of grain now.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does, but this is one of the questions which the country needs to be educated upon, and the hon. gentleman may have something to learn as I had. If I am not mistaken it costs about three cents to carry a bushel of grain from Buffalo to New York, and perhaps a little more at times.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Including the terminal charges.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, Now, the cost of carrying a bushel of grain from the western points to Buffalo and to Port Colborne will be about the same. The point is how much will it cost from Port Colborne to Montreal ? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) thinks that Kingston and Prescott will suffer. I hope they will not. I am confident that there will be trade for all the ports on the lakes, but the broad question is : whether the Welland canal will continue to carry only 10,000,000 bushels, as against 200,000,000 bushels received at Buffalo. It is not a patriotic policy for us to try and raise little differences between town and town. The main point is whether Canada will retain her own trade, and whether we can capture the American trade. Our route is the shortest, and the problem for us is to make it the best and cheapest. I feel confident that we will be able to carry grain from Port Colborne to Montreal inside of two cents a bushel, and if we can accomplish that, then when we have completed the port of Montreal and the deepening and the widening of the St. Lawrence, we are going to take the life out of Buffalo. We have only to put our hands and our heads together to do that. My friend (Mr. Bennett) asks what accommodation we are going to have when these works are completed at Port Colborne. I believe the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) is providing for a harbour 1,200 by 600 feet.

Mr. CLARKE. What depth ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Twenty-two feet.

Mr. CLARKE. At what cost ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It will cost between $900,000 and $1,000,000.

Mr. CLARKE. To make a harbour 1,200 feet by 600 feet, and 22 feet deep.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the entrance to the Welland. The entrance is to give a depth of channel of between 500 feet and 600 feet in width, and the excavation we will have to make will extend over a distance of about 1,200 feet. Our side wings will extend out, and we will have to dredge to a depth of 21 or 22 feet for the length and width specified. The work at the entrance is our work. In connection with one of the side wings, and as part of them we are making our structures substantial and sufficiently wide to admit (with one or

two projecting piers) of ships coming right straight from the lake and lying alongside the pier. There will be no turning and twisting to get into the pier, and there will be no difficulty in getting out. My hon. colleague (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is now asking for an appropriation for a breakwater which will inclose—for the purpose of extension and enlargement, if need be—a very considerable harbour, and it will be just as the needs arise, whether or not we will make a harbour of any larger area, and whether we will do in the future any rock dredging, of which there will be a good deal. There is a large quantity of rock in that inclosure; and whether we will dredge any of it in the future or not, we do not want to do any more than is absolutely necessary. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) was not present at the time the plan spoken of by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) was mentioned, and I think, produced; and I would like to remind the House, as I think the hon. member himself recollects, that it was stated very distinctly at that time that it was a plan, covering the whole of the work which the engineer would advise us to do, and had not been passed upon by either the present minister or the acting minister, nor had it been considered by the government. It was the suggestion of the engineer of the department. It was a very expensive plan. He proposed dredging out the whole of this basin all the way from the breakwater to the canal piers, and providing for piers being thrown out inclosing the whole basin between the breakwater and the canal entrance. It would not be fair to treat that plan as a concluded policy on the part of the government, because it had never been considered.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In other words, the engineer who made the surveys simply showed on the plan what could be done if it should become necessary later on. The plans which we are carrying out have nothing to do with that big plan, which I hope it may become necessary later on to carry out. If we were in a position to receive 100,000,000 bushels of grain in a couple of years, or were capable of supplanting Buffalo, I am sure this parliament would not hesitate to spend a couple of millions to do so.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask if the contract has been let for the work which the minister alludes to, and, if so, who the contractors are?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The contract has been let to Messrs. Hogan & Macdonell.

Mr. BENNETT. The Minister of Public Works has not answered the question I asked him. While to-day you are carrying cargoes in vessels of 75,000 bushels capacity to Kingston, which cargoes you discharge into barges going down the canal, what would be the lessened cost when you are to carry in larger vessels to Port Colborne, and transfer there to barges which will go to Montreal? Has the department any data to show that?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nobody can have any exact data as to that; but experience has shown that waterways are the cheapest means of transportation. We have now a fourteen-foot channel between Port Colborne and Montreal, and by transhipping at Port Colborne into boats of fourteen feet draught, we shall necessarily decrease the cost of transportation from the west to the east. That seems to me just as clear as daylight. We shall certainly have enterprising people who will build fleets of large boats. I quite grant that we are short of Canadian bottoms. This is one of the difficulties, but all these matters will be settled in time. When the trade is there and the improvements are completed, the fleets will come. For the moment, what I consider important is to prepare the accommodation for the freight. The deep water channel would be nothing without harbour facilities. Port Colborne is in the same position as Buffalo, and there is no reason why, with a fourteen-foot channel, we could not carry trade more successfully through Canadian waters than the New York Central does to New York.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister has made the exact statement which I wished him to make. His statement is that despite the fact that millions of bushels of grain have gone through the Welland canal system to Kingston in barges of 75,000 bushels capacity, and that grain has been going to Montreal, he is now asking the country to pledge itself, and the country is going to do so, to an expense of nearly $1,500,000—to do what? To try the experiment of transferring the grain at Port Colborne instead of at Kingston. If you had to take 10,000,000 or 100,000,000 bushels of grain to Montreal, you could do exactly as has been done in years past—take it to Kingston in 75,000 bushel barges, and transfer it there to barges of 30,000 or 40,000 or 50,000 bushels capacity. The hon. gentleman says that has not been successful. He says, I am convinced that we should make a new experiment at Port Colborne at an expenditure of $1,500,000, of having larger boats to carry the grain to Port Colborne, and having it there put into identically the same barges as in past years have carried it from Kingston to Montreal. And the minister makes the astounding statement that his government are going to spend this $1,500,000 when they do not know what difference there will be in the freight. Would any business man plunge into an expenditure of that kind without having any idea of the saving that

would be effected ? The only advantage in favour of Port Colborne will be the lessened freight that there may be in carrying grain from Fort William to Port Colborne in 250,000 bushel bottoms against 75,000 bushel bottoms to Kingston. For this expenditure of $1,500,000, what are we to have ? We are to have a basin 400 yards in length and 200 yards in width.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, that is not the basin ; that is the entrance.

Mr. BENNETT. What will the basin be on the inside ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. member knows the situation there pretty well. We throw out from the mouth of our canal two projecting piers starting in the form of a funnel. From the side of one of these piers we throw out a couple of cross piers as it were out into the entrance, of sufficient length to enable us to safely receive and tie up the largest crafts that is likely to come down the lakes. They unload there. That is where the elevators will be. From these the grain will be loaded again into the barges which it is anticipated with every confidence will be the mode of carriage from Port Colborne down to Montreal. We have no basin in the sense the hon. gentleman would convey. We have an entrance and ships can get right in, and this breakwater is designed for the purpose of protecting that entrance from the extremely heavy storms which very often occur at that point.

Mr. BENNETT. When you get inside of these basins after you have done this dredging, what will be the depth of water on the inside ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Twenty-two feet. The hon. gentleman has affirmed, over and over again, that every year the steamers employed as freighters on the lakes are increasing in size, and that these large steamers are absorbing the traffic of the lakes. Why do they ? Because it is cheaper to carry tonnage in these large steamers. Every year the number of small steamers is becoming less, and the number of large steamers greater. When large steamers come down in the neighbourhood of Port Colborne, they are compelled of necessity to pass the entrance of that canal and go to Buffalo. And they must continue to go to Buffalo until we make suitable provision for them at Port Colborne. That is as plain as any proposition that can be advanced. The ultimate result, when we will have equipped Port Colborne, will be that these vessels can ride into the entrance of that canal, lie there safely against the winds and the storms, unload their cargoes into the elevators, and we will have secured all this freight for our canals, which we are now losing.

We did not act upon any mere conjecture, but took the opinions of every shipper that could be reached. We took the opinion of every one who is doing business on the Canadian route, and also the opinions of some of those who are doing business by the Buffalo route. I read in this House two years ago a number of these opinions, and all agreed that there is no hope for the future of the St. Lawrence canals unless we put ourselves in a position to handle the cargoes that come down by large steamers. Relying upon the best expert opinion we could obtain, we deliberately came to the conclusion that the only remedy was to put Port Colborne in such a shape that large steamers could be induced to go there.

Mr. CLARKE. Was there not a difference of opinion between the government engineers as to whether Port Colborne or Port Maitland was the best ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We took the opinions of various engineers as to which port was to be preferred. Our engineer was decidedly in favour of Port Colborne. Mr. Thompson had no doubt whatever upon the question. Mr. Keefer said that something had to be done either at Port Colborne or Port Maitland. He was in favour of Port Maitland, and I did the best I could, in view of these conflicting opinions. I had these two gentlemen together, I let them cross-examine one another and cross-examined them myself as well as I could, and applying the best judgment I could to the differences which existed between them, I came to the conclusion, in which I was supported by the concurrent judgment of the chief engineer, that Port Maitland was entirely out of the question. It was a number of miles away, and there were other disadvantages into which I need not now enter.

When the steamers get into Port Colborne, their cargoes will be transferred into elevators, just as they are at Buffalo. At Buffalo they are transferred into elevators, and thence into cars, and this is done at very small charges. Why ? Because they have established an elevator system up to the highest degree of perfection, and there are fifty or sixty elevators at Buffalo. When these same steamers come to Port Colborne, they will have also to transfer their cargoes into elevators and thence into these large barges instead of into railway cars, and we propose to go right through with these barges from Port Colborne to Montreal, just as the trains go right through from Buffalo to New York. My hon. friend says why do you not elevate at Port Colborne, and load into small barges and then elevate again at Kingston ? Or if you take the large barges at Port Colborne, why not load into them and then go to Kingston, and elevate again at Kingston,

and transfer into small barges and take these down to Montreal ? But, there would then be two elevating in the one route when you need only have one.

Mr. BENNETT. My contention is, that at present you take a 75,000 bushel barge to Kingston, and you transfer then to any barge that will go through to Montreal. You take your vessel to Kingston and transfer into an elevator, and then into a barge, and on to Montreal. We agree on that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We do not agree as to the necessity of transferring at Kingston.

Mr. BENNETT. If you take a 75,000 bushel barge——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If you do not propose to have your big steamers at Port Colborne, you do not propose to have any business.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) simply excludes from our Canadian waters all those large carriers which are the favoured carriers, and wants only small carriers. It is well known that the size of the ships on the lakes is increasing every year. But, he does not want them at Port Colborne, but wants them at Midland.

Mr. BENNETT. They are going there anyway.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am just dredging to 22 feet at Midland. Why ? Because it is necessary to have deep water there for these large carriers. My hon. friend wants them at Midland, but not at Port Colborne. That is not very logical in my opinion. My hon. friend is all mixed up.

Mr. BENNETT. No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I believe he is. There are two kinds of ships navigating the lakes to-day, ships of small size and ships of larger size—and growing larger every year. We want both kinds. The small ships will continue navigating our canals, but the larger ships will come to Port Colborne. Last year only ten million bushels of grain came by our route. I make this prophecy to the House—that when we have completed our equipment at Port Colborne and Montreal, the Welland canal will carry five times more grain than it does—I believe at least five times more. Large ships cannot go to Port Colborne to-day. Do we want those large ships ? My hon. friend says, no.

Mr. COCHRANE. Nonsense.

Mr. BENNETT. I said nothing of the kind.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He says that practically. If there is no accommodation at Port Colborne the large vessels cannot go there. Is that a fact or is it not ? We know that there is no accommodation and that the large ships cannot go there. And, if the hon. gentleman says we are not to provide the accommodation, that is another way of saying that he does not want the ships to go there. Let us talk plainly. Without necessary accommodation at Port Colborne those vessels will continue to go to Buffalo.

Mr. GERMAN. I have listened for two days to the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), and I have failed to understand his idea. He put before us the other day a proposition to bonus the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canada Atlantic in order to induce them to carry grain from Midland to Montreal and the seaboard. The proposition he has to-day is that the government should enlarge the Welland canal sufficiently to allow the largest upper lake boats to come to Kingston and tranship the grain there. If that is not his proposition there is no earthly meaning in what he says. The boats that navigate the upper lakes with profit cannot go to Kingston, they cannot get through the Welland canal, unless it is greatly improved. The new aqueduct which was built at Welland cost $700,000, which is to afford navigation of 14 feet. You cannot get a boat drawing 22 feet of water through an aqueduct having a depth of 14 feet. You would need to build a new aqueduct at an expenditure of at least $1,000,000 in order to get these large boats from the upper lakes through.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You would need to rebuild the canal.

Mr. GERMAN. Yes, you would need to rebuild the canal at an expenditure of $5,000,000 or $10,000,000. It is simply an impossible proposition.

Mr. COCHRANE. Nobody suggested it.

Mr. GERMAN. The hon. gentleman from East Simcoe says, if his language means anything at all, that the transhipping should be done at Kingston——

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. member for East Simcoe will never be responsible for trying to make the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) understand plain English, I can assure him of that.

Mr. GERMAN. If I have not stated the proposition correctly, then I should much like to know what the proposition is. The hon. gentleman has been talking of transhipping at Kingston. He told us of vessels going through the Welland canal carrying 75,000 bushels of grain and said that these boats should go to Kingston, and the transhipping

should be done there into smaller barges for Montreal. I think I am quoting him properly in that, and if I am not I should be glad to have him correct me. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that there are not half a dozen boats going through the Welland canal carrying 75,000 bushels of grain. There is a line in connection with the Vermont Central between Chicago and Ogdensburg carrying 70,000 bushels, but there are not half a dozen carrying 75,000 bushels nor anything like it. The fact is that all the boats navigating the upper lakes with profit are boats drawing from 20 to 22 feet of water. These boats go to Buffalo. The proposition of the government is that the Buffalo harbour is exceedingly congested, and vesselmen are continually saying that they want a harbour at Port Colborne so that they can send their cargoes by that way, and so relieve the congestion at Buffalo. Building a breakwater at Port Colborne will make as good a harbour as there is on Lake Erie. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart) says he does not believe that a good harbour can be constructed at Port Colborne. Well, he has been there and ought to know the situation ; but I will venture to say that there is no practical engineer in the country who will not admit that, when a breakwater is built at Port Colborne as is proposed by the Minister of Public Works, there will be one of the safest harbours of refuge there that is to be found on Lake Erie.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will be a closed harbour.

Mr. GERMAN. And it will be a harbour with 22 feet of water; a harbour into which even the heaviest vessels on the upper lakes can come. They can then go right up to the piers at Port Colborne, transfer their cargoes into vessels drawing 14 feet which will pass through to Montreal. There is no question of doubt in my mind that that will be the route which will carry the grain of the North-west in a very few years hence. There is only one other point I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and that is that he must put more money into his estimates to put the Welland canal into the condition it ought to be in. It is in no proper condition now, by reason of the curves in it and by reason of the bridges which were built under an antiquated plan. It will be necessary to spend in the neighbourhood of $200,000 to put the Welland canal into a proper condition by the time the breakwater and harbour improvements are made at Port Colborne.

Mr. BRITTON. While the plan of the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Public Works, if carried out, would seem to do away with the large business that is now done at Kingston—and, in so far as it will do that, certainly I, as representative of Kingston, should oppose any such plan—yet, if I understand it aright from the argument that has been brought forward, all this business that is to be done by the transhipment from the very large vessels that will come to Port Colborne in the future is practically new business. It is said that we do not get that business now, and if we had the facilities we could get that business in the future. Now, so far as that may be done, if it does not cost too much, I certainly shall not oppose it. In this estimate is an amount for improving the harbour at Port Colborne. As I said last year, so I say again that irrespective of these very large vessels, a large share of the improvement in the harbour is necessary, both as to dredging and building a jetty or breakwater. Let me tell you how the business is done at the present time. As the member for Simcoe says, a large amount of business has been profitably done for some yars. There are four vessels, at all events, carrying grain from Duluth and Port Arthur direct to Kingston, the Rosedale, the Rosemount, the Algonquin and the Bannockburn. They carry cargoes, in round figures, of 80,000 bushels, if they are loaded up to their full capacity they carry 90,000.

Mr. GERMAN. They cannot go through the canal with that.

Mr. BRITTON. But they go to Port Colborne, drawing from 15 to 17 feet of water. They have to lighten at Port Colborne, and from there the grain is carried to Port Dalhousie by the Niagara Railway, where it is taken on these boats again and carried on to Kingston. I am sorry to say that it is carried at a very high rate over this railway, and I think one thing the government ought to do soon is to take over that railway. To that extent, I am in favour of the proposition that has been so often mentioned in the House, of government ownership of railways. This railway stands at Port Colborne as toll taker on the grain carried from the west to the east, they charge a toll of two cents a bushel. That means that it would pay these boats just about as well to come from Duluth with a cargo of 60,000 bushels as with a cargo of 80,000, because they have to lighten to the extent of 20,000 bushels at Port Colborne, and they have to pay two cents a bushel for carrying that 20,000 bushels the distance from Port Colborne to Port Dalhousie. Therefore, they have to pay $400 for that 20,000 bushels. Now, they could go through on the 4-cent rate from Duluth and Port Arthur to Kingston, and be glad to get it, and probably will have to do so for a good deal less. They have got to pay two cents a bushel for this 20,000 bushels that they lighten. That means that for the 40,000 bushels of grain carried by the canal to Port Dalhousie, they only get as their share two cents a bushel on the whole route from Duluth or Port Arthur to Kingston. That

won't pay, as things are at present. So they might as well come down with a 60,000 bushel cargo, and for this reason. They cannot get a 60,000 bushel cargo as easy as they can get an 80,000 bushel cargo. Persons who have grain to carry want as much carried as possible, and therefore it is easier to get an 80,000 bushel cargo from these upper lake ports. Now, these vessels that I have mentioned, each take with them two consorts or lake barges. Each of these lake barges will carry in round figures 50,000 bushels, therefore, each of these boats with its consorts brings down a cargo of 180,000 bushels. The barges do not have to lighten, they can go through the canal drawing no more than 14 feet of water. It is only the steamship that has to lighten, after which she goes through the canal with her 60,000 bushels, takes her barges again at Port Dalhousie, and goes on down the lake. That has been a very profitable business to the railway for some years.

Mr. CLARKE. Do these barges that are towed by the steamer from Fort William to Kingston discharge at Kingston ?

Mr. BRITTON. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. They do not draw more than 14 feet of water, do they ? Why are they not sent on down to Montreal ?

Mr. BRITTON. Because we want them to go back as soon as they can. The steamship is too big to go down the St. Lawrence, and through the canals profitably. The barges could go through the St. Lawrence canals, but as soon as they are empty, after the discharge of the cargo at Kingston, they go back with the steamer.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that because they are a part of the steamer's outfit ?

Mr. BRITTON. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the tonnage of these steamers ?

Mr. BRITTON. I cannot tell the tonnage, but they have a carrying capacity of 80,000 bushels. At all events, while they may go down with safety, it is not economical to navigate the St. Lawrence with that class of steamers. They are expensive steamers, and they cannot go down with a full cargo. Of course they have got to be lightened so that they will draw less than 14 feet. If you have only 14 feet in the canal, you cannot load them for 14 feet, they cannot draw that. In order to have safe navigation, you have to have at least one foot of water under the keel of the boat.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have got more than that in the canal, except in the locks.

Mr. GERMAN. A boat will go through a lock with three inches under her keel.

Mr. BRITTON.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have gone through with six inches.

Mr. BRITTON. That is the way, at all events, that grain has been carried. Now you propose to improve Port Colborne to accommodate larger vessels ; vessels that will carry a larger quantity of grain than 80,000 bushels, as high as 250,000, then they will not have to stop at Kingston or Prescott to transfer, but go on straight down to Montreal. Now, two questions arise. One is what kind of vessels are you going to use ? You have either got to have barges, such as we have already, towed with steamships, else you will not have safe navigation of Lake Ontario, because, as the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Calvin) said this afternoon, Lake Ontario is a large lake and requires a very staunch and seaworthy vessel to carry grain safely. The scheme that is before us for improving the harbour at Port Colborne by deepening it, and by building this pier, is something that is needed, even for the present for bringing grain down. Of course it is very rough sometimes at Port Colborne. Even if there is 18 feet of water in the harbour, a vessel drawing 17 feet of water cannot go safely through in rough weather, everybody knows that. Therefore, it requires deepening, and it requires breakwater protection in order to give facilities for the present mode of carrying grain.

I do not want to commit myself, and I do not commit myself to any large scheme of building elevators at Port Colborne, but, generally, the transhipment of grain there for the purpose of the St. Lawrence route, the improvements that are necessary in the harbour and the consequent expenditure of money, are things that are urgently needed. I remember last year that the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) spoke about this Niagara Railway. I do not know whether he submitted it as a scheme or not, but what he did say seemed to me to be most reasonable and ought to have the consideration of the government. Just as much as the want of harbour facilities at Montreal stands in the way of the use of the St. Lawrence route, the Niagara Railway stands in the way of the shipping trade availing itself of the greatest advantages afforded by the Welland canal route. There ought to be something done to reduce the cost there. They are coining money with the quantity of grain that goes down at a two cent rate for such a short distance, elevating it at one end and spouting it out at the other. For this haul of twenty-one miles they get actually half of what the carriers get for bringing the grain down. This is something that ought not to be tolerated, and if nothing better can be done it would not be out of place, considering the large expenditure this country is making in providing transportation facilities, if the gov-

ernment bought out the Niagara road and used it as a link in the transportation system. Our boats have to pay, in addition to this two cents a bushel for lighterage, canal dues of twenty cents a ton, and these are charges imposed on the carrier which reduce his profits to a minimum. This is something worth considering. I do not give it as originating with myself. I think the hon. member for Grenville is entitled to any credit for the suggestion which he made in regard to that railway. Now, I wish to say a word or two in reference to the fourteen foot channel. I read what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said in reference to that fourteen foot channel, and he blamed the transportation companies for rather throwing discredit upon the claim that there is a fourteen foot channel between Kingston and Montreal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say they all did that.

Mr. BRITTON. I do not think it is in the interests of the transportation companies, nor have they any desire, to withhold credit from the government for doing what they have done, but I think they would not say anything in reference to the channel that is not borne out by the facts. There is a fourteen foot channel, but there are places where some money has to be expended to make the fourteen foot channel as it ought to be. It is not enough that there should be a fourteen foot channel just wide enough, or a little bit wider than is sufficient, to allow a vessel to go through. There must be a fourteen foot channel, and it must be so well defined that vessels can navigate it with safety and without the necessity of creeping along that part of the river. I did call attention when the estimates of the Department of Public Works were under consideration before to one point in the river and I will just mention it now. It is no part of the Canadian channel from west to east, but it is a place where you cross over from the Canadian channel to the American channel at the foot of what is known as Long island, the longest island in the St. Lawrence. The channel stretches above and below it, and it requires to be deepened in order to make it a fourteen foot channel. But, hon. gentlemen may say: why do you ask to have that place deepened so as to allow vessels to cross from the Canadian to the American channel. There are two reasons. American boats carrying grain from any American port bound down come up the Canadian channel until they get to that point, and if they want to lighter at Kingston they can do so, if they want to purchase supplies at a Canadian port they can do so, and then they can go over to their own channel and go on down, or, Canadian boats can use the American channel which is a straighter channel between Kingston and half way to Brockville than the Canadian channel is. They are both good channels, but the American is the straighter and the deeper channel and Canadian boats use it. Now, I shall say a word in reference to Montreal. Enough has been said about that port so that I need not take up the time of the committee in stating what the port needs. What it needs now is that something should be done to relieve the carrier from the enormous charges made by the elevator men there. The elevator company are using floating elevators and charging half a cent a bushel for transferring grain at Montreal. They are coining money. I speak in the hearing of some shareholders of that elevator company.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Forty per cent.

Mr. BRITTON. They have made from forty to ninety per cent year after year. Something ought to be done to relieve the carrying trade from such enormous charges. Half a cent a bushel may not seem very much, but it is a good deal when rates are cut as fine as they are now in the carrying trade. If relief is given in that direction immediately before the harbour is equipped, it will be of great assistance to the carrying trade and we can at once begin to increase the traffic by way of the St. Lawrence route. These points suggest themselves to me, and I give them to the committee at this stage.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Mr. Chairman, in listening to the discussion here for the last two or three days of the transportation question and the best way of carrying grain to market, I observe that every hon. gentleman who speaks upon it has an object in speaking. He is speaking for his constituency and not keeping in mind the best way of carrying our grain to market. Now, if the government have devised a scheme, if after mature consideration they have concluded that Port Colborne is the best point at which to tranship the grain en route to Montreal, if they have had the advice of the best engineers, I do not think it is right for us to stand and quibble about that amount in the estimates. I notice that the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) wants all the trade drawn to the port of Midland. He wants all the vessels to go to Midland, while the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) has a word to say for Kingston. We heard the other evening of the port of Halifax as being the place where the trade should go, and the hon. member for Welland Mr. German), of course, has been standing up for the system adopted by the government. We also heard from Toronto the other day. If the government have a well-devised scheme, and if it is shown that we can carry grain cheaper by adopting that scheme in preference to any other, for pity sake do

not let us quarrel about it. Let us pass the estimates and have done with it. I do not want to give the committee any plan because I think the plan which the government have presented is better than any plan which I could put forth, and therefore I cheerfully submit that the estimates should be passed and that we should get value for the money expended.

Mr. MORIN. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) said a short time ago that the distance from Buffalo to New York was 445 miles. I contend that our railroads from Port Colborne to Montreal are as good as the railroads from Buffalo to New York, and our waterway from Port Colborne to Montreal is better than the waterway from Buffalo to New York. Now, why is it that it costs more to handle the grain from Port Colborne to Montreal than it does from Buffalo to New York ?

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). One word more. If the people of Montreal are charging the farmers and the shippers of this country 90 per cent for the use of their elevators, I would not be a bit surprised if Portland were made the outport. The people of Montreal are inducing shippers to leave Montreal by that kind of exaction. I think the Montreal people ought to consider this matter well. I do not make the charge; I want to know if it is true.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must admit that unfortunately it is true that there is a floating elevator company which has exacted very high rates.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I want you to see to it that they do not do it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I denounced them from my place in this House two years ago. But that state of affairs will not last very long. When we have improved the port of Montreal, we shall have elevators. We have no accommodation in the port of Montreal ; but we are getting it now.

Mr. COCHRANE. How ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have explained that over and over again ; we are building large piers.

Mr. COCHRANE. You talk so much you do not explain.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I want to obtain a little information from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. I do not understand the works at Port Colborne very well. I gather from what the hon. gentleman said that the work which is projected there is a funnel-shaped enlargement of the mouth of the canal, and the side of it is about 1,200 feet long. Is that right ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have a sketch of it which I will show the hon. gentleman.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask one question of the hon. Minister of Public Works. I think he said that the present cost of carrying a bushel of grain from Buffalo to New York was about 3 cents, and he also said that after these improvements were completed the cost of carrying a bushel from Port Colborne to Montreal would be about 2 cents.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope less.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That would, of course, give that route a very decided advantage. What is the hon. minister's data for making that statement ? And perhaps he would tell us what is the present cost of carrying a bushel of grain from Port Colborne to Montreal, so that we may compare the two.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My data is that the Parry Sound Railway is able to carry grain from Parry Sound to Montreal for 3 cents a bushel, and it is making money at that rate.

Mr. CLARKE. Does that mean carrying grain from Parry Harbour to Coteau Landing, putting it into barges there, and conveying it thence to Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. I have reason to know that. If the Parry Sound Railway could reach Montreal direct, without the necessity of transhipping at Coteau, I think we should be surprised at the low rate at which it could carry grain to Montreal.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Possibly there may be some more immediate connection between the charge of the Parry Sound Railway and the cost by this waterway, than I can at present see. The reason I ask this question is that it seems to be most important to know to what extent we can depend upon the opinion which the hon. gentleman gives to the House. I would also like to ask : does that include, as I understand, the 3-cent rate from Buffalo to New York includes, the terminal charges ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it does.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not know that this discussion was coming on to-night, as I have some statements which I have gathered from reliable sources on the whole subject, and which I intend to have when my estimates come up.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that I am well informed that Mr. Booth carries grain from Duluth and other western points to Montreal for inside of 5 cents a bushel, and I believe it does not cost him more than 1 cent a bushel, or perhaps a trifle more, to carry it to Parry Sound. From Parry Sound to Montreal he

can carry for inside of 3 cents a bushel, and make a profit. He has his own terminals at Parry Sound. He should have his own terminals at Montreal. When the government have equipped our canals, and when we have terminals, either our own or terminals which would be under our control, we would be very unfortunate indeed if we were not able to do what the private corporations can do.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister did not answer my question, as to the present cost per bushel of carrying from Port Colborne to Montreal.

Mr. BRITTON. It is rather difficult to answer that question, because there is no rate quoted that I know of from Port Colborne to Montreal. The rate from Kingston to Montreal is 1½ cents per bushel. Then you would have to apportion the rate from western points to Kingston, which is 4 cents.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. member for Kingston could give me the information I desire. I see the difficulty he suggests : the rate to Kingston and the rate from there to Montreal are through rates. Therefore, it is impossible to say, except on a mere estimate, what the rate is from Port Colborne to Montreal. Will the hon. member for Kingston be good enough to explain to me how the rate by the Parry Sound Railway, referred to by the hon. Minister of Public Works, compares with the rate by water through the Welland canal to Montreal ?

Mr. BRITTON. Of course we cannot tell, but we have understood that the rate by rail has been so cut that it is a little under what has been the ordinary rate by water, and that the railways have got business by cutting in that way. While I do not know the exact rate, it is a little under what it has been carried for from Port Arthur to Montreal.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is correct in saying that grain would be carried for two cents from Port Colborne to Montreal, it does seem that we might have a possible solution of the difficulty surrounding this grain-carrying trade. If this rate of two cents includes the same charges as the three cent rate from Buffalo to New York, it must give a decided advantage to the Canadian route. Is that what the minister intends to suggest ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister has referred to the Parry Sound Railway, but I do not see the sufficiency of his grounds for stating that the rate from Port Colborne to Montreal would be no more than two cents.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman from Kingston (Mr. Britton) has told us that the rate between Kingston and Montreal would be one cent and a half, and the rate from Port Colborne to Kingston would remain at one-half cent. I may add to that statement, that I have met a great number of American grain shippers as well as Montreal shippers, and their information tends to confirm that statement. The American capitalists who, two years ago, applied for a site in the port of Montreal, gave me valuable information as to the rates at which they could carry grain. Perhaps I may be told that they have not succeeded so far. Mr. Conners, I am sorry to say, has not got along as speedily as he expected, but the House must not forget that if he has not succeeded so far it is because the big monopolies in the United States could kill any individual who would try to fight against them. I know that several times he has succeeded in getting his money, and that every time they got at his men and simply took the life out of him. The information conveyed to me by the most important shippers in the United States was, that they expected to carry grain from Port Colborne to Montreal for two cents, or even less. I, of course, cannot give definite assurances. These rates vary, and when I speak of three cents between New York and Buffalo, that is the average rate, because in some months of the year the rate is higher and in some months lower. But, if by rail they can carry a bushel of grain between Buffalo and New York for three cents, then water transportation being admittedly cheaper, and Canada having a 14 foot canal system, it seems to me that when I estimate a rate of two cents I am making a pretty conservative estimate.

Mr. CLARKE. There are a few words I should like to say before this discussion ends. I agree with the minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that we have the best all-water route ; in fact, the only all-water route ; but, there is a disadvantage which is to be found in the length of that route. Now, having spent such a vast sum upon our canal system in making it perfect, if there is a defect at any particular part of our water route, that defect ought to be remedied. There is a defect in the Lake Erie entrance to the Welland canal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) have declared that expert testimony has caused them to come to the conclusion that Port Colborne, rather than Port Maitland, is the best place to make good the defect in this water route. When the matter was under consideration on a previous occasion, I drew the

attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that at least one of the experts appointed by his department favoured Port Maitland. I presume there is no use discussing that matter any further, because the minister, after the fullest consideration, no doubt, has come to the conclusion that Port Colborne is the proper place, and the government are carrying on the necessary works there to enable vessels of 20 or 22 feet draught to enter Port Colborne and discharge their cargoes there. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has pointed out a fact that cannot be controverted when he stated, that the only advantage that will result to our all-water route by the expenditure of this money is the advantage that will be gained by enabling vessels of a capacity of 250,000 bushels to bring cargoes from the head of Lake Superior to Port Colborne and discharge them there. That is the only advantage, after all, that will be gained, and whether that advantage will be sufficient to offset the disadvantages under which this all-water route labours, I am not prepared to say. The minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) tells us, however, that he hopes—I am sure we all hope that his expectations will be more than realized—that when the works at Port Colborne have been completed, and when large vessels are able to enter the new Port Colborne harbour, he will be able to reduce the rate per bushel for carrying grain from Port Colborne to Montreal to two cents, or a little less. Let me draw the attention of the committee to this fact: that according to the statement which the hon. minister has made, the Canada Atlantic Railway have been bringing grain from Parry Sound to Coteau Landing, a distance of 384 miles by rail, have been discharging it there into elevators, and again transferring it into barges, and bringing it 30 miles thence by water to Montreal, at three cents per bushel.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Less.

Mr. CLARKE. Less than three cents per bushel. The minister says that the distance by water from Port Colborne to Montreal is 375 miles, and if I took his figures down correctly, he said there was a distance of 384 miles between Parry Harbour and Coteau Landing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And Montreal.

Mr. CLARKE. It is thirty miles to Montreal from Coteau, and, therefore, the distance from Parry Harbour to Coteau would be 354 miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Thirty-eight miles from Coteau.

Mr. CLARKE. At all events, there is a land haul of about 350 miles, and there are two transhipments of grain between Parry Harbour and Montreal, and Mr. Booth has demonstrated the practicability of making a land haul about as long as the distance between Port Colborne and Montreal, transhipping his grain at Parry Harbour, and transhipping it again at Coteau Landing for Montreal, and doing all that at a cost of less than three cents a bushel. Now, in view of this, unless the minister can by these proposed improvements at Port Colborne materially reduce the cost of the carriage of grain to Montreal below two cents per bushel, it seems to me that his expectations cannot be realized from this large expenditure at Port Colborne. The minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) referred this afternoon to the proposition to expend a large sum of money to make North Bay one of the termini on the upper lakes for large steamers coming from the head of Lake Superior. He also spoke of the expenditure which is being made at Port Colborne. I feel very much disappointed that the hon. minister has apparently overlooked the manifold advantages that would accrue to the Canadian government if it had a second bow to its string by the construction, or part ownership, if you will, of a railway specially constructed for the carriage of grain between Collingwood and Toronto.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did allude to it.

Mr. CLARKE. Unfortunately, I must have been absent. I think the hon. gentleman just alluded to it in passing, but it was a mere allusion. I do not think he held out any hope to us that a matter, with respect to which we thought he was so favourably impressed a year or two ago, would receive very much consideration from him at present.

I want to draw attention to the fact that there is practically no difference in point of distance between Port Arthur and North Bay, Midland, Parry Harbour, Collingwood or Owen Sound. They are practically equidistant from Port Arthur. The distance from Port Arthur to Montreal by any of these routes is nearly 300 miles shorter than going round by Port Colborne and the Welland canal, and the most feasible route, it seems to me, that can be developed by the government is the route which will have Collingwood for its lower terminus on the upper lakes. The government are spending a large sum of money in deepening and improving the harbour of Collingwood.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. They have promised, I think, to make a considerable expenditure for the purpose of deepening and improving the harbour at Toronto. I expected to have an affirmative nod from the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will speak by-and-by.

Mr. CLARKE. I had hoped to have some sign of assent from the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. You will have a friendly speech.

Mr. CLARKE. Both these works being accomplished, the distance from the head of Lake Superior to Montreal is reduced to 995 miles as against 1,296 by the all-water route via Port Colborne, thus shortening the distance by 300 miles, and of that distance of 995 miles less than 75 are by land. The entire distance, less about 70 miles, is by water. I need not appeal to the committee that it would be a very great advantage indeed, as supplementing the water route, if the government would give favourable consideration to the proposition to acquire a controlling interest in the road specially to be constructed for the carriage of grain between Toronto and Collingwood. I do not know whether these large freighters that carry grain to Buffalo receive return cargoes or not.

Mr. GERMAN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They take back coal.

Mr. CLARKE. But there would be a great deal more likelihood of vessels running to Collingwood from the head of Lake Superior obtaining return cargoes, if there was a route established from Collingwood to Toronto and from Toronto to Montreal or Quebec. The advantages are so obvious that I do not think I need take up the time of the committee in enumerating them. The hon. the Minister of Public Works has been to Toronto and has given some attention to the matter. He has discussed it with the members of the board of trade and he had the pleasure of listening yesterday to the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), who pointed out some of the advantages that would obtain if more consideration were given to the establishment of Canadian marine on the upper lakes and the lower lakes as well. I am perfectly satisfied that if the hon. Minister of Public Works will spend one-half as much time in considering the advantages to be obtained by the people generally from the establishment of this almost direct route for the transport of grain to the seaboard, he will come down—if not in the next supplementary estimates, at the next session—and ask for a grant, not only to deepen the harbour at Toronto, but also for the construction of an air line between Collingwood and the Queen City. It is not unreasonable to ask him, in view of the representations made by both sides of the House and those of the board of trade of Toronto, not to overlook this matter longer, and not to forget the claims of Toronto harbour and the Collingwood and Toronto route. That route will be 300 miles shorter than the all-water route. If the government can afford to spend a million and a half or two millions on what has not passed beyond the experimental stage, it is not unreasonable to ask them to make a moderate expenditure in the harbour of Toronto and on the construction of an air line. These works being completed, we will have the shortest, the most direct and best route from the head of Lake Superior to Montreal.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have much pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in endorsing the strong appeal made by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) on behalf of the short line between Toronto and Collingwood. I had intended to make a few remarks on the motion of my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) yesterday, but owing to the debate having come to the abrupt termination it did by reason of the fact that the hon. member withdrew his motion, I was unable to do so. Nor do I feel that at this juncture it should be necessary to urge on the government the advantages of the Toronto-Collingwood route. Parliament will not forget the struggle which took place in the Railway Committee room last year between two very strong bodies of financial magnates, seeking to obtain a charter of incorporation to build that short line of railway from the Queen City to Collingwood. Could there be a stronger demonstration of the advantages to be gained by that route than the fact that men of such high financial ability should be struggling for a charter to build that line? That in itself appeared to me conclusive evidence of the great benefit such an enterprise would be to our shipping trade and the interests of the country generally. It was unfortunate that the Upper House last year saw fit to prevent the passing of what is known as the Canada National Railway Bill. That Bill passed this House after a struggle, but was defeated in the Railway Committee of the Senate. In my opinion, this country will regret the action of that body. In my opinion, our people will regret that one or the other of the corporations endeavouring to obtain a charter was not given the opportunity of carrying out the promise made by each, that if a charter were given, the first sod on the projected line would be turned within six months. Now the enterprise has been delayed a year, and after a year's delay what do we find? We find practically the same gentlemen coming again to parliament and making renewed applications for a charter, and without expressing any opinion favourable to the one set of financiers as opposed to the other, I do hope that parliament will grant a charter which will enable that short line to be built this year, and I feel confident that just as soon as a charter is granted, that road will be pushed ahead and we will have a link joining the upper with the lower lakes which will give us a route shorter than any other from the great west to the seaboard. We are spending large sums of money on the Welland canal and Port Colborne which, in my humble opinion, might

be much better spent on the Toronto and Collingwood route. There is doubtless a certain justification for this government in spending money on the former route. They have this justification, at all events, that their predecessors spent such large sums upon that route that they must keep it in proper condition, and to that extent I am with the government, but they have advanced the further argument that they must put the harbour of Port Colborne in such a condition that it will compete with the harbour of Buffalo. Well, Sir, I have submitted to this parliament and I submit again, that the transhipment at Collingwood would be no more expensive than the transhipment at Port Colborne.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What is the mileage of that railway ?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is eighty miles as it goes now, but sixty miles as the crow flies, and through a country easy for railway construction.

Mr. MAXWELL. Watch the crow fly.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend (Mr. Maxwell) says ' watch the crow.' Certainly there are a number of vultures, at any rate, when it comes to distributing public money through different parts of the country. I do not care for the jeers, if we get fair-play. The money should be spent on the best route, and the best route, if you take mileage into consideration, is via Collingwood and Toronto. There is every justification I believe for maintaining the Port Colborne route in its present efficiency; but to squander more money on Port Colborne I hold, is not justified by the information we have. I was going to say that transhipment at Port Colborne will cost no less than at Collingwood and at Port Dalhousie no less than at Toronto. The question is : Is it cheaper to take a vessel through the Welland canal having regard to the delay necessarily involved in canal navigation, or is it cheaper to take a vessel load of grain down by rail ? I submit that it is cheaper to take the load by rail from Collingwood to Toronto than it is to take it through the Welland canal. In Collingwood, I am very glad to say, we have received fair consideration at the hands of the government. We have advanced in our work in a way satisfactory to the citizens of Collingwood, if we are to judge by the votes they have given in the last two elections. The question we are now discussing is not so much the vote at Collingwood as the general question which route should receive the consideration of this government. If you take the mileage there is no doubt about it, it is the shortest. And I submit that with an expenditure of a far less sum than would be necessary to improve Port Colborne harbour, the harbour of Collingwood would be made far better than Port Colborne, and you would then have a complete route, not a waterway I admit, but the transhipment would be the same, and you would have a shorter route which would be in the best interests of the country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think I cannot be accused of having overlooked the importance of the air line between Collingwood and Toronto. We are improving Collingwood harbour. The road is not yet built between Toronto and Collingwood. My hon. friend says he has expected a friendly nod from me in reference to Toronto harbour.

Mr. CLARKE. I have been expecting it for some days.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not treated Toronto too badly. We are carrying out large works of improvement there, but we are in the difficult position that at Toronto the two jetties that lead into the inside harbour have been built on a quicksand, and it will be difficult to give much additional depth without incurring a large expenditure. I do not accuse any engineer, especially those who are no more, of having been unwise, but all the same, it is a well known fact that all the harbours in Ontario have been built on a twelve-foot basis. We have to rebuild the whole thing, practically, because the conditions have changed. I fully recognize that the route indicated by my hon. friends would be the shortest route, but I beg of them not to deprecate any other route. There are forty millions of tons of freight originating in the great lakes. There is trade for all the ports. I claim that Georgian Bay is, perhaps, the greatest trade reservior in the world. Collingwood, Owen Sound, Midland, Parry Harbour—all the harbours of Georgian Bay should be equipped so as to receive the trade from the west. I think that if we give our best consideration to the different routes and the ways and means of getting freight for Canada, we might, in a few years, be surprised at the results we were able to achieve. I am always sorry when I hear a member of parliament deprecating any of the Canadian routes. All the roads that lead to the great St. Lawrence route are good. I was accused once of having made a speech in which I was for everybody. Well, I honestly believe that all the ports on Georgian Bay may be great recipients of trade; but I would like that every bushel of grain, every ton of freight carried to these ports should be carried further down to Canadian waters. That is a point we should never lose sight of, and that is the reason why, at times, I feel a little sore about Midland. We are carrying on great works there, but a good deal of the trade which comes from Midland is taken to American ports. If some morning, I can find a way of stopping that and directing the trade to our own ports. I will do it. I do not blame the Grand

Trunk Railway, because we have not in Montreal harbour facilities that would justify us in taking strong measures even if we were able to do so. But, when the St. Lawrence is equipped and the port of Montreal is equipped, I do not think that there will be any railway strong enough to take its stand against Canada.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask the hon. minister when he expects to have the port of Montreal equipped. I have been listening to a good deal of discussion; and the minister perhaps, thought I was a little rough when I complained that there was more talk than explanation. I did not want to be offensive. But I think the hon. minister will allow me to say that I do not think it helps him to get his estimates through to be talking all the while, instead of giving explanations in a few words. I have no interest in one of these harbours more than in another. My only interest is to see that the money we vote in parliament is expended where it will be best in the interest of the whole country. I do not care whether it is Midland, Collingwood, Port Colborne, Parry Sound or any other port. When the whole case comes to be summed up, it seems to me that the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Public Works are competing with Mr. Booth and that it is Mr. Booth who is lowering the rates and not our canal system. Our canals are not carrying the grain to-day, as I understand it, as cheaply as Mr. Booth is carrying it by his railway to Montreal. What does that prove? It proves that, after you get your great improvements at Port Colborne completed, after you complete your Welland canal, after you get your great equipment at Montreal, Mr. Booth is going to carry the grain.

Now, the Minister of Public Works says that it is because Port Colborne is not properly equipped that there is a falling off in the amount of grain carried through the Welland canal. I do not see it that way. It is because Mr. Booth is carrying grain cheaper than you can carry it by waterway, and he is carrying grain that formerly went through the Welland canal. The hon. gentleman shakes his head; but will he tell me there is not as much grain carried to the seaboard now as there used to be? Will the Minister of Public Works take the ground to-night that there are as many bushels of grain carried to the seaboard as formerly? Either he must take that ground, or admit the fact that the Booth railway is carrying grain that used to go through the Welland canal.

Now, I do not understand the contention between the member for Simcoe on the one hand and the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Railways and Canals on the other. The Minister of Public Works is fighting for this principle, that if he can get the amount of money spent at Port Colborne that he wishes, he is going to have a larger class of vessels, carrying 250,000 bushels, coming to Port Colborne that are now going to Buffalo. By doing so he thinks that he is going to reduce the rate of carrying that grain down to Montreal. Now, the member for Simcoe and the member for Kingston recall a fact to my mind that has not been controverted. Men are bringing grain to-day from Lake Superior down with vessels carrying 80,000 bushels, and each vessel has two consorts carrying 50,000 each, or 180,000 bushels altogether. They are now bringing this grain to Port Colborne. But the difficulty is that an 80,000-bushel vessel cannot get through the locks, therefore, she has to be lightened at Port Colborne, and the grain taken off is carried by railway down to Port Dalhousie, and then taken on again. Now, is it not a fact that this class of vessels do not pay under these circumstances? That fact has not been controverted by the member for Kingston. Grain has to be transhipped at Port Colborne and Port Dalhousie before it can be sent down to Montreal, that is a portion of it. How are you going to overcome that fact? You have to have a better class of vessels to carry freight from Port Colborne to Kingston than a class that will pay to take it from Kingston to Montreal. There is the difficulty. If the hon. gentleman succeeds I shall be very glad of it, but I do not think, with the data we have at hand, he is going to effect the saving he expects. I do not think it is prudent to go on and spend the enormous sums of money that he has in view, because I do not think that prospects will justify the expenditure. I may say this to the Minister of Public Works. He is a younger man than I am, and if he takes care of his health and does not get too excited, he will live to see the grain of the great North-west carried out by railway, and the canal system will only serve to keep the rates down to a proper level. That is what Mr. Booth is doing now. I am here to add my testimony of respect to Mr. Booth, for I believe his line is going to be one of the most important lines of railway in Canada for the transportation of grain from the North-west to the port of Montreal. Instead of spending so much money at Port Colborne, to my mind, it would be better to equip the harbour of Montreal so that you can handle the grain there, and not rob the people that are trying to get grain to the seaboard.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to point out to the minister that the works that are being done at Toronto are works for the preservation of Toronto island. Those works are being carried on as the result of an agreement entered into years ago between the government and the city of Toronto. The government took the extraordinary position that before they would construct the

necessary works for the preservation of the island, which, of course, makes the harbour of Toronto, the municipality should be called upon to contribute a portion of the cost, and the municipality did contribute $100,000 towards the construction of the works that were necessary to maintain Toronto island. Now, the other work that we are asking the minister to provide for is a work that has been rendered necessary because of the action of the government. They acted, I presume, upon the advice of their responsible engineer. They thought the deviation of the course of the Don, which enters Toronto harbour, would help to cleanse the harbour of Toronto, and that it would remain as deep as it was before the deviation took place ; but instead of having that effect, the mud that is carried down in the spring and fall freshets has been deposited in the harbour, with the result that it is being continually made shallower.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is not that largely caused by the straightening done by the municipality of what was formerly a circuitous river going slowly down to the bay, and not depositing its silt in the bay at all ? The municipality, I understand, straightened it and enabled it to flow straight down.

Mr. CLARKE. Evidently the hon. gentleman cannot stand very high in the engineering profession, otherwise he would know that the widening and straightening of the channel rendered freshets an impossibility. There is no such a thing as a freshet in the Don since this great channel has been constructed ; but we have made a reservoir for the deposit of mud and silt that come down in the spring and fall, at a cost of half a million dollars. The municipality has provided a dumping ground for this silt in the new channel of the river. The point I want to make is this, that the city of Toronto is so reasonable in its request to the government that the government ought not to withstand the request any longer. The request of the city of Toronto is, that the damage to the harbour, which has been partially filled up—the eastern part of it, practically, wholly filled up—as a result of the government works undertaken on the advice of the government engineers, should be undone by the government.

The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) drew the attention of the House to the fact that Toronto is a greater distributing point actually than the city of Montreal ; and I am sure that the representatives of Toronto heartily sympathize with the Minister of Public Works in his desire to build up an all-Canadian route, and to secure as much trade as possible for our Canadian channels. I want to point out to the minister that if the harbour of Toronto is deepened to enable vessels of the full capacity of the St. Lawrence canals to come in, there will be a stronger competitor secured for the producers and consumers of this country against the railways than by any other policy that can be adopted. If the Collingwood and Toronto route is established, as I am sure it must be, for it will continue to press itself upon the attention of the government, vessels drawing 14 feet of water can proceed from Toronto to Montreal and Quebec during the season of navigation, and they are more likely to get full return cargoes back again to Toronto than to any other possible point. Mr. Booth, in bringing grain from Duluth and Port Arthur down to Montreal, had to find return freights for his cars. Vessels coming to Port Colborne, large freighters, that discharge their cargoes there, will have great difficulty in finding return cargoes to bring back to Port Arthur and Port William. But, with a line of vessels running from Toronto to Montreal or Quebec there is a greater probability of return cargoes being obtained through the entire season of navigation than by any other proposition which has been submitted. Now, I can point to the fact that the work being done in Toronto is done because of a contract made in good faith between the government and the city years ago. The work that we are asking to be done is to repair the damage which has been caused to the harbour of the city of Toronto, because of the action of the government and the government engineers in diverting the channel of the Don years ago. Surely this proposition is so reasonable that we may look for a substantial appropriation in the supplementary estimates of the hon. Minister of Public Works to have this work commenced and carried out to completion as speedily as possible. Estimates have been voted by the House before, but so far practically nothing has been done. May I appeal to the hon. minister that there shall be no further unnecessary delay ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say, first, that I do not feel inclined to admit all the wrongs that the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) says have been committed by the government. I will not place the question on that ground at all, because I think we might not agree. But, I will say of Toronto, what I have said of all the other points. If the air line between Collingwood and Toronto, after full investigation, is proved to be a practical line, if transhipping grain twice, once at Collingwood and again at Toronto, is not a barrier against that route, in spite of Toronto's failings, I would be very much inclined to do anything I could to help it, because, in questions like this with me here, there are no party politics. I hope that the House will share my views upon that. Montreal, Toronto—all points that can be made reservoirs of Canadian trade should be placed above party politics. But, I do not know that the hon. member for Toronto will rise in his

place and say that the question has been investigated fully as to whether the problem of the construction of 80 miles of railway, the transhipping at Collingwood and transhipping at Toronto, has been solved.

Mr. CLARKE. I will draw the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that it has been solved by Mr. Booth. He transhipps from large freighters at Parry Harbour to cars, he carries the grain in cars down to Coteau Landing, he there transfers it from the cars into barges and sends it down to Montreal, and he does it for three cents a bushel. The difference in favour of the route which we advocate, as against Mr. Booth's route is, that, whereas there are 350 miles of haul by land that Mr. Booth has to perform and 30 by water, there is a haul of only 70 miles by land and of 300 miles by water by the Toronto-Collingwood route, and there are no more transhipments to be made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But, the hon. gentleman must not lose sight of the fact that Mr. Booth's transhipment at Coteau Landing is only a temporary one. I may say that if Mr. Booth did not contemplate having a direct communication with Montreal perhaps he would not have tried to accumulate as much trade as he has done, but the Grand Trunk Railway were simply asking him to pay $150,000 a year to carry his grain to Montreal. He had to do something else and he has built an elevator at Coteau and is transhipping there. It is only a temporary arrangement, while transhipment twice will be a permanent feature of the air line. Speaking for myself, I would like, before we are too old, to have expert testimony as to the feasibility of that plan. The government are open to argument. If I were not a minister perhaps I would speak a little more freely, but, of course, if I were to say too much, I would be accused of wanting to spend a large amount of money, I have notions of my own. I would like to see the trade of this country developed to the greatest possible extent before I die, and before I go to heaven with all the hon. members here. In other words, I would like if the country would do now what is to be done even if we have to spend some money. Some millions, more or less, do not amount to much provided they are spent with prudence, with care and with intelligence.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. minister passes to a better world before he has completed the reasonable works that we require at Toronto, and assisted in the construction of the Collingwood-Toronto route, I think he would regret it for all ages.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps it would be better for the hon. minister to get his estimates passed and go to bed instead of going to heaven.

Mr. INGRAM. There are a few things that I cannot understand and one is this: The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) says that it is not the government's intention to either widen or deepen the canal between the entrance of Port Colborne and the other end of the canal because the cost of such work would amount to several millions. On the other hand, the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) says that boats arrive at Port Colborne with cargoes of 80,000 bushels that they have to lighten to 60,000 bushels in order to pass through the canal. The government say that their object is to bring in vessels bearing 250,000 bushels of grain to Port Colborne harbour, and in order to do that they have to build a breakwater at a cost of $3,950,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is for the whole work, not the breakwater.

Mr. INGRAM. The total cost of the whole work is to be $5,000,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, no.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood two years ago that the object of enlarging the canal was for the purpose of building elevators, enlarging the entrance of the canal, &c., and that this work would cost in the neighbourhood of $5,000,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, no.

Mr. INGRAM. Very well; we will let that pass. The entrance of the canal is to be between 500 and 1,000 feet wide, 22 feet deep and 1,200 feet long. What is the object of expending this large sum of money at the entrance of Port Colborne harbour to bring in vessels carrying 250,000 bushels of grain, when it is now necessary to reduce cargoes from 80,000 to 60,000 bushels to enable vessels to pass through the canal? If it is the case that we have to pay high rates for grain passing over the Port Colborne and Niagara Railway, if the company controls the rates, if the government cannot bring that company under control sufficiently to reduce the rates and increase the amount of grain coming into that harbour, what benefit will Canada gain by expending this large sum of money in order to bring larger cargoes into Port Colborne harbour without being able to put larger cargoes through the canal than are now able to pass through it? Will the hon. minister explain that?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have explained that matter over and over again.

Mr. INGRAM. I will put it plainer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand the case, but I have answered at least a dozen times. The object of building the breakwater at Port Colborne is to

allow the big ships that are carrying the grain to Buffalo to come to our Canadian harbours and unload there as they do at Buffalo. There will be a fleet of steamers and barges of less capacity which will take that grain at Port Colborne down to Montreal. That is the object in two words.

Mr. INGRAM. That implies that these boats that come to Port Colborne are not to pass through the canals.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some will and some will not.

Mr. INGRAM. But none will that exceed 60,000 bushels capacity. I have not heard any description as to what distance the breakwater is to be from these piers, and what distance these piers are to be extended into the lake. I know something of the harbours on Lake Erie, and I know the difficulties experienced in Lake Erie harbours at the present time. I know that at Port Stanley and Port Burwell, that there is a great difference in how you build the piers. If the arms extend in a funnel-shape as it is proposed here, and if the breakwater does not prevent the sand from washing in between these piers, you will be no better off than in the other harbours on Lake Erie. The western piers have to be extended a certain distance beyond the eastern piers in order to prevent the sand coming in.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no sand there; it is solid rock bottom.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not saying that there is, and I am not saying that there is not, but I do know that this is the difficulty in other harbours on Lake Erie, and that the government of Canada have expended thousands of dollars in dredging out the harbours because the breakwaters do not keep out the sand, and in view of that, very great care should be exercised at Port Colborne where there is so much money to be expended. I am not finding any fault with Port Colborne. Like my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), I am willing that any harbour in Canada shall be improved if it is in the best interests of the country to do so. My hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) said that this would make a great harbour of refuge. Well, in view of the large amount of money expended on it, it ought to make a fine harbour of refuge. Before sitting down I wish to compliment the Minister of Public Works for the interest he has taken in the harbours at Port Stanley and Port Burwell. We know that Lake Erie is a shallow lake, and that there is danger on it from storms, and I believe that a judicious expenditure of money now will place these harbours in such shape that vessels in distress within reasonable distance of them will be able to find refuge.

Mr. TARTE.

Mr. BRITTON. I wish to refer to a question which was asked me earlier in the discussion by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). I spoke from memory, and after he asked me the question I telephoned to the general manager of the transportation company, and his reply to me is that they carried grain from Kingston to Montreal last year for 1⅜ cents, which, of course, includes the elevator charges at Kingston. He said that if he was asked to make a rate from Port Colborne to Montreal, although there is no such rate made at present, it would probably be 2⅜ cents; perhaps 2½ cents.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps less.

Mr. CALVIN. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) say that that includes the transferring charges at Kingston.

Mr. BRITTON. Yes.

Mr. CALVIN. Does it include any of the elevating charges at Montreal?

Mr. BRITTON. I think not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These charges will disappear in Montreal.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thank the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) for the information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will take up the votes for public buildings, as there are no controversial items, they being all old votes.

Mr. WILSON. There are some controversial items; there are votes for immigration buildings at St. John and Halifax and Quebec, which will require some explanation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All these items will come up in the supplementaries.

Mr. WILSON. I know that, but we must have the information when they are being passed by the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We have been going on with about thirty members in the House for the last three hours, and perhaps it would not be expedient to go further.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is only to make progress.

Halifax, new public building..... $25,000

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to ask for some information in regard to this vote. The site for this building was purchased some time ago, and there is urgent need for immediately extending the accommodation required by the Dominion offices at Halifax. The item of $25,000 would not be nearly enough for the purpose of erecting such a building. I would like to learn

from the minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) what is the cause of the delay in connection with the erection of the building, and if it is the policy of the government to erect it, why is it that we have not a vote which would be sufficient to make substantial progress, and if possible, complete it during the ensuing year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am just asking parliament to place at my disposal the sum of $50,000; this sum of $25,000 was voted at last session of parliament. We had a great many buildings to erect all over the country. We were just completing in Halifax a large drill hall. Perhaps we have not gone as fast as some of our friends expected us to go, but my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) may rest assured that no time will be lost now. I think I speak the views of my colleagues when I say that the government intends to erect in Halifax a building worthy of that capital. We consider that Halifax is one of the most important cities in Canada. It is a kind of Imperial city. Without spending too much money, I hope that the new building will be a credit to Canada and to the city of Halifax. I understand that the plans are now completed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There has been a great deal of delay already. I remember last spring arguing an appeal to the Exchequer Court from a decision with respect to the expropriation for the site which had taken place a great many months before.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was not expropriated; it was purchased. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) is referring to some other property. The city market building was not expropriated. I know it was purchased, because I negotiated the purchase for my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte.)

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The term 'expropriation' is, perhaps, not technically correct, but there was a question of the interest of one of the parties. The money was paid into the Exchequer Court, and it was practically dealt with by the Exchequer Court in the same way as if it had been expropriated. However, that is immaterial. The question is: what is the date when the site was acquired, what is the cause of the delay which has since taken place, and what delay will there be before the building is constructed? It is very nice to know that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) regards the city in so favourable a light as an Imperial city, and so forth, but still that does not help us so much with respect to the advancement of this building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can only say that no time will be lost. I do not want to plead illness, but my hon. friend knows that I have been away from this country through illness. No time will be lost now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not press my hon. friend in that aspect of the matter of that kind, but I would suppose that this would be dealt with by the engineers and the permanent officers of his department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, no time will be lost now.

Mr. WILSON. What is this building intended for? Those of us who are not acquainted with the city of Halifax do not know much about it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The building is intended chiefly for a customhouse, and also for other offices. There has been no public building for that purpose erected in Halifax since confederation. The public offices, so far as it is possible to accommodate them, are in a building erected before confederation, and with the growth of business it has been necessary to hire offices in different parts of the city. For example, the Assistant Receiver General's office is a hired appartment in one part of the city, and there are various offices connected with the customs and inland revenue scattered over the city. The object of this vote is to provide for these in one building. The present building is chiefly used for customs and post office, and both these departments need better accommodation.

Mr. WILSON. What will be the probable cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I stated, on a previous occasion, that if the building cost over $150,000 we would again communicate to the House. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has told me since, that he feels that a building of a proper character for the city could not be erected for less than $200,000, and that is one of the reasons why I have not felt like pressing my hon. friend to award the contract, because I had given assurances that in case it cost more than $150,000, the matter would be mentioned again in parliament. Up to the present time no contract has been awarded.

Mr. WILSON. This is a small vote for a building of that kind.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The building will occupy some time in erecting.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Does the $200,000 include the site?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The site was paid for by a special vote of $25,000. I fancy this will not include the site.

St. John immigration building $11,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the building.

Mr. WILSON. I wish the minister to explain what kind of building is in St. John now, what great necessity there is for this new building, and what it is to cost. I do not

want to enter into a general discussion of our immigration policy, but I feel that we are spending a great deal more money in that direction, and this vote will be charged to another account than immigration.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that we have no accommodation whatever at that port now. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) knows, St. John is one of the winter ports of Canada, and it is out of the question to try and bring immigrants there unless we have accommodation. The cost of the building will range between $25,000 and $30,000, and it will have to be equipped as a good immigration building should be equipped.

Mr. WILSON. Was there anything spent out of the vote last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. WILSON. It is wonderful how you got along so many years without an immigration building there. I find from the returns that the number of immigrants landing at St. John is not very large. The people who travel to St. John are usually tourists and such.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All the same, if we are going to have a fast line, as I hope we will have, we must have an immigration building there surely.

Mr. WILSON. Is it the intention of the government to have large immigration buildings at all the ports ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not all the ports.

Mr. WILSON. Is there not one in Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have one in Halifax and one in Quebec.

Mr. WILSON. You are building one in St. John, and have you not one in Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have none in Montreal.

Mr. WILSON. It is strange you should want one in St. John and none in Montreal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The people of Montreal are very moderate in their demands, and they have taken care of their immigrants up to the present.

Buckingham building	$7,000
Drummondville public building	9,000

Mr. WILSON. What did these public public buildings cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The one at Drummondville will cost just $14,000, with furniture and everything complete ; and the Buckingham building will cost $15,000, with furinture. They will just cost what is in the estimates for them.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 11, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Crow's Nest Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 58) to incorporate the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Similkameen and Keremeos Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the United Empire Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Birkett.

Bill (No. 61) respecting the W. C. Edwards Company, Ltd.—Mr. Rosamond.

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Pontiac Colonization Railway Company.—Mr. Murray.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 6) an Act respecting the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Forestters, and to change its name to the Independent Order of Foresters.—Mr. Emmerson.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 40) an Act respecting the British Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Fraser.

Bill (No. 44) an Act respecting the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Ottawa, Gatineau and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Champagne.

QUESTIONS.

PICTOU, N.S., MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. BELL (Pictou)—by Mr. Clarke—asked :

1. What postmasters in the county of Pictou have been dismissed since November 6, 1900, and who have been appointed to fill vacancies so created?

2. What contracts for carriage of mails to or from points in the county of Pictou, have been made since November 6, 1900?

3. In how many cases and for what sums have these been made without advertising for tenders?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. I beg to reply :

2 & 3. The following contracts or agreements for carrying mails to or from points in the county of Pictou have been made since the 6th November, 1900 :—

MOUNTAIN ROAD AND RIVER JOHN.

Semi-weekly—4 miles.

This contract having expired on the 31st December, 1900, notices were issued on the 15th October, 1900, inviting tenders to be received at the department on the 23rd November for a new contract for four years from the 1st January, 1901, and the tender of Robert Holt at $33, being the lowest, was accepted.

BARNEY'S RIVER AND RAILWAY STATION.

Semi-daily—4½ miles.

Notices were issued on the 13th November, 1896, inviting tenders to be received at the department on the 25th December, 1896, for a new contract for four years, to date from the 1st January, 1897, and the tender of A. Murray at $140.85, being the lowest, was accepted. Mr. Murray's contract having expired on the 31st December last, and it having been reported to me that the service had been satisfactorily performed and the conditions advantageous to the public interest, acting under the provisions of section 2 of clause 61 of the Postal Act, I authorized the renewal of this contract with Mr. Murray for a further term of four years, from the 1st January, 1901.

KING'S HEAD AND NEW GLASGOW.

Tri-weekly—7½ miles.

Notices were issued on the 18th December, 1896, inviting tenders to be received at the department on the 5th February, 1897, for a new contract for four years to date from the 1st April, 1897, and the tender of N. McKenzie at $150, being the only one received, was accepted. Mr. McKenzie's contract will expire on the 31st March next, and it having been reported to me that the service has been satisfactorily performed, and the conditions advantageous to the public interest, and acting under the provisions of section 2 of clause 61 of the Postal Act, I authorized the renewal of this contract with Mr. McKenzie for a further term of four years, from the 1st April, 1901.

MEIKLEFIELD AND MAIN POST ROAD.

Semi-weekly—2 miles.

Notices were issued on the 18th September, 1896, inviting tenders to be received at the department on the 6th November, 1896, for a new contract for four years to date from 1st January, 1897, and the tender of D. Meiklefield at $18, being the lowest, was accepted. Mr. Meiklefield's contract expired on the 31st December, 1900, and it having been reported to me that the service had been satisfactorily performed, and the conditions advantageous to the public interest, and acting under the provisions of section 2 of clause 61 of the Postal Act, I authorized the renewal of this contract with Mr. Meiklefield for a further term of four years, from the 1st January, 1901.

MEADOWVILLE STATION AND SUNDRIDGE.

Tri-weekly—4 miles.

Notices were issued on the 18th December, 1896, inviting tenders to be received at the department on the 5th February, 1897, for a new contract for four years, to date from the 1st April, 1897, and the tender of G. Clark at $69, being the lowest, was accepted. Mr. Clark's contract will expire on the 31st March next, and it having been reported to me that the service has been satisfactorily performed, and the conditions advantageous to the public interest, and acting under the provisions of section 2 of clause 61 of the Postal Act, I have authorized the renewal of this contract with Mr. Clark for a further term of four years, from the 1st April, 1901.

HODSON AND RIVER JOHN.

Tri-weekly—10 miles.

Notices were issued on the 18th December, 1896, inviting tenders to be received at the department on the 5th February, 1897, for a new contract for four years, to date from the 1st April, 1897, and the tender of W. Gammon at $69, being the lowest, was accepted. Mr. Gammon's contract will terminate on the 31st March, 1901, and acting under section 58 of the Postal Act, which provides that the Postmaster General may, in special cases, enter into contracts under $200 by private agreement, if he conceives that the public interest will be promoted by such a course, I have authorized that a contract be made with Mr. John Ritchie, on the same terms and conditions, for a further term of four years, from the 1st April, 1901.

RIVER JOHN AND RAILWAY STATION.

Semi-daily—1 mile.

Notices were issued on the 18th December, 1896, inviting tenders to be received at the department on the 5th February, 1897, for a new contract for four years to date from the 1st April, 1897, and the tender of W. Gammon at $39, being the lowest, was accepted. Mr. Gammon's contract will terminate on the 31st March, 1901, and acting under section 58 of the Postal Act, which provides that the Postmaster General may, in special cases, enter into contracts under $200, by private agreement, if he conceives that the public interest will be promoted by such a course, I have authorized that a contract be made with Mr. John Ritchie on the same terms and conditions, for a further term of four years, from the 1st April, 1901.

BLUE MOUNTAIN AND NEW GLASGOW.

Daily—15½ miles.

This contract being about to expire on the 31st December, 1900, inquiries were set on foot as to the best arrangement for the service in the future, and as these were

not completed when the contract expired, a temporary agreement was made under section 62 of the Post Office Act, with the former contractor, at the lowest rate which could be obtained, viz.: $400 per annum, and notices were issued on the 4th January, 1901, inviting tenders to be received at the department on the 22nd February, 1901, for a new contract for four years, from 1st April, 1901. The lowest tender has been accepted, subject to inquiry as to the competency of the party tendering.

NEW GLASGOW AND TRENTON.

Semi-daily—1½ miles.

Notices were issued on the 18th September, 1896, inviting tenders to be received at the department on the 5th November, 1896, for a contract for four years, from the 1st January, 1897, and the tender of J. W. Church at $149, being the lowest, was accepted. Mr. Church's contract having expired on the 31st December, 1900, and it having been reported to me that the service was satisfactorily performed, and advantageous to the public interest, acting under the provision of section 2 of clause 61 of the Postal Act, I authorized a renewal of this contract with Mr. Church for a further term of four years, but Mr. Church having declined to enter into a new contract for four years, was willing to continue temporarily on the same terms and conditions until permanent arrangements were made, and the department arranged with him accordingly.

The matter is at present engaging the attention of the department.

PICTOU AND PICTOU LANDING.

Daily—1¼ miles.

This contract being about to expire on the 31st December, 1900, inquiries were set on foot as to the best arrangement for the service in the future. These were not completed when the contract expired. A temporary agreement was made under section 62 of the Post Office Act, with the former contractor, at the lowest rate which could be obtained, viz. : $197.80 per annum.

The matter is still engaging the attention of the department.

SCOTSBURN STATION AND WEST BRANCH RIVER JOHN.

Daily—14 miles.

This contract having expired on the 30th June, 1900, notices were issued on the 13th April, 1900, inviting tenders to be received at the department on the 25th May, 1900. The lowest tender was that of W. A. Berry at $420 per annum. This was considered by the department too high, and the inspector was instructed to obtain a lower rate. The inspector reported that Mr. Berry would not reduce his tender, and that he could not obtain a lower rate, and the contract having expired on the 30th June, a temporary agreement was made under section 62 of the Post Office Act with Mr. Rae, the contractor, at $415, the lowest sum for which the service could be obtained, and on the 6th December, the tender of Mr. Berry at $400 per annum was accepted. Mr. Berry declined the contract on the ground that he was not in a position at that time to undertake the service. Mr. Rae, who had been carrying on the service for $414, since the expiration of the contract on the 30th June, refused to go on after the 31st December, unless he was paid at the rate of the tender he made to the department in May, that is, $445 per annum, and he has been paid at that rate since that time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not notice that the hon. gentleman answered the first paragraph of the question.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think that was answered on a previous occasion, but this being a matter involving a good deal of preparation, was held over. The answer to the first part will be found in 'Hansard.'

MAIL SERVICE—CLARENCEVILLE AND LACOLLE STATION.

Mr. POPE—by Mr. Ingram—asked :

Why does the mail carrier to and from Clarence village and Lacolle station receive $93 a year more than his tender reads for?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. The contractor for the mail service between Clarenceville and Lacolle railway station is not paid anything more than the amount for which he tendered for the service. This service was last up to tender in 1898, notices being issued on the 15th July, and tenders due to be opened on the 26th August. The service is daily each way over a route four miles in length, and the rate paid prior to that period was $240 a year. The only tender received was from Mr. M. J. Burwort at $313 a year. The department regarding this tender as too high, directed the inspector to see if a lower rate could possibly be obtained. The inspector after inquiry reported that no lower rate could be obtained, the tenderer explaining that he had to pay fifty cents per day, or $156.60 a year, for tolls. The inspector, also, stated that every effort had been made to secure offers for the service, since, besides posting up the notices in all public places, all those likely to tender were notified by him directly of the bidding ; but as the only tenderer was the late contractor, who enjoyed the confidence of the public, no person desired to bid against him. The inspector also reported that there was a railway in course of construction which would pass near Clarenceville and might affect the mail service, and he recommended that instead of a regular contract a temporary agreement be made with Mr. Burwort at the rate of his tender, viz. : $313 a year, which was done. The service is still being carried on under the terms of that agreement.

COLONIZATION OF ABANDONED LANDS, MANITOBA AND N.W.T.

Mr. DOUGLAS—by Mr. McCreary—asked :

1. What steps, if any, have been taken by the government during 1899 and 1900 to bring the abandoned lands of Manitoba and the North-west Territories now in the hands of colonization companies into the market for sale or settlement by homestead entry ?

2. What number of patents have been issued by the Department of the Interior to these companies during the years 1899 and 1900?

3. What special difficulty stands in the way of issuing such patents?

4. What amount of such land has by the action of the Interior Department during these years been made liable to taxation?

5. Will any action be taken by the government this session so to amend section 44 of the Dominion Colonization Act, so as to enforce the provisions of the same in all colonization companies and thus protect the interests of the settlers and the rights of the Crown?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. The government, in order to bring the abandoned lands in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, now in the hands of companies or individuals who have made advances to persons, under clause 44 of the Dominion Lands Act, into the market for sale or settlement by homestead entry, has notified such companies and individuals that under the provisions of the said Act they are bound to place a bona fide settler on such homestead by the sale thereof to such settler or otherwise within two years from the date of such patent, and in default of so doing within the said period shall be bound and obliged, on demand, to sell the said homestead to any person willing to become a bona fide settler thereon, for such sum of money as is sufficient to pay the amount of such charge and interest, and the expenses incurred by the patentee in obtaining such patent and in retaining the homestead.

The department has notified the persons interested in pursuance of the condition named, which, in case of refusal will mean the absolute forfeiture of the property and all claims thereon, and of the patent or other title thereto.

2. Ninety-four patents, covering an area of 15,040 acres, to the several companies and individuals authorized under clause 44 of the Dominion Lands Act.

3. There is no special difficulty. The department requires a statutory declaration showing a compliance with the terms of the Act before taking steps to issue patent.

4. It is assumed that all the lands patented are liable to taxation.

5. It is not thought advisable, in view of the fact that advances were made to the settlers under its provisions, to amend the Act this session, but it is the intention of the department to take necessary steps to enforce a compliance with the conditions referred to.

MURRAY AND ROSS—LIQUOR PERMIT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER—by Hon. Mr. Prior—asked :

Referring to the following letter :—

Ottawa, April 20, 1900.

To the Chief License Inspector,
Dawson City.

Sir,—Messrs. Murray and Ross have satisfied me that they are the holders of a permit from Mr. Ogilvie under which they purchased liquor for shipment, and that in accordance with the rule adopted they are entitled to take in the amount purchased. You will therefore be good enough to admit for this firm 6,400 gallons liquor under proof, on payment of the fees provided by law.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) JAMES SUTHERLAND,
Acting Minister of the Interior.

1. What are the full names of Messrs. Ross and Murray?

2. What was the date of the 'permit from Mr. Ogilvie' ?

3. What amount of liquor did the permit from Mr. Ogilvie cover?

4. By what means did Messrs. Murray and Ross satisfy the acting Minister of the Interior that they were holders of a permit, as stated?

5. Did correspondence take place on the subject?

6. If correspondence took place, why has it not been brought down to this House, as ordered on 12th February, 1901?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1 and 2. The department has no record of the full names of Messrs. Ross and Murray, or of the date of the permit from Mr. Ogilvie.

3. Ten thousand gallons.

4. Statement was made to the acting minister which satisfied him of the facts as set out in the letter.

5 and 6. There is no correspondence on the subject.

PERMIT TO H. J. LOCKYER.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER—by Hon. Mr. Prior—asked :

Referring to letter of September 1, 1900, of acting Minister of the Interior to license inspector, Yukon territory—

1. On what ground was this permit given to Mr. H. J. Lockyer?

2. Was there any correspondence between the applicant and the department respecting the permit?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. This permit was granted to Mr. H. J. Lockyer, because the acting minister in his discretion considered Mr. Lockyer a proper person to receive it.

2. No.

DEPOT HARBOUR BREAKWATER.

Mr. McCORMICK—by Mr. Ingram—asked:

Who has been awarded the contract for construction of locks or breakwater at Depot Harbour?

What is the price of lowest tenderer?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte). No contract has been awarded yet.

LIGHTKEEPER, MUSQUASH ISLAND, N.B.

Mr. WILMOT asked :

1. Is G. W. McDonald lightkeeper at Musquash Island, Queen's county, N.B.?

2. If not, when was he dismissed, and for what reason?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In the absence of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies), I would give the answer as follows :

1. No.

2. Mr. Whitfield McDonald, keeper of the light at Musquash island, N.B., was dismissed by order in council, dated 19th January last, because he was an exceedingly offensive political partisan.

YUKON—GAMBLING HOUSES AND DISREPUTABLE SALOONS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER—by Hon. Mr. Prior—asked :

1. Is the following letter authentic?

Dear Sir,—I have read a good many complaints, most of them of a private character, in regard to the fact that women of bad repute are permitted to be employed in the bar-rooms and drinking places, where they are used for the purpose of decoying people into such places, and in regard to the lack of effort in suppressing gambling; it is also charged that the fact of fining gamblers is indirectly a license to them to continue their operations. I have not heretofore interfered in this matter, because it seemed to me that yourself, the commanding officer of the Mounted Police, should have been able to decide on what ought to have been done, but from information which I have received, it seems to me that a considerable increase in stringency is required. I see no reason why what is known as dancing halls, but which are in reality, as I understand it, bar-rooms with women selling liquor, should not be summarily suppressed. The same remark applies to the systematic and open gambling. I desire, therefore, that you will take the necessary steps to carry out these views without delay.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the commanding officer of the Mounted Police, with whom, no doubt, you will require to consult, but who will be directly charged with the carrying out of the above instructions. It would be just as well for you, after the receipt of this letter, to intimate that the matter has been considered, and a resolution has been arrived at on the above lines, so that the people generally will understand what is going to be done, and govern themselves accordingly.

Yours truly,

CLIFFORD SIFTON,
Minister of the Interior.

(a) If so, what is its date?

(b) Has any report been received showing what action has been taken on said letter?

(c) If such report has been received, will steps be taken to cause it to be laid before the House ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. A letter to the effect of that set out was written by me to Mr. Ogilvie. It is not quoted with absolute correctness.

(a) Date of letter 14th August, 1900.

(b) A report has been received from the commanding officer of the mounted police.

(c) The papers will be brought down within a day or two.

YUKON—ROAD AND BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER—by Hon. Mr. Prior—asked :

1. Is the government aware that the commissioner of the Yukon was reported by the press to have announced, in the fall of 1900, to the residents of White Horse, in regard to the request for the construction of roads, trails, &c., that the only revenue available for such purposes is that derived from the liquor traffic, through the sale of permits, by fines, license, &c.?

2. Would such a statement be substantially correct ? If not, from what sources is such a revenue derived?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. No. The government is not aware of such fact.

2. The statement would be incorrect, inasmuch as the government of Canada expends a very large amount annually in the construction of roads and bridges in the Yukon territory.

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF—CERTIFICATE OF PRODUCTION.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

What proportion of the goods that have been entered under the preferential tariff has a certificate attached to the customs entries, to the effect that a portion of such goods has been manufactured in other countries than Great Britain and the British colonies?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). A separate invoice, covering only articles entitled to preferential entry, is required under the preferential tariff. In the certificate prescribed to be made on the invoice, the exporter certifies that all the articles included in the invoice are bona fide the produce or manufacture of one or more countries (naming them) entitled in Canada to the benefits of the British preferential tariff, and that a substantial portion of the labour of one or more of such

countries has entered into the production of every manufactured article included in the said invoice to the extent in each article of not less than one-fourth of the value of every such article in its present condition ready for export to Canada. There is no certificate attached to the invoice (or customs entry) to the effect that a portion of such goods has been manufactured in other countries than Great Britain and the British colonies.

ISSUES OF SCRIP.

Mr. OSLER—by Mr. Clarke—asked :

1. What amount of scrip has been issued to half-breeds and others in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, in each of the years since 1896 ?

2. What is the total amount of scrip received by the government in payment of Dominion lands, in each of the years since 1896 ?

3. What is the total amount of scrip now outstanding ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1.

Scrip Issued.	Cash Scrip.	Land Scrip. Acres.
1896-7	$ 7,616 64	.....
1897-8	8,113 13	480
1898-9	10,480 54	240
1899-1900	282,393 97	45,440
July 1, 1900, to Feb. 28, 1901	558,262 27	441,536
Total amount of scrip received	$866,866 55	487,696

2.

1896-7	$ 19,429 38
1897-8	29,428 53
1898-9	21,307 58
1899-1900	92,656 94
July 1, 1900, to Feb. 28,'01	*268,990 65
	$431,813 08

3. Amount of cash scrip outstanding on February 28th, 1901, is $538,026.87, including $102,973.40 prior to 1st July, 1896.

Amount of land scrip outstanding on February 28th, 1901, is 339,260 acres, including 23,400 acres prior to 1st July, 1896.

* February is not quite complete. There are a certain number of Dominion Lands Agents' returns that have not yet reached the department.

EXPORTS OF ANIMALS TO GREAT BRITAIN AND UNITED STATES.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. What was the number of cattle, over one year old, produce of Canada, exported to Great Britain yearly, from 1894 to 1900, inclusive, and the total value and average price for each of said years ?

2. What was the number of cattle, over one year old, produce of Canada, exported to the United States yearly, from 1894 to 1900, inclusive, and the total value and average price for each of said years ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). Statement showing the number and value of cattle, over one year old, the produce of Canada, exported to Great Britain and to the United States respectively ; the value and average price per year, during the fiscal years, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, and 1900 respectively :

Fiscal Year.	Exported to Great Britain.		Average price per head.	Exported to United States.		Average price per head.
	Number.	Value.		Number.	Value.	
		$	$ cts.		$	$ cts.
1894	80,531	6,316,373	78 43	219	3,139	14 34
1895	85,863	6,797,615	79 17	346	17,806	51 43
1896	97,005	6,814,141	70 24	223	5,256	23 57
1897	119,998	6,454,029	53 79	31,310	479,525	15 31
1898	122,091	7,403,915	60 64	75,674	1,131,447	14 95
1899	115,311	7,121,633	61 76	68,8 4	1,055,223	15 34
1900	114,405	7,564,257	66 12	57,064	1,026,039	17 98
Totals	735,204	48,471,963	65 93	233,660	3,718,435	15 91

BOUNTY ON PIG IRON.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. What was the total amount of bounty paid by the Dominion government for the manufacture of pig iron from native ore in each of the years ending June 30, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1900, and also for the six months ending December 31, 1900 ?

2. What was the total amount paid as bounty on pig iron made from foreign ores for each of said years, and for the last six months of year 1900 ?

3. What was the total amount paid as bounty on steel for each of said years, and for six months of year 1900 ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) :

For Year ending	Bounty on Pig Iron.		Bounty on Steel.
	Canadian ore.	Foreign ore.	
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
June 30, 1896	104,104 84	.....	59,498 52
" 30, 1897	6[illegible],508 69	.....	17,366 16
" 30, 1898	59,930 80	105,673 45	67,454 03
" 30, 1899	95,582 40	92,371 95	74,644 28
" 30, 1900	103,853 89	134,442 25	64,360 29
Last six mos. of 1900....	27,205 55	60,403 77	33,503 68

PRODUCTS OF ANIMALS—IMPORTATIONS INTO THE UNITED KINGDOM.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. What quantities of butter, cheese, bacon, hams, and eggs respectively were imported into the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland from all other countries in each of the years 1898, 1899 and 1900 ; also the value in each case for each of said years ?

2. How much of each of said articles so imported came from Victoria, New South Wales, and New Zealand respectively, and the values thereof for each of the years 1898, 1899 and 1900?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). This is a question which I am afraid cannot be answered by the government. We have not any information respecting the trade returns of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland which is not public property and accessible in all quarters. Moreover, the mode of making up those returns differs somewhat from our own ; so I am afraid I will be unable to comply with the request of the hon. gentleman.

HOG IMPORTS FROM UNITED STATES.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

What was the total weight in pounds of all hogs and hog products, viz., hogs, lard, pork, bacon and hams imported into Canada from the United States in the year 1890 ; also for the year 1900 ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). The weight in pounds, so far as hogs are concerned, cannot be given. During the fiscal year 1890 there were hogs to the value of $82,964 imported from the United States, no quantity being given in the returns of that date. In addition to the foregoing, there were 7,250,861 pounds of swine to be slaughtered in bond for exportation ; also 128 swine (in number) admitted free for improvement of stock. The quantity of lard amounted to 4,826,103 pounds; of pork, 17,739,082 pounds, and of bacon and hams, 4,414,321 pounds. During the fiscal year 1900, the quantity of hogs imported from the United States amounted to 183,703 pounds, and in addition 47 swine (in number) for improvement of stock. The quantity of lard imported was 687,958 pounds ; of pork, 5,774,432 pounds, and of bacon and hams, 5,273,434 pounds.

EXPORTS OF BUTTER, CHEESE, &c.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. How many pounds of butter, cheese, bacon and ham respectively, produce of Canada, were exported to Great Britain in each of the three years 1898, 1899 and 1900; also the value in each case for each of said years?

2. How many dozen of eggs, produce of Canada, were exported to Great Britain in each of the three years 1898, 1899 and 1900, and the total value for each of said years?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). Statement showing quantities and values of butter, cheese, &c., exported (home produce) from Canada to Great Britain during the years ended June 30, 1898 to 1900, inclusive ; from Canadian returns :

	Years ended June 30,		
	1898.	1899.	1900.
Butter... Lbs.	10,461,823	19,120,034	24,317,436
" ... $	1,915,550	3,526,007	4,947,000
Cheese... Lbs.	196,220,771	189,259,989	185,627,757
" ... $	17,522,681	16,718,418	19,812,670
Eggs .....Doz.	10,280,466	9,564,220	10,109,383
" ....$	1,244,051	1,254,392	1,447,030
Bacon.... Lbs.	76,779,313	111,820,279	132,156,051
" .... $	7,283,624	9,948,324	12,469,209
Hams.... Lbs.	8,429,249	4,752,854	2,793,078
" .... $	745,858	459,268	279,966

YUKON TERRITORY—HOUSTON PERMIT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER—by Hon. Mr. Prior—asked :

Referring to Houston permit (863 Hansard, 1901), is there any report, communication or correspondence respecting it not brought down to this House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Yes. The papers will be brought down if desired.

YUKON TERRITORY—IMPORTATION OF LIQUOR.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER—by Hon. Mr. Prior—asked :

1. Has the government, or any department thereof, knowledge of the amount of beer or

other liquor shipped by J. H. Russell or the Atlin Brewing Company of Glenora, into the Yukon district in 1900?

2. If so, under what authority were the shipments made?

3. What amount of beer or other liquor was so shipped?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. J. H. Russell, of Atlin, was granted a permit to import into the Yukon territory 1,000 gallons of beer, on August 8, 1900. No further information on the subject is in the possession of the government.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—PATENT BRANCH.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

(a) What has been the revenue of the patent branch of the Agriculture Department each year since 1891, inclusive?

(b) What has been the cost of the patent branch each year since 1891, inclusive?

(c) What has become of the balance of the revenue, if any, each year?

(d) How many examiners are there now in the patent branch?

(e) (1) Is each examiner abreast with his work, or (2) are there any applications awaiting attention ? (3) If there are any awaiting, how many are they in number? (4) How long in arrears is the work, viz.: What is the date of the last applications passed upon in the regular course?

(f) Is it the intention of the government or of the Minister of Agriculture to expend upon the patent branch each year for the future the revenue derived therefrom?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sidney A. Fisher) :

(a.) I have the honour to submit the following figures, taken from the minister's report :

	Revenue.	Expenditure.	Surplus.
1891	$ 77,723 63	$41,394 41	$36,329 22
1892	84,720 83	39,643 37	45,077 46
1893	62,344 68	36,116 70	26,227 98
1894	78,777 02	38,010 71	40,766 31
1895	84,603 26	36,254 53	48,357 73
1896	92,498 81	39,840 68	52,658 13
1897	100,531 89	36,335 34	64,196 55
1898	97,522 70	34,402 17	63,120 53
1899	105,354 60	35,808 09	69,546 51
1900	111,331 58	43,046 93	68,284 65
			$523,313 31

(b.) I may say that there are now eight examiners, one of whom was appointed on January 15. I have found that the work needed more men, and I have been adding to the number, until at last there are eight.

(c.) As to the balance of the revenue, it goes into the consolidated revenue fund like all other revenue.

(e) There is always a number of applications before each examiner. I have here a statement of the unreported applications before the individual examiners, which is as follows :

			Filing date of oldest case before each.
1.	Examiner McCabe....	264	February 7, 1900. Ref. March 13, 1900.
2.	" Bailey	78	February 13, 1901. Ref. June 6, 1901.
3.	" Thomson ..	220	February 19, 1900. Ref. Feb. 22, 1900.
4.	" Richard ...	135	December 1, 1900. Ref. Dec. 10, 1900.
5.	" Megill	247	July 4, 1900. Ref. July 15, 1900.
6.	" Campbell ..	206	April 5, 1900. Ref. June 8, 1900.
7.	" Belanger ..	196	*July 26, 1900.
8.	" Stevens ...	152	†January 8, 1900.
		1,507	

*All referred October 1, 1901; taken from other examiners.

†All cases referred to this examiner on the 15th January, 1901.

On October 1, when Mr. Belanger began his work, some cases were taken from other examiners and referred to him. Mr. Stevens only commenced on January 15. I have the following statement from the chief clerk in charge of this branch :

The examining work would be closer to date and more satisfactory to the inventors, if the staff of examiners was further augmented.

Comparison may be made with the United States patent office and this office, in respect to this branch of the work.

During the year 1900, the United States patent office received 41,980 applications, with a staff of 219 examiners (of whom nineteen were added two years ago) and one or two copyists to each division; while this office received in the same period 4,629 applications, with only seven examiners and no clerical help. The last-appointed examiner (No. 8) not examining to any extent as yet.

According to the American basis, the Canadian office should have twenty examiners to keep the work up to the six weeks' limit, which I have found the United States patent office has reached. (United States commissioner's report, page 1, 382, O.G., February 12, 1901.)

It may be added that many of the cases filed in the early part of last year were not referred to the examiner for weeks after (although their filing date is preserved and appears in this report) for the reason that the applicants, or their solicitors, delayed in returning the papers, when called upon to amend the form.

The original date of the application is not a fair one to the office, because frequently applications have to be returned, and sometimes they remain months in the hands of the solicitors who prepare them, while they are being put into proper form. The patent branch received 4,692 applications during the year 1900, and issued 4,181 patents. Two hundred and thirty-nine were reported on but not issued. In the year 1899, the branch added 887 applications to the arrears, making a gain during last year of over 600 in the comparison between the number of applications and the number of patents reported upon. In January and February of this year, which are very heavy months,

the branch received 368 applications in January and issued 313 patents ; while in February, it received 344 applications and issued 325 patents.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). I did not get the answer to the last section.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no intention on the part of the government to spend on the patent branch the revenue derived therefrom, but it is the intention to ask parliament for sufficient money to carry on the affairs of the office properly.

LONG SERVICE MEDALS.

Mr. SHERRITT asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to issue Long Service medals to those volunteers yet living who have served twenty years and upwards in the militia of Canada ?
2. If any are to be given, when may they be expected ?
3. In what position does the matter now stand ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). The issue of a long service decoration and medal to colonial forces was approved by the Imperial authorities some time ago. Regulations governing the same have only recently been approved by His Majesty's government, and were received at the Department of Militia and Defence February 4 last. They will be promulgated in next General Orders, being the first orders submitted for the approval of His Excellency in Council since the receipt of the approved regulations. These regulations contain all the information in the possession of the Militia Department on the subject.

LAKE MANITOBA DREDGING.

Mr. BOYD—by Mr. Roche—asked :

Has the following petition been received by the Hon. the Minister of Public Works :—

To the Minister of Public Works of the Dominion of Canada.

The undersigned, your petitioners, would respectfully say :—

1. Your petitioners residing along the west shore of Lake Manitoba are residents, being as shown as opposite our respective names herewith attached.
2. It is understood that next year a regular line of boats will operate on this lake.
3. Owing to our close proximity to the lake and the distance we are located from railway facilities, it is decidedly to our advantage to transport our farm products, etc., to the lake during the season of navigation.
4. There are obstacles in the way that prevent a boat from landing, in the nature of sandbars and rocks.
5. Your petitioners believe that for a very moderate expense these difficulties can be overcome, by dredging the sandbars and removing the rocks, for a landing at or near Lakeland, Big Point and Sandy Bay, as shown on the provincial maps.
6. Your petitioners, therefore, pray that you may, without undue delay, cause an investigation to be made, that facts may be ascertained, and if such facts bear out the above statements, that the work be undertaken with the least possible delay, that we may avail ourselves of the advantages that will be afforded us.

Is it the intention of the government to accede to the legitimate request of the petitioners ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). No trace of such a petition can be found in the department. It may be there, but we cannot find it.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S VISIT TO DAWSON.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER—by Hon. Mr. Prior—asked :

Referring to Order of the House, February 12, 1901, and return in compliance respecting His Excellency's visit to Dawson and petitions presented, does this return cover 'all orders in council, correspondence and papers in any way connected with the said address and the requests and representations therein' ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Yes.

CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. GOURLEY asked :

Are there at the present time any negotiations being carried on between the government of Canada and the government of Newfoundland with a view of the latter province becoming a member of this Confederation ? If not, is it the intention of the government to open such negotiation during the present year ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There are negotiations now pending between Canada and Newfoundland on the subject mentioned in this question ; and, further, that the time does not seem auspicious for the opening of such negotiations.

YUKON RAILWAY—MACKENZIE AND MANN'S CLAIM.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER—by Hon. Mr. Prior—asked :

1. Have Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann filed with or laid before the Minister of Railways and Canals or any other member of the government, any claim in connection with the contract for the construction of the Yukon Railway ?
2. If so, when was such claim filed, or laid before the government or any member thereof ?
3. What is the amount of such claim ?
4. Has any action been taken by the government with regard thereto, and if so, what action has been so taken ?
5. Has the government or any member thereof given any promise, assurance or statement, written or oral, to Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann, or to any person on their behalf, or to any bank or other corporation, stating the intentions of the government with respect to such claim ?
6. If so, when was such promise, assurance or statement given, and what was it ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann have filed a claim against the government which has been examined and considered, and which, with all the papers relating to it, will be communicated to the House at an early date.

DISMISSAL OF MR. W. F. SCARTH.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. Has Mr. W. F. Scarth, formerly postmaster at Virden, Manitoba, been dismissed from that position ?
2. If so, for what reason ?
3. Have charges been made against Mr. Scarth and has an investigation been held into those charges, if any, since 1896 ?
4. If investigation has been held, what was the result ?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND :

1. Mr. W. F. Scarth has been removed from the postmastership of Virden, Manitoba.
2. Mr. Scarth was removed from the postmastership of Virden on representations, which were considered satisfactory, that the post office, when under his charge, was not properly managed.
3. Charges of political partisanship were made against Mr. Scarth in April, 1897, which were investigated by the post office inspector.
4. The result of the inspector's investigation was that the charges brought forward were not sustained.

ASHCROFT AND CARIBOO MAIL CONTRACT.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. What company or individual had the contract during the year 1900 for carrying the mails between Ashcroft and Cariboo, in British Columbia ?
2. What was the mileage covered by said contract ?
3. What amount per annum was the contract for ?
4. How many trips per week did the contract call for ?
5. Has the said contract expired ? If not, when will it ?
6. Has the government renewed said contract, or given a new one to any person or persons ?
7. If so, to whom has it been given, at what price and on what terms ?
8. If said contract has not been renewed, or a new one given, is it the intention of the government to call for public tenders for said mail service as soon as the contract in force last year expires ?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND :

1. The British Columbia Express Company were the contractors for this service during the year 1900.

2 and 4. Between Ashcroft and Barkerville, 287 miles, semi-weekly from May 15 to October 31, weekly for the remainder of the year.

Between Ashcroft station and Clinton, 32 miles, semi-weekly from November 1 to May 14, weekly for remainder of year.

Between Alkali Lake and Clinton, 90 miles, weekly throughout the year.

Between Ashcroft and Lillooet, 63 miles, weekly throughout the year.

Between 150-Mile-House and Horsefly, 40 miles, weekly throughout the year.

Between 150-Mile-House and Keithley Creek, 80 miles, weekly throughout the year.

Between Soda Creek and Alexis Creek, 90 miles, weekly throughout the year.

3. Rate of pay is $23,250 a year.

5. The contract will expire on September 30, 1903.

6 and 7. The present contract was made with the British Columbia Express Company on October 1, 1899, for four years from that date.

8. As the contract will not expire until September 30, 1903, the department has not yet considered its future action regarding it.

METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked :

1. Is the government aware that on an annual revenue of $344,158 the lapses of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company in Canada are of $5,695,372 ?
2. Has the actuary of the Insurance Department made inquiries as to this abnormal proportion of lapses ?
3. Is the government aware that the largest proportion of the business of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company is carried on with the mechanics and the poor class of the population ?
4. Is there in the Insurance Department any information given by the life companies as to the reasons that are given to the heirs in order to make settlement at less than the face of the policies issued ?
5. Is the Insurance Department informed of the reasons why claims are resisted by life companies—more particularly in cases where this information is denied to the widows having claims against said companies ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) :

1. The government is aware that the lapses of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company in Canada for the year ended December 31, 1899, amounted to $5,695,372, and that the income of the company in Canada for the same year amounted to $344,158. The figures were published in the report of the superintendent of insurance for that year.

2. No special inquiry has been made as to the proportion of lapses, but the returns made to the government show that the proportion of lapses is large.

3. The government is not informed as to the class or classes of the population insured by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, but is aware that the larger portion of the company's business in Canada is known as industrial insurance.

4. The superintendent of insurance is not aware that any attempts at settlement have been made at less than the face of the

policies issued. No complaints of this kind have been received at the department from policy-holders or others.

5. The department is not informed of the reasons why claims are resisted by life insurance companies.

CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR EAST ELGIN.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. The following answers were given to questions 1, 2 and 3 on February 12, 1901, by the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture :—

Census Commissioner for East Elgin.

Mr. Ingram asked :—

1. Who is appointed census commissioner for the electoral district of East Elgin ?

2. How many applicants applied for the position and what are their names ?

3. How many applied for the position of enumerator, what are the names, and how many have been selected up to date ?

The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) —Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. gentleman's question, I would say that Mr. A. D. McGugan will be the census commissioner for the electoral district of East Elgin. In reply to questions 2 and 3, I would say that there have been no applicants.

Mr. Ingram—Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) say Mr. McGugan for East Elgin or West Elgin ?

The Minister of Agriculture—A. D. McGugan for East Elgin.

Will the hon. Minister of Agriculture say if these answers are correct to day ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). The second and third answers are correct. The answer to the first should have read 'No one.' Mr. McGugan is recommended for West Elgin. My officer made a mistake by saying for East Elgin. No appointments are made.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman say who is for East Elgin ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No appointments have been made.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. Has the government considered whether the establishment of a system of technical education falls within the jurisdiction of the Dominion ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to decide this question promptly ?

3. In case the Dominion has jurisdiction, is it the intention of the government to establish such a system ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). From what consideration we have been able to give to this subject, we are not satisfied that the subject of technical education falls within the jurisdiction of the Dominion government.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the Prime Minister answer the second part of the question ?

The PRIME MINISTER. If the subject is not within our jurisdiction, we cannot take any action. We are not satisfied that the subject of technical education is within our jurisdiction. We think it is within the jurisdiction of the provinces.

FOREST RANGERS.

Mr. WILSON asked :

How many forest rangers are in the employ of the Dominion government, what are their duties, where are they located, and what are their salaries respectively ?

How many forest fire rangers are employed by the Dominion government, where are they located, what are their duties, and what are their salaries respectively ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Eleven homestead inspectors who act as forest rangers when required, and in addition to the homestead inspectors, there are three persons employed by the department. One at Boissevain receives a salary of $900 per annum and is in charge of the permanent timber reserve at Turtle Mountain ; one at Winnipeg, at $600 per annum, whose work is confined to the timber north of the Canadian Pacific Railway and east of Winnipeg, and one at Carlyle, at $600 per annum, who has charge of the Moose Mountain permanent timber reserve.

The duties of forest rangers are principally to prevent illegal cutting or destruction of timber. Their services are also utilized in collecting dues on timber cut illegally, and investigating and reporting upon cases of reported illegal cutting of timber.

There are no forest fire rangers employed by the Dominion government permanently, but the above officials assist in performing the duty, and men are employed when it is felt necessary to protect timber from fire. They are located at the most convenient point, and their duties are generally to protect the timber by taking every necessary precaution to that end. They also distribute copies of the law respecting prairie and forest fires. They are paid, when so employed, at the rate of $3 per day for man and horse, including all their expenses.

In the Department of Indian Affairs there is one forest bailiff employed from time to time as required in the Saugeen Peninsula. He makes seizure of timber illegally cut on Indian lands, and when on duty receives a daily allowance for himself of $1.50. Other forest bailiffs are employed on Indian reserves for the purpose of protecting the reserves and making seizures where timber is illegally cut.

SYDNEY INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton) asked :

1. Has any effort been made by any person or persons to secure possession of the Indian reserve in the town of Sydney ?

2. If so, by whom ?

3. Will the government lay on the Table of the House all official correspondence having reference to this matter ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1 and 2. Applications have been received to be allowed to purchase the Indian reserve at Sydney from Wm. McDonald, M.P., in February, 1884 ; J. A. Gillies, M.P., in October, 1899 ; the Town Council of Sydney in February, 1900.

The question of surrendering the land was submitted to the Indians in December, 1899, but they refused except on conditions that could not be acceded to by the department, and the land is not, therefore, open for sale.

3. Yes.

BUIES' PAMPHLET—PARIS EXPOSITION.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. In what printing office was the pamphlet entitled 'Animals, &c. of Canada,' by Arthur Buies, distributed at the Paris exhibition last year, printed ?
2. What was the total issue of said pamphlet ?
3. What was the average cost per pamphlet ?
4. What was the total cost of said pamphlet ?
5. Who supplied the paper for the work ?
6. If printed in any establishment other than the Government Printing Bureau, why was this done ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher) :

1. Government Printing Bureau.
2. 10,000 copies.
3. A fraction over 9 cents per copy.
4. $906.49.
5. Government Printing Bureau.

OFFICIAL CATALOGUE PARIS EXHIBITION.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

1. Has the government seen the following editorial comment in a recent issue of the Ottawa Free Press :—

'Another query was put yesterday with regard to the printing of the official catalogue of Canadian exhibitors at the Paris exhibition, and the information was given that the work was done in the office of the Montreal Herald, which supplied 5,000 copies, together with the paper. Further, the House was informed of the reason why the procedure was followed. It appears from the reply of the Minister of Agriculture, that such work is done "through the Printing Bureau, as owing through pressure of work it could not be done there." This must necessarily occur at times of pressure. But previous answers given to similar questions, all of which indicated that other work of various kinds had been sent to Montreal, leads to the conclusion that the Printing Bureau is decidedly partial in its selection of "donkey engine" printing establishments. The Secretary of State should instruct it to give other publishers with equally good, and perhaps better equipped offices than are to be found in Montreal, a show.'

2. Is it the intention to give 'other publishers' a share of the departmental printing ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher). I have no knowledge of the statement referred to. The departmental printing will be treated in the future as it has been in the past. It will be referred to the Printing Bureau and each case taken up on its merits and treated accordingly.

HOUSTON PERMIT.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Does the hon. the Minister of the Interior require a formal motion for papers asked for in question No. 20 ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). No, I will bring them down to-morrow or next day without a motion.

LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Hughes (Victoria)—moved for :

Copies of all orders in council, correspondence, contracts or agreements between the government or the Department of Public Works or any member of the government as such, or any officers of any department of the government and Nicholas K. Connolly and Michael Connolly, contractors, referring to the building of the Long Wharf Terminal Improvements at St. John, New Brunswick ; also what payments have been made on same and the date of said payments.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). I do not believe there has been any correspondence at all between the Public Works Department and Messrs. N. K. and Michael Connolly. I am under the impression that correspondence, if any, was with the Department of Railways and Canals. Since I have been in office, I am sure that there has been no correspondence between the Department of Public Works and these gentlemen, and no work carried on by them in my department. My hon friend must be mistaken.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). I do not know anything about it, but merely put the question in the absence of Mr. Fowler, and at his request.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copy of all correspondence between the Canadian and British governments relating to commissions to be granted Canadian officers in the British army.—Mr. Bourassa.

Copy of all correspondence relating to the recruiting of the South African police force in Canada; also copies of all offers or requests made since last session of parliament for new Canadian troops for South Africa, including correspondence with the British government on both matters.—Mr. Bourassa.

Copies of all correspondence with the Department of Railways relative to the building of a line of railway between Sydney and East Bay, in the county of Cape Breton, and copies of any reports made to department having reference to this matter.—Mr. Johnston (Cape Breton.)

Copies of all papers, correspondence and claims made in connection with the alleged non-observ-

ance of the fair-wage clause in the contract for the construction of the St. Andrews lock.—Mr. Puttee.

Return of all correspondence between the government or any officer thereof and Col. Van Wagner, relating to the retirement of that officer from the command of the Hamilton Field Battery; and also the authority for considering Col. Van Wagner as a 'commanding officer,' and thus bringing that officer under the operation of the 'five years tenure of command law.'—Mr. Hughes (Victoria.)

Copies of all contracts connected with the improvements at Sydney Railway yard and at North Sydney Junction ; also a statement of all prices paid per cubic yard for earth (different kinds) and rock (different kinds), and for borrowing for embankment under said contract and in connection with said improvements ; also how much was paid for ditching, clearing and close cutting and grubbing, per acre or per hundred feet ; also for culvert masonry, retaining walls, cattle guards and crossings, fencing and gates.—Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, by Mr. Borden (Halifax).

Return showing: (a) Net receipts and expenditures of the Intercolonial Railway for each month from 30th June, 1899, up to the 1st day of March, 1901. (b) The expenditure on capital account with respect to the Intercolonial Railway for each month from 30th June, 1899, up to the 1st day of March, 1901.—Mr. Borden (Halifax).

Copies of all correspondence, reports and certificates in regard to the application of Robert Gray, late lighthouse keeper at Entrance Island, British Columbia, for superannuation; also statement showing how long and what amounts he had paid into the superannuation fund.—Hon. Mr. Prior.

Copies of all orders in council, regulations and other documents since the 1st day of January, 1897, presenting or showing what percentage or proportion of value of goods entitled to the advantage of the preferential tariff could be created in foreign countries, and what percentage or proportion of such value must be created in the United Kingdom; and also setting forth and showing what declarations, statements, affirmations or oaths must be made, declared or sworn to by exporters or other persons consigning such goods to Canadian importers, or by persons in Canada importing such goods from Great Britain and Ireland.—Mr. Clarke.

Return showing the quantity of Servis railroad tie plates purchased by the government since June 30, A.D. 1887, the persons or companies from which the purchases were made, the quantities purchased, prices paid, dates of contracts and times of delivery.—Mr. Fowler, by Mr. Wilmot.

Copies of all rules and regulations and all correspondence in the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to fishing berths and the shore fishery in West Halifax, more especially within the polling district of Prospect and Dover.—Mr. Roche (Halifax).

DUTY ON LUMBER.

On the motion :

Mr. Bennett—That, in the opinion of this House, duties should be levied upon lumber imported into Canada corresponding with those now existing upon lumber entering the United States.

Mr. BENNETT. Stand.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am obliged to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) that the next time this is called, it must be proceeded with or it must be dropped.

Motion allowed to stand.

P.E.I. COMMUNICATION.

Mr. ALFRED A. LEFURGEY (East Prince, P.E.I.) moved for :

Copies of all reports, letters or other correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the boards of trade of Summerside and Charlottetown, or with any other person or persons acting in regard to the subject-matter of the motion, during the years 1899-1900 and 1901, regarding the placing of the government winter steamer Stanley on the route between Summerside, P.E.I., and Cape Tormentine, N.B., for the conveyance of mails, passengers and freight.

He said : When this motion came up a few days ago, I asked to have it stand over because the Minister of Marine (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) was not in his place. I am sorry he is not here to-day, as he is probably more familiar with the matter in hand than most of the other hon. gentlemen on the government benches. However, I wish to draw the attention of ministers and of members generally to the unsatisfactory, in fact the deplorable state of affairs which has existed in Prince Edward Island ever since confederation in regard to the transmission of mails, passengers and freight to and from the mainland, and more especially to a period lately passed, and to which reference has already been made in this House, and which is far from satisfactory to a country entering the twentieth century. I wish to point out further that it is a condition of affairs which is due not to the lack of opportunities or even of facilities to remedy it, but to causes which reflect most unsatisfactorily upon the heads of the departments who have been cognizant of the situation, and could have improved it had they been determined to do so. The most ludicrous part of the miserable situation is that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who, during the time that he wandered in the wilderness of opposition, declaimed year after year about the treatment to which Prince Edward Island was subjected, is the head of the department at whose door chiefly lies the responsibility for the conditions Prince Edward Island has had to face this winter. I shall not deal with this subject at length, because it has been before the House, I suppose, every year since confederation. I merely wish to lay before the House some facts presented by the Board of Trade of Summerside, at whose request I deal with the subject this afternoon. I shall lay before you communications that have passed between the Minister of Fisheries and the Board of Trade of Summerside, and reports and recommendations from captains of win-

ter boats Minto and Stanley, and from the government engineer, Mr. Schreiber, to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, which together with subsequent events will present a case of incompetence or wilful neglect. I should be recreant in my duty to my constituents did I not take this opportunity of placing this matter before the House.

Prince Edward Island, as you all know, entered confederation in 1873, under definite terms. One of the terms of union was as follows :

> Efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers to be established and maintained between Prince Edward Island and the mainland of the Dominion, winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of the Dominion.

That has not been carried out. I do not wish to treat this as a matter in which the Dominion should be forced to fulfil the terms of its agreement. I simply read this section to you to show that the condition exists, so that it will be seen that the Dominion is in honour bound to carry it out. It is to the feeling of justice and fairness that I would appeal for a remedy for existing evils. We in Prince Edward Island are not complaining because millions are spent in opening up the trade of the country at various points, nor because facilities are given by rail and water for the development of the resources of the country. But what we want, gentlemen, is a fair treatment of the provinces down by the sea.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I must ask the hon. member to address the Chair.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that the island and the other provinces down by the sea should receive a fair treatment at the hands of the government. Prince Edward Island came into the confederation in 1873, and for the first few years we really got no consideration as regards communication. Later on a steamer by the name of Albert was put on, which did not meet the requirements of the situation at all. In 1876 we were given the steamer Northern Light, and for a number of years she plyed between the island and the mainland, but like the Albert she gave very little satisfaction. In 1887 we got the Stanley. The government had experience of the Northern Light and put on a boat which really did good service up to 1899 ; but of course after having been battered up by the ice during all those years, she began to go down, and a second boat was indispensable if service was to be kept up. Then the Minto was put on in 1900, during the late parliament. One would have thought that the government would have taken pattern by the Stanley and put on a first-class boat with all the modern improvements ; but instead of having her built by the people who had experience of building the Stanley, for the sake of saving $30,000 or $40,000 they had the Minto built in a second-class yard ; and a proof of this is that an answer given on the floor of the House to an inquiry in committee showed that the sum of $12,000 had to be voted for repairs in riveting after she had only been running one year. Of course she was a vessel of great power, but what was the use of putting more power into a hull that was not capable of resisting the impact of the ice ? Moreover, after the Minto came out to the island before she could go on service and do the freight and passenger business required by that service, she had to be altered in many material respects. Surely the government in charge of her should have known this before accepting her and bringing her to the island. I do not know why this was done, unless it was that the present government did not wish to take pattern by the boat which had been supplied by the Conservative government. They have pursued a similar course in the matter of the fast Atlantic service ; but one notable case in which they did not do it was in respect of the national policy, for in that question they followed the example of the Conservative government.

At present, Mr. Speaker, we have two boats available, and that at the time when we should have our best service, is when the bungling of the opportunities at hand occurs and calls for some explanation, which I trust the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will give. A large number of business men, both in the province of Prince Edward Island and the county of Westmoreland contiguous, have for a number of years been advocating the Summerside and Cape Tormentine route as the natural and most favourable route for steam communication between the island and the mainland during the winter season. This project was advocated for some time, and finally we had a boat called the Petrel which came down from the lakes, a boat which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should have known, which any reasonable man with a proper knowledge of the straits should have known, was not of sufficient power to break through two or three inches of ice, let alone keeping open navigation across the straits. And so we had that miserable failure which, I suppose, served the election purposes. Possibly up to the advent of the second steamer, the Minto, we cannot attach too much blame to either government for not experimenting with this route ; but after we got the steamer Minto it was only fair that the people of the western end of the island should have the benefit of her for freight and passenger traffic, and the conveyance of the mails. In 1900, promises were made that route would be tested, yet the Stanley was lying tied up at Georgetown wharf, when there never had been a more favourable time in the past twenty-five years for a steamer to test the expediency of this route. The Stanley remained tied up there the whole winter, and the govern-

ment gave the old excuse that there was not enough water in Summerside harbour, and that there were not landing facilities at Cape Tormentine. But in May last, when the Dominion elections were in sight, promises came from the head of the department that these conditions would be remedied; and, wonderful to relate, a dredge did come to Summerside to prepare the harbour for the Stanley. But stranger still the $500 or $600 necessary to repair the pier at Cape Tormentine to receive the Stanley was not forthcoming. I know that a circular was sent through the district a couple of days before the election, saying that $15,000 would be spent in Summerside each month during the winter season while the Stanley was on the Summerside and Cape Tormentine route. Yet they subsequently use this very neglect in repairing Cape Tormentine pier as an excuse for removing the boat. I only mention this because this whole subject of communication betwen the island and the mainland appears to have been treated merely from a political point of view; it has not received that due consideration which these matters should have, and which the people down on the island deserve. Now, I am going to bring to the attention of the House some extracts of a report that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries received from his engineer, Mr. Shewen:

Mr. Shewen, in his report of September, 1900, referred to the work at Cape Tormentine as follows:—

That the Stanley required a vertical face 175 feet long on the outside of the return, or southern arm of the pier. And he used these words as to the route. The experiment proposed to be made with the Stanley between Summerside and Cape Tormentine is of the utmost consequence to the whole province of Prince Edward Island and to the other provinces with which the island does business, and at the narrowest part of the strait is found the greatest current and the current assists in loosening the ice. In the neighbourhood of Cape Tormentine the currents meet and part twice a day.

That was the report of the engineer, Mr. Shewen, to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The hon. gentleman was not altogether satisfied with that, and so he wrote to the captains of the winter boats, the Stanley and the Minto, and asked the following questions:

1. Is Cape Tormentine pier in a condition to receive the Stanley, or could she make it as a landing?

This is the answer:

Cape Tormentine pier or breakwater is not in a fit condition to receive any steamer; on account of it being built with a slope, a steamer could only bear on it with her bilge, which would be certain to injure her, and break her propeller. In summer, or before the ice makes, she could get round inside of the breakwater, but after the ice forms it would be impossible to put her inside, because it requires more space to turn in ice, and deeper water than there is inside of the breakwater.

Mr. LEFURGEY.

Generally, is this route feasible under present circumstances for winter; if not, what would be required to make it a feasible route?

Answer. We cannot tell whether the route is feasible or not without a trial.

3rd Ques. Can you suggest any circumstances under which an experiment could safely be made to test the feasibility of that route?

Answer. The only thing, in our opinion, that can be done to test the route is this: after the steamer Northumberland stops running, place the Stanley at Summerside and have her all ready and let her remain there until the bord ice in the vicinity of Cape Tormentine breakwater is sufficiently strong to hold the steamer; then a landing can be made on the ice. This has been done at Souris and Georgetown on several occasions.

This reply is dated November 1, 1900, and is signed by the two masters of the winter boats, Capt. Finlayson and Capt. Brown, on whom every reliance is placed, and on whom the minister is accustomed to rely and would shift responsibility in all cases. When the harbour of Summerside had been frozen over for about a month, or on December 22, the Stanley came into Summerside harbour, and continued to make daily trips between Summerside and Cape Tormentine, occupying from one hour and a half to two hours each trip, until on January 3 we find that news comes from Charlottetown that the Stanley is to be removed from this route and is in fact taken away to Georgetown, under the excuse that the facilities at Cape Tormentine pier are not requisite to land passengers, mails and freights, and on account of an epidemic of smallpox in Westmoreland, N.B. I want to show, from the data which I will put before the House, that we did not receive fair treatment in the matter of this trial, and I desire to point out that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not act up to the recommendation of the persons who were experienced in the matter of winter communication. When the board of trade found that the boat was going to be removed from Summerside, they addressed the following correspondence to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

Summerside, December 26, 1900.

Hon. Sir Louis Davies,
Ottawa.

Crossed with Stanley yesterday, Summerside to Cape Tormentine and return, making round trip under four hours, encountering ordinary winter conditions of ice. There can be no doubt about feasibility of daily communication, weather permitting. The only present difficulty is absence of bord ice is Tormentine pier, which requires piling and trestle work, as recommended by Captain Brown in November, 1899. In consultation with Mr. McGlashing, your official at Tormentine, he says work can be done at a small cost in a few days. Will you kindly instruct him to have work done immediately.

R. C. MACLEOD,
President of Board of Trade.

On December 26, the following message was also sent to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

In view of the success and rapidness of trip of Stanley here yesterday, we would suggest that mails be sent by her. The Minto being relieved of carrying mails and passengers, could easily handle all the freight. There were no mails here for four days till last night. The mails by the Stanley could be easily landed daily. Until pier is repaired or bord ice makes, mails and passengers can be landed at low tide by boats if necessary.

R. C. MACLEOD,
President Board of Trade.

The following telegram was received from the hon. minister on December 26 :

R. C. Macleod, Summerside.

Am inquiring with respect to epidemic smallpox in country surrounding Cape Tormentine. Fear will have to withdraw Stanley.

L. H. DAVIES.

The board of trade replied to the minister as follows :

Smallpox scare greatly exaggerated. Was on the ground yesterday. Do not withdraw Stanley. Sending delegation to-morrow to fully investigate health conditions. Will report.

R. C. MACLEOD,
President Board of Trade.

In the meantime the hon. minister replied that nothing would be done until he received the report of the delegates. The delegates reported that the infected district had been fully quarantined and every precaution taken by the health officers :

New coaches have been substituted for those used on the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railroad when epidemic was discovered, and no local passengers, freight or mails are permitted on the trains between Sackville and Cape Tormentine. The nearest case to Cape Tormentine is eight miles distant. There are several cases known, but of a very light type, and the epidemic is now thought to be under control.

They also reported in regard to Cape Tormentine pier that Mr. McGlashing, in the employ of the government there, informed them that the repairs could be completed in a few days, if ordered, at a cost of from $200 to $300.

In face of this, Mr. Speaker, the boat was taken away, and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in reply to these communications, telegraphed on January 3, 1901, as follows :—

Letter received; regret impossible to make promises suggested, owing to absence of terminal facilities Tormentine combined with smallpox scare. Stanley is carrying little freight, few passengers and no mails. See no prospect her being much public service remainder of winter on this route while tremendous congestion of freight at Pictou demands her presence there to relieve it.

I contend that a reply of this kind, in the face of the evidence that has been presented to this House, is a barefaced excuse. The want of terminal facilities was known to the hon. minister ; it was pointed out to him, and the necessary repairs were recommended by his engineer. These were also pointed out by Mr. McGlashing, the engineer at Cape Tormentine in charge of the work, who reported that they could be made at a cost of from $200 to $300 ; yet, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries goes back to the excuse of the want of proper terminal facilities, after promising, in the fall of 1900, to have these same repairs made. Then, he goes on to say that there was a scare of smallpox. He takes care to say that it was a scare, because the facts proved that it was nothing else. Whoever heard of a smallpox scare, or even of a real case of smallpox stopping the trains ? Are you not having smallpox cases in Montreal and in Ottawa every season, and do you stop your trains because of this ? The excuse is too small to be put forward by any gentleman who holds the position of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. As to there being no orders for passengers, freight or mails, I have read you the communications that passed between the board of trade and the minister, asking that the mails be transferred to the Stanley in view of the quick trips she was making. As regards passengers and freight, I may say that at this time in Summerside, there were between twenty and thirty cars of freight, composed of frozen fish, poultry and pork, manufactured lumber, &c., waiting. The board of trade could get no satisfaction from the authorities as to whether these goods could be shipped by the Stanley, and the Stanley had some 400 tons of coal on board during the time she was on this route. The result was that very little went in the way of freight or passengers, because the passengers could not depend on the movements of the Stanley, or whether or not she was likely to be taken away at any time. The congestion of freight, to which the hon. minister referred, did not exist at all. One of our merchants, a prominent member of the board of trade, wired to Pictou on hearing of this reported congestion of freight at Pictou, asking if he could get freight accommodation on the Minto, and the reply came back that two days would remove the congestion of freight at Pictou.

Furthermore, I myself was at Pictou about this time, and I inquired as to the congestion of freight there, as I had also heard that the Stanley was going to be removed. I was informed that the Minto could relieve any congestion of freight in a very few days, providing the mails were transferred to the Stanley. These excuses did not amount to anything with the people of Prince Edward Island, who are so vitally interested in receiving their mails and freight. The result of the arrangement made last winter was that both boats were caught in the ice for ten days, and from 1,200 to 1,500 bags of mails were piled up at Cape Tormentine and Pictou, while the ice-boat service was not even called out to relieve the congestion until after some days. I am informed by

trustworthy people in the island and at Cape Tormentine, that there has not been a single day this winter when the Stanley could not have made return trips to Prince Edward Island from Summerside to Cape Tormentine, and we have the same reports at the present time. It was not my intention to rebuke the government, but in view of the bungling and mismanagement to which the people of the western end of the island (indeed all over the island) were obliged to submit during the last winter, some explanation is required from the government. I would be more pleased to think that it was the result of neglect than that the Minister of Marine (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) had been influenced by any political pull coming from West Queen's. I do not want to make any political capital out of this matter because the people of the island and of the whole Dominion, irrespective of political parties, are deeply concerned. We have the facilities at hand, and what we complain is that they are not utilized in the best interest of the people. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the people of Prince Edward Island are an intelligent people, and since they entered confederation in 1873 they have been a long-suffering and patient people as regards this matter, but patience must have its limit. There may be some hon. gentlemen here who do not know that Prince Edward Island is a most fertile province, and that we have resources there in almost every line of agriculture. During the last few years the dairying industry has made marked progress, but that progress must necessarily be retarded unless we can send our products to the markets at all times of the year. I wish to emphasize that the route which I advocate is better than any other route which has been experimented upon, or which is known, and it will receive the approval of seven-eighths of the people of the island, for the following reasons: Three-fourths of the freight and passengers and mails must pass through Sackville before coming to the island, and Sackville is a great many miles removed from Pictou, so that a great deal of time would be saved. As to the steamers themselves they would have from 24 to 80 miles less ice breaking, because the route between Summerside and Cape Tormentine is only 15 miles whereas between Georgetown and Pictou it is about 50 miles. There would be consequently less wear and tear on the steamers by the shorter route. It is 132 miles shorter from Charlottetown to Sackville than via Georgetown. It is 182 miles shorter from Summerside and the west, than by going around via Georgetown, and it is 40 miles nearer to Sackville going to Georgetown via Summerside and the Cape than it is to go around via Pictou and Georgetown. The route, therefore, has many advantages in the saving of distances. Mails and passengers arriving by the Intercolonial Railway express from Montreal get to Sackville at 12.23 p.m., and by the Canadian Pacific Railway from Halifax at 11.50 a.m., so that by proper train connection they could reach Charlottetown at 7 p.m., or 24 hours sooner than by the route now used. Take the example of two men leaving Charlottetown for the main line of the Intercolonial Railway in the morning at the same hour. The man going by Summerside and Cape Tormentine would be at Sackville when the man from Charlottetown and Georgetown would arrive at Pictou. In other words, he would be 24 hours ahead on a trip to Montreal or any point west. Another advantage is that the winter boat from Summerside to Cape Tormentine is never out of sight of land, and if the steamers carried ice-boats the passengers on that dangerous trip could be landed in a few hours without any delay. As the engineer pointed out to the Minister of Marine (Hon. Sir Louis Davies), the tide meets there twice daily and consequently the ice is kept loosened up. The winds also favour this route, because at Charlottetown and Georgetown we have the north and north-east winds, which completely block up the straits at times, while at Cape Tormentine this does not occur, or if we had a boat at either end it would more nearly carry out the terms of confederation, because if one boat was tied up on the Georgetown-Pictou route with north-east winds we would have the other route absolutely free of ice, or, on the other hand, if westerly winds blocked the western route the eastern would be open. Another point in favour of this route is that if there was any congestion of freight while there was open water we could have a boat ply from Summerside to Cape Tormentine twice daily. There is no business man in the House, nor any man of common sense, who, in view of the conditions that exist will deny in the face of these facts that the people of Prince Edward Island have not been treated fairly in this matter. We would like the assurance of the hon. the Minister of Marine—who, I regret, is not here—and the hon. the Minister of Public Works, that this matter will be remedied in the near future, and that this pier at Cape Tormentine will be put in repair, as was promised time and time again, and not be kept for use as a political machine during election time. Furthermore, we would ask that the steamer Stanley be put on a Summerside and Cape Tormentine route at the earliest possible moment. I have letters from reliable persons every day telling me that there has been open water on that route almost every day this year, and that the Stanley could have made round trips between those points without interruption the entire season. I thank the House for its kind attention, and would again ask the consideration of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the government and the members of this House to the topic I have brought before them.

Mr. EDWARD HACKETT (West Prince, P.E.I.) Before this motion is carried, Mr.

Speaker, I desire to say but few words, as my hon. friend from East Prince has dwelt so ably and exhaustively on the subject that he has left me very little to say. There is one thing we regret in connection with this matter, and that is that we have not the pleasure of seeing the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) in his seat. This motion was allowed to stand on the Order paper a week ago because of his absence, and now we find that he is again away from the House, and that we have to press this motion on the attention of this House in the absence of the minister in charge of the department. We are thus compelled to address ourselves to hon. gentlemen who are unfamiliar with the details, and it is very unsatisfactory to us to be placed in this position, representing as my hon. friend and myself do the majority of the people of the island and the intelligence and views and desires of that majority. We are the more disappointed, because we were led to believe by the hon. minister, who is not here to attend to the affairs of his province that he was going to revolutionize affairs once he obtained a seat on the treasury benches. Why is the hon. gentleman absent to-day ? The reason is not far to seek. There is a by-election on in Prince Edward Island, and he is more anxious to bring back to this House a supporter of the government than to remain here and attend to the business and wants of the people. The other day, on his return from a trip to the island, the hon. gentleman complained that he had been imprisoned in that province, and we had the hon. the Postmaster General, when asked for an explanation of the delay of ten days in the mail service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, telling us that he would explain the delay as soon as his colleague returned. We know why the Minister of Marine went to the island at that time and sympathized with him. He went down to the bed side of a sick father, and we know that with his characteristics of filial love and affection, he would not leave that bed side as long as his father remained ill, and we would have to wait until his return for the information we required. When the hon. gentleman came back he told us how he had been imprisoned owing to the ice blockade, and yet we find him going down and risking imprisonment again in his native province, but this time his object is to bring back a supporter to himself. He is not here to attend to his duties and the affairs of his province, but is down at the island trying to elect the candidate who was defeated on the 7th of November last, and bring him back to vote for this government.

This question we are discussing is one of great importance to the people of Prince Edward Island. One of the principal inducements at the time of confederation to Prince Edward Island to become a part of the Dominion was the promise held out to the people that the Dominion would establish uninterrupted winter communication between the island and the mainland. We were told by both parties that the Dominion, having means at its disposal, would, if the island entered the union, provide the continuous steam communication in winter and summer, so necessary to the welfare of that province, between the island and the mainland. In bringing this question to the notice of the House, we therefore make no apology, because it is not one which affects our province alone. We have in that province a population of about 120,000, intelligent, fairly prosperous, and mostly composed of farmers and fishermen. We have no manufacturing industries of any importance, and consequently have to buy from the other provinces the manufacturing goods we require, and to-day, notwithstanding the ice blockade, we find commercial travellers from Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, St. John and other cities of Canada visiting our province and selling their goods to our people. This question therefore is not one which affects the island alone, but the whole Dominion, and consequently we require to make no apology when bringing it to the notice of the House.

My hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) has dwelt so fully upon what has been done that little remains to be said. We know that the government has been approached by the local government of our province and shown that a large amount is due us by the Dominion because of the non-fulfilment of this article of confederation. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) replied that we have now one ice boat—I think that was in 1898—and that next year he would provide another one, and thus fulfil the terms of union. He sent away the delegation, and we have received no compensation for the non-fulfilment of those terms although they have been so long left unfulfilled. Another steamer was placed on the route, but to provide the continuous communication, guaranteed us by the terms of confederation, the two boats should not be kept on the same route between the same two points. It has been shown that the route between Cape Tormentine and Summerside harbour is the natural one. Between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse is really the natural route, as the distance across is only eight or nine miles, but as there are not proper facilities at Cape Traverse, communication cannot be kept up between those points. But Summerside harbour, lying some fifteen miles east, is easily accessible. That crossing was experimented upon by the steamer Stanley, which was sent there on the 22nd December, after ice had formed in the harbour, and she had no difficulty getting to the wharf and made the round trip in three hours, taking from Summerside a number of people and bringing back a number of passengers from the other side, thus clearly estab-

lishing the feasibility of that route. At that point, we have the best information obtainable that there has been open water there all this winter, and no solid packed ice as there is at the eastern end of the island. The engineer, Mr. Shewen, assures us that by the action of the currents and the tides, the ice is separated and loosened all the time, and consequently easily navigable by a good ship.

But it is somewhat amusing to review the history of this matter. When I had the honour of a seat in this House in 1896, I asked the hon. the Minister of Marine what he was going to do in order to keep up navigation between the island and the mainland, and he replied that he had a scheme which he had no doubt would get the support of the hon. member for West Prince. What that scheme was he would not make known then, but he said that he had a scheme, and had $20,000 voted to carry it out. The scheme was this: He hired a tug boat, a boat that would do for towing rafts on Lake Ontario, and had her brought to Prince Edward Island to keep up steam communication. I happened to be in Summerside when that boat came into the harbour there. The people were assembled on the house tops and on the streets watching her coming in. They were able to get her up to the Queen's Wharf, the lower wharf, and a party of tourists boarded her—this craft that had been hired from some pets of the minister up in Ontario. These people took passage to Cape Tormentine, intending to return the same evening. This was in the month of November, and, unfortunately, a little frost came on, causing a light coating of ice to form—and the new boat remained at Cape Tormentine, while the tourists were obliged to go around by Pictou, and return by the old Stanley, that had been built by the Conservative government. And that was all this new boat did. I had occasion to cross in the ice boats from Cape Traverse about the end of February. They were expecting the Stanley. There was open water, and no doubt about the boat running. In the morning I was aroused by the whistle of a steamer. I rose, dressed rapidly, and rushing down stairs, asked the host if the Stanley had arrived, and if that was her whistle that I had heard. He said: 'No, that is the government whistle. She has been there whistling all winter; she whistles us up in the morning and whistles us to bed at night.' And she did nothing to keep up communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Now, as I have said, if the minister would place the Minto between Georgetown and Pictou at the eastern end, and have the Stanley run between Summerside and Cape Tormentine, you would have an ideal system of communication. To have the two boats on the same route as at present is most unwise. Both were stuck in the ice about February 1. If you had one of these boats plying between Summerside and Cape Tormentine, and the other on the other route, there would be no detention of mails, passengers or freight. But the hon. minister has seen fit to keep the two boats at the eastern end of the province, having no means of communication direct with the western end. This cannot be on account of politics; we do not want to make this a political question. It is a question that interests every man on Prince Edward Island, and every man in the Dominion of Canada as well. I do not know who is to take the place of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and give an answer to our question. I saw the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) here a few moments ago, but he also has disappeared. He went to Prince Edward Island during a by-election two years ago, and barely escaped being imprisoned in the ice also. He came across from Summerside to Point Du Chene, N.B., just in time to escape. He ought to be able to give us a little information on the matter. I see the right hon. Prime Minister is in his place, and I would remind him that in any conversation he has with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he should impress upon him the necessity of having terminal facilities completed at Cape Tormentine, and have the Stanley on the route between Cape Tormentine and Summerside, P.E.I., leaving the Minto at the other end of the province. This would enable the government to keep up communication. It should be impressed upon the Minister of Fisheries that a north-east wind which packs the ice in the gulf at the eastern end of the province, loosens it at the western end, so that you always have one route with open loose ice through which a winter boat can navigate. I am glad to see that the Prime Minister is paying attention, and I hope that he will impress this matter upon his colleague. And even if the independent electors of East Queen's do reject his candidate, I hope that both these hon. gentlemen and the government generally will see the necessity of doing something for Prince Edward Island.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry that my hon. friend and colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is not here, and that he has not had the advantage of hearing my hon. friend. But, in that hon. gentleman's absence, I can assure my hon. friends that I have taken their remarks all in, and I shall be happy to report everything that has been said to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If I correctly understand the view of my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett), it is that the Minto should be left at the eastern end of the island, and that the Stanley should do service between Summerside and Cape Tormentine, and that this is the ideal service—almost as good as a tunnel would be. I shall report that faithfully to my col-

league. Meanwhile, there is no objection to the adoption of the motion.

RETIRING PENSIONS TO MEMBERS OF PERMANENT CORPS.

On the motion :

Hon. Mr. PRIOR :

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when the best interests of Canada demand that the government should without further delay introduce a Bill embodying a workable scheme looking to the granting of adequate retiring pensions to the officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the permanent corps of the militia of Canada.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Stand.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Does not the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Prior) move this ?

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Several hon. gentlemen on the other side wish to speak on the subject, and have asked me to allow the motion to stand. Do I understand that if I ask that it be allowed to stand now, it will be taken off the Notice paper ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, I will give another chance. I said at the opening that we would allow motions to stand to-day if desired, but at the next sitting I will ask that those not moved be dropped. I may remark that the session is advancing, and the hon. gentleman's chances of getting his motion forward are becoming more slim.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I would move it to-day but for the absence of supporters of the right hon. gentleman, who wish to speak upon it.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well, let it stand.

Motion allowed to stand.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF RIFLE SHOOTING.

Mr. S. HUGHES (North Victoria) moved :

That in the opinion of this House it would be in the best interests of the militia of Canada were the government or the Minister of Militia to authorize the payment of ten dollars annually towards the expenses of one man, selected under departmental regulations, from each company, squadron and battery, or other unit of the active militia, to attend the provincial rifle Association annual rifle matches, each in his own province ; and that the sum of fifteen dollars annually be granted to each of two men of the foregoing number from each battalion of two hundred and fifty men and corresponding number of cavalry and artillery and other arm of the service while an additional man should be selected for each extra one hundred and twenty-five members of any arm of the service) toward expenses in attending the Dominion of Canada Rifle Association matches annually ; and further, that a liberal supply of ammunition should be granted to each active militiaman free, for practice under proper departmental regulations on local or home ranges.

He said : In placing this motion upon the paper, I am actuated by a desire to bring the importance of this question to the attention of the House and the country. I will not dilate here on the great importance of rifle shooting for the defence of any nation, it is not necessary to enter into any sentimental discussion of that aspect of the question. All the arguments have been advanced in years gone by in favour of rifle shooting, and they have been vigorously opposed by those who have taken the opposite view, opposed on the ground of red-tape and other reasons. But all these reasons have been exploded by the recent war and the absolute necessity of encouraging rifle shooting has been made abundantly plain. My object is simply to draw the attention of the minister and of the country to the necessity of the government and of the Militia Department taking cognizance of rifle shooting. I understand that the government are bringing down some scheme of rifle associations. I have not seen the scheme yet, it may be a good one, but I very much fear that a mere scheme of establishing rifle associations over the country, unless they are under the control of the Militia Department in some definite way, will not redound to the benefit of the militia of the country. What I fear is that when these associations are organized these men will disassociate themselves from the militia of the country, at least so far as they can do so under the regulations. We have already existing very good associations, but I feel they can be much improved. I desire again to impress upon the minister the scheme I had the honour of bringing up a number of years ago. Why not offer a prize to each militia company all over Canada, that prize to be a certain payment—I have only put down a nominal sum here, that need not be adhered to—but a certain prize to go in payment of his expenses towards attending the provincial rifle association matches which receive the sanction, the cognizance and support of the various provincial governments all over Canada, and rightly so ? Let the government set apart, say, two men from each unit all over the country to attend these provincial matches, and then pick out say one or two of the best of these men from every battalion or certain sized units to attend the Dominion of Canada Rifle Association matches. The expenditure of money, I am satisfied, would be more than returned to the government in the impetus given to rifle shooting, At present, with the long range rifle, and these long range targets that we must necessarily have now, and expensive targets too, rifle shooting as a science, has largely become centered in the cities. It is almost impossible in a rural district to get a range that will not be objectionable to some one. After you get a range, the first thing you know is an appeal from the township council that it is dangerous, somebody kicks,

and unless the militia is strong enough to control the council, the range has to go. Indeed there is not that incentive to rifle shooting in rural regiments now that there formerly was. One reason is the expense of providing a rifle range, and you cannot expect rural men, with little time at their disposal, to go in for this expensive training.

I take the liberty of drawing the minister's attention to a point which has been considerably discussed by militiamen, and I think he has considered it in the plan that he is carrying out, although I have not seen his plan, in relation to rifle associations throughout the country. I am satisfied that possibly he will be able to adopt some framework of my suggestion here in his new range regulations, if I may call them so. At all events, I trust that the minister, in framing his resolution on the question of rifle associations and ranges, will give this matter his serious consideration.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monk). Mr. Speaker, in regard to the motion of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes), I have a very few words to say. Personally, I am much interested in the subject of rifle shooting from having had a long connection with the militia of Canada. To my mind, this subject has been, to some extent, neglected in the past, owing to the fact that the people of Canada have not sufficiently realized its importance. One of the good results arising from the South African war is that the people have had called to their attention the fact that good soldiership means the ability to use the weapon of the day. If we go back in history we find that in very early times the ability to use the particular weapon of the time was the fact upon which the winning of the battle largely depended. We find that in the battle of Flodden Field, where, for once the English got the better of the Scotts, the victory was owing largely to the fact that the English had in their ranks the better marksmen. While holding the views I do upon this subject, I have no wish to see adopted in this country a military system that would bear heavily upon the people. We do not, in Canada, want to be ground under the militarism of the old lands, but we want a citizen soldiery which will be effective and which, if need be, can take the field and give a good account of itself and will do so if we have better facilities for rifle practice. I am not in favour of confining the opportunities for rifle shooting merely to military organizations. When I use the term military organizations, I may say that I am speaking of the active militia which is necessarily small in number, being composed of some 40,000 men, which, after all, represents a very inconsiderable proportion of the force upon which the country depends. I have heard it stated by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Mr. Borden), who has always done a great deal ever since he took the portfolio, in the interest of the militia, that rifle clubs are to be organized and facilities given to men to shoot, although they are not active members of the militia. I believe there are limitations imposed to the effect that these men should agree to sign a document that in the case of their services being required they would give them. That, to my mind, would be an entirely unnecessary precaution. I feel convinced that if Canada were in trouble her sons would come promptly to the front and give their services in her defence. When the North-west Territories rebellion broke out the great difficulty was the choice of men. So great was the number of applications that the men were struggling for the places. The same thing occurred when this country offered to send troops to take part in the South African war. I believe that if you teach men how to shoot with the rifle of to-day you will have provided the best means of defence for this country. Take the little country of Switzerland where they have between 500,000 and 600,000 men who are fair shots at from 600 to 800 and 1,000 yards. There is an immense force in that country to guard its frontiers in time of need. I am heartily in accord with the motion of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), and I hope the hon. Minister of Militia will take this matter seriously into his consideration and give the members, if not absolutely free ammunition, at least cheap ammunition—ammunition at cost, or even at, perhaps, half cost, and that everything will be done to promote rifle shooting in this country.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, I would say, in reference to this expenditure that is foreshadowed for crack shots, that we do not want to forget the general militiamen or volunteer, because, what we want are not a few men that can shoot well, but the encouragement of many men who can shoot fairly well. Otherwise, we would be in danger of paying too much attention to these few men and neglecting the great body of our militiamen. I think it would be well for the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Mr. Borden) to bear that in mind. While I am heartily in favour of both the Dominion and Provincial Rifle Associations, it seems to me that we should pay more attention to securing a large number of men that are capable of shooting fairly well than to get a few who can shoot excellently well. From year to year men grow older, and while they may still have an interest in the subject, they lose the capability of rendering active service which devolves upon the young men who are growing up. Therefore, in my opinion, it is better to have plenty of shooting that is fairly good so that this marksmanship will be available for the defence of the country. The money would be better expended if

some system were evolved that would encourage all of the volunteers and the militia, whether on the reserve or active list, to be able to master their weapons and shoot fairly well than by giving too much encouragement for a few men in the different battalions who might be able to shoot particularly well.

Hon. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I am heartily in accord with the resolution moved by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes). I wish to say a word in regard to what the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) has stated. He says he does not think that any agreement should be asked from the men who join these proposed rifle clubs because Canada always can find plenty of men who are willing to fight for her in the time of need. It seems to me, that, although we can find plenty of men, we cannot always find plenty of men who are first-class rifle shots, and these clubs are proposed for the express purpose of teaching men how to shoot. Why should any man, when he joins one of these clubs, object to signing an agreement to serve? He knows that the reason that the club is formed is to make men first-class rifle shots so that, in case of need, his services would be worth something to the country. If it were not for that nobody would wish him to join that club. I cannot see any reason why a man who joins a club of that kind should object to signing an agreement to serve in case his services are required. I am perfectly well aware that the governmnt can find plenty of men, as it has done in the past, but it is those men who have proved themselves to be first-class shots that should be the first asked to join when they are required. I do not see any hardship in calling on a man, when the government assists him, either with money, or with ammunition, or by giving him a first-class rifle range, to come forward as a militiaman in the defence of his country.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). Mr. Speaker, I think we should all be very much obliged to the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) for having brought this matter up. I assume, however, that in doing so, his object was simply to discuss the matter and not with any idea of tying the hands of the department by the actual passage of this resolution. There can be no question as to the vital importance of rifle practice to the militia. The fact is that without it the militia amounts to nothing. That being the case, as I have said recently in another place, the department has been considering the establishment of rifle associations in the country. I expected that before this the proposals would have been formulated and published in the Gazette, but owing to a discussion which took place at the rifle association meeting the other day, I thought it was desirable to give a little more consideration to the matter. I hope before the militia estimates are considered that the regulations will have been published. I think my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) will, perhaps, change his opinion later as to the desirability of applying no test to the men who become members of the proposed associations. I agree with the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) that it is desirable that a test of some kind should be applied in order to make sure of the good faith of the men to whom we supply rifles and free ammunition to learn the art of rifle shooting. It is the custom of a good many people in the Dominion to pursue rifle shooting simply as a pleasure without any idea of carrying it further in case of necessity. I have no objection to that, but I do not think that we should supply these persons with free ammunition, and it is to make it necessary that those to whom we supply the rifles and ammunition should put their marksmanship to some practical use that we apply the test. Now, that my hon. friend from North Victoria has attained his object in bringing about the discussion I understand that he will withdraw his motion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to ask from the minister whether or not his department has under consideration the desirability of training young men throughout the country in the art of riding and managing horses. I know that progress must be gradual in these things, but it seems to me that this is a matter which the department might take into consideration. In connection with that, the question arises as to whether we can train men throughout the Dominion to shoot from horseback. That also seems to be a very desirable, if not a necessary part of a soldier's training in these days.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This matter will be discussed on the estimates. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) will remember that last session the question of establishing mounted rifles was thoroughly discussed, and I stated that we would make a beginning in Manitoba and the North-west. I think a school will be established, probably in the city of Winnipeg or some part of Manitoba for a corps of the kind designated by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). I think the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Hon. Mr. Prior) as well as the hon. Minister of Militia slightly misunderstood the remarks of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson). I am sure I voice the opinion of the House in congratulating the hon. gentleman (Mr. Thompson) on the very masterly manner in which he handled the subject. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Thompson) did not at all object to the rifle men

signing themselves. He took it for granted that every man who trained for rifle shooting would be ready to come to the front in case of necessity. At the same time there are a great many young fellows who might not in the immediate future wish to enroll themselves in the militia, but who would wish to have a rifle training and would in case of necessity come to the front. I stated at the outset that all I wished to do was to place this matter before the minister so that in the framing of his rifle association regulations he might keep it in view. With all due deference to my hon. friend from Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale), what we want is a large number of men who can shoot well. I am of the opinion from a rather long experience in the business, that the battalions and companies which make the best general average in shooting are the battalions that include among them a few of these good shots. You must have a few enthusiasts to set the lead so that the others will follow. My motion touches the men who have already signed and are already in the ranks. The highest prize of riflemen in this country is the Bisley team, and numbers of our militia men are prohibited from competing in that under present conditions. The country battalions have no rifle ranges and not a tithe of the opportunities our friends from the cities have. I should not wish for a moment to deprive the city corps of the advantages they have, but I would like to see some encouragement given to the boys on the side roads who have proven to be quite their equals—I will not say the superiors—of the lads from the cities and towns. The experience of the South African war is that the men who could shoot straight, mighty soon taught the Boers to fear them. The Boers learned the corps that could shoot straight just as soon as the British themselves did, and when these gentlemen were around the Boers avoided them most religiously. Now, that I have drawn the attention of the Minister of Militia to the subject, I beg leave to withdraw my motion.

Motion withdrawn.

THE STAFF COLLEGE COURSE.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria) moved :

That in the opinion of this House it would be in the best interests of the active militia of Canada, were the books and data used in the staff college course of the Imperial service placed at the disposal of such officers of the Canadian militia as might wish to have the reading thereof.

He said : This is a very simple motion, Mr. Speaker. We have had in Canada for a few years past a kind of staff college course. If you look over the list of nearly all those who attended that school you will scarcely find the name of a man outside of the permanent corps, or else some one who has nothing to do. You will hardly find one of them who is a free citizen of Canada. If they are members of the permanent corps they should have had this training before they entered it. With all due respect these are not the type of men we want to have in the leading militia positions of this country. Very few of the men in the active militia can afford to spend three or four months taking this staff course, and what I want is that the department should furnish to each of the officers, say above the grade of captain, the books that are on the list of that staff college course. I do not say it with any disrespect to the staff college course, but if any one who has taken an interest in militiary studies—as every officer of any standing in the militia should—reviews the books in that staff college course, he will be surprised to find that the great bulk of them will be in his own library.

My suggestion is that those books should be placed at the disposal of those officers who do not enjoy access to them, and do not know just where to write to get them. We must have a democratic militia. I have always contended in favour of our adopting such a system, but my arguments have been generally sneered at and frowned upon. To-day, however, the best men in the British army have expressed themselves in favour of that policy, for advocating which I was met with all sorts of hostile prejudices in the days gone by. And in order to carry out that policy, you must give our rank and file the opportunities to read at their own homes at night or on Sundays and week evenings, these works which are used in the staff college course, and I do not know that an evening could be better spent at our annual camp meetings than by having it devoted to an examination on these works, with an occasional lecture on them by some one of the officers. I have no desire to press this motion, but simply wish to draw the attention of the minister to the matter, in the hope that he will give it his consideration.

Motion withdrawn.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 12, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

VISIT OF THE DUKE AND DUCHESS OF CORNWALL AND YORK.

Hon. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the right hon.

leader of the government to a paragraph that appears in the Victoria Daily Times, of Tuesday, March 5. It is headed : 'The Duke is coming—Aulay Morrison telegraphs that his visit is practically decided upon' ; and reads as follows :

Upon the opening of the House to-day the premier read a telegram from Aulay Morrison, M.P., stating that the visit of the Duke of York and Cornwall to British Columbia was practically fixed. The announcement was greeted with great applause.

That was on March 5. On March 7, I called the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the fact that the people of British Columbia would like to know whether their Royal Highnesses were going to visit that province or not, and the right hon. gentleman replied as follows :

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I stated some time ago to my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) that we are corresponding at this moment with the Colonial Office upon the subject of the visit of their Royal Highnesses, that the correspondence is not concluded, and that I would not like to make a statement until the correspondence has been concluded. But in the meantime, I think, without divulging any secret, I may assume to say that it would be, I think, quite proper and fitting that their Royal Highnesses should visit Vancouver, B.C.

Now, Sir, I cannot believe that the hon. member for Westminster (Mr. Morrison) sent that telegram without having some——

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. member will not make any discussion ?

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. If I am assured by the right hon. gentleman——

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish also to state that my mind is not clear that such a question should be brought before the House just now. I cannot see that it is either a question of privilege or a question of urgency. The question may, perhaps, come up later on.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I only want to get some information.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am simply stating the rule, which is that when the Orders of the Day are called, the only matters which may be brought up are questions of privilege or questions of urgency. I do not see that this is a question of urgency. Besides, if I may be permitted to suggest, when a question of urgency is raised, it might be better to have an understanding with the government, that the question should be answered without notice being given.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Of course, Mr. Speaker, if you rule it out of order, I cannot say anything more. I wish to get the information from the right hon. First Minister as to whether Mr. Morrison was authorized to send such a telegram as that——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR—or whether the right hon. gentleman was treating the House in a manner——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR—which, I do not think, was at all proper, in stating that he had not the information to give.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, I gave to the House the only information I could give pending the correspondence, which had not been concluded. I gave no information to Mr. Morrison or anybody else. I never saw Mr. Morrison on the subject at all.

SUPPLY—S. A. WAR—CANADIAN INTERVENTION, &c.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Since I have given notice of the motion which I am now to propose, a double accusation has been brought against me.

On one hand, I am pointed out to the eyes of my English-speaking fellow-citizens as a French demagogue; and, on the other, I am denounced to my own countrymen as a dangerous British Imperialist.

Of course, having made up my mind to say what I think, as I think it, on all matters of national importance, I will not trouble myself with the opinion of this paper or that one: it would be easier to get a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than to bring a political sheet to appreciate an idea with complete independence and good faith.

In the course of my remarks, I will have occasion to deal with the charge of French demagogy, to which, I must say, I never attached any importance. The intention of raising a racial agitation on this matter has always been so foreign to my mind and so totally absent from my utterances, that I never took the trouble to confute that accusation. I thought I could rely on the common sense and straightforwardness of English Canadians to do justice on that slander.

As to my imperialistic tendencies, they should not call for much argument either. Nevertheless, the problem has received so little serious consideration, from the Quebec representatives especially, that some explanation may be required. The preamble of my motion sets out my intention clearly enough, I think. I do not recede for one moment from the position which I have taken and kept from the day the Canadian government decided to take part in the South African war; that position being identical to that occupied by the cabinet till the 13th October, 1899.

This proposition therefore does not imply an admission on my part that the government had a right and a duty to interfere in

South Africa. I shall never admit that the country could be thrown in any war by order in council. I shall never acknowledge that the government was excusable, for the sake of power or popularity, or even in order to avoid the nightmare of racial agitation, to open, by a mere cabinet decision, a new era in our relations with Great Britain, without at least enlightening the people upon the real consequences of their action. I still assert that Canada is not bound and should not be called to any other military action than the defence of her territory.

Such principles being reserved, there is no necessity for my insisting any more upon them at present. The point I want to make is this: We, Canadians, have been taxed, some wilfully and some forcibly, to defray the cost of this expedition; we have, therefore, the right to pronounce on the outcome and the settlement of the conflict in which we have been made a party, and we should not allow the British government to presume and decide arbitrarily of our opinion without even consulting us on the matter. As I have stated when I moved my anti-Imperialist resolution last year; as I repeated the other day in support of the motion of the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) requesting the abolition of the anti-Catholic declaration forced upon the King on the day of his coronation: I believe it is our right and duty, as representatives of a self-governing British community, to express an opinion and to make suggestions on any matter of vital interest to British power—provided always we impair in no way our full liberty and complete self-control of action.

Strange to say, no traces of Imperialism were pointed out in the help given by Canada to soldiers wounded in the Crimean war; nor in the part played by Sir John A. Macdonald in the settlement of the Alabama claim at the expense of Canada; nor in the three resolutions in favour of home rule for Ireland discussed in this parliament; nor even in the motion of sympathy with the gold miners and speculators of the Transvaal adopted by this House at the request of Mr. Rhodes's agent. But now, Imperialism is declared to be the basis of a proposition asking that a conflict in which we have taken an active part should be settled upon the same principles that have made Canada happy and prosperous and which this parliament wanted, some years ago, to be applied to Ireland. Stranger still, I am told that Canada has not the right to say that an end should be put to a war in which her required contribution of 500 men has been raised to over 3,000, and her national expenditure of a few thousand dollars to more than two millions. And finally when British authorities are unable to find police recruits in the United Kingdom, in New Zealand and in Australia, when the Cape Colonists themselves, for the benefit of whom that force is organized, refuse to enlist—I am denied by Imperialists and by anti-Imperialists as well, the right to say that Sir Alfred Milner and Mr. Chamberlain should not have been allowed and helped to play any longer upon the candid and enthusiastic naivety of Canadians.

The principles upon which I have based this proposition are not new; they were born with the British nation itself; they were brought by the Saxon pirates from the dark forests of Teutonia to the Celtic island of the north; they were laid down as the corner-stone of the British constitution by a section of that robust Norman race of which the French Canadians are to-day, perhaps, the most direct and thorough offsprings. Many a blow was struck at them; they were reddened by the blood of powerful assailants and of heroic defenders; I hope they will stand the present craze as they stood the attacks of monarchs and mobs, of oligarchists and aristocrats. I mean the right, for all British subjects, of petition and remonstrance to the Crown, and the right of directing the use that shall be made of their money.

The new Imperialism is the very antithesis of these rights. The tendency of Mr. Chamberlain's ideals, favoured, either wilfully or blindly, by most colonial public men, is to centralize gradually the political, military and economical ruling of the empire, making it as free as possible from independent local action. In order to set asleep the susceptibilities of the Canadian or of the Australian, and to kill their colonial vanity by swelling their jingoistic pride, it is whispered that the capital of the new empire may not stay where it is. But that does not matter: whether worshipped at London or at Toronto, at Melbourne or at Calcutta, the Buddha of the Imperialists will remain the same omnipotent fetich, and the choir of the faithful shall have to howl the same hymn. One of the most remarkable features of the new Britisher is that the more he swells in ambition the less tolerant he grows towards differing convictions.

It has been said, printed and sung on all tunes for over a year, that this war has raised the past subservient state of British self-governing colonies to the rank of free nations allied with Great Britain. Eloquent periods have been thrown to the four winds, celebrating the proud position which we occupy now in the British Empire.

Those triumphant effusions of colonial pride recall forcibly to my mind the decadent years of the Roman empire, when poets and rhetors, forgetful of the rude but free life of their forefathers, were extolling the glories of Cæsar and worshipping his golden image, because they were allowed to share in his refined debaucheries; because the old warriors of Gaul and Brittany, of Iberia and Germania had become the best legionaries of the empire, and could help in conquering more lands, in looting more herds, in burn-

ing more farms, in ravishing more women and starving more children for the everlasting glory of 'Cæsar, imperator et deus' Rome held a vaster empire, her provinces were better subdued, she boasted more of her power on the eve of her downfall than at any other period of her history. But we know now, and her clearsighted citizens knew then, that the time of her greatest moral and material strength was when her statesmen thought more of curing evils at home and of keeping the old Roman spirit of liberty, than of plundering the world and worshipping brutal force and insatiable greed in the person of the Emperor.

But I do not want to add fuel to the fire of jingo feelings. I will simply remind the members of the House, those especially who are most proud of the position we occupy in the empire, that, if we do not want Canada to be considered by the British government as a mere colonial field for profitable speculation, it is most urgent that we should make ourselves respected not only on the battlefield, but also in His Majesty's councils. The time has come when we should tell Mr. Chamberlain that, having had at leisure and unreservedly the blood of our blood and the flesh of our flesh, the tears of Canadian mothers and the sweat of Canadian farmers and workers, in order to enrich himself and his brother and his son and the whole of his tribe, by selling guns and ammunition, he should at least respect the language of the Canadian people, and not distort as he pleases the documents which are sent to him by the Canadian government.

I exposed before the House, at the last session, the strange course followed by the Colonial Secretary; his using our Transvaal resolution of 1899 to say that we were in favour of his provoking and arrogant policy; his acceptation of our offers of help before they had ever been tendered ; the publication by the London papers of his official despatch to Lord Minto before it had reached our government ; and above all, his insolent reply to the order in council of October 13th. Since then, we have had another manifestation of the growing audacity of the master of the empire. Last year, on the 4th of June, I put the following question to the government :

> Has the government, or any of its members, been consulted as to the conditions upon which the South African war should be settled? Is it the intention of the government to offer any suggestion or opinion on the matter?

To which the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) replied :

> Neither the government, nor any of its members, have been consulted as to conditions upon which the South African war should be settled. They are not considering the advisability of offering any suggestion or opinion upon the matter.

And the reply was noisily applauded by the opposition. This session, on the 18th of February, I put the following question :

> 1. Was the Canadian government, or any of its members, consulted by the British government on the South African question since the 1st of June last?
>
> 2. Did the Canadian government, or any of its members, offer any opinion or make any suggestion to the British government on the matter?
>
> The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Canadian government was not consulted, nor any of its members, by the British government on the South African question since June 1st last. No member of the Canadian government offered any opinion on the matter.

Let us now cross the ocean, enter Westminster Palace, the mother of parliaments, the source and safeguard of British liberty, of British justice, of British truth. On the 7th day of August last—I read from the Times' parliamentary report :

> Mr. Faber (York) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, considering the part taken by Canada and Australia in the South African war, it was proposed to ascertain the views of the government of those countries in regard to the settlement and government of the Transvaal and Orange State when the war was over.

And remembering the declarations made by the Prime Minister of Canada on the 4th of June, 1900, and on the 18th of February, 1901, let us hear the reply of the oracle of the new British world :

> Mr. Chamberlain.—I have already made myself acquainted with the views of the colonies of Canada and Australia in regard to the main points of the future settlement, and Her Majesty's government are in complete accordance with them as to the necessity for annexation, the establishment of a government supported by military force, with the ultimate expectation of an extension to both colonies of representative self-government. (Cheers.)

Yes, cheers on both sides of the Atlantic, —but which is which ?

One would be tempted to qualify such a flagrant contradiction in terms that would call for your ruling, Mr. Speaker. But, after all, this was not much worse than when being told officially that the Canadian government were permitting the enlistment of the first contingent because they considered that the colony was not committed to any future action, the Colonial Secretary replied officially that the British government were accepting our troops as an evidence of our willingness 'to share in the risks and burdens of the empire,' and as a proof of our sympathy with his policy in South Africa. That first distortion having been tacitly accepted here, the Colonial Secretary was only encouraged in his methods. But I think it justifies me in appealing to the members of this House in the name of Canadian self-respect to put a stop to that arbitrary treatment. I appeal to those at least who have not reached that point of devotion to Mr. Chamberlain that to be made tools of in his

hands is to be considered a great honour to Canada.

In that new alliance with Great Britain which has changed our state of humble servility into a glorious matrimony, I would like to know how long we are called to play the part of a deceived but contented husband. In national intercourse as well as in private life that role is not yet considered as one to be much boasted about—by the husband at least.

I do not see that I have to apologize for anything I said in the past on this question. My course has been twice endorsed and emphatically approved by my constituents. It has been said that the almost unanimous voice of the people of Canada approved of our intervention in South Africa, and therefore, that we, the few members of this House who condemned that intervention, must be in the wrong. I deny this proposition in toto. It is false both in principle and in fact. First, number does not make right what is wrong. Majority rules, but not always in truth and equity. I am an optimist. I firmly believe that, on the whole, good is prevalent and that right conquers might at the end. But there are periods of moral depression when thousands and millions of men, when entire nations seem to lose the path of justice and even the sense of self conservation. If it is but an accidental attack of fever, a reaction follows which restores health and common sense in the body politic. If it is the last illness, the nation disappears and a new one takes its place under the sun. And the world goes on under the guidance of God. Fortunately for Canada, signs of reaction are already noticeable; and I can foresee the day when the judgment of the people of Canada, English as well as French, will not be so hard on me as the speeches, the votes, the songs and the howlings which illustrated the debates of last session. That reaction is not yet of such a character to warrant the confidence of my Quebec Liberal friends who naively believe that Imperialism is a fake or a dead issue. But the change is strong enough to give hopes to those who dread for our rising nation the brutalizing effect of soldiery rule, the development of the spirit of conquest and plunder, and the heavy burdens of Imperial militarism. Even in England the reaction is manifest. In fact the wave of jingoism never reached there the point it attained here. As usual, the true colonial jingo outdid the loudest London cockney. Before going to the polls, Mr. Chamberlain the master of the British administration, made of his war the main, nay the sole issue of the electoral contest: 'A vote against the government is a vote for the Boers,' said he in his peculiar Bismarckian way. And in reply to this passionate appeal, and in spite of the disorganization of the Liberal party, 1,603,537 suffrages were given for the Boers—to use the Colonial Secretary's own stamping—in 427 divisions, and eighty ridings returned oppositionists by acclamation. And every one admits that the vote would be far more favourable to the Liberals now than last fall. The change effected in the editorship of the Daily News is quite an indication of the change of sentiment. We may see before long a repetition of the anti-war feeling which followed the deplorable Crimean expedition. Now take the result of the London county council elections just held last week. The Moderates, despairing to get a majority on straight municipal issues, dragged the khaki cry in the contest. 'Do you want a pro-Boer council?' was their war cry; and what was the reply? An increased majority for the Progressists.

As far as Canada is concerned, the verdict of the electorate has been interpreted by the people of Great Britain and of the empire at large with such an ignorance of the real issue that it is most proper to make a short analysis of the situation. In order to give to the House an idea of the way British opinion was misguided on Canadian feelings, by the leading Tory organs, I will just quote a few lines from the London Times. In a letter from its special correspondent in Toronto, dated September 24, and published on the 6th October, the political situation in Canada and its bearing on Imperial affairs is very ably considered. After saying that the French Canadians are more thoroughly Canadian than all others, and consequently less interested in British and Imperial concerns, the writer adds these words, which I commend to the attention of the House:

> It was a singularly fortunate circumstance that at this critical time in national affairs a French Canadian statesman was at the head of the Dominion government. Without his leadership, Quebec might have caused trouble. A French member of the cabinet and more than one private member of parliament objected to the conditions on which the Canadian contingents were sent to the front.

Then speaking of the hesitations of the Prime Minister in sending the troops:

> No doubt he (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) felt that his compatriots required to be educated by degrees to the full demands of British citizenship.

I would like to hear from the right hon. gentleman on what lines and how far he is prepared to carry on that course of education. After the elections, the great English Tory organ thought it was good policy to interpret the Liberal majority as a victory for Imperialism. In an editorial dated November 10th, it said:

> Both parties in Canada are Imperialist; and we believe that the Conservatives, if they had been in power, would have pursued, in this respect, the same course that was pursued by the Liberals. Nevertheless, it fell to the Liberals, as a matter of fact, to do the work, and it was done with a promptitude, a gracefulness, and a liberality which could not have been surpassed,

and which Great Britain will never forget. As far as obtaining popularity in this country was concerned, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his cabinet had a magnificent opportunity and they employed it to the full. That they should do so was the more gratifying when we consider that the back bone of their strength is derived from the French population of the Dominion and especially from Quebec which from circumstances which we, perhaps, do not fully understand, was less strongly represented in South Africa than some other provinces.

I think this is rather hard on hon. gentlemen opposite who are mostly stout Imperialists but whose Imperialism would have no doubt been greatly strengthened by access to power, even at the hands of French dominators. But the most peculiar appreciation by the Times of the electoral result in Canada appeared in its Toronto letter, dated November 10, and published on the 24th. I quote the following words :

> On one point of national importance the election has cleared the air. It is now manifest that Sir Wilfrid Laurier has not been injured among his French Canadian followers by his British Imperialism. So far as Quebec is concerned, the sending of the Canadian contingents to South Africa was fully ratified by the vote of last Wednesday. The Premier had never shirked the responsibility which he assumed in the matter, and the issue was fairly before the French electors. . . . So far as Imperial politics are concerned, therefore, the decisive attitude of Quebec is satisfactory.

The conclusions of the two last quoted articles are utterly false, and the intelligence of Canadian affairs displayed in the former is an evidence of the wilful bad faith of the two others.

The question of Imperialism was put neither squarely nor fairly before the people of Canada. In the English-speaking provinces, it was kept on the ground of sentiment where it had been placed in this House, each party claiming the first prize in their competitive devotion to the mother land ; but the constitutional aspect and the ultimate consequences of our military expedition were not discussed.

In the province of Quebec, when the issue was raised, both parties were simply charging each other with being the cause of that display of jingoism which had forced the hands of the government. What was claimed in one part of the land as an act of virtue, was denounced in the other part as a crime. I may tell, in passing, to all those who are sincerely seeking for peace and harmony between the two races who compose the Canadian nation, that they vainly endeavour to reach that happy result so long as they keep up that double-faced system of treating great national problems. I will come back to this point later on.

Let me now place before the House a few facts which prove that the sentiment of the English-speaking people was not so decidedly one-sided as it has been stated in this House and throughout the country. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) was quoted as having said at a public meeting shortly after last session :

> I voted for the expenditure of $2,000,000 in South Africa, although I admit the justice of the position taken by Mr. Bourassa, and believe there is nothing in the constitution to warrant such expenditure. I simply voiced the wishes of my constituents in this matter.

On the eve of polling day he was bitterly denounced in the organ of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). The above words appeared on nearly every page of the Winnipeg Tribune in heavy type with headings and comments like these :

> No Contingents for Him.
> Puttee Stands with Bourassa.
> Voted Against his Convictions.
> Too British for Him.

> If Mr. Puttee had had his way, there would have been no contingents sent to South Africa in defence of the empire. His sympathies were with Mr. Bourassa.
>
> Winnipegers want a representative at Ottawa who is a Britisher at heart and who will stand by the empire on principle.

These are ultra-loyal appeals——

Mr. PUTTEE. The paper that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) has quoted was incorrect on that occasion and admittedly so.

Mr. BOURASSA. I was just coming to that point. I do not say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Puttee) used these words, but I simply say, that, on the eve of the polling day, if the passions of the people had been aroused to the point that was stated, if there had been such a current of public opinion, a man simply supposed to be what is called a pro-Boer, and supposed to have said that the government should have hesitated a little before committing this country, would have been swamped by his opponent. What was the result ? The hon. gentleman was elected by a majority of 1,183, while, ten months previous, when he had the strength of two governments behind him, he was elected by 8.

In the east riding of Lambton the member-elect (Mr. Simmons) was denounced by the local Liberal organ, the Petrolia Topic, as a pro-Boer. True, the hon. hon. gentleman denied the accusation ; but the paper kept it up and, in reply to the hon. gentleman's denial, published half a dozen interviews with residents of the town affirming that, in several instances, the hon. gentleman had not disguised his disapproval of the position taken by the British government on South African matters. I do not pretend that the statement was founded ; but nobody will deny that, had the war feeling been overwhelming in that riding, such accusations would have proved hard against the Conservative candidate. And here he is, returned by the majority of the people in a constituency which was represented last session by his opponent, a worthy and honourable citizen no doubt popular in his riding.

But here is a case still clearer. Dr. Weldon, who represented the riding of Albert, N.B., in this House from 1891 to 1896, is a distinguished professor of international law in the loyal city of Halifax. His disapproval of British policy in South Africa was widely known. He went as far as dedicating one of his lectures to the interpretation of the conventions signed between Great Britain and the South African republic; and his conclusion was a thorough condemnation of Mr. Chamberlain's attitude. I was told that he even dissuaded his son from starting for South Africa and taking part in a war which he considered unjust. This did not prevent that honourable and distinguished gentleman from being chosen as the Conservative candidate in the county of Albert and from being accepted as such by the very men who nearly fell into fits of apoplexy in this House when I gave expression to similar sentiments. True, Dr. Weldon was defeated; but in a contest where the Liberals have made tremendous gains in that province, he reduced his minority of 243 in 1896 to 116 in 1900.

These are the only three cases where it may be said that there was a slight indication in the English-speaking provinces, of what jingo prophets call pro-Boer feelings on the part of candidates. And I do not think the results show that to differ on this question with Mr. Chamberlain and even with the leaders of both parties in Canada has been considered a national felony.

Other indications of reaction against military jingoism have been manifested in our English provinces since the election. On a previous occasion, the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) spoke of the enthusiastic reception tendered in Halifax to volunteers returning from South Africa. I know Halifax to be very sentimental. Even its dry fish and hardware dealers cannot refrain their poetical ardour and introduce patriotic rhymes—not home-made, I must say—in their board of trade reports. But elsewhere, the enthusiasm was not quite so pronounced. Commenting on the arrival of our boys in the metropolis of Canada, the Montreal Gazette of December 25th last, said very philosophically:

> The second detachment of the Canadian infantry received only a moderately warm welcome on its return from South Africa. The country is getting used to heroes, it would seem. It does not esteem them less, but it is less demonstrative of its feelings.

Of course this was in disloyal Quebec. But let us cross the Ottawa river and penetrate to the heart of the good old sister province, the bulwark of loyalism. Woodstock is an Ontario town, and if I am not mistaken, not largely peopled with pea-soup eaters—unless my hon. friend from North Oxford (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) has educated his constituents to the taste of that healthy food. Here is a description of the quiet way in which returned soldiers were received in Woodstock, according to the Sentinel-Review of December 26th last:

> When the train moved in yesterday morning about one person in twenty cheered; a minute after the men had alighted and before the band recommenced playing, there could hardly have been greater quietness at a funeral ceremony. Have we forgotten how to cheer?

I could contrast that funeral reception with the warm welcome which greeted Major Fiset on his return in the French town of Rimouski. I would suggest to the hon. member for North Oxford (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) to get our colleague from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) to deliver there some essays on Krugerism and Huttonism. And if these stimulants do not succeed in infusing enthusiasm in the Woodstockians, let him secure the musical services of Mr. G. E. Foster and Dr. Montague to sing the National Anthem in Woodstock three times a day in open air for the length of time they used to pass here.

Speaking in a general way, the Toronto Star, one of the Canadian papers which kept best its cool senses during the jingo spree of last year, gave this advice to our returned heroes on December 31st last:

> Get Back to Business.
>
> The men who have come from the war have received welcomes that greatly surprised them. People in country places especially are generally very slow to exhibit enthusiasm over young men who belong to their own towns. Yet in a great many cases young men in khaki have been welcomed in royal style, banqueted and presented with watches and sums of money. They should not harbour the hope that they can continue to walk on air.
>
> The wise ones will get back to earth as soon as they possibly can, will put away their regimentals and get to work again. An old saying may be amended to read that nobody is a hero to the people of his own village.

I must beg pardon to the House for multiplying these quotations from English papers. But I am bound to do so. Should I make such utterances on my own account, they would be called 'manifestations of French disloyalty.' In the same copy of the Gazette which I have just quoted appeared a long editorial dealing with the alleged mutiny of some colonial troops in South Africa. The whole thing is a lecture to British authorities on what they should expect and not expect from colonists:

> Lord Kitchener's statement, published in our yesterday's issue, makes it clear that all that occurred was the refusal of some time-expired men to go on duty when ordered to do so. . . . If they are not willing to serve any longer, they cannot be blamed, certainly not by men who were unwilling to serve at all. . . . They were in the field before the C. I. V. and the Household Cavalry, and they have seen the latter return home not without suspicion that social influence had weight in the preference. . . . . It has evidently taken some of the British officers a long time to learn how the colonial troops should be handled. . . . The enthusiasm for the war is waning, and the men are probably right in the belief that the rest of the cam-

paign will be mainly police work. . . . . They have done all they promised to do, and have done it in a way to make us proud of them.

But the best expression of sentiment in that sense was given by the Evening Telegram, of Toronto, on October 25 last. It appeared as the leading editorial, under the title :

'Did Well to Come Home.'

It was not exactly Col. Otter's duty to accept on behalf of the Royal Canadian Regiment Lord Roberts' cordial invitation to remain in Africa until the war was technically over. The instincts of a professional soldier like Col. Otter, do not seem to be in line with the inclinations of all the volunteers under his command. They have their rights and did well to exercise these rights, and not be browbeaten into staying in Africa when they wanted to come home. They gave the empire good service in the hour of danger, and could well afford to leave professional soldiers to complete the remaining stages of the campaign.

This gem of common sense must have been a cause of amazement to all those who heard here its responsible author, the late member for East Toronto, Mr. John Ross-Robertson, lecturing the government for not voting sufficient money to pay for the total maintenance of our troops in South Africa, even if England refused our alms.

Every man of good faith will admit that we are far from the frantic appeals of October, 1899, for troops and horses, for guns and cartridges.

My conclusion to all this is that loyalty is almost as elastic as a politician's conscience. At the start of the war, when nobody in Canada expected it could last more than a few weeks ; when the British government wanted only 500 men from Canada —not to fight, but to express our sympathy with Mr. Chamberlain's policy—I was branded as a traitor because I wanted the government to pause a few weeks and give to the representatives of the people an opportunity to discuss the consequences of this new military policy. A year later, when the situation was darker than ever, when the British army found it hard to hold its few positions, and could not prevent the enemy's invasion in British territory, the very men who put me under the ban of British opinion, plainly said to their beloved mother land : 'Get out of the mess the best you can ; for us, we have enough of the game. Come back home, boys ; God save the Queen !'

At the end of December last, it was announced that some more Canadians would have a chance to go to Africa, and this time for a long period and a good pay ; with full opportunities to loot cattle, to burn houses and farms, to steal clocks, mirrors, jewellery and money, to chop pianos just for the fun of it, to turn penniless, on the veldt, women and children at the mercy of barbarous and lustful natives. I take all those words from letters from Canadian volunteers. At the risk of being called a 'little Englander,' I venture the opinion that Lord Wellington's humane methods of warfare will remain in history as more glorious to the name of Great Britain than Lord Kitchener's improved system. And, perhaps also, the military glory of the wise tactician of the Torres Vedras and of Waterloo will not be totally eclipsed by the ferry trade of Sir Redvers Buller.

Anyhow, when it was decided to raise Canadian recruits for the South African constabulary, the explosion of enthusiasm was not defeaning. On December 31 last, the Toronto Star published an article entitled : 'We need our men at home,' in which I read the following lines :

This country cannot therefore regard as a favour that a thousand of our young men are to be accepted as volunteers for police duty in Africa, Asia, South America, England, or anywhere else. We need them at home. This country has no reason to consider a kindness, either, that commissions are offered our young men in the Imperial army, for these are prizes that wean them away from the tasks for which this country educates them. We need more young men than we can grow and we grow better ones than we can import.

It is all right for this country to jump into the middle of the ring in a time of crisis and strike a few blows for the credit of the family, but what we have to remember is that in making Canada what she ought to be, one native is worth a wagon load of immigrants.

At the risk of abusing the patience of the House, I will also quote two articles which appeared in the Canadian Military Gazette. I take for granted that this publication is neither an anti-militarist organ nor a French disloyal mouthpiece. The first article was published on January 15 last, and read as follows :

The South African Police.

Now that recruiting depots for the South African police are to be established in different sections of the Dominion, much unfavourable comment is heard. Surely the Canadian government did not express a desire to the Imperial authorities that such should be done, and if the latter acted on their own initiative, they certainly took a step that was ill-advised. Our aim in this country is to get population not to send our young men abroad. It appears that ranchers and other of that class, to be found mainly in Manitoba and the Territories, are the men preferred and by holding out the inducement of big pay it is hoped to entice away one thousand or more of the flower of our manhood. Canada can ill spare these men, and as a term in the South African police means, in the large majority of cases, that they will ultimately settle in the country, the Dominion is actually being denuded to populate another portion of the empire.

The Imperial government should be plainly told that, if it is absolutely necessary to have men from Canada to fight for British supremacy in the dark continent, this country will send not 1,000, but at least 10,000, but we have no men to spare for doing routine police duty, while millions of acres of the finest land in the world lay untilled for want of population. Until the men are urgently required, the Canadian authorities should not hold out any inducements to recruits in the country. Canadians wishing to join the police of their own free will should be

permitted to do so, but it is not fair to the Dominion that they should be encouraged to enlist.

On February 19, the same paper came again to the front and said :

The S. A. Constabulary.

According to the Army and Navy Gazette, of London, Eng., usually one of the best-informed service journals published in the United Kingdom, the basis of all applications for membership in the South African constabulary is taken to be that 'those sending in their names desire to settle in South Africa after service with the force.'

Such has been strongly suspected in Canada, although the authority have taken the utmost pains to conceal the fact from the public, and the Gazette, after reading the article referred to in our English contemporary, is more strongly than ever opposed to the action of the Canadian militia authorities in encouraging the virtual deportation from our country of a large number—for us—of the best settlers obtainable anywhere in the world.

As has been said on several previous occasions, this journal is not by any means opposed to sending men to fight the empire's battles, if they are required for that purpose, but in this instance it is not even pretended that such is the case, the statement being that they are required for doing police duty in the conquered country, the ultimate aim and object, doubtless, being at the expiration of their three years' term of service that they will be induced to settle in Africa, to the exceeding great detriment of the Dominion.

In this connection, it may be said that the government of New South Wales, being evidently better seized of the facts than ours at Ottawa, have emphatically refused to permit an Imperial officer to recruit for the force in that portion of the empire, and the Gazette is of opinion that recent developments justify the course.

Let all who desire to join the force of their own volition do so without throwing obstacles in the way, but to cajole and encourage men to enlist is not fair to the land we live in.

A few days later, on February 25th, the Montreal Witness, following along the same line, said :

Canadians seem to be taking all too kindly to the establishment among them of recruiting depots, whose object will be to withdraw the most vigorous of our youth from nation-building to the adventure of war. We presume that in every community as full of virility as the Canadian people there will be a certain proportion irresistibly drawn towards such a life. The wild beast has not yet died out of our human nature. If there are some called by nature to military life, and there certainly are many who seem better adapted to success in that than in any other calling, it is better that they should enlist in the service of their own empire than in that of strangers. We cannot, however, look on the whole thing without much regret.

With regard to the attitude of the government of New South Wales, I have gone through the London Times to ascertain the truth ; and the first thing I find is a despatch from Sydney, dated February 17, as follows :—

Sydney, N.S.W., Feb. 17.—Sir Alfred Milner having notified the government of New South Wales of his intention to send an officer to recruit in Australia for the South African constabulary, the government has replied that the colony objects to such a proceeding.

From the London Times of February 20, I find the following despatch :

Cape Town, Feb. 18.—There is no foundation for the statement contained in telegrams from London to the effect that Sir Alfred Milner proposed to recruit men in Australia and New Zealand for the South African constabulary, and that the New South Wales government had objected.

For those who have followed the course of Imperial authorities on this war question, it is easy to read between the lines of these despatches. It is now said that no applications were made in Australia or New Zealand for recruits ; but the fact seems to be that the British government, having confidentially asked for the opinion of the governments of those colonies as to the feasibility of recruiting, and learning that they were not willing to be played upon by Sir Alfred Milner, the statement was put forth that the request had not been made. I may here also read the following despatch which came in the month of January :

New York, January 14.—The London correspondent of the Tribune says: The announcement is made by the Post that the scheme for raising a colonial police force has been abandoned for the present. The rates of pay were not considered tempting enough by the people living in South Africa, and of 16,000 men who applied to the United Kingdom to join the force, only 500 or so were selected as suitable.

Sir, I was perfectly justified in the opening of my remarks in saying that the British authorities, having found that they could not obtain in South Africa or in Australia recruits for the constabulary organized for the protection of South Africa, they came to this rich land of Canada to ask from us what other British colonies declined to give, and what the only colony directly interested in this war is not able to give.

I may add that the attempts on the part of Imperial authorities in South Africa to keep our young men as settlers is not a new feature of this war. As early as the 24th November last the Montreal Herald's special correspondent with the Strathcona Horse wrote from Potchefstrom a letter which appeared in the Herald of January 5. It begins as follows:—

The eye of the Canadian volunteer is turning towards Rhodesia, the most northern inheritance of the British South African Company, as a prospective place of settlement, attracted by the exceptional inducements offered by the Chartered Company, and the tales heard on the march or by the camp-fire, of the mineral and agricultural wealth of this portion of South Africa. In the ranks of Lord Strathcona's corps are twenty or thirty Canadians who are at present deeply interested in the country, and may yet make it their future home. . . . The special inducements to settlement extended by the British South African Company are offered only to Canadian, Australian and New Zealand volunteers and English Yeomanry who will volunteer for the defence of Rhodesia.

With the Military Gazette, I regret strongly that the Canadian government, which is taxing the people of this country to bring in foreign immigration, should have assisted British authorities in the draining of our best blood for the benefit of Mr. Rhodes. And again that step has been taken without the consent and knowledge of parliament. The cabinet cannot invoke this time the excuse of popular will. I did not hear of the slightest protest against the articles of the Toronto Star and of the Military Gazette which, I think, expressed the general opinion. And it cannot be pretended that this is another case of urgent necessity. On the 8th of January last, Lord Raglan, Under Secretary of State for War, said to a representative of the Associated Press :

> The condition of affairs in South Africa absolutely forbids prophecy. You cannot call it war, yet in some respects this is worse than war. . . . . The secret of the whole thing consists in horses. We have enough men there, but not enough mounted men.

A strange war indeed ! At the outset, the defeats of the British army were attributed to a lack of strategic science on the part of the mules ; and now we are told that the Imperial forces being unable to conquer this remnant of a handful of peasants, horses only can do it. Anyhow, since horses only were required, why did not the government offer to the British authorities all the horses they wanted, and told them to leave here where they are badly needed the men they do not want.

I go further : I say that the moment the government were convinced that the war was over—and convinced they were as early as the 7th of June last when they congratulated the Queen on the end of hostilities—it was their duty to notify the British government that Canadian soldiers should be sent back here at the expiry of their first period of engagement, that is, after six months of service. That duty became imperative when Lord Roberts annexed the two republics and every minister in England boasted that the war was over, and that the few Boer desperadoes who were still foolish enough to keep on fighting should not be considered as belligerents. If I understood well that popular voice which forced the hands of the government, our soldiers went to Africa and we paid them for the defence of the empire. But our purpose was not, I presume, to keep there at the expense of Canada a force of men to loot farms and do police work in a war which is not a war, as Lord Raglan termed it three months ago, or but a 'technical war,' as Mr. Ross-Robertson, of the Evening Telegram, would qualify it.

Coming back to those articles of the Toronto Star, of the Military Gazette, of the Montreal Witness, I am most happy to observe the revival of that robust common sense and of that practical spirit which every true observer of modern nations admires as the backbone of Anglo-Saxon strength, and to which the Anglo-Saxon shall have to come back if he does not want to see his power vanishing. But, to be impartial, I must point out the weakness of reasoning which characterizes those articles. If we admit the desirability of military expeditions outside of Canada, even scarce and accidental, we must prepare for them. Not only must we go in expensive purchases of weapons and ammunitions, we must also develop a military spirit in our peaceful community. If we make ours the quarrels of Great Britain ; if we wish to have at least 10,000 young men ready to start at England's first call in Europe or Africa, in Asia or Oceania, we must prepare the youth of this country for such emergencies. From the cradle, through the kindergarten, the school, the college, the university, the ear of the Canadian boy must be made familiar with the clang of arms and the strident appeal of trumpets. He must be taught to drill and to shoot and to love camping and loafing with spurs at his boots and a sword at his belt. Instead of war being painted to his eyes under its true colors as one of the chastisements of God over a sinful humanity, as one of the worst social scourges, more cruel and detrimental to the welfare of nations than cholera or famine, his young enthusiastic mind must be imbued with the barbarous, anti-Christian notion that war is the true path to glory, the most healthful and noble aim of a strong people. And the result will be that, not only by loyalty, not only in cases of imperative necessity, not only to defend the flag and the land, but simply to follow its new instincts, the 'flower of our manhood' will be ready to start at any time, for any cause, good or bad. In time of peace, that new martial education of the youth will lower to their mind the ordinary but fruitful occupations of life. And thus will be lost to our country the best of its blood, of its intelligence, of its vital strength. Military passion is brutal, and cannot be controlled easily by reason. I am glad to find out that some organs of the English-speaking community are beginning to agree with me ; but without any desire to discourage their honest and well-directed efforts, I may be allowed to say that if they want to avoid the consequences they must try to extirpate the causes. They have helped in throwing a bad seed to the national ground ; if they dread the harvest, let them go and unroot the crop ; cutting a few of the heaviest ears is but a childish and useless game.

Coming now to the province of Quebec, the attempt made by the London Times to interpret the almost unanimous vote given to the government in that province as an approval of the war, or of the participation

of Canada in the conflict, is simply preposterous. I regret that some members of the cabinet have contributed to propound that false impression. They may have done it with a good purpose ; but what is the use ? Not only good intentions, but honesty, clear-sightedness, and frankness, are the best policy always.

At a banquet which was tendered to him at Toronto, on the 11th of December last, the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) was reported by the Toronto Globe as having said on Imperial issues :

In the province of Quebec the main attack that was made upon the government was on account of the Imperial policy which was followed by our right hon. friend. (Hear, hear.) The issue that was mainly raised there between the Prime Minister and his supporters and their opponents was as to whether Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the French Canadian Prime Minister, who had inaugurated the British preference, who had sent the troops to South Africa, whether he was to be supported in taking that action ; and we have only to look at the newspapers which were circulated by our Conservative friends in the province of Quebec, at the literature which was circulated by those gentlemen in Quebec, to see that that was the main issue upon which they appealed to the province of Quebec, and their appeal was that the people of Quebec should declare against Sir Wilfrid Laurier because he was an Imperial statesman, because he had thrown in his lot with the British empire. (Hear, hear.) What did the people of Quebec decide? What was their verdict? Was it for the men who attacked our hon. friend? No ; it was an endorsement of everything he had done to cement Canada more closely to the British Empire.

The hon. gentleman appealed to the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and to the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) to uphold his views. But these two gentlemen remained perfectly silent on that point, and for good reason : both of them were too polite to contradict their colleague and too sincere to strengthen him in his delusion. Of course, this opinion of the Minister of the Interior was an after-Toronto-dinner thought, and this may be pleaded as an extenuating circumstance. The hon. gentleman is, I know, a total abstainer, and the very opposite of a jingo ; but it may be he was affected by the Toronto atmosphere in the same way as a friend of mine who was once visiting the London docks : just by passing through the huge warehouses where all sorts of liquors are stored, he was nearly intoxicated by the alcoholic emanations which filled the air. In Toronto, jingo microbes are such in quality and quantity that even when stimulated only by Apollinaris water, they can affect the most solid brain.

The case of my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) is harder to diagnosticate—unless I call it an outburst of juvenile enthusiasm. Not that I don't acknowledge and respect the experience and solid mind of the hon. gentleman ; but in every man there are two men, and in every minister there are at least three—unless the man is perfectly null by himself and takes all his brains in his portfolio, which is far from being the case with the hon. minister. So that a member of the cabinet may very sincerely entertain and express quite opposite views on the same subject, according to whether he uses his personal brains or his ministerial mind. In spite of his keen experience and sound judgment as a man and as a politician, the Minister of Inland Revenue is officially the Benjamin of the cabinet. I think he relied exclusively on his young and fresh ministerial brains, naturally excited with the joy of victory, when he gave his opinion of the Quebec vote on the 9th of November last. He was reported as follows by the Ottawa correspondent of the Montreal Herald :

It was not at all a question of race or contingents. Even Mr. Chauvin, who voted in the House against sending contingents, was defeated by Mayor Préfontaine, who supported their going, while the majorities of both Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Monet were materially reduced.

After having referred to the Manitoba school question as one of the most important issues in the contest, he added :

The second topic of most opposition speakers was the increase of debt resulting from sending soldiers to South Africa at a cost of $5,000,000. This was the complaint against Laurier; Mr. Chauvin's defeat was the answer of the people.

And by the Ottawa Evening Journal :

The two great issues which the opposition had put forward were the Manitoba school question and the sending of the troops to South Africa. The opposition asked the electors to condemn the Laurier administration because the school question was not satisfactorily settled by the government, and also because the premier had sent the contingents to South Africa. It was Sir Wilfrid particularly who was held responsible for this. The vote has shown that the government has been endorsed for its action in regard to these questions. Mr. Chauvin, Conservative, who voted against sending the contingent, was defeated. The majorities of Monet and Bourassa were reduced. . . .

I regret, or rather I rejoice, that in my case, the hon. minister spoke under misinformation. My majority was larger by a few votes that in 1896, in spite of the fact that the lists were much less favourable and especially that 1,000 voters at least were absent from the localities where I took the strongest vote.

Mr. COWAN. You were lucky.

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes, I was lucky to represent an intelligent constituency. My friend from Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Monet), whom I am so happy to see here again, ready to fight with me for the Canadian flag, should we even remain for some time yet in a glorious isolation, could tell to the House that the reduction of his majority was due to causes entirely foreign to the war question. In fact, his opponent took the same view as he did of the war question and said he would have voted

in the same way as my hon. friend did on this matter. I could also point out the vote in the counties of Two Mountains, Bagot, Charlevoix and Maskinongé, where members who voted with us on this question were all returned by increased majorities. I do not think that any of those gentlemen receded, during the electoral campaign, from their former position on this question. I know that in Charlevoix and Maskinongé especially, the members-elect (Messrs. Angers and Legris) fought the battle straight on our lines. And I know as a matter of fact that before going to his political death in Maskinongé, Sir Adolphe Caron vainly endeavoured for several weeks to get the nomination in his former constituency, Three Rivers and St. Maurice ; and if he could not succeed, his position on the war question was to a certain extent an obstacle in his way.

Since the Minister of Inland Revenue has mentioned the defeat of Mr. Chauvin in Terrebonne as the result of his vote on my motion of the 13th of March last, and as an evidence of the sentiment of Quebec in favour of our military expedition to the Transvaal, I feel bound to give a few details about that election. I have here the political manifesto of the present member for Terrebonne (Mr. Préfontaine), who represents at the same time the riding of Maisonneuve. It is a long and interesting document treating of the Manitoba school question, of the financial prosperity of the country, of the progress in agriculture—but not a paragraph, not a line, not a word about the war, or the sending of contingents, or Imperialism. It appeared in L'Avenir du Nord, a Liberal paper published at St. Jérome, and largely circulated not only in Terrebonne county, but throughout the whole district. This paper, ably edited, has not a little contributed to the liberalizing of the counties of Terrebonne and Two Mountains, those old fortresses of the Conservative party. It is one of the strongest anti-Imperialistic publications in Quebec, one which denounced most bitterly the sending of troops to Africa, approved all along of my position, and congratulated Mr. Chauvin on his vote of the 13th of March last. I may say even that it has gone very often much farther than my own sentiments would lead me. I am anti-Imperialistic, but strongly attached to British institutions ; this paper is almost a secessionist. One may think that it changed its tone in order to support the Liberal candidate against Mr. Chauvin. Not at all ; on the contrary. First, in the same copy announcing that Mr. Préfontaine had been chosen as the Liberal candidate, Mr. Chauvin was denounced as a cowardly capitulator on the question of Imperialism. The article dated September 13, begins as follows :

Mr. Chauvin, Capitulard.

The county of Terrebonne is represented at Ottawa by a 'capitulard';

I do not know if my hon. friends whose native tongue is English quite understand the meaning of that word. It means not merely a capitulator, but a coward capitulator, one who capitulates without reason.

—Mr. Adolphe Chauvin himself.

At Beauharnois he declared that he was following Sir Charles Tupper's flag with the whole Conservative-yellow-blue-Tory party united as one man . . . . Ha ! Mr. Chauvin has tried to play the man of character at Ottawa with the Bourassas, the Monets and the Ethiers ; but our representative was really not built to keep up that role. He has capitulated ! Nay, he has surrendered without striking a blow. He does better : He goes back with arms and baggage to the camp of the militarists and the mountebanks of Britishism.

In the next issue L'Avenir du Nord published an article on Mr. Préfontaine's candidature. After a well-deserved eulogy of our worthy colleague, it goes on as follows :

One may tell us : 'All what you say is very true, but Mr. Préfontaine is an Imperialist.'

What evidence on this point can be given to us ?

No, we do not believe that Mr. Préfontaine, who has in the past given so many striking evidences of patriotism and of national zeal, may have, as a wish in his heart and as an article of his programme the participation of Canada in the foreign wars of the British Empire. No, we do not believe that Mr. Préfontaine admits, that in principle, we should give millions and shed our blood to defend England in conflicts, the motives of which are more than suspicious. We do not believe that Mr. Préfontaine is in favour of a military Imperialism which would afflict our peaceful country with the horrible wound of militarism, and this for the benefit of another nation.

Then, after proving that the government's policy on that question was less dangerous than Sir Charles Tupper's, it says :

Well ! Mr. Préfontaine who, as a supporter of the government, has approved the sending of contingents, but under the condition that this action shall not commit us in the future, is yet to be preferred to Mr. Adolphe Chauvin, who, after having pronounced himself against the sending of contingents in the House, walks now on the steps of Sir Charles Tupper whose Imperialistic ideas he endorses without restriction . . . . On that question of Imperialism which we have fought and shall always fight, Mr. Préfontaine is less to be feared than Mr. Chauvin.

Then, on October 4, appeared an article, the third of a series, in which the Imperialistic tendencies of both parties were cleverly analysed—the conclusion being that Tory Imperialism is worse than Liberal Imperialism, that between the two evils the less should be chosen, and Mr. Préfontaine preferred to Mr. Chauvin.

Then, on October 11 :

Is Mr. Chauvin of the same opinion as Sir Charles Tupper, his leader, who solicited the government to send contingents to Africa—or is he not ?

Then, on October 25, appeared a leading article on 'Responsibilities as to the send-

ing of contingents.' The three following paragraphs give an exact idea of the whole :

The responsibility of the military expedition to the Transvaal falls entirely on Sir Charles Tupper and the whole English Conservative press . . . . The responsible authors of the contingents are Sir Charles Tupper, Mr. Bergeron and the Conservative party . . . . The great culprit in the contingent question is Sir Charles Tupper, of whom Mr. Chauvin is now the candidate.

And, finally, on November 8, appreciating the result :

Mr. Chauvin is defeated and he deserved it. Men who denounce Imperialism and who brand themselves as the most faithful supporters of declared Imperialists, cannot expect their electors to accept to be laughed at more than five consecutive years.

One can hardly find in all these quotations any trace of the slightest approval of the sending of Canadian troops to the Transvaal. And I do not believe that the present member for Terrebonne (Mr. Préfontaine) will claim his victory as a triumph for Imperialism.

Speaking now of the province at large, the truth is that the question was minimized almost to the point of annihilation in most of the constituencies. On September 24, there was a large meeting at St. Hyacinthe, the residing place of the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Bernier), the county seat of his constituency, and the centre of an extensive and prosperous district. The Prime Minister was there and addressed the meeting in his usual eloquent and convincing manner. He dealt at length with all the issues of the day, including the school question ; but not a word fell from his lips touching the African question or any of its sub-issues. The Minister of Inland Revenue referred briefly, but not enthusiastically to that subject. He was reported as follows by La Presse of the following day :

It is stated that Laurier is an Imperialist ; but is it because the Liberals are loyal subjects that they are so accused ?

Is it because the government has allowed the sending of a contingent to Africa that its members should be branded as Imperialists. . . .

As you see, the title of Imperialist was not accepted in Quebec by ministers of the Crown with the same pride as by their honourable colleagues and supporters in Ontario, where it was set up as a most glorious and brilliant plume.

It is possible that some electors see a danger for the future of our country in the sending of a contingent ; but the government has but acceded to the wishes of the Imperial government and allowed the recruiting of volunteers and nothing else. Can the government be reproached with having decided to pay the expenditure of those volunteers ? But, is it said, supposing the thing reoccurs ? Well, said Mr. Bernier, let us wait for events to come ; the government will study then the necessity of sending a contingent. What would have been the result of Sir Wilfrid Laurier refusing to send a regiment to Africa ? He would have been thrown down from power and Tupper would be now in office. He indeed is the one who would have sent contingents ; 5,000 men would not have been sufficient for Sir Charles !

La Patrie of the same day gave a shorter but similar account of that speech :

He (Mr. Bernier) then treats the contingents question, saying he approved of the attitude which his leader had taken on that matter and that the sending of troops did not mean Imperialism. Is it because Canadians went freely and voluntarily to the secession war that they became by that fact Americans ? Have those who went to the Philippines, or to Cuba become Philipinos or Cubans ? We are not Imperialists, but we are loyal subjects of the British Crown and of the free institutions under which we are living.

His own organ, La Tribune de St. Hyacinthe, after a week's time, left to the friendly supervision of the editor, gave a report of the hon. gentleman's declarations almost identical with that of La Presse. A few days previous, the hon. minister had spoken at St. Hilaire, in your own riding, I believe, Mr. Speaker ; and his short remarks on the war question were reported as follows by his organ, La Tribune, on September 21 :

Our enemies say that the Laurier government has sent volunteers to South Africa ! It is not correct; the government gave orders to nobody. It simply lent its help to good wills. Had they been in power, what would have been done by those who denounce us? Ask Mr. Bergeron, who has just cried out at Alexandria that England would have only to ask in order to receive, should they be in power.

In another column of the same copy of the same paper, a leading article, entitled 'Soyons Francs—Let us be straight,' discusses the war question with its Conservative antagonist, Le Courrier de St. Hyacinthe. The following paragraph shows the spirit of the article :

But the argument which has above all played upon the nerves of our confrere is the one, very clear indeed, which proves that the country has been most fortunate to have as its leader Sir Wilfrid Laurier at the time the contingents were sent. We shall have $2,000,000 to pay above our share of the bloodshed in that unfortunate Transvaal war. Every French Canadian knows that had Tupper directed the affairs of the country at that moment, he would not have stopped there, in spite of his furious denunciations.

I could keep the House for hours on similar quotations ; these are sufficient to define the position taken by the government organs and supporters in Quebec, and to show that their victory in that old Canadian province can hardly be counted as a triumph of Imperialism, and even as an approval of our military expedition to the Transvaal. The straight ministerial candidates, the devout believers, as I may call them, did not approve of the war or of the sending of Canadian troops to South Africa. They kept aloof from the subject as much as possible ; and when attacked by their opponents and questioned by their followers on that point, their invariable reply was that the government could not resist the move-

ment, that Canada was not committed to any future contribution to English wars, and especially that, had the Tory leaders been in power, they would have sent more men and expended more money than the government. They made their contention good by quoting Sir Charles Tupper's telegrams and speeches, and his leading supporters' utterances. They divulged to the people the scant hypocrisy of the Tory party, and proved, with undeniable evidence, that while their opponents in Quebec were accusing the government for having dragged us in Imperial concerns and sold Canada to England, their compeers in Ontario were denouncing in rabid terms Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the traitor Tarte and his French-dominated cabinet, which had consented but reluctantly and meanly to go to the rescue of the empire, and when forced to do so under the powerful and patriotic pressure of Sir Charles the Great.

I may have hurt the feelings of the ministerialists in showing the somewhat double game they have played on this question; they have undoubtedly shown through all this crisis a lack of nerve most painful to all those who had been attracted to the old Liberal party by its moral courage, its disinterested attachment to principle and its joyful disposition to prefer truth to success. I leave to my friends on this side of the House to decide for themselves if this softening of their temperament must be attributed to the effects of la grippe or to the sweets of power. I hope the former cause is the real one; because the latter would prove that their stern virtue, like that of certain vestals of old and modern times, simply waited for a propitious occasion to fall.

But, the government and their supporters may find some solace for their weakness by contemplating the perversion of their rivals. While the Liberals had the excuse of being on the defence, and only played that double game with a certain timid and blushing indecency, the Tories threw themselves soul and body into the abysses of sin. Members of the late parliament will remember the very patriotic attitude of the member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), his speech on the war, and his noisy handclapping when the Prime Minister refused to accept my motion ratifying the constitutional reservations contained in the order in council of October, 1899. I would respectfully advise the right hon. gentleman, when he is applauded from the other side, to repeat, silently if he likes, what I say openly when I am afflicted with the same evil: 'Timeo danaos et dona ferentes.' I say silently, because, on this question of Imperialism, the right hon. gentleman would be more exposed than I am to become fastidious at quoting the Virgilian verse.

Now, I will quote a few words of the speech of the hon. member for Montmorency on that war question:

> It was an evidence that all the colonies were united with each other to prove not only their patriotism and their loyalty to the British Crown, but to prove that the empire cannot be attacked in any one of its parts without all the other parts coming to its rescue.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOURASSA. But wait a little to see whether you will approve the second quotation:

> Sir, the people of all the provinces of the Dominion are carried away by this patriotic conception of their duties, and I as a French Canadian will not stand aloof and remain an indifferent spectator of the tremendous struggle which the British Empire is engaged in at the present time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOURASSA. I now invite hon. gentlemen who say 'hear, hear' to listen to another declaration from the same gentlemen whom they applauded last session as one of the patriotic French Canadians standing for a united empire.

A few days after the session was over, there was a big Conservative rally at Kamouraska, where Messrs. Casgrain, Chapais, Bergeron and other pontiffs of that dying worship once called the Quebec Conservative party, gathered and fulminated their first excommunication decrees of the season. The member for Montmorency made an appeal to the electors of Kamouraska against the Imperialistic tendencies of the Liberal party, and in a most pathetic display of paternal sentiment he cried out to the people:

> I am ready to see my only son fly at the defence of my country; but I refuse to sacrifice him for the quarrels of England, though just they be.

Why do not hon. members opposite applaud now? They are silent.

But I need not go out of my own constituency to give an illustration of the tactics of the Conservative party. Of course, in Labelle, the ground was much clearer than in most of the other constituencies. I fought the battle on that question, though I had great trouble in keeping my opponent on these lines; he wanted to do as all the straight party candidates in Quebec, and try to shift the issue. His position was that the cause of our expedition was to be found in the Prime Minister's speeches at the jubilee; that the honour of the country was engaged, and that, after all, the inconveniences of the war were well compensated by our sales of hay, cheese and horses; a business point of view, as you see. In fact, he approved more than he disapproved of our participation in the war. But his eloquence dealers were more decided in their opinions. In the English-speaking section of the county, the Tory committee sent a young patriot, who said that in Labelle it was no question of Liberals or Conservatives, of Laurier or Tupper, of good or bad administration; it was and should be:

'Down with Bourassa, who opposed the Canadian contingents to South Africa!' In the northern extremity of the county, all French-speaking, Mr. Nantel, an ex-provincial minister—the same gentleman who, for over a year, in his organ, Le Monde Canadien, and in his public utterances, had been denouncing the war, the contingents, and the Imperialistic movement—came full of ardour and denounced me as a hypocrite, because, although I voted against the war and declared myself ready to oppose any future military expedition, I still called myself a Liberal and a supporter of the government on its administrative policy. He admitted that Sir Charles Tupper had some slight Imperialistic tendencies, but almost imperceptible compared to the deep Imperialism of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The former was only in favour of commercial Imperialism, based on reciprocal terms; whilst the latter was in favour of commercial Imperialism, all in favour of England; of political Imperialism, swamping our legislative independence; and of military Imperialism, committing us to participation in all Imperial wars.

In a letter to his constituents, published shortly after the crushing defeat of his party and the downfall of his dynasty, the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) said:

> No one would be surprised, still less complain, that natural sympathy existed in Quebec for a French Canadian leader, but when the French Canadians have almost to a man rallied around him, can we believe that this result has been due to any other cause than race feeling, so fostered, manipulated and developed by Messrs. Tarte, Bernier, Bourassa, Monet, and others, skilfully played upon by the Prime Minister himself. At any rate, our French Canadian friends who have been swamped by this temporary craze of Quebec, tell us so.

I am ready to give to the hon. gentleman the benefit of extenuating circumstances. A convict is allowed twenty-four hours to curse his judges. A defeated leader, hurt not only in his political and personal ambitions, but also in his filial sentiments, for which I can but admire the hon. gentleman, may be given a few weeks to exhale his bitterness. But that natural explosion of bad temper should not have gone to the point of slandering his opponents and a large proportion of his fellow-citizens. As to the general accusation of racial appeals made by the Liberal party to the French Canadians, and as to the reply given to those appeals, I will say a word later on. As to my personal position, the hon. gentleman should apologize to at least one of the gentlemen with whose names he coupled mine in his letter. I mean the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier). I have for the hon. minister the greatest personal esteem and friendship, and I trust he entertains the same feelings towards my humble self. But to put him and me in the same canoe, as far as this question is concerned, is rather grotesque. Why? Ever since the hon. gentleman entered the cabinet, we paddled in the very opposite direction. He wanted to run down the stream, and I persisted in facing the current. The chief French Conservative organ in Montreal, Le Journal, even announced one day that I would accept the candidature against him in St. Hyacinthe. I must say, however, that this was a pure Tupperism.

As to my appeals to the electorate, I defy the hon. member for Pictou here and now to quote one sentence of my public or private utterances justifying his accusation. Let him search all the newspapers in which my speeches throughout the whole province were reported—and I give him free access to respectable organs of all shades of opinion, both English and French; let him unearth any witness, French or English, Scotch or Irish, Italian, German or Belgian—all those nationalities are represented in my constituency; let him pick the man, credible under oath, who will say to my face that I have resorted to any racial appeal in my election or previous to it, within or without my county. He will never find that man; because such appeals I never made; and I could not have made them for two excellent reasons: First, the idea that the Transvaal question and all its incidents and consequences in Canada could be discussed on racial lines, always appeared to me as most foolish and absurd; second, nothing is more repugnant to my heart and conscience as that basis of political argument. And what is not in my heart has never reached my lips. I do not expect to ever be a minister of the Crown or a Knight of this or a Commander of that; but I cherish the ambition that my humble name shall never be used to enrich the Canadian glossary with a synonym to Tupperism. True, racial prejudices were aroused in my county during the last campaign; they fermented constantly from the day I resigned my seat to appeal to my constituents on this question in October, 1899, until the very last polling hour of the 7th November, 1900. But they were not raised by me, nor on my behalf; they were set against me by a small group of English-speaking Liberals and Conservatives, who denounced me for a year as a French rebel and a traitor, and thereby gave votes to my opponents, the candidate of gentlemen opposite. In all justice to that gentleman, I must say that if he profited by those tactics, I do not think he was responsible for them. That campaign was started long before he was a candidate. I could have retaliated and made counter appeals to my French-speaking constituents, who represent at least two-thirds of the electorate of Labelle. But, I did not, and I would not have done it, had even my success depended on those tactics. Sir, it is my pride, my legitimate pride that the position which I took on this question, I kept it rigidly on the solid ground of respect to the constitution

and of true devotion to Canadian interests in preference to Mr. Chamberlain's political aims ; and in doing so I remained all along faithful to the true traditions of British Liberalism. I am happy to say that my attitude was well understood by the free citizens who sent me here. Although I lost a good many English-speaking supporters, the true old Liberal Scotch stood by me. I never felt prouder in my life than at a public meeting held in a thorough Scotch settlement of my county, two days previous to the election, when two of the leading residents, one Conservative and the other Liberal, told me with the approval of their fellow-citizens : 'We are especially satisfied with your position on the war question. You stood independently for Canadian rights. England is rich enough to look after her quarrels ; let us mind our own business and live peacefully in Canada.'

Speaking now of the general position taken by the Conservative party on this question : I hold in my hands two electoral pamphlets which were largely circulated by Tory heelers in Ontario and Quebec. The former is a leaflet entitled 'The Case of Bourassa and Monet;' it contains extracts from our speeches carefully stripped of the context which only could give our correct and complete views on the war question, and it denounces the government for not having excommunicated us. The copy I have has been sent to me by an elector of the riding of West York. The other document is the famous pamphlet No. 6, being one of a series of brochures prepared, printed and sent broadcast to the four corners of the province of Quebec by the Central Conservative Committee of Montreal. This pamphlet is well known to all the members of this House. Apart from the school question to which it refers, it arraigns the Liberal government for having dragged us in English wars ; it reprints my motion of March 13, 1900, and extracts from the Prime Minister's reply to my speech ; and it contends that the Liberal party is responsible for the introduction of Imperialism in Canada. The title is in itself a poem:

Imperial Federation—Laurier approves of it, Tupper condemns it.

South African War—Laurier says we shall take part in other British wars if needed.

And, mind you, the trade of this gem was not lessened for a moment after the pious denunciation of Sir Charles Tupper. I really think that this very denunciation lost more votes to Sir Charles Tupper in Quebec than any of the other blunders he and his friends committed—and indeed they were numerous and gigantic ! It opened the eyes of the few Conservatives who still naively believed that their leader was the great opponent of Imperialism ; but above all, it convinced a great many more that the Tory party in its desperate effort to climb to power was prepared to resort to any means. The result was that many votes given to Liberal candidates were not inspired so much by love and admiration for the party in power than by a thorough disgust for Tory tactics. This may seem hard on the opposition and doubtfully flattering to the government, but it is true. I hope the selection of the present leader of the opposition, whom I am pleased to honour as a broad-minded man and a true patriot, means that the Conservative party is opening its eyes to its misdeeds of late years and preparing to go back to its most respectable traditions, those of the time of Macdonald and Cartier. I am one of those who believe in the necessity of a sound opposition as well as of a good government. But a bad seed has been thrown to the ground and it needs to be exposed thoroughly in order that it may be sterilized. Like the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), several Conservative leaders and organs attributed their defeat to the French cry in Quebec. It seems as if they did not realize that the people from that province do not only read their French newspapers, but follow up closely at the same time the movement of ideas in the other parts of the Dominion. It is true that the people of Quebec voted largely in favour of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The right hon. gentleman will pardon me for naming him. It is the best way to express the meaning of the vote given in favour of his government by all the French-speaking groups of Canada. But I deny utterly that this vote implies a spirit of French domination or racial exclusiveness. The French Canadians did not vote for the Prime Minister because he was a French Canadian ; but the Prime Minister having been led to the pinnacle of power by the people of Canada, they did not want to see him thrown down simply and solely because he was a French Canadian. Mr. Tarte having been selected by his leader as Minister of Public Works and having done good service in that capacity, they did not see why he should be scouted because he was a French Canadian, and thought fit to say so. And I claim emphatically that it was the right and the duty of my countrymen to do so. Had they done otherwise, they would have proved basely unworthy of the free institutions which their fathers struggled so long and so painfully to obtain ; unworthy of the noble flag which guarantees the equality of all nationalities and creeds in this land ; unworthy to be the subjects of the Queen, who was herself a living example of toleration. The French vote is not the challenge of a race to another. It is the calm, dignified, constitutional reply from a worthy class of citizens, from one-third of the Canadian people, to the frantic appeals of fanatics. It is an assertion of liberty, of equal rights, of true British citizenship. And as such it should be applauded by all men of good-will who sincerely wish the welfare of Canada. And no one should speak of garrisoning British troops at Quebec to face possible emergencies. If our word of honour kept true for 140 years, and sealed

twice with our bloodshed in defence of the British flag when assailed by the English-speaking Puritan fathers, uncles and cousins of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), is not a sufficient guarantee of our loyalty, a British garrison in Quebec would not make it any better. A few red coats would just be the proper thing to make us, not pro-Boers, but real Boers.

But to interpret the French Canadian vote as an approval of the special action of the government in sending Canadian soldiers to the Transvaal, and further still, as an expression of Imperialistic sentiment, is so absurd that nobody from that province, I think, will venture to make that assertion here—unless one cares very little for truth or accuracy. On the contrary, I affirm categorically that the strength of the Liberal vote in Quebec was largely increased by the anti-war feeling, though, I repeat, the question was kept as much as possible as a side issue. As the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) said in France, 99 per cent of the French Canadians detest this war, as the whole civilized world does, as nearly one-half, if not more, of the United Kingdom does. They think that it could have been averted by arbitration ; they believe that the political difficulties in the Transvaal did not justify it ; they are convinced that Mr. Rhodes's rapacity, that Mr. Chamberlain's arrogant and brutal refusal to arbitrate, were the real causes which precipitated the conflict ; they wished that it should be stopped. The Colonial Secretary and his faithful may call them pro-Boers. They are pro-Boers, just as Mr. Bryce, Mr. Morley, Mr. Courtney, Sir Robert Reid, Sir Edward Clarke and millions of Englishmen and Scotchmen. They are not pro-Boers because they are anti-British. But their instinctive sympathy goes to a small nation struggling for independence. Their fathers have been forced to rebellion and led to exile or dragged to the scaffold by a policy similar to Mr. Chamberlain's, and a repression similar to Lord Kitchener's ; they still remember of Lord Colborne and his farm burnings at St. Eustache and St. Benoit. Peace and liberty were restored here by a policy the kind of which Lord Grey and Mr. Gladstone inaugurated in South Africa and his true disciples are urging now to be applied anew. Supposing their feelings went as far as rejoicing at the success of Boer arms, they should no more be taxed with disloyalty than William Pitt when he openly vowed for the triumph of American rebels, because, in his opinion, that triumph would open the eyes of the British nation and crush down that spirit of arrogant domination which had seized at that time the rulers and the people of England, and was leading the kingdom to its perdition.

Now, as far as the contribution of Canada in this war is concerned, it is no use to make any mistake about it. Inasmuch as it was discussed before the people of Quebec, the action of the government has not been approved but excused ; and excused on the ground that it was not a precedent and that the Tories were more to be dreaded on that question than the Liberals.

There is a fact, a great national feature which our English-speaking neighbours do not realize perhaps, but upon which they should open their eyes. While they have been wandering between narrow provincialism, whence we all started, and unbounded Imperialism, we have been developing quietly but constantly on the solid ground of Canadianism. We may be from their standpoint less British, but we are more thoroughly, more exclusively and, I may be allowed to say, in all good spirit, better Canadians than they are.

I have quoted the London Times previous to the election and its false deductions of the vote after it was taken. I will now commend to the attention of the members of the House a series of letters written from Canada to the Manchester Guardian by a distinguished English journalist, Mr. Harold Spender. That gentleman came to Canada and remained here during the electoral contest in order to study by himself the real sentiments of the Canadian electorate and especially of the French Canadians. He very soon grasped the true situation. I may be permitted to quote a few extracts from that interesting correspondence :

> With some similarity to our recent struggle in Great Britain, both Conservative and Liberal candidates, with very few exceptions, tumble over one another in applauding the empire and waving the flag. 'But behind all these party appearances is the solid, sombre fact, which neither party can conceal, that the French Canadians hate the war and are using most of their political influence to oppose the war policy. . . . . In short, like their friends in Great Britain, the Tories out here are just trying to crush the Liberal party by the cry of ' pro-Boer.' Another bond of empire, indeed! But under this there are tragic possibilities, for by all this they are gradually alienating the French Canadians and dividing race from race.

In another letter, speaking of the lack of interest which the war question, as it was discussed in Canada, would offer to his English readers, he says :

> They may even prefer that the Canadians should reserve to themselves the right of discussing, a year after the event, whether Sir Wilfrid Laurier sent away the Canadian contingent a month too late or too soon. It is not for us to enter into that domestic quarrel, which is really the only form in which the war question has been seriously raised here outside the constituency of Mr. Bourassa . . . .
>
> I have said that the Canadians have not fully considered the issues of the South African war, and if any Canadian reads these words I shall probably be fiercely blamed for this opinion. Well, I have talked to many on the subject, and I could number on the fingers of one hand those whom I have found familiar with the causes of the quarrel or the details of the despatches. . . . .
>
> Of course, the majority of Canadians support Laurier in the ' contingent ' policy. But if Tupper had been in power the opposition of the

French Canadians, whose sympathies are with the Boers, would have made it impossible. As it is, Laurier persuaded Quebec, and Ontario had already taken the lead in urgency. But though the French Canadians follow their idol, even in his South African policy, their real mind is voiced by Tarte, with his 'no precedent' cry. That is the issue of the future—Is the South African war to be a precedent? The Imperialists of Toronto are raising it by pressing that arms should be stored and barracks built in order that Canada may become a military power ready to support the empire in any venture. Quebec Liberals are sullenly but obstinately opposed to all this. . . . . But men like to know what they are fighting about, and thus the war has raised the profoundest issues of Imperial government. How is it that none of these issues have been raised in the political warfare here? I have already noted that there is no discussion and no real knowledge about South African questions in Canada; the war is now scantily reported, and no interest is taken in the settlement. This is partly parochialism——

I draw the attention of my hon. colleagues to the following words :

—but partly also due to a certain lack of courage that runs through all Canadian politics. As in the States, so in Canada ; politics are much dominated by electioneering. Perhaps we ought not to preach, but there is in English politics a tradition handed down from men like Bright and Cobden, and sometimes dimly followed, that principle is more important than party or place. Canada still wants that tradition of political martyrdom.

I will end these quotations by the following remarks on the subject of Imperialism as viewed in Ontario. They were written from Toronto after the elections :

The majority of business men know that peace is the most important asset to Canada, and many look askance on the whole Imperialist movement as dangerous to the progress of the country. 'How do we know,' said one to me today, 'that we may not be drawn into trouble any day? One never feels safe.'

This is an expression of opinion with regard to Canada; and the other day the statement was published that the New Zealand government were urging the British government to use their influence in the Asiatic sea to acquire a couple of islands in the neighbourhood of New Zealand, because of that swelling sentiment of aggrandizement which is now seizing the whole British world. New Zealand also wants to form its little confederation; it wants to enlarge and expand. Suppose the British government acceded to that request, and suppose on its way to realize it, it came into conflict with the interests of some other European power, and war were declared, we Canadians, in pursuance of this new policy which has been entered upon, might be called upon to expend money and send soldiers to help New Zealand in her schemes of extension and aggrandizement.

I have dealt with military Imperialism at some greater length than I wished to do. But, I felt bound to set myself right, at the opening of this parliament on that vital question of the relations between Great Britain and her colonies. In spite of the efforts of scared politicians to shift the issue or to convince themselves that the question is not at stake, this is to be the great political and national problem of the near future throughout the empire. The so-called statesmen and their followers who scorn the idea and pretend to believe that this is only a temporary movement of opinion, are simply imitating the ostrich in the desert, when being chased by the hunter, it conceals its head under its wing and thinks it is safe because it does not see the danger. I thought it my duty also to tell the truth—not the political truth, not the party truth, but the plain truth—about the real feelings of the French Canadians on that question. The eccentricity of my position in this House allows me that freedom of speech. I did not do it with the purpose of arousing racial feelings; on the contrary. The best way to avoid national frictions is not by imagining that all sections of this country entertain the same opinion, should even that opinion be the best; but by looking thoroughly through the minds and hearts of all the racial groups which form the nation in order to prepare a sound public opinion based on mutual respect and conciliation. My utterances have not been inspired either by a sentiment of animosity or indifference towards the British flag and British connection; on the contrary again. It is because I prize highly the advantages of British institutions which we have made ours—in spite even of British authorities—that I believe it is an imperative duty to us all to prevent any danger that might threaten them in the future. Should we leave the British government and the British people under misapprehensions as to what they can expect from Canada—not in a time of enthusiastic ferment, but when the popular mind will set again on its normal basis—the moment might come when they thought they could rely upon us for more than what we would be ready to give. A mistake of that kind would be the cause of serious complications which for my part I wish to be avoided.

I go further. This war and its bearing on British and colonial concerns have led me to a new and deeper study of British history, of British institutions, of British politics, of British character. And the more I have analysed the vital parts and the solid limbs of that splendid body politic, its strong nerves and its rich blood, the wider has grown my admiration for Great Britain. I used to be a contented British subject, as most of my countrymen are ; I feel now the full pride of British citizenship. But the Britain that I love and admire is that noble, progressive, industrious, peace-loving nation which has done so much for the development and the welfare of humanity; that mother of true liberalism who, from the time of Simon de Montfort

down to the days of William Ewart Gladstone, through good and bad fortune, under the sun of her glorious days as well as in the midst of political storms, worked slowly, but steadily, to the betterment and the reform of her laws, of her constitution, of her political and social life. The Britain that I love is that great apostle of liberty, who preached and practiced the worship of freedom for herself, but who respected also the rights of others. The Britain that I love is that steady, laborious, persevering community of workers, of settlers, of tradesmen, who while enriching themselves have thrown open to the world so many hidden treasures. The Britain that I love was boastful of her qualities, but she did not refuse to listen to the voice of her conscience and never hesitated to correct and to expiate her crimes and her weaknesses. And the more I have known to love that Britain, the true Britain, the more I have hated and cursed the vampires who are now trying to suck and to poison her blood.

Under the guidance of her statesmen, that great nation had extended her power on all seas. She had found on the globe the space required for the natural growth of her magnitude. Her petty tyrants of to-day, like that of the Fable, are torturing her body either to shorten it to the size of their patriotism or to lengthen it to the measure of their ambitious madness. When ruled by true British statesmanship, England may have excited the jealousy of other nations: she was at least respected, admired and feared. The canker worms of to-day are endeavouring to make her an object of hatred, of derision, of contempt to the world. Refusing to accept the patriotic and clear sighted warning of General Butler, they have been forced to immobilize on the ungrateful soil of Africa the best of her armies and to send her bravest sons to die of fever under the commandment of incapable officers. In the meanwhile, Great Britain was obliged to humble herself under the tutelage of Germany and of the United States, and to become a silent accomplice of the monstrous barbarity of Russian Cossacks, in order that her name should not be totally forgotten in China, where she ruled for half a century under the wise policy of the so-called Little Englanders. If I were the Anglophobist that so many charge me with being, I could not wish for better means to be taken for bringing the downfall of British power. But although some of my words may have fallen hard upon those who look at things from a different standpoint, they should at least have the good faith to admit that my vehemence or my bitterness or even, if they like, my rudeness is not caused by disloyal sentiments nor by racial animosity.

Now, I think my motion should receive the support of all fair-minded men in this House—whether they agree fully or partially with me on the merits of this war, or on the Imperialistic movement, or whether they we differ totally on either of those questions. This resolution does not deal with the causes of the struggle ; it does not revive old and irritating controversies ; it does not discuss the political consequences of our contribution to the war ; it does not treat of Imperial federation or of Canadian independence. It leaves to every one a free hand and an uncompromised position on all those matters. It does not even trace a rigid line of conduct to the British government on the settlement of the war ; it simply lays down the principles upon which that settlement should be effected, leaving to the British parliament a full sway of action as to the point where such principles can be carried under actual circumstances. It is simply intended to express the wish of a peace-loving British community, praying that a long and cruel war should be stopped, and that this new century, which has seen the death of a noble and kind-hearted Queen, and the accession of her worthy son, should not be a century of race hatred and struggles in His Majesty's possessions in South Africa. As Canadians, as loyal subjects of the British Crown, we are all interested in the peace of every part of the empire. If peace can be made in South Africa, let peace be. And the only peace that can be made to last must be of such a character to cure the deep wounds inflicted to the heart of the Afrikanders, not only those of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, but those also of Cape Colony and Natal. Such peace is not the brutal and pagan crushing of the vanquished by the conqueror. It is the kind, generous, Christian treatment of the weak by the mighty, the forgiveness of offences suffered so that committed offences may be forgiven.

For the last sixteen months I have been branded, not only in Canada, but throughout the empire, as a disloyal subject, as an ungrateful beneficiary of British favours, as a traitor and a rebel. I have been hissed and hooted in this parliament because I refused to throw ridicule upon the British Crown by celebrating the end of a war which is yet raging ; because especially I refused to slander our noble Queen by making her responsible for Mr. Chamberlain's policy. Nine months have passed since we declared that the war was over, and the struggle is fiercer than ever. The death roll gets longer and longer every day ; the stream of blood is overflowing ; the public exchequer of Great Britain is neavily strained, and we may feel here before long the effect of financial depression in England.

It is no more a war between combatants ; it is the beginning of a savage conflict of races. Should even General De Wet and his heroic followers be captured to-morrow, I say the war is not over. The actual fight may be ended, but this is only the first act of the tragedy. For every

Afrikander homestead burned by order of British commanders, one hundred brands of hatred have been lighted up ; they may be covered for some time with the ashes of defeat and repression. But let a blast come from the Orient or the Occident, from the north or from the south—a rebellion in India, a conflict in China, a war in Europe ; and, the occasion may not be far away, if jingo rule is to be left a free hand for some time yet in England—and the blaze will again be lighted ; and once more shall the decimated compatriots of William the Silent astound the world. Do you want to extinguish that fire for ever, go to those stern, ignorant, fanatical Boers—give them the epithets you like—but make them to understand that Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Rhodes, that Lord Kitchener and Sir Alfred Milner are not the British people ; that behind and above the unscrupulous politicians, the money-grabbers, the brutal soldiers, the bureaucratic martinets with whom they have come in contact for the last ten years, there is a broad, generous nation, upon which they can rely for the safeguarding of their national and individual existence.

'Oh, but Mr. Chamberlain is in power, the empire is safe,' cry out the jingoes ; 'let us teach those brigands a lesson they shall never forget.' Take care only that they do not remember it too long ; you may pay later on with your own blood the cost of that bloody education.

Yes, Mr. Chamberlain is in power, and the war is not stopped—but Queen Victoria is dead ; and the public rumour, and the public conscience, and the public sentiment tell us that her days have been shortened by that disheartening and unglorious war. Up to the day of her death, two thoughts had always kept me lighthearted in the midst of insults and slanders. I knew that I was actuated solely by the pure love of Canada ; I felt also that I was in no way responsible for the bloodshed on the veldts of Africa nor for the tears shed in so many Canadian homes. Now a new thought fills my heart with happiness ; I am not an accomplice of murderers of the Queen.

I sincerely believe that in urging the House to support this proposition, I am simply asking the parliament of Canada to respond to one of the last and most heartfelt desires of her late Majesty. I move it as a tribute of homage, of admiration, of love to her memory. It is modest, compared with the magnificent and pompous necrologies that have fallen from the lips of kings and statesmen. But, it is free and sincere ; it has not been paid and does not expect to be rewarded by any prize or honour ; it is pure of all speculation upon the name of that noble and venerable woman. It is simply the wish of a true Canadian and a true British subject, and in that spirit I move, seconded by Mr. Angers :

That, whilst strictly adhering to the fundamental principle of Canadian autonomy, and refusing to admit that the intervention of Canada in South Africa has committed this country to any future participation in the wars and policy of Great Britain,

This House thinks that the contribution of Canada in the South African war, both in armed help and public expenditure entitles the Canadian people to express an opinion on the matter.

This House, therefore, humbly reminds His Majesty, King Edward VII., that the glorious reign of his august mother, Queen Victoria, whose memory shall ever be cherished by Canadians of all origins and creeds, was inaugurated in bloodshed and rebellion in this part of her dominions ; that peace and prosperity were subsequently restored for ever when Her Majesty's advisers understood, as Lord Grey told in his instructions to Lord Elgin, Governor of Canada, that it was 'neither possible nor desirable to carry on the government of any of the British provinces in North America in opposition to the opinions of its inhabitants' ; that since that time, Her Majesty has found in no portion of her empire a more faithful, devoted and contented people than her French Canadian subjects.

This House, therefore, expresses the hope and desire that His Majesty's government will endeavour to conclude in South Africa an honourable peace founded upon the law of nations which guarantees independence to all civilized peoples and upon the true British traditions of respect to all national and religious convictions and to the spirit of colonial autonomy.

This House further declares that there is no necessity for sending any more Canadian troops to South Africa, and that the enlistment of recruits for the South African constabulary should not be allowed to take place in Canada.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that it is with a great deal of regret and with some surprise that I have seen my hon. friend persist in his determination to move the motion of which he gave notice some few days ago, and which he has now placed in your hands. Well remembering the uncompromising hostility which my hon. friend showed to our policy, nearly two years ago, of sending contingents to South Africa, well knowing from a long acquaintance and a long friendship the logical mind of my hon. friend, remembering also that he had on more than one occasion announced himself as entirely opposed to what he calls Imperialism, remembering also that he had somewhat ostentatiously and most persistently refused assent to the policy we advocated of sending troops to South Africa for the prosecution of the war, I must say I was little prepared for the present attitude of my hon. friend. I would have supposed that he would be a stalwart to the end, and that, having refused to send troops to South Africa he would not ask us to send advice to England. But my hon. friend has taken an attitude altogether different from that. He would not allow us to offer troops ; he now wants to send advice. He would not fight for the cause of England, but he is

willing to sit at the council board in discussing the cause of England to-day. How this conduct of my hon. friend is in keeping with his former well-known views is a problem, as to which I shall offer no opinion of my own, but which I shall leave for his own pondering. As to the right on our part, asserted in this motion, of making representations to the Imperial authorities on all questions that may affect the British Empire in whole or in part—that is a right which is no longer in question. We asserted it nearly thirty years ago, when, on the 20th of April, 1882, we passed a resolution in favour of home rule for Ireland. We asserted it again a few days ago, when we passed a resolution on the coronation declaration. The fact that we sent contingents to South Africa almost two years ago does not in any way affect our right in this respect. It is to-day what it was before ; it has not been altered in any way ; it is no larger and no smaller than it was. We have a perfect right to offer advice, and we claim we have the privilege of making representations to the Imperial authorities. Therefore, we can approach the question submitted by my hon. friend on its merits and on its merits alone. The question which we have before us is not so much the speech of my hon. friend, but the motion itself. Shall we adopt this motion or shall we not ?

Before I approach this subject, let me say that I care not, to go into the long speech which my hon. friend made us. Eloquent, as all his speeches are, it yet has no relevancy to the question placed before the House. I care not to go into the question of the significance of the late election. I care not as to the attitude of any portion of the community. And certainly it is not fair nor right to judge any of the issues which have been involved in the last election simply by the comments of isolated newspapers. Why, my hon. friend himself gave us an idea of the little value which we must attach to the comments of interested newspapers on one side or the other when he told us at the very outset of his speech that he had been misrepresented on both sides of this question—that as to the very motion which he now has brought before us on one side he was represented as a demagogue, and on the other as an Imperialist. That being the case my hon. friend will permit me to say we can dismiss all the arguments he has brought forward to prove a thesis which he has not placed before the House. The question before the House is : Should we adopt this motion ? The conclusions of it are to be found in the last two paragraphs. First, let me read the last one :

This House further declares that there is no necessity for sending any more Canadian troops to South Africa, and that the enlistment of recruits for the South African constabulary should not be allowed to take place in Canada.

As to the first conclusion of this proposition, that there is no necessity of sending Canadian troops to South Africa, I must say I altogether agree with my hon. friend —not for the same reasons that have prompted him, but for the reason that the war is at an end. There may be still some guerilla warfare, there may still be some brigandage under the name of war, but the war is no longer at issue. Though my hon. friend pretends to be very much in doubt as to the issue of the war, for my part I am ready to leave the issue in the hands of the men who have it in hand now, and to say, with my hon. friend, that there is no necessity for sending Canadian troops to South Africa. As to the other portion of the conclusion that enlistment of recruits for the South African constabulary should not be allowed to take place in Canada, I ask my hon. friend what reason can there be why the enlistment of men for this force should be put to an end in Canada ? If there are men in Canada who—I care not for what motive, whether high or low, whether dignified or undignified, whether because they desire to get a living, or from a spirit of adventure, or from the nobler impulse of fighting for their sovereign—wish to take service in the South African constabulary, on what principle should a Canadian government interfere to prevent their liberty being so exercised ? My hon. friend has spoken well and eloquently upon the cause of liberty, on which he has constituted himself the champion in this House, and almost alone ; but I must ask him, what kind of liberty is it which will not permit a British subject, if he so chooses, to offer his King to serve him, no matter in what capacity ? I am a Liberal as my hon. friend declares himself to be, but my idea of liberty does not agree with one that will not allow that freedom to every British subject in Canada. But, Sir, the gist of the motion of my hon. friend is in the last paragraph but one, which reads in this way :

This House therefore expresses the hope and desire that His Majesty's government will endeavour to conclude in South Africa an honourable peace, founded upon the law of nations, which guarantees independence to all civilized peoples, and upon the true British traditions of respect to all national and religious convictions and to the spirit of colonial autonomy.

If this means anything, it means that we are to invite the British authorities to restore to the two republics, the South African republic and the Orange Free State their independence. My hon. friend will not deny that this is the meaning that he has in his mind, but, strange to say, he never said a word as to that proposition. I would have expected him to deal at length with this point which, after all, was a noble subject to consider, and one which might invite discussion. I would have expected him to give his reasons and arguments why the

British authorities should be invited by the Canadian parliament to undo what they have done and to restore to the two republics the independence which they forfeited on the 9th October, 1899. My hon. friend did not speak a word upon that subject.

Sir, perhaps I might sit down here. And I would do so, and not utter another syllable upon the subject, were it not for the fact that my hon. friend, in some of his arguments has been so unjust, so unfair, to the British government, that I feel constrained to place before the House the other side of this question. My hon. friend, if he means anything, means this, that the two republics, the republic of South Africa and the republic of the state of Orange, should be restored to their independence, should be restored to the position which they occupied on the 9th of October, 1899 ; that the supreme arbitrament of war which they themselves invoked should be set aside ; that all the blood which has been shed should count for nothing ; that all the suffering which has been endured should be forgotten ; and that Mr. Kruger and Mr. Steyn should be restored to the positions of which they made such an abuse.

My hon. friend spoke eloquently of the miseries of war, of the destruction of farms, of the burning of houses, and I agree with him, I take no exception to what he said in that respect. Miserable indeed is the condition to-day of the once proud South African republic, miserable by reason of its ruined farms, its closed mines, its cities arrested in their growth, its people impoverished, and its aged president a fugitive in Europe, a fugitive from the misery which he brought upon his own country. Miserable indeed is the condition of the once happy state of Orange, which had no quarrel with Great Britain, but which was precipitated into the horrors of war and of invasion by the man to whom it had entrusted its destinies, himself to-day a self-constituted outlaw in his own country. These men appealed to the God of battles, and the God of battles has pronounced against them. They invaded British territory, their territory was invaded in turn, and it was annexed to the British domain in consequence of the terrible logic of war.

If I understand my hon. friend aright to-day, he would have the government and parliament of Great Britain undo what has been done and bring the rebellious Boers back to the position which they occupied on the 9th of October, 1899, and which they had forfeited. My answer to the hon. gentleman is a very simple one. Whether he will agree with me or not, I am sure everybody else will agree that in the terrible uncertainties of war, in the series of successes and reverses which generally make up the history of war, the leader of the defeated people has no right to complain if he receives from his victorious opponent the same treatment which he had previously applied to his opponent in the hour of victory. Now, the hon. gentleman knows very well that when Lord Roberts invaded the state of Orange and raised the British flag in Bloemfontein, when subsequently he invaded the Transvaal and raised the British flag in Pretoria, and when he annexed the state of Orange and the Transvaal to the British dominions, the hon. gentleman knows very well that Lord Roberts then and there applied to the vanquished the very same law which had been proclaimed as a law of war by the Boers, in the first stages of that war. Sir, my hon. friend is aware of the insolent ultimatum by which President Kruger went to war with such a light heart on the 9th of October, 1899, he is aware that the following day the state of Orange, which had no quarrel with England, joined hands with the Transvaal Republic, and that President Steyn called upon the Free State burghers to stand shoulder to shoulder against what he called the oppressor; my hon. friend is aware that that very same day the Boers invaded the British colony at Natal; that within the following week they invaded several other places, they invaded Newcastle, Laing's Nek and Harrysmith. My hon. friend is aware also that within a week of that time the Free State burghers invaded the British colony of the cape, that they occupied no less important a place than the district of Kimberley; and that by a series of proclamations, which I have here, from the commandants of the invading army, they annexed the district of Kimberley and the state of Orange. Well, Sir, those things took place in the beginning of the war. My hon. friend pities to-day and laments the condition of the Dutch citizens. Sir, I have here in my hand the evidence of British subjects in the district of Kimberley, who were forced to serve in the Dutch army, and when they appealed to President Kruger were told that the district of Kimberley henceforth would be part of the state of Orange. I will quote for the information of the House upon this subject a most suggestive affidavit which has appeared in the last blue-book on this subject, and which I think my hon. friend will agree with me affords a justification to the British government for all that they have done :

Stephen Strydom, sworn, states :—

I am field cornet for ward No. 4, Albert district, and reside at Leeuwplaats. I remember the Free Staters entering Burghersdorp about the middle of November last. About three days after this I received orders from Landdrost Rensburg to report myself the following day at the Landdrost's office. I came to Burghersdorp and saw Rensburg. He said to me, 'We want you to commandeer the people in your ward.' I understood him to mean he wanted me to commandeer men to take up arms. I said, 'I don't understand this thing,' and told him I was a field cornet under the British, and had taken the oath of allegiance. This conversation took place in the Landdrost's office. He told me

to go outside and read the proclamation on the blackboard in front of the office. I went out and saw a proclamation, signed by Commandant Swanepoel, of the Free State, declaring the district of Albert Free State territory. I again saw Rensburg and said that I still did not understand. He said, 'This is Free State territory, and you are a subject of the Free State. After further conversation, I refused to have anything to do with them. The same day my assistant field cornet, Jan Hendrik Coetzee, of Nooitgedacht, commandeered me to go to the front. I refused to go and returned to my car. In January I was again commandeered by Jan H. Coetzee. I refused to go. I then made up my mind to go to Bloemfontein and interview President Steyn on the subject. About the 10th of January I obtained a pass to go to Bloemfontein. I was accompanied by Geo. Aldrich, of Groot Vley. We arrrived at Bloemfontein and met President Steyn in his office. I told him that I had been commandeered to go to the front. I also told him that I was a British subject and a field cornet under the colonial government, and that I had taken the oath of allegiance, and I explained to him about the commandeering in my ward. I asked him for protection, as Commandant Grobler had promised all British subjects protection. He said, 'You are not a British subject any more or a field cornet or justice of the peace, but a private burgher of the Free State.' I told him that Albert had been declared Free State territory. I asked him if annexing the district and commandeering the people was according to international law. He said it was, and that precisely the same thing had taken place in the Franco-Prussian war.

Well, Sir, those were the first stages of the war. But the tide turned. The Boers who invaded British territory were repulsed, and their own territory was invaded and annexed to the British territory. They again invaded British territory and were again repulsed. Now, I ask my hon. friend what injustice can the Boers urge against the British government, when the British government treated them exactly as they had treated British subjects and British territory. What injustice can they urge in receiving exactly the same treatment as they had meted out to their opponents when they were in the ascendant? Mr. Speaker, I believe that there was logic in the method followed by the burghers. In the opening stages of the war they laid down the principle that South Africa had to be either Dutch or British, and the verdict of the God of armies has been that it should not be Dutch, but that it should be British.

I could go on multiplying these examples. Let me give another argument. If I understood my hon. friend aright, and I think I did in that respect, he would like the British government to go back to the policy of Mr. Gladstone in 1881. Mr. Gladstone was magnanimous towards the Boers in 1881, magnanimous, perhaps, to a fault. When he had the Boers in his power he treated them with the greatest generosity, expecting that when they had British subjects in their power they would treat them with the same generosity. That was a mistake, he measured the men with whom he had to deal with the measure of his own great soul. If magnanimity be a fault, and if that was a fault with Mr. Gladstone, everybody must admit that magnanimity has never been a fault of Mr. Kruger. If Mr. Kruger had had the slightest touch of the magnanimity of Mr. Gladstone, there would have been no war; if Mr. Kruger had shown towards British subjects the elementary principles of justice there would have been no war; if Mr. Kruger had simply kept his pledge towards Mr. Gladstone and his commissioner, there would have been no war.

What are the facts upon this question? They must be recalled in the face of the speech we have heard to-day from the hon. member for Labelle. In 1881, when the Boers had gone to war against England and after their ephemeral success at Majuba Hill, the government of Mr. Gladstone filled the country with British troops. Lord Roberts was ready to take the field and the issue could not have been in doubt, but Mr. Gladstone, in his great soul, resolved to give the Boers another chance, to give them their independence, retaining only the British Crown suzerainty. Commissioners were appointed to settle the terms of peace. The commissioners were Sir Hercules Robinson, Chief Justice de Villiers, a Boer, of French descent, like my hon. friend and myself. He is of Huguenot descent. The third commissioner was Sir Evelyn Wood. This commission had to settle the terms of peace, and the terms of peace implied the independence of the Transvaal, and the independence of the Transvaal implied that there were British subjects who would become Dutch citizens. Naturally, the commissioners were anxious as to what should be the position of these British subjects under the new regime, and naturally, the British commissioners negotiated upon this point. There were negotiations, and Mr. Kruger was questioned as to what would be the fate of the British subjects who then became Dutch citizens, and here is the answer which was given by Mr. Kruger. Sir Hercules Robinson, addressing himself to Mr. Kruger, said:

> Before annexation had British subjects complete freedom of trade throughout the Transvaal? Were they on the same footing as citizens of the Transvaal?
>
> Mr. Kruger—They were on the same footing as the burghers; there was not the slightest difference, in accordance with the Sand River Convention.
>
> Sir Hercules Robinson—I presume you will not object to that continuing?
>
> Mr. Kruger—No; there will be equal protection for everybody.
>
> Sir Evelyn Wood—And equal privileges?
>
> Mr. Kruger—We make no difference as far as burgher rights are concerned. There may, perhaps, be some slight difference in the case of a young person who has just come into the country.

That was on the 10th May, 1881, and a few

days later, on the 26th May, Dr. Jorissen explained what was meant by a young person.

According to our law a new-comer has not his burgher rights immediately. The words 'young person' do not refer to age, but to the time of residence in the republic. According to our old Grondwet, you had to reside a year in the country.

There you see all the rights of citizenship were reserved for British subjects and a residence of one year was enough to entitle them to these rights. But, my hon. friend knows that this pledge given by Mr. Kruger was not kept, that the rights of British subjects were abridged, that the period of probation which prevailed at that time was extended from one year to five years, from five years to ten years and from ten years to fourteen years. Naturally, this caused a great deal of comment and of complaint on the part of the men who had gone into the Transvaal at the instance, afterwards, of Mr. Kruger, to develop the country, who were taxed mercilessly, who founded cities over which they had no control whatever, and who, when they asked for the privileges of citizenship, were told that they could not have any. It is no wonder that the best men in the Transvaal and in South Africa protested against that treatment. My hon. friend has laid the blame of the war upon Mr. Chamberlain and the British government. It is not part of my duty to defend Mr. Chamberlain, who has shown that he can take care of himself upon every occasion It is not part of my duty to defend the British government, but I may say to my hon. friend with all frankness—and he knows the great friendship that I have for him—that, notwithstanding that friendship, the attitude which he has taken is so unfair and unjust to the British government that I deem it my duty to place the facts, which he had left to oblivion when he had brought that question up, before the House. Who is responsible for the war ? I deplore it as much as he does, but, I ask him again : Who is responsible for the war ? Is it the government of Great Britain ? Sir, the man who is responsible for the war is Mr. Kruger himself. He was the president of the South African republic. A great deal of light has been shed upon the Transvaal question by the correspondence found at Pretoria after its occupation by Lord Roberts. Amongst the ablest men in South Africa today is Sir Henry de Villiers, chief justice of Cape Colony. Amongst this correspondence letters written by Sir Henry de Villiers proved that in the summer of 1899, when negotiations were going on between Mr. Kruger and Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Henry de Villiers went almost on his knees to Mr. Kruger to induce him to make concessions to the Outlanders. Here is a letter which he wrote on the 21st May, 1899, addressed to Mr. Steyn, President of the Orange Free State :

I sometimes despair of peace in South Africa when I see how irritating and unjust the press is on the one side and how stubborn the Transvaal government is on the other. On my recent visit to Pretoria I did not visit the president, as I considered it hopeless to think of making any impression on him, but I saw Reitz, Smuts and Schalk, burghers, who, I thought, would be amenable to argument, but I fear that either my advice had no effect on them, or else there opinion had no weight with the president. I urged upon them to advise the president to open the Volksraad with promises of a liberal franchise and drastic reforms. It would have been so much better if these had come voluntarily from the government instead of being gradually forced from them. In the former case, they would rally the greater number of the malcontents around them; in the latter case, no gratitude will be felt to the republic for any concessions made by it. Besides, there can be no doubt that as the alien population increases, as it undoubtedly will, their demands will increase with their discontent, and ultimately a great deal more will have to be conceded than will now satisfy them. The franchise proposal made by the president seems to be simply ridiculous.

He goes on to say, and I call the attention of the House to this further part of Sir Henry de Villiers' letter :

I am quite certain that if in 1881 it had been known to my fellow-commissioners that the president would adopt his retrogressive policy, neither President Brand (Orange Free State) nor I would ever have induced them to consent to sign the convention. They would have advised the Secretary of State to let matters revert to the condition in which they were before peace was concluded; in other words, to recommence the war.

I ask the hon. member for Labelle to-day : Is not the conduct of the British government justified when Chief Justice de Villiers, himself a Boer, told President Steyn, in 1899, that, if he had conceived when he was acting as peace commissioner in 1881, that Mr. Kruger would so abuse the power vested in him, that, instead of advising the independence of the Transvaal, he would have advised the British government to go to war again ? There never was a greater justification of the policy maintained by the British government than this letter of Chief Justice de Villiers. I could go on multiplying these letters. There are four or five published in the same book which I have now in my hands, but I will give simply the letters of a man who is a friend of the Boers, Mr. Merriman, a member of the government of Mr. Schreiner, himself an Afrikander of extreme views. In 1888, Mr. Merriman wrote to President Steyn in these words :

One cannot conceal the fact that the greatest danger to the future lies in the attitude of the president, Kruger, and his vain hope of building up a state on the foundation of a narrow, unenlightened minority, and his obstinate rejection of all prospects of using the materials which lie ready to his hand to establish a true republic on a broad, liberal basis. The report of recent discussions in the Volksraad on his

finances and their mismanagement fill one with apprehension. Such a state of affairs cannot last; it must break down from inherent rottenness, and it will be well if the fall does not sweep away the freedom of all of us.

In another letter, written on the 1st of January, 1899, and addressed to President Steyn, again Mr. Merriman uses this very singular language :

I had the opportunity the other day of a long talk, or rather several talks, with Lippert about the Transvaal. He takes a very sane view of matters there, and is very hopeless. He represents Kruger—as others describe him—as more dogged and bigoted than ever, and surrounded by a crew of self-seekers who prevent him from seeing straight. He has no one to whom he turns for advice, and he is so inflated as to have the crazy belief that he (Kruger) is born to bring about peace between Germany and France. If he falls or dies, who have we to look to? All this plays the game of Rhodes and his brother capitalists.

In the last letter written just after the outbreak of hostilities, on November 14, 1899, to Mr. Piet De Wet, who was a member of the Cape legislature, Mr. Merriman said :

If the republics had not made the fatal mistake of sending the ultimatum when they did, things would have gone differently; but it is of no use going back on what might have been.

There was the mistake. It was the sending of this fatal ultimatum which brought all these calamities upon the Boers which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) deplores now. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the responsibility for this does not lie upon any other head than on the head of the late president of the Transvaal republic, who has himself been the first victim of his own doings. And notwithstanding all his faults, and notwithstanding that he has brought all this on his own head, considering his great age, I cannot help feeling for Mr. Kruger a great deal of sympathy. My hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) deprecates the war. I do not deprecate it to the same extent that he does ; but I do believe that it is, perhaps, the greatest calamity which has befallen England within the last forty years, because it places on England the burden and the duty of governing South Africa, with its two races estranged, perhaps for generations, by the cruel memories of war. But, Sir, even so, we must take the situation as it is. The problem of South Africa is this : That you have in that country two races so mixed and so intermingled that it is not possible to separate them. These two races must be governed by the same power and the same authority, and that power has either to be the power of England or the power of the Dutch. It has either to be the liberal and enlightened civilization of England of to-day, or the old bigoted and narrow civilization of the Dutch of two hundred years ago.

Let my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) forget for the moment that he and I are British subjects ; and in the name of civilization, in the name of humanity, I ask him which is the power that ought to govern in that distant land. Is it the enlightened power of England, or is it the semi-barbarous civilization of the Dutch

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is but one future for the Dutch. They have been conquered, but I pledge my reputation and my name as a British subject, that if they have lost their independence they have not lost their freedom.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is but one future for South Africa, and that future is a grand confederation on the pattern of the Canadian confederation. It is a federation in which Cape Colony and Natal, and the Orange Free State, and the Transvaal, and Rhodesia, shall be united together under a federal constitution, under the British flag, and under the sovereignty of England.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) will agree with me that when they have the British flag over South Africa, they shall have that which has been found everywhere, during the last sixty years, under the British flag : liberty for all, equality for all, justice and civil rights for English and for Dutch alike.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. For these reasons, I have to ask the House not to agree to this motion and to vote it down.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I had obtained the floor for the purpose of making a personal explanation in regard to an allusion made by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), and also for the purpose of making some remarks on the question before the House. While I do not suppose that a very large number of members agreed with my hon. friend, even among his own fellow-countrymen, and while perhaps it is not necessary to attach a very great degree of importance to the position he has taken, yet I think the question is one of such great importance that a full discussion upon it, now that it is under the consideration of the House, is not only proper, but in the highest degree desirable.

I can compliment the hon. member for Labelle upon his eloquence and his evident sincerity, although I do not feel able to pay as high a compliment to his discernment.

I think he is radically wrong, and I believe that the positions he advances are untenable. The hon. gentleman at the outset took the government to task for having acted in the matter of sending a contingent to South Africa without first having consulted parliament. Now, governments must in every case of emergency be prepared to assume responsibilities. Under our form of government the action taken by a ministry is subject to review by parliament, and if that action fails to command the assent and approval of parliament, the government of course suffers the consequences; and the government of my right hon. friend, in determining to send a contingent to South Africa, determined at the same time to assume all responsibilities and face all the consequences of that determination, and if they failed to secure the approval of parliament for their action, there was no course left open to them but to resign.

Then the hon. gentleman contended that we have a right to participate in the settlement of this war. Mr. Speaker, we are participating in the settlement of the war. The war is being settled exactly on the lines we desired when we sent our contingent to South Africa. Those troops were sent to South Africa to help to maintain the British cause, to assert the supremacy of Great Britain in that country; and if that object is secured and the rebellion suppressed, we are aiding in the settlement of the war upon the lines we designed.

The hon. gentleman also told us that it is desirable to settle this war upon principles that have made Canada happy and prosperous. That, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what the British government proposes to do. It proposes to settle this war upon the same principles that apply in the Dominion of Canada. It proposes to give to all classes in South Africa, whether they are Boers or English or Germans or Americans or natives —it proposes to give to every man, woman and child in South Africa the rights that pertain to British subjects under the law—the same rights enjoyed by His Majesty's subjects here in Canada. So my hon. friend's desire in that respect will be met.

The hon. gentleman will, I think, upon reflection, perhaps regret that he cast aspersions upon the conduct of British officers and British soldiers and upon the conduct of the British government in the management of this war, by comparing their career and conduct in South Africa to the conduct of Rome at the time her mercenary legions were guilty of ravage and rapine and all kinds of outrages. He tells us that our troops availed themselves of opportunities to burn and loot and turn out harmless and peaceful citizens from their homes. Sir, I must take exception to this assertion; I believe there is not a shadow of foundation for it. I believe the conduct of the British troops in South Africa has been marked in the highest degree by kindliness, by abstaining from outrage and violence, and, so far as the laws and the necessities of war would permit, by respecting the rights of combatants and inhabitants of the country.

The hon. gentleman proceeded to tell us that there is evidence that this war is growing unpopular, that there is a degree of public coldness manifested, that our soldiers when returning from South Africa do not receive that same effusive greeting which characterized their going forth. Well, I suppose it is a characteristic of warlike operations always and everywhere that men tire of the slaughter that is necessary, tire of the efforts and the sacrifices that it is necessary to make; and that is a test of the endurance of a nation—when it stands up under these untoward circumstances and pushes the contest through to the end. And while there may be a lack of that effusive enthusiasm which characterized public sentiment at the outset, there still remains that grim determination which will put this thing through to a triumphant issue.

The hon. gentleman gave expression to some criticisms about permitting recruiting in Canada—criticisms which were answered so magnificently by my hon. friend the leader of the government; and stated that this was not permitted in Australia. If I am not misinformed, the objection to recruiting in Australia was that the Australian government desired that the force raised in that country should be officered by Australians. There was no objection to recruiting there, but it was a mere question as to how the force should be officered.

The hon. gentleman desired to treat this question, not on the ground of the interests of the empire, but on the ground of Canadian interests. I would inquire whether it is possible to separate the interests of Canada from the interests of the empire. As long as we are a portion of the empire, as long as the British flag waves over Canada, our interests are identical with the interests of the empire; and the empire can suffer in no part, in no interest, in no manner whatever, without injuriously affecting our interests. We depend upon Great Britain to a great extent for our market. We sell to that country 64 per cent of our exports. The prosperity of the British Empire, its commercial and manufacturing prosperity, and its territorial integrity, are matters in which we are directly and intimately interested; and if we aid in maintaining the integrity of the empire, and in averting disaster from it, we are shaping our conduct on the lines of Canadian interest as well as upon the lines of Imperial interest. Then the hon. gentleman told us that he had a great admiration for Great Britain, but the Britain he loved was the peaceful, industrious, non-combative Britain; the Britain which flourished and grew by the exercise of the arts of peace. That is very well. But the steady, progressive, in-

dustrious Britain has risen to the position she occupies to-day by asserting her rights, by meeting her foes if necessary on the battlefield and triumphing over them ; she has reached the position she occupies to-day by guarding her rights and interests by the sword; and, while she is a peaceful nation and desires peace and desires to prosper by the avocations of peace, nevertheless she is a nation that must and will defend her rights. And, when the day comes when she has not the courage to defend her rights if necessary on the battlefield, the day will speedily follow when she will no longer be the progressive, the prosperous, the industrial Britain that the hon. gentleman tells us he admires.

Then, he advises us to go to the Boers with the olive branch and with the assurance of kind regards, if we want to end the war. Why, Mr. Speaker, attempts to carry the olive branch to the Boers, if I am not mistaken, have resulted even in the death of the envoys. Messages of peace have been sent, and overtures from the officers of the British army and from the Imperial authorities, representing to them the hopelessness of the struggle and urging upon them the fact that Britain was ready to grant them every privilege that could be enjoyed by British subjects. The envoys have been met, as white flags have been met, with mauser bullets. The only way to reach these men is to subdue them. There is no other course open than to put down the war and subdue the force of the Afrikander element in South Africa. Only when that is done can peace be restored to the country.

I was struck with the similarity of the views expressed by my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) and those expressed in a recent article by ex-President Benjamin Harrison. The ex-president, in dealing with foreign affairs, takes up the question of the war in South Africa. He takes the ground that the British were the aggressors, and he draws his comparison. He says that in Texas there may be an altercation between two men, and one of the men will say : I will not discuss this matter with you any longer, and reaches to his hip pocket for his revolver. The other man, anticipating his intention, gets, as they say there, the drop on his opponent and shoots him. The law and public opinion justify the man for killing the one who had attempted to draw his revolver. So, the ex-president says with regard to Britain in the Transvaal—the Dutchman commenced active hostilities by shooting first, but England was the aggressor, having reached for her revolver. A little later on I will deal with this view of the case, and I will prove that Britain had no intention of drawing her revolver, that she was merely putting herself in position to resist aggression, to prevent outrages upon her citizens, to resist invasion of her territory, and to defend her power in South Africa. The assumption of that position by Great Britain, I shall show later on led to the precipitation of hostilities by Kruger.

Now, it might be well, at the outset, to inquire, what are Britain's rights in South Africa ? That is a question of some importance. If Britain is in South Africa as an aggressor, if Britain is there as a robber, if her title is not good, then we might bestow upon the Boers a degree of sympathy that we would withhold from them under other circumstances. Now, England occupies South Africa, first, by right of conquest ; second, in consequence of a long period of occupation and discovery, and, thirdly, by purchase. She conquered South Africa in 1796 ; she ceded the country to the Netherlands in 1803 ; reoccupied it in 1806 ; and purchased the right of the Netherlands in South Africa in 1814 for the sum of £6,000,000 sterling. During her occupation of the country she has pressed forward the work of exploration and discovery. Livingstone, the great missionary—a man, by the way, whom the Boers hated, and whose library and effects they looted when he was absent on a missionary expedition to the natives of the interior—pushed discovery northward, and was the first to show that the idea that the interior of South Africa was a sandy desert was a mere mith. He found beautiful rivers, and fruitful and salubrious uplands. He reached the Zambesi, and discovered the great Mosi-oa-tunya fall ; pushed north and discovered Lake Nyassa ; later discovered Lake Tanganyika, and finally died on the shores of Lake Bangweolo. His explorations of the Zambesi were carried on under the auspices of the Royal Geographical Society, and there is hardly a foot of what is now known as Rhodesia that was not naturally secured by the explorations of Livingstone. Then, there were the discoveries of Cumming and many others. Britain does not occupy a foot of that country to which she has not a title of exploration and purchase as well.

From 1833 to 1837, the ' great trek,' as it is called, took place. A portion of the Dutch population of Cape Town were restive under British rule. They were slaveholders. They had the kind of religion which is taken from the old testament, if it is not enlightened by the spirit of the new. They believed in hewing Agag in pieces before the Lord ; they believed in exterminating the nations of Canaan ; they believed in making bondslaves of the sons of Ham. And so they trekked off to the remote wilderness, where they could own their negroes and manage their own affairs in their own way. In time civilization reached them, and there was contention in the Orange Free State, as represented by British institutions, and that of mediavilism, as represented by the institutions and ideas of the Boers. There was a contention in the Orange Free State. Finally, England abandoned that country, and gave it to the Dutch in 1854, the

Orange Free State thus becoming independent. The Transvaal never became independent. There was a collision between England and the Transvaal in 1881. There was a settlement in which British rights, I fear, were not stood up for as they ought to have been. But, by the terms of that settlement Britain retained the sovereignty over the Transvaal on a basis of suzeranity, settled by the conditions of a convention which gave her, perhaps, in some indefinite way, paramount authority over that country. And that paramount authority never was surrendered.

Now, after the incident at Majuba Hill and subsequent to 1884, England proceeded to acquire great territorial possessions in South Africa to the west and to the north of these two Dutch states. She acquired first of all Griqualand, then Bechuanaland, then Matabelaland, then Mashanoland, and that brought her possessions up to the Zambesi, extending from the Portuguese possessions on the east to the Portuguese possession on the west. She then pushed across the Zambesi and obtained what is known as Northern Zambesi, a vast country of over half a million square miles, a beautiful country, the finest inland country in Africa, not only a rich agricultural country, but a rich mineral country, with beautiful undulating hills 5,000 feet above the level of the sea, and a country rich in coal, in iron, in copper and in gold. This region of Northern Zambesi reached to Lake Nyassa on the west, 350 miles long, it reached to Lake Tangyneka on the north, 400 miles long. It swept around and embraced Bangineola lake about one-half the size of Lake Ontario. Now, all those who are familiar with South Africa are well aware that these acquisitions of territory are pregnant with the most important results in the future, for those vast, fertile and salubrious regions possess greater mineral wealth than any other section on the face of the globe. This region extends from the head of the Zambesi to a point about 300 miles from its mouth. England has secured from Portugal the right of way for railroads across Portuguese territory that intervened between this vast region and the Indian ocean on the west, and the right of the free navigation of the Zambesi.

Now, the Orange Free State and the Transvaal if assuming an attitude of hostility or unfriendliness to England could cut communication between Cape Town on the south and the vast and important region to the north which I have described. The extent of this great South African possession of England, aside from the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, was 1,350,000 square miles, or with the Orange Free State of 42,000 square miles, and the Transvaal with 114,000 square miles, which we now pronounce unhesitatingly to be British territory, this vast country embraces an area of 1,500,000 square miles.

Now, from a very early date the hostility of the Transvaal was manifested towards England. The Africkander Bond, as the organization is termed, which embraced the population of the Transvaal, the population of the Orange Free State, and a large portion of the Dutch population of Cape Town, aimed at securing supremacy in South Africa. The Bond was organized for that purpose. There was a deep laid plot, the purpose of which was to expel England from this vast region. The English colonial office was well aware of the existence and the purpose of this Bond, and of the danger that threatened British supremacy in South Africa in consequence of its machinations. About fifteen years ago gold was discovered in the Transvaal, and Mr. Kruger invited immigration. He promised to immigrants who came into that country equal rights, as we have been informed this afternoon by the leader of the government, equal rights to those of the burghers. Immigration poured in. It soon became apparent that this volume of immigration would be very large. It was feared, and there was good ground for the fear, that the Uitlander population, as it was termed, would outnumber the Boers, and very speedily a change of policy was adopted by Paul Kruger. The Uitlanders' rights were trampled upon, not at first perhaps, in a very flagrant manner; but these outrages became more and more pronounced as time passed on. During all this time, and especially after the rich mines of the Witwatersrand yielded Kruger a large amount, the Dutch Transvaal were making active and extensive preparations for war, were importing arms, were importing artillery, were importing munitions of war, and were erecting fortifications to command Johannesburg and Pretoria; and it was evident to any man who had ordinary power of observation that a crisis was impending.

The operations of Paul Kruger embraced a system of most onerous taxation. The output of gold in the Transvaal was taxed to the extent of about 35 per cent. These Uitlanders, it must be remembered, were mostly British subjects, and the South African republic about which we hear so much, was a republic only in name. It was an oligarchy ruled by a despot, a despot who had neither breadth of mind nor intelligence, as we count intelligence, but was a narrow, bigotted, stubborn old Dutchman, disregarding the rights of men in every respect where those rights stood in the road of the accomplishment of his own purposes. His course was marked year after year by an arbitrary disregard of the rights of the subjects of the Queen.

Now, I want to inquire, Mr. Speaker, whether, under these circumstances, we are to suppose that Great Britain, having supreme control under her right of suzerainty, was to stand idly and passively by and submit to the outrages upon their own subjects

without protest, or without attempt to remedy the difficulties that existed in the Transvaal? Between January, 1896, and December, 1898, Paul Kruger was guilty of the following abridgements of British liberty, and the following outrages upon the rights of the Uitlanders in the Transvaal:

First of all, he abolished the high court, which stood in the way of carrying out his arbitrary and unlawful purposes. Then he gagged the press; then public meetings were prohibited, and the Uitlanders, if they assembled in numbers of more than three or four together, were liable to arrest, and were arrested. Then the president took upon himself the power to expel from the Transvaal, by his own edict, any person he pleased, without any reference to an edict of the court, without any legal proceedings, without any reason whatever except his own will. Then military service was established, and the Uitlander was liable at twelve hours notice to take up arms on behalf of the government that was depriving him of all his rights, and to serve without pay, sundered from his family, dragged from his business, and put into the ranks of the Transvaal soldiery at twelve hours notice. Then the taxation of the municipal government was oppressive. The city of Johannesburg, with 100,000 inhabitants had 250 voters, and these voters were all Dutchmen. The taxes collected in that city for school purposes could only be applied in schools where the teaching was in the Dutch language; and the great proportion of the men who paid the taxes in that city were entirely disfranchised and were at the mercy of a few Dutch burghers who happened to reside in that city. Then taxation without representation was increased. New monopolies were established, dynamite monopolies, a monopoly of transportation, a gunpowder monopoly. Any business or anything in the Transvaal that could be made the subject of a monopoly for wringing money from the Uitlanders, was made a monopoly; and the money drawn from the Uitlanders in this way was squadered amongst the Dutch burghers. Then, the acquisition of the franchise was made impossible by the fact that when the Uitlander had lived in the Transvaal for fourteen years he could have the franchise if three-fourths of the burghers in the municipality where he lived voted that he should be invested with it. This condition made it absolutely impossible that any Uitlander, after residing fourteen years in the Transvaal, should exercise the right of the franchise.

Mr. GOURLEY. Then they would have shifted it instantly to twenty-four years.

Mr. CHARLTON. Every one of these outrages was the result of a settled, deliberate purpose on the part of Paul Kruger. What

was declared to be the purpose of the Afrikander Bond? I have a work here on the South African question by Mr. Bell and at page 31, I find this statement as to the purposes of this organization known as the Afrikander Bond:

The bond knows no other nationality but that of Afrikanders, considering everybody as such, no matter what his origin may be, who shall bind himself to advance the welfare and prosperity of South Africa.

The object of the Afrikander Bond is the establishment of a South African nationality by fostering true patriotism.

This object shall be attained by encouraging Afrikanders, from a political as well as a social point of view, to assert themselves as a nation: (a) by establishing this Bond in all the states and colonies, and by creating an organization throughout South Africa.

Now, this Afrikander Bond was hostile in every purpose and in every movement to British supremacy, or to the continuance upon any terms of British authority in South Africa. Paul Kruger declared in a despatch to the New York Tribune, to use his own words, that the trouble in South Africa

—was a struggle for supremacy in South Africa by a combination against the English.

There was talk about an independent federation of states, and Mr. Chamberlain, of whom we have heard a good deal to-day, in dealing with this question, made the following statement:

It is an inspiration which cannot be accepted by the people of this country, and until it is frankly abandoned, there cannot be a final and satisfactory settlement, but, short of this, we are ready now, as at all times, to give the fullest and most favourable consideration to the wishes and sentiments, even to the prejudices, of all parties in South Africa, and to co-operate with them in all measures for the good of the whole community.

Could anything more be asked than that, any broader or more liberal condition of settlement than this foreshadowed in the statement I have just quoted? Sir Alfred Milner, at the Bloemfontein conference, used the following language:

It is my strong conviction that if the government of the South African repupblic could now, before things get worse, of its own motion, change its policy towards the Uitlanders, and take measures calculated to content the reasonable people among them, who, after all, are a great majority, such a course would not only strengthen the independence of the republic, but it would make such a better state of feeling all round, that it would become far easier to settle outstanding questions between the two governments.

Again he says:

I know that the citizens of the South African republic are intensely jealous of British interference in their internal affairs. What I want to impress upon the president is, that if the government of the South African republic, of its own accord, from its sense of policy and

justice, would afford a more liberal treatment to the Uitlander population, this would not increase British interference, but would enormously diminish it. If the Uitlanders were in a position to help themselves, they would not always be appealing to us under the convention.

Later on he says :

No doubt it is a difficult business to get different races to pull together inside one body politic. That is the problem all over South Africa. But it is solved in other parts of South Africa more or less. It would be solved altogether and for ever, if the principle of equality could be established all round. It is the one state where inequality is the rule which keeps the rest in a fever. . . . . I see it suggested in some quarters that the policy of Her Majesty's government is one of aggression. I know better than any man that their policy, so far from being one of aggression, has been one of singular patience, and such, I doubt not, it will continue. But it cannot relapse into indifference.

True it is, Mr. Speaker, that the British policy in South Africa has been a policy of singular patience. Since Majuba, in 1881, the British government have borne and foreborne, and they never made an effort to place a military force in South Africa until rebellion had reared its crest, until two states had given unmistakable signs of an intent to raise the flag of rebellion against British authority. Well, the Bloemfontein conference was held, the negotiations failed and wrongs went on unredressed. Then came the ultimatum to which the Prime Minister has referred this afternoon, issued upon the 9th October, 1899, and I think it well, Mr. Speaker, to place the demands of this ultimatum upon record in this House. This ultimatum, in two instances, spoke of the independence of the Transvaal republic being threatened. The ultimatum was as follows :

That all points of mutual difference shall be regulated by the friendly course of arbitration, or by whatever amicable way may be agreed upon by this government with Her Majesty's government.

That the troops on the borders of this republic shall be instantly withdrawn.

That all reinforcements of troops which have arrived in South Africa since June 1, 1899, shall be removed to the sea coast, with an assurance that they will be removed from South Africa within a reasonable time, to be agreed upon with this government, and with a mutual assurance and guarantee on the part of this government that no attack upon or hostilities against any portion of the possessions of the British government shall be made by the republic during further negotiations within a period of time to be subsequently agreed upon between the governments, and this government will, on compliance therewith, be prepared to withdraw the armed burghers of this republic from the borders.

That Her Majesty's troops which are now on the high seas shall not be landed in any port of South Africa.

Well, this is a refreshing piece of assurance, a refreshing piece of impudence. One wonders, in the light of subsequent events, what the burghers of the Transvaal and what Mr. Reitz, the Secretary of State, who penned this ultimatum, imagined the feelings of the British government would be—the troops on the borders of the republic to be instantly withdrawn, troops that had been landed since June 1st, of that year to be sent to the sea coast, troops then on their way from Great Britain to South Africa to be diverted from their destination and sent somewhere else. Why, the most powerful nation of Europe, the greatest empire in the world, would not have ventured to dictate an ultimatum of that character to a first or even a second rate power. This ultimatum left no doubt—if doubt had previously existed—of the tendency and the trend of events and the inevitable struggle that was at hand. And immediately upon the issuing of this ultimatum, the Orange Free State wheeled into line. There was concerted action between the Orange Free State and the Transvaal. It was perfectly well understood that the two were to act in concert, and the sympathy of a very large portion of the Dutch inhabitants of Cape Town were in the same direction. Then came the invasion of Natal following almost immediately by the investment of Ladysmith, Kimberley and Mafeking, and the annexation, as the right hon. the First Minister told us this afternoon, of British territory to the Orange Free State. Then came the flight of the refugees, which was characterized by the infliction of great cruelty and barbarity on the part of the Dutch inhabitants of the Transvaal. Here is one little incident mentioned in the work of Mr. Bell :

The cause of the assaults was that the refugees left the trucks or carriages for the purpose of obtaining sustenance on their long and painful journey. For this they were lashed and assaulted by armed Boers of the Free State, although they offered no provocation, and although no state of war existed between the republics and Great Britain. Women in the crowded trucks, in some instances, gave birth to children, passengers were spat upon, and in one case, of which I have particulars, the father of a thirsty child was beaten back to the train, only to witness the death of his child from thirst, although water was obtainable at the station at which he endeavoured to procure it.

This is a specimen among many that might be cited of the atrocities that were perpetrated by these men, on whom the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) expends his sympathies, the Boers of South Africa.

The issue, whatever the hon. member for Labelle may believe, of this war, has been from the outset plain and clearly defined. The issue has been and is to-day : Is South Africa to be Dutch or British ? That is the issue, and there is no middle ground between these two conditions. South Africa must be the one or the other. If we insist upon staying in that country, it will be British, but if my hon. friend from Labelle has his way, it

will be Dutch, and we will retire from South Africa in disgrace.

England's South African Empire is a possession of such importance that no nation in the world would permit its surrender without a struggle to the death. Its possibilities are untold. From the Witswaterrand 11,000,000 pounds stirling in gold were extracted the last year before the war, and it was estimated that £25,000,000 or £30,000,000 annually would be extracted in a few years to come. The wealth in that mining region is not a tithe of the wealth of gold possessed by this country. The region of Mashonaland and Matabelleland is the old Ophair, with vast indications of ancient mining—drifts, shafts, ruins, indications of the operations of the ancient miner in days gone by upon a very extensive scale. The country abounds in reefs of gold, rich gold washings, and in copper and iron. I repeat that no portion of the world is as rich in mineral treasure as southern Zambesi or the region north of the Transvaal. The value of this country cannot be computed. There is not only the value of these 1,500,000 square miles, but there is the probability of great future expansion in that region. England has a scheme of running a railway from the cape to Cairo, a distance of 5,000 miles, and the time will speedily come when she will bridge the gap between the head of Lake Pangauska and Uganda by acquisition of a strip of territory of the Congo Free State on the west side of Lake Pangauska and have territorial possessions from end to end of Africa.

To permit the independence of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State would be to place in Central South Africa a hostile barrier to all England's communications between the north and south. The law of preservation has decided the attitude which England must necessarily be compelled to take, and there will be in the future no more incidents like Majuba Hill, and the surrender of the Soudan, when Gordon was killed at Kartoum, but Great Britain will hold a firm grip upon the possessions she already has and obtain more as circumstances permit, and the more she obtains the better for the interests of humanity. The struggle of course has been a costly one, but the result is inevitable. The war perhaps has lasted longer than many of us anticipated, but it is practically ended, and whatever it may have cost in treasure and in life, the result is more than adequate for the cost that has been incurred. There is evidence that the Dutch Boers and prisoners realize that they have been made victims of misplaced confidence and are disposed to condemn the Afrikander Bond and the leaders who have precipitated upon the country grievous disasters, which have culminated in the capturing of these thousands of men who are now prisoners.

A Dominion of South Africa will be the realization, in all probability, of the near future, a dominion, where these states will be confederated provinces, where this Boer population, now discordant and hostile, will settle down into peaceful and loyal citizens. We have already in history one instance of the absorption of a Dutch colony—the colony of New Amsterdam forming now the state of New York. This colony was conquered by England. The same bitter hostility existed among the New Amsterdam Dutch that exist to-day in the Transvaal and Orange Free State, but this population became assimilated with the Anglo-Saxon and merged with the other population of the United States. The Knickerbocker element in New York is distinct to-day to some extent from the other elements, but it is as thoroughly loyal, thoroughly Americanized, thoroughly English—speaking in the broad sense—as any element in the United States, and the same results will be produced in the case of the Dutch element in the Cape Colony, the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. It will be one of the great works in which England is engaged to assimilate, to render the different elements of the population homogeneous, to introduce amity and goodwill among them by the influence of British institutions which will give to all these people their rights, under which no one will have the advantage over another, but all will be equal before the law—all British subjects, secure in the possession of their rights and property. These very misguided Afrikanders will in the near future realize the mistake they made in resisting an authority which will confer upon them blessings such as they have never enjoyed or even dreamed of in the past.

These contrasts exist to-day between the purposes of those two elements. The Boer leader desires to oppress the British, the British leader desires to grant every human and every natural right to the Boer. I do not need to dwell upon the impertinence of this resolution which professes to instruct England in the proper course for that great nation to pursue in the settlement of a matter with which we really have no direct connection. The effect upon our interests in Canada of our participation in this struggle has been most salutary and beneficial. Canada has secured a recognition from the world at large that she never had before. The world realizes that in this vast region north of the United States there is growing up a nation; the world realizes that this country now has a population which possesses energy and courage and devotion to the interests of the empire, and is worthy of respect and worthy of consideration. The cost of sending the contingents from Canada to South Africa is infinitely more than recouped to this country by the beneficial influences which are the result of that action, and which will redound in so

many ways to the credit and to the advantage of the Dominion. Our interest in this matter is a direct one. It is not a matter of pure sentiment, although sentiment had much to do with it, but our material interests are of a character to have rendered the participation of Canada in this struggle a natural thing to do. As I have said, England is our great market. We can only maintain that market by maintaining the power and the prestige and the prosperity of the empire that affords it. We have been driven to seek that market. We have been driven from the markets of the United States. We market to-day $70,000,000 worth of farm products in Britain out of a total of $80,000,000 that we produce. We cannot afford to lose that market, and it is a matter of the most vital importance to Canada that England and all her interests shall be maintained inviolate. And so it goes beyond the sphere of sentiment and comes down to the sphere of actual material interests, when we take our position as a portion of the British Empire and are prepared to bear our share of the sacrifices, and of the cost in blood and treasure, if that be necessary, for the defence of those interests. The integrity and the glory of this empire is our individual interest. We have a sentimental interest, but speaking from the low standpoint of material interest alone we cannot afford to see Britain's career in Africa, or in any other quarter of the globe, hampered or made to fail. These, Mr. Speaker, in brief, are some of the thoughts I wish to present to this House in reference to this great question which has been brought up for discussion to-night in the manner in which it has.

In dismissing this question, I wish to refer to a personal matter. My warrant for doing so is an insinuation or direct charge rather, made by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). I am sorry, Sir, to trouble the House or to take up the time of the House with a matter of such trivial consequences to the country as the one I am about to allude to, and I shall allude to it as briefly as possible. My hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) with an evident animus that did not indicate the possession of the most friendly kind of feelings, referred to the report that has been circulated with regard to an alleged utterance of mine during the late election in a speech made at Delhi, in the north riding of Norfolk. I suppose I need hardly say to members of this House that in the heat of an extempore speech upon the hustings, men sometimes undoubtedly make use of expressions which, if they had time to carefully weigh their words, and had an opportunity afterwards to revise their speech, would appear in a different shape before the public. At times the reporter who is giving a synopsis of the speech may unintentionally convey a false impression or an impression not warranted by the language of the speaker. He may at times misunderstand the speaker. The speaker may in the hurry and excitement of an extempore speech fail to express in language exactly the idea that he intended to convey. In the speech in question, if I remember correctly, I distinctly made the statement in reply to the chairman, that I disclaimed any intention to cast an aspersion or an insinuation upon the loyalty of my French Canadian fellow-citizens. This House is no doubt aware that I have on different occasions spoken highly of the loyalty of the French Canadians? I remember upon one occasion referring to their loyalty, when thirteen years after the conquest of Canada an attempt was made at the time of the revolt of the thirteen colonies to detach them from their allegiance to Great Britain, and when that attempt signally failed. The French Canadians then, with only thirteen years experience of British rule, proved steadfast and true in their allegiance to the institutions of England. I have spoken of their loyalty upon other occasions. On the 5th day of March, 1900, in conection with an attack made in this House upon my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) growing out of certain incidents that arose in the riot at Montreal, I referred to this question, and without quoting from that speech, I ask my French Canadian fellow-members to do me the kindness to read the speech which is reported in 'Hansard' of the 5th of March. I state here now that that speech expresses my sentiments and that I stand by the assertions made therein.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, the great importance of maintaining friendly relations between the diverse races in this Dominion. I realize that the man who would do anything to disturb these friendly relations; the man who would wantonly create bitterness and friction is an enemy of his country. I realize that we must go on together side by side and hand in hand in the development of Canada, if we are to make a success of the experiment of British institutions on this North American continent. Of course I am not of French descent; I am an Anglo Saxon; I am a Protestant, and all I ask is to have my own particular views respected and be allowed to entertain them, while I grant equally and fully the same privileges to the man who does not agree with me. We have got to build up our institutions upon the broad basis of civil and religious liberty. We cannot make religious tests here, and a few days ago I spoke from this point of view in a manner which will clearly indicate the position I take with regard to religious tests and declarations which are offensive and unfair to any body of Christians, or any sect in the Dominion of Canada or in the British Empire. But, Sir, I say again that in taking this position I surrender no tenet that I hold, no principle that I entertain, and I ask no other man to surrender any of his. I repeat that I ask of him to respect my rights under the broad principle of civil and religious liberty, and I

pledge to him that I will endeavour to respect his. So much for that point.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question as to whether, in the speech referred to, I gave expression to the opinion that it would be a good idea to have a British garrison at Quebec, I say I did express that opinion; and the difficulty arises when there is attributed to me, for the expression of that opinion, the belief that disloyalty in Quebec rendered such a step necessary. It was not upon such a ground that I expressed the opinion that it would be a good thing in the interest of Canada to have a garrison at Quebec. On the contrary, Sir, I believe it would be in the interest of all Canada to have the great strategic position of Canada garrisoned.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. Mr. Tarte). Why not Toronto ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Why not Toronto, or any other place ? Why should it be taken as an imputation on the loyalty of any place that a garrison is stationed there ? Is it any imputation on the loyalty of Halifax that there is a garrison there? Is it any imputation on the loyalty of Victoria that there is a garrison at Esquimalt ? I would make Quebec the military headquarters of the Dominion ; I would put the arsenal of the country there for the store of arms ; I would make that citadel an impregnable stronghold. I would do it for the purpose of bringing into contact with the French Canadians influences that would have a tendency to make the two races better acquainted with each other—for the purpose of letting the French Canadians see the British flag, mingle with British officers, and enjoy the social relations that would naturally grow out of that circumstance. I go further : I believe in making Quebec—and I hope the Minister of Public Works will pardon me—the great commercial centre of this Dominion ; and I think my hon. friend the premier understands that to be my belief——

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON——for I once waited upon him with a delegation for the express purpose of promoting the commercial interests of Quebec. It seems to me absurd to dig a hole in the bottom of Lake St. Peter, when we have a harbour 130 miles further down the river, which can be kept open two or three months longer than the harbour of Montreal, possibly the whole year. Vessels from Port Colborne can go to Quebec as well as to Montreal to transfer their cargoes to deep-draught ocean steamers.

So, upon commercial, social and political grounds, I am in favour of making the city of Quebec the headquarters of the military system of Canada, and the commercial headquarters of Canada, bringing it great prosperity, running a railway line to James Bay, and diverting the trade of that region and of other regions to Quebec by through lines to the interior, and centering at Quebec great resources, great buisness interests, great prosperity, and a great population. What will be the effect of that, in a political sense ? It cannot do otherwise than accelerate that process of assimilation and the creation of that homogeneity and affinity which we all desire, and which must be the precursor of the full exercise of the powers of the Dominion in the line of progress. It always makes me sad to reflect that there are, perhaps, a million people in Quebec who cannot speak the English language, who are deprived of the opportunity to test their powers, who are deprived of the opoprtunity to make headway in the world, who cannot do justice to themselves because they are not in touch with the race which has the commercial transactions, the business transactions and the capital.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I did give utterance to the opinion that there should be a British garrison in Quebec, for the purpose of bringing into contact with each other, to the extent that a garrison would do so, the two branches of the population. Quebec ! Why, I have love for Quebec, Mr. Speaker. Queenly Quebec, beautiful for situation, with its white hamlets and its green fields, surrounded by its mountains ; Quebec, the impregnable old fortress ; Quebec, the strategic centre of North America, Quebec, the gateway of the north, at the foot of whose citadel-crowned promontory the waters of the great inland fresh water seas and the Atlantic mingle, and from whose harbour there extends westward the shining pathway over which her early explorers and voyagers sought the far west and founded the French posts around in the rear of the English settlements along the Atlantic. Historical Quebec, where one of the great epochs of history was wrought out, and the hand of fate decreed that the course of an empire should be changed. I should not like to contemplate the possibility or the probability of retaining that grand historic spot as a city where there would continue to be ten speaking French to one speaking English—as a city which would not fulfil the destiny which Providence designed for it. I want to see Quebec the great centre of this Dominion, in commerce, in wealth, in activity ; one of the great factors in assimilating the two populations whose united efforts, if they do unite, will be so conducive to the prosperity, the wealth and the advancement of Canada.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that these explanations which I have made with regard to this matter will set at rest the aspersion which has been levelled against me, that I insinuated that we wanted a garrison at Quebec because, forsooth, we wanted to keep a disloyal population overawed and in order. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that under all the

circumstances it would have been just as prudent for me, at the time that speech was made, to have said nothing about a garrison at Quebec; it gave opportunity for misconception. If I were making the speech again, I would no doubt avoid saying anything about it. But, nevertheless, I do not take back water, and I am in favour of putting a garrison at Quebec, centering railroads there, centering business there, and making Quebec a great business and social centre.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). Mr. Speaker, I really do not think I should interfere in the little family party that has been going on this afternoon on the other side of the House. We first find the very eloquent and charming member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) introducing a rather radical resolution. Then, we find the right hon. premier coming on with his silver-tongued oratory, completely setting at nought the arguments of the young member for Labelle; and I must congratulate the right hon. gentleman on the very excellent, patriotic and really loyal speech he made. Then, we find our good friend, the independent member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), coming on to-night, and, I believe, from his conclusion, that the real object of his speech was to square himself for a speech which he delivered on a previous occasion. He says that if he had to do it over again, he would not deliver that speech. I have heard it whispered that that speech won him a very easy election. Inasmuch as it has been referred to, I have a copy of that speech, which I will read to the House, in order to let the House see whether the speech in question has justly caused this little turmoil or not. It is taken from the Toronto Globe, of October 20, 1900. The hon. gentleman starts out in that pious manner which is characteristic of him, by saying :

God forbid that he should say anything against the French or call their loyalty into question, but he could not be ignorant of the fact that the tri-colour is shown in Quebec a thousand times where the Union Jack is shown once. These people look back with regret to the time when the empire passed from the hands of France to England, and the history of North America was changed, and while he would not abridge one iota the privilege the French Canadian possesses or insinuate aught as to his loyalty, yet he would say that the safety of Canada lay in Anglo-Saxon hands, and realizing that, he felt it would not be improper to have a British garrison stationed in Quebec——

Mr. BOURASSA. To make it a commercial centre, or perhaps apply the provisions of his Seduction Bill.

Mr. HUGHES (reading)—

—ready at any moment to assert British authority under any circumstances or emergencies that might arise.

Did I hear some one say something about commercial union ?

Mr. BOURASSA. I said it was to make of Quebec a commercial centre, or perhaps apply the provisions of his Seduction Bill.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I thought it was a commercial union that was spoken of. However, I was glad to hear to-night the right ring from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and I was sorry this afternoon to hear the hon. member for Labelle waste his eloquence in the way he did. I thought that he would have presented the other side of the question—because every question has two sides—in a logical manner, and one characteristic of that hon. gentleman on most occasions ; but I think the House will agree with me that little pickings from newspapers here and there, up and down the country, could not be considered argument in any sense. I trust, however, that he will see the error of his ways, and that when another session rolls on we will find him on the floor of the House using his splendid eloquence along the right lines, in building up the British Empire and defending everything noble in the cause of humanity.

Had it not been for one or two statements, I would not have spoken to-night, because a short time ago I spoke in this House, at considerable length, on this question from a historical standpoint. My hon. friend stated that Britain was unable to find recruits for her forces in South Africa, and therefore had to call on the colonies. But surely my hon. friend, who has evidently been reading the papers very assiduously, must have found out in the course of the last few weeks, in the English and Canadian newspapers, items by the score, showing that Great Britain does not know what to do with the number of men who have volunteered to serve in South Africa.

I was very sorry to hear the hon. gentleman this afternoon join in the slanders that have been cast at the British troops in South Africa. He referred to the conduct of British soldiers in insulting women. I was more than pained to hear a member of this House, who should have been inspired by the chivalric instincts characteristic of the race from which he springs, speak the way he did. The city of Ottawa has furnished an instance of how these slanders have arisen and how they have been utilized by the pro-Boer party in England. We have Lieutenant Morrison, an officer in the artillery, of this city, quoted all over the United States and the British Empire as having written certain things slandering the British troops, showing how cruel they have been in their treatment of the Boer women and children. Yet we find that Lieutenant Morrison was misquoted, and when what he did say was put alongside of the garbled version of his utterances, the conduct of those who circulated the slander is clearly shown to the light.

Let me give an instance that came under my own personal notice when in South Africa. One of the officers in command at one of the stations received a letter from a Boer lady, whose husband had been one of

the chief members of the war committee, and was a prisoner. She complained that her house had been broken into the previous evening, and that she had been insulted by two British soldiers. The matter was taken promptly in hand and a patrol visited the place. There was not found the slightest sign of the house having been broken into, and when questioned the woman said that it was not her house, but a neighbour's. Her letter was produced, in which she had alleged that it was her own house, but she pleaded that she had written it in a state of great excitement, and had intended to say it was her neighbour's, a woman by the name of Mrs. Schalkurjk. A visit was made to the neighbour's house, and Mrs. Schalkurjk told the patrol that her only ground for saying her house had been broken into was that two soldiers had stopped there the previous evening, as they rode by, and made some inquiries. These men had never offered the slightest word of insult, yet this woman had the hardihood to write to the officer in charge of the station that her house had been broken into and herself insulted. All these facts are on record, but if that story had been allowed to go uncontradicted it would have afforded campaign material to be utilized by gentlemen of the views of my hon. friend from Labelle.

That hon. gentleman spoke of the failure of the British army in South Africa. Well, I took occasion recently in this House to point out that the rule in war is that one man behind a fortification breast high is equal to eight or ten advancing against him. And when instead, the ordinary fortification on the plain, you have fortified the mountain fastnesses and kopjes, you can quadruple the strength which each defender has against the enemy. The House must not forget also that Great Britain was upwards of 7,000 miles from the scene of hostilities, and had to transport men and materials all that distance. Hon. members must equally bear in mind that the Boers had 95,000 men in the fighting line, and in order to cope against a force of that size, with all the advantages in their favour that the Boers possessed, Great Britain required to have about 500,000 or 600,000 men in the fighting line. But, instead, she had less than 325,000 men. Little disasters did occur, as will occur in any war, but in the history of the world the qualities shown by the British army in South Africa have never been surpassed. I do not pretend that the generalship on all occasions has been good, but there never has been a war yet where it has always been good, and there never will be. But the fighting qualities of the British soldier, and the general success of the British arms, have never been surpassed, when we consider the difficulties under which the troops laboured.

The hon. gentleman has referred to New Zealand and New South Wales. I like to believe him honest, for I think he intends to be, but he must know as well as any man in Canada that New Zealand has repeatedly sent contingents to Africa, and New South Wales has sent five contingents to fight there.

Mr. BOURASSA. But no policemen.

Mr. HUGHES. New South Wales sent five men to one sent by Canada.

Mr. BOURASSA. Soldiers, not police.

Mr. HUGHES. These policemen whom we are sending are to be in the service of His Majesty, and not in the service of the colonial government, and may be utilized for fighting purposes if necessary.

I take this opportunity of summing up my hon. friend's position. He is always ready to give advice to Great Britain. The other day he wanted to amend the coronation declaration. Then, some years ago, he voted in favour of the motion, asking that home rule be granted to Ireland ; but he accepts the advantages of the British consular service ; he benefits by the guarantee of the British Empire for the Canadian loan in the money markets of the world ; he profits by the advantage to Canada in the guaranteeing of her national debt, and by the expenditure of British capital in the development of this country.

But he, as a French Canadian, and his fellow-countrymen, enjoy under British rule liberties and advantages that they could not have under any other country that ever existed on God's green earth. And yet, while he enjoys the protection of Britain's army and navy throughout the world, he stands in this House and slanders His Majesty's soldiers fighting the battles of the empire in South Africa. And he says we must not fight. That is not the kind of patriot we want. That is the kind of patriot we saw in France at the close of the eighteenth century ; for instance, in Robespierre, one of those gentry who would weep if he trod on the foot of a cat, one of these tender-hearted men who, did not believe in quarrelling, but who preached the doctrines advocated by my hon. friend from Labelle, and who brought France to the position of which the poet speaks when he says :

> But France got drunk with blood to vomit crime,
> And fatal have her saturnalia been
> To Freedom's cause in every age and clime.

Liberty is not secured or advanced by the doctrines preached by the hon. gentleman this afternoon. I shall not go into the details of the causes of the Boer trek. I spoke of that here the other night. We are told by the hon. gentleman that the Boers trekked from Cape Colony on account of British tyranny. They trekked because Britain freed the slave, because the Wilberforce Act passed in Great Britain had freed the slaves wherever the British flag flew. The

credit of British discovery was not due, as my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said it was primarily, to Livingstone, because he had not reached there when this work was begun by Moffat and other devoted missionaries who had preceded the Boers on the fertile lands beyond the Orange river and the Vaal. It was through the discoveries of these men that the Boers knew that to the north there was pasture land infinitely better than the barren karroo in the southern part of Cape Colony. The Boers trekked to escape British taxation, or rather that they might have the levying of taxes themselves. As one of themselves puts it, the Boer believes in no taxation except that levied by himself on the British and the Kaffirs. They trekked there that they might see no other white man's smoke, and that they might lay the foundation of a Boer republic with Durban as its seaport. And history from that day to this proves that the Boer has never given up his hope of driving the British into the sea. As I pointed out on a previous occasion, the lack of a seaport in South Africa was Britain's weakness there. In 1795 and 1796 no less than 1,500 British merchantmen were captured by French cruisers operating from Mauritius alone, this being made possible by the fact that Britain had no naval base in South Africa. The fact that Britain must have a naval base in that country makes it absolutely necessary that the country in the rear must be friendly ; and for that, if for no other reason, Britain must control the whole of South Africa from the Zambesi to the sea. I fully expected that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) would enter into the causes of the war. Both the leader of the House and the member for North Norfolk have pointed out the disabilities under which the Outlanders laboured. But there was one reason, chief of all, to which these hon. gentlemen did not refer. The American war of Independence was in the main an assertion of the principle that there shall not be taxation without representation. That principle was ruthlessly violated in the Transvaal, and that fact alone was sufficient justification for the Outlanders to resist and for Britain to step in to the assistance of her people. There is another point—in 1877, when Britain annexed the country, Kruger could not pay his own taxes. But to-day he is worth more than Her Majesty was at the time of her death. And Kruger's sons and grandsons, as has been aptly said by a prominent Afrikander, possess more power in South Africa than Queen Victoria's sons and grandsons do in Great Britain. Notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) says in his speech, the last thing that Kruger and his oligarchy wanted was an independent republic. Kruger knew that the moment that the people had a voice in the management of affairs, that moment he and his oligarchy would disappear. Why, in that whole country, there were only 15,000 voters—not as many as in one ward in the city of Toronto. Here was the real motive that was at the root of many poor fellows being brought into the war. The agitators held out before them the vision of Kruger's wealth and told them : Let the Boers join us in a republic and you will soon become wealthy out of her mines too. They went to those farmers who were in debt to mortgagees or shopkeepers—nearly all the money being owed to English people—and said to them : Join us in this war and when it is over your debts will be wiped out, for we shall drive the English into the sea. They commandeered the poor people. On every farm there were a number of poor whites. I reasoned with some of the women folk of these poor people. I remember one family, three of whose men were slain one morning. Reasoning with the women as to why they had allowed their men to go to war, their answer was something like this : Even in times of peace we are slaves, we have not laid by enough to move us to the next town much less resist these burghers or to take an independent stand against them ; they have the power over us even in times of peace. How much more is their power when martial law is declared ? For, Mr. Speaker, this territory had all been annexed to the Free State or the Transvaal and the condition of these poor people was worse than slavery. There were some Boers who were patriotic, who fought for what they regarded as a principle ; but their patriotism was of the negative kind—they fought rather for hatred of Great Britain than for love of their fellows. I agree with much that has been said with relation to these people. I am sorry that my hon. friend did not do them justice. They are a great people, and when they become civilized, when they come in contact with the people of the world I am perfectly satisfied they will make a great race. History shows them to be descended from the greatest races the world has ever seen, the Huguenots of France and the Dutch—races that resisted tyranny for ages. Yet, as soon as the Huguenots reached South Africa they were persecuted by these very Dutchmen, and were compelled to give up their language and adopt the manners and customs of the Boers. Consider how the Kaffirs are treated by the Boers. A Kaffir dare not walk upon the sidewalk, but must take the middle of the road. He could not own an acre of land ; he must not carry on a trade in vegetables ; until two years ago he could not be married legally. More than that, he had to be attached to some baas and wear a bandage on his arm with his number on it. If he did not wear this bandage, he might be arrested and be made a slave of the state. The system has not always worked very creditably, for they really had indirect slavery in the Transvaal. However, I will not go into these details.

Reference has been made here to-night to the reception accorded to the soldiers re-

turning from South Africa. I want to tell the hon. member for Labelle, that the returned soldiers do not look for receptions. The soldiers who went to South Africa realize that they have done their duty, and that is all the reward they look for. No doubt many hon. gentlemen present have read this old adage :

When war's proclaimed, and danger's nigh,
'God and the soldier,' is the cry ;
When war is over, and wrongs are righted,
God is forgotton and the soldier slighted.

The soldier realizes this, and he looks for no favours. He knows that there are people in any community, especially a community such as this, who oppose soldiering in any form; he knows he will get no sympathy from them. He knows, moreover, that for every one who went off to the front there were fifty others anxious to go, and these will naturally look with a little jealousy if exceptional favours should be showered upon those returning. As a consequence, if he is a sensible soldier, he will, on coming home, go back to his business, and by respecting himself endeavour to command the respect of the community. I tell my hon. friend from Labelle that he would do himself credit, he would do credit to the chivalrous race to which he belongs, were he to rise in his place to-night and ask the indulgence of this House while he retracted the foul slander that he has cast upon the British soldier in South Africa for his conduct towards women. I say he would command the respect of this House and of the people of this country also, were he to retract the foul slanders which he has cast upon the soldiers of His Majesty in calling them loyal murderers. I trust my good friend will accept these suggestions and act accordingly. I could quote copious extracts from Afrikanders and Boers to refute the slanders of the hon. gentleman; because all Boers are not disloyal. Many have been loyal to Britain, and have fought manfully for the British flag in South Africa, and have spoken manfully, and used their efforts in every way to put an end to this unhappy war. But it is not necessary to quote these extracts under the circumstances, inasmuch as the hon. gentleman made no attempt to defend his assertions. I have merely taken this opportunity to reply to the hon. member for Labelle on account of his slandering of British soldiers.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (Elgin). Inasmuch as I have a resolution on the paper which has a bearing upon the question now before the House, I shall content myself with saying only a few words. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) spoke this afternoon for something over two hours, and although he spoke loudly, it was difficult for me to learn all his sentiments, but I did learn sufficient to convince me that his sentiments are not the same as my own.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

I think that the time of this House has been taken up this afternoon to very little purpose, and I do not think that any good can come to this country from the discussion that has taken place. The hon. gentleman from Labelle told us how loyal he was, how much he loved Britain for her noble traits, for the character of her sons, for the noble work she has done in civilization, and in carrying the standard of freedom, of liberty and of justice over the world. He told us how much he loved her for all this, yet he has moved this resolution condemning Britain for making war on those republics, and condemning her for refusing them their independence. He has been ably answered by the Prime Minister, who has shown very clearly why the people of the Transvaal and of the Orange Free State are not entitled to their independence. Sir, as an Englishman and as a Canadian I would have been very sorry if England had not accepted the challenge that was thrown down to her by the Boers when they gave her only forty-eight hours to leave South Africa with the alternative of being driven into the sea. I say if Great Britain had not accepted that challenge, I should have been ashamed to call myself an Englishman.

Now, Sir, I think we all appreciate what Britain has done for the world, and like the premier we love that dear old flag that has braved the battle and the breeze for a thousand years. Sir, when any one tells me that the French Canadians are not loyal to Britain I deny it emphatically. There may be a few exceptions, as we have seen here to-night; but since 1763, when the treaty of Paris was signed, there was never known a French Canadian, with one or two exceptions, who was not loyal. Through good report and through evil report they have stood true and loyal to Britain. Sir, what I dislike above all is to hear hon. gentlemen get up in this House and use so much vituperation against Britain.

Now, as to the first clause of this resolution I think it has been answered already by the hon. gentlemen who have spoken. But the second clause of that resolution has not been answered, and I intend to answer it. If the parents or the ancestors of the hon. member for Labelle had held the same ideas that he holds, that gentleman would not be here to-night to move his resolution, because it was only brave men who dared to go across the seas in a desire to improve their condition, and their descendants are here to-day. I tell him that unless his forefathers had more spirit, more pluck and more venturesomeness than he is willing to give Canadians credit for he would not have been here. Therefore, I think I have answered that objection. Now, why do we love the British Empire ? Because it has for a thousand years stood the test, and it will stand the test if we be true to ourselves. You know well the proud empires

that have gone to destruction. The deadliest foe always come from within. I wish to put myself on record as protesting against such a resolution as this being introduced into this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the House ready for the question ?

Mr. BOURASSA. I shall not abuse my right to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) has no right to reply.

Mr. BOURASSA. Is this not a motion ?

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no right to reply on a motion in amendment to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BOURASSA. I will submit to your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, there are one or two words that I would like to address to the House in regard to this motion. I think there is a great deal of point in what my hon. friend (Mr. Robinson, Elgin), who has just spoken, has brought to the attention of the House. It is that this resolution was very unnecessarily introduced, and that we really have wasted a whole day in this House without any possible benefit, so far as I can see, that can in any way accrue from the introduction of the resolution. I am bound to assume that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) intended some good by this resolution ; I am bound to assume that, because I have the pleasure of that hon. gentleman's acquaintance, and I have seen nothing of him which would induce me to think that he brought this resolution before the House without some definite aim, but, I am equally bound to say that I cannot, for the life of me, conjecture what idea he had as to any good which could result from the introduction of this resolution. I cannot believe that the hon. gentleman supposed that this resolution would pass the House. A very large portion of the speech he delivered in the House to-day I have heard before, certainly on one occasion, and, I think, on two occasions, in the last parliament. The hon. gentleman obtained, on those occasions, an expression of the opinion of this House, which, I think, should have convinced him that no possible good could result from the introduction of this resolution, and I regret that the ability and talents that we must all concede to that hon. gentleman in a high degree have not been put in this House to a better use than they were put by that hon. gentleman. I say this to my hon. friend without in the slightest degree desiring to be offensive to him, and I assure him that I say these words to him in all possible sincerity and friendship. He dealt with all manner of subjects, from the customs and laws of our Teutonic ancestors to the causes of Mr. Chauvin's defeat in the province of Quebec, and he dealt with the causes of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire as well as with the position of both political parties in the late election in the province of Quebec. Well, I do not quite see, as the right hon. gentleman who leads the House (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was unable to see, the relevancy of all this to the particular motion which we are invited to pass in this House. And, I would go further——

Mr. BOURASSA. I think the leaders did not like it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I trust that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) did not take up the time of the House merely for the purpose of saying something that would be displeasing to both leaders. For my part, I am bound to say that a portion of the hon. gentleman's remarks was displeasing to me, not that portion of his remarks which reflected upon the political party which I have the honour to lead in this House, because, I intend to let those remarks of my hon. friend pass without a single word ; but, I do regret that the hon. gentleman introduced into his speech certain remarks which seemed to me to invite controversy along certain lines which, I, for one, do not desire to see introduced in this House.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. leader of the House has stated that the speech which was made by the hon. mover of this resolution was irrelevant. I entirely agree with that statement, and I go farther; I say that the resolution itself, so far as the preamble is concerned, is absolutely irrelevant to the conclusion. How does the hon. gentleman invite us to deal with this subject ? He invites us, in the first place, to bring to the attention of His Majesty that we are not committed to any future participation in the wars and policy of Great Britain. Well, that is a matter as to which I, at once, concede the hon. gentleman is entitled to have his opinion. I find no fault with him because he differs possibly from my opinion in regard to that. He proceeds to say :

> That the contribution of Canada in the South African war, both in armed help and public expenditure, entitles the Canadian people to express an opinion in the matter.

Well, it may entitle the Canadian people to express an opinion in the matter, but, certainly, it does not entitle the hon. member for Labelle to express an opinion in the matter, because he has from the first to the last held that we should have nothing at all to do with it, and should not be expected to contribute to it.

Mr. BOURASSA. As long as the contribution was not paid I objected to the payment of it, but the moment our contribution

was made, as well as the contribution of all British citizens, I became entitled to express my opinion on the matter as well as any one else, whether I pay willingly or am forced to pay.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the hon. gentleman may be regarded as having waived his former position. He is willing to take advantage of the contribution we have made for the purpose of introducing this resolution into parliament. I am very glad to know that the hon. gentleman has been converted to that small extent, but the hon. gentleman was not very logical, as the right hon. leader of the House pointed out, because, while he is very desirous of giving advice to the Imperial government, he is not at all dsirous of giving any assistance in the wars of the empire. I think the hon. gentleman was hardly worthy of himself when he suggested, that, no matter what force assailed the empire, we, in Canada, were to stand to one side until the soil of Canada was assailed. Does the hon. gentleman expect that the empire will stand to one side when only the soil of Canada is assailed ? Suppose that such an eventuality should occur, as it may possibly occur, although we all hope and trust it never shall, that the soil of Canada should be assailed by an armed invader, whom we were unable to repel, would the hon. gentleman then think that the remainder of the empire should say : We have nothing at all to do with Canada, we are not assailed, we shall stand to one side ? Unless we are prepared to accept that position, how shall we say, while enjoying as we do all the protection of the British Empire, and the British navy, that we are never to join the forces of the empire unless the soil of Canada is assailed ? I known my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) has a generous nature, and I trust and believe that when he comes to consider this matter in its true aspect, he will not always adhere to some of the opinions which I have heard him express in this House in regard to it. Let us look at the rest of his resolution. He then proceeds as follows :

> This House therefore humbly reminds His Majesty King Edward VII. that the glorious reign of his august mother, Queen Victoria, whose memory shall ever be cherished by Canadians of all origins and creeds, was inaugurated in bloodshed and rebellion in this part of her dominions; that peace and prosperity were subsequently restored and for ever when Her Majesty's advisers understood, as Lord Grey told in his instructions to Lord Elgin, Governor of Canada, that it was 'neither possible nor desirable to carry on the government of any of the British provinces in North America in opposition to the opinions of its inhabitants;' that since that time, Her Majesty has found in no portion of her empire a more faithful, devoted and contented people than her French Canadian subjects.

Possibly I would be inclined to say that my hon. friend might have simply used, with regard to that, the word 'Canadian subjects.' I think that would have expressed his meaning just as well, and would have been equally true.

Mr. BOURASSA. I would not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman too frequently, but I may be allowed to state that my intention was to point out that in countries where there are different races, the government of these races could not be conducted unless by the application of those principles which I contend are not applied in South Africa. Therefore, I wish to point out that the non-British population of this country have come to love the British flag on account of the application of these principles.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I must remind my hon. friend that it was not French Canadians alone who were in rebellion in 1837, because in the province of Ontario English Canadians, if I may so designate them, were in rebellion also. Therefore, the hon. gentleman's views as expressed in this resolution have no more application to the French Canadians than they have to the inhabitants of the province of Ontario, who were endeavouring in the same way to obtain redress of the grievances under which they believed they were then labouring. But I desire to ask the hon. gentleman: what has all this historical reference to wrongs which were suffered in Canada in 1837 to do with the invasion of British territory by the Boers—because my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) proceeds afterwards to say in his resolution : therefore, we are to resolve so and so. Two hostile states, the Orange Free State and the Transvaal invaded British territory in South Africa, and Britain used force to repel them. They not only invaded British territory, but it is beyond doubt that they invaded British territory for the purpose of making that territory their own. I will not ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) to take my statement with regard to that, but I will ask him to accept the statement of the Boers themselves and here is their own language ; the language of the Boer Peace Committee, addressed to the people of Cape Colony, and reported in the London Times of the 9th of January last. Referring to the misery and desolation that had been brought about by the war, they say this :

> All this misery is caused by a small and obstinate minority who will not bow to the inevitable and who make the majority suffer. Any encouragement to the men still on commando to continue the hopeless struggle can only injure us and cause us further misery.

I call the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) to what follows :

> We have done our best and fought to get Africa under one flag, and we have lost.

There is the Boers' statement that this war was precipitated for the purpose of bringing all the British possessions in South

Africa under the Boer flag. Does my hon. friend suggest, in view of that, that when that invasion has been repelled, when (as has been pointed out by the right hon. the Prime Minister), British territory has been declared to have been annexed to these hostile states; does my hon. friend suggest that we are to hold our hand and leave the British possessions in South Africa still menaced by the very same danger which has been present during the past ten years, and which has recently assailed them. This letter continues as follows :—

> Let there be no mistake about this. England has spent millions and sacrificed thousands of lives, and no reasonable being can believe for one moment that she will now give up the fruits of victory. It is, therefore, a duty for us, her beaten foe, to accept the terms offered by our conqueror. . . . England has definitely announced that she will not restore the independence of the two republics.
>
> Let us, in the interests of lasting peace in South Africa, accept this announcement as final, and let us work for conciliation on that basis.

There is a suggestion in these words which my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) might well have taken to heart before he ventured to make the speech which he has made in the House this afternoon, and before he ventured to introduce this resolution. For my part I do not think that the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) really required any answer in this House. I would have been content to vote on the question, upon the basis that the hon. gentleman had confuted himself. I do not think that the question of the causes of the war comes properly under discussion at this present time, and while I do not say that it was not advisable for the right hon. the Prime Minister to go into that, yet I do say that it was not necessary. Under the circumstances which now exist in South Africa; in view of the fact that the Boers themselves admit that conquest of British territory was the object of the war they began; in view of the fact that the great majority of the Boers admit that they are beaten; in view of the fact they they admit (as they do admit in those letters) that the terms which are offered to them by England are fair terms—it was not necessary to introduce such a resolution in this House at all. I venture to think that we have work to do in this parliament at this session which is more worthy of our attention than matters of this kind. It has been our hope and our expectation that we should finish the business of this session within some measurable time, and for my part I say in all sincerity that I have endeavoured to expedite the business in this House, and I intend to do so in future. But if we are to take up a day or two days at a time for the purpose of discussing matters which are of purely Imperial concern, it seems to me that we are going to have only a very moderate amount of time to devote to subjects that really do concern this parliament. I am prepared to vote against this resolution, and I would have been prepared to vote against it even if I had not heard the very able and eloquent speech which the right hon. the leader of the government delivered to this House, as well as the speeches of the other hon. gentlemen who followed him.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Bourassa) :

YEAS :

Angers,	Monet—3.
Bourassa,	

NAYS :

Alcorn,	Legris,
Archambault,	Lewis,
Ball,	Logan,
Barker,	Loy,
Belcourt,	Macdonald,
Bell (Addington),	Mackie,
Bell (Pictou),	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Bennett,	MacLaren (Perth),
Bernier,	Maclean,
Bickerdike,	McColl,
Birkett,	McCool,
Borden (Halifax),	McCreary,
Borden (King's, N.S.),	McEwen,
Bourbonnais,	McGowan,
Britton,	McGugan,
Brock,	McIsaac,
Brown,	McLennan,
Bureau,	Madore,
Calvert,	Marcil (Bagot),
Calvin,	Matheson,
Cargill,	Meigs,
Carscallen,	Mignault,
Christie,	Morin,
Clare,	Morrison,
Clarke,	Murray,
Cochrane,	Northrup,
Copp,	Oliver,
Costigan,	Osler,
Cowan,	Parmelee,
Culbert,	Préfontaine,
Davis,	Pringle,
Dobell,	Prior,
Dyment,	Proulx,
Edwards,	Puttee,
Erb,	Reid (Restigouche),
Ethier,	Richardson (Grey),
Fielding,	Richardson (Lisgar),
Fitzpatrick,	Robinson (Elgin),
Flint,	Robinson (Northumberland, N.B.),
Fortier,	Roche (Marquette),
Fortin,	Roddick,
Fraser,	Rosamond,
Ganong,	Ross (Ontario),
Gauvreau,	Ross (Victoria),
Geoffrion,	Rousseau,
Gibson,	Russell,
Gilmour,	Schell,
Gould,	Scott,
Gourley,	Sherritt,
Guthrie,	Sifton,
Hackett,	Simmons,
Harwood,	Smith (Vancouver),
Heyd,	Smith (Wentworth),
Holmes,	Stephens,
Horsey,	Sutherland (Essex),
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Sutherland (Oxford),
Hughes (Victoria),	Tarte,
Hyman,	Taylor,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Thompson,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Tisdale.
Johnston (Lambton),	

Kaulbach,	Tobin,
Kemp,	Tolton,
Kendall,	Tucker,
Kidd,	Turgeon,
Lancaster,	Vrooman,
Lang,	Wade,
LaRivière,	Wallace,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Ward,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Wilmot,
Lavell,	Wilson,
LeBlanc,	Wright—144.
Lefurgey,	

Amendment negatived, main motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Government of the North-west Territories—Insane patients $45,000

Mr. LaRIVIERE. There is a decrease of $5,000. How does that come about ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Under an arrangement made by order in council some years ago, we pay a fixed amount per day for each patient to the Manitoba government, who provide for the patients in the provincial asylums. We simply estimate the amount which we think will be necessary, and according to the number treated, a bill is rendered to us, which we pay.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. What was the amount expended last year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. $39,992.22.

Schools in unorganized districts, including clerical assistance $6,500

Mr. WILSON. I would like the hon. minister to tell us how many schools there are in the districts occupied by the Doukhobors. I have seen articles in some newspapers, in which it was stated that there were practically no schools located among the Doukhobors, and I would like to know what portion of this vote is for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. None of the schools referred to are in the organized parts of the territories. None of them therefore are amongst the people to whom the hon. member refers. This vote is for the purpose of assisting in carrying on schools in the far northern portions of the country which are unorganized. The schools are mostly conducted by the different churches among the Indians and half-breeds, under an arrangement that has been in operation for some years. I can give the hon. gentleman a list of schools if he desires it.

Mr. WILSON. No, but what I would like to know is what provision the government are making for the education of the Doukhobors.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We are not making any special provision at the present time, because the work of education in the organized territories is carried on by the North-west government. They are required to look after the education of the people out of their subsidy.

Grant for schools, clerical assistance, printing, &c. $332,979

Mr. WILSON. Under this item perhaps the hon. minister can give us some information with reference to the schools established by the territorial government. I am of opinion that something ought to be done in some way for the education of the Doukhobors. They ought not to be allowed to live in communities by themselves without some provision being made for their education.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The North-west government have had for years past a school Act under which they organize school districts just as is done in other portions of the western country; and they give a special grant to each school district in proportion to the amount of work done. I do not know that I have any special information with regard to the arrangements they are making for school districts amongst the foreign settlers; but I can give the hon. gentleman the statement made by the North-west government with regard to education in applying for this grant. During the year just closed they have expended in all $187,591. Petitions were received during the year for the erection of ninety-nine new school districts, of which forty-nine have been erected and fifty are in process of construction. The heavy immigration of the past two or three years causes a rapid increase in the expenditure on schools.

In discussing the estimates with the members of the North-west government, they urged very specially upon me during the last couple of years the necessity for an increase in their grant on account of the increased amount of educational work to be done in the new settlements. Last year an increase was given, but in this vote there is no increase. My impression, however, is that next session we will have to ask an increase.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Are the children taught the English language ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No other language is taught.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to have a statement from the hon. gentleman as to the erection of the portion of the Territories into a province. Is that likely to happen after the census is made ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A deputation consisting of two members of the North-west government, Mr. Haultain and Mr. Ross, were in Ottawa some time ago on other business, and took the opportunity of discussing this question. I may

say that while during the last three or four years they have not addressed any official communication to the government, yet from time to time they have discussed with myself and my colleagues the question of giving the Territories provincial status, and lately they handed us a memorandum on that subject. We have not officially replied to that memorandum as yet, but expect to do so shortly. This is a matter, of course, requiring serious consideration, but I may say in a general way that I am of the opinion that it will have to be dealt with in the very near future. The people of the Territories are as capable of self government as any other people in Canada, and have shown their fitness by the admirable manner in which they have carried on their present administration. Of course the financial question is a serious one. The subsidy required for the Territories in the course of a few years would have to be greatly increased, and there is the question of the control of public lands and matters of that kind which would have to be settled.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps the hon. member for Selkirk, who knows a good deal about school matters among the Doukhobors, would favour us with his views.

Mr. McCREARY. I do not think that any schools receiving assistance are yet established among the Doukhobors. In some of the outlying villages they attend some of the schools that were established before they arrived; and there are one or two private schools started by the Society of Friends of Ontario. Some provision should be made with the government of the Territories for the establishment of schools among those colonists, and I think there should be a condition imposed on this vote providing that the North-west government should assist those foreigners in the matter of education as they do English settlers. Any one who has been up there will understand the situation. In two or three months there will come into a district sufficient children to start a new school, and in some cases to start three or four schools, and yet in such cases these people have had to do without schools for two or three years. I have known of one family which came out from Ireland and seriously contemplated returning just because of this lack of schooling facilities. There is no doubt that with the increased immigration, the government of the Territories will not be able to provide adequate schooling facilities unless it gets a larger grant.

Salaries and expenses in connection with the administration of the Yukon territory $270,000

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the reason of the increase of $25,000 ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is entirely due to the fact that we have had to make a readjustment of the living allowance. We have made a readjustment under which the officials are allowed $50 for rent in addition to their salaries. The salaries amount to $104,140, and the living allowances to $118,090. There is a vote of $45,000 for contingencies to cover travelling expenses, care of officials in hospital, freight and express charges, printing, advertising, stationery, telegrams, the contingencies of the Crown timber and land office, and the gold commissioner's office, and to pay expenses incurred with the bank for handling gold.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. minister state the policy of the government as to the issue of liquor permits in the Yukon ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I laid on the Table of the House the other day an order in council providing regulations for the introduction of liquor into the Yukon. Under that order, provision is made for the issue of wholesale licenses in the territory, and permits may be granted to the holders of wholesale licenses but not to any others.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the practice to be discontinued that has heretofore existed of issuing permits from the department for parties to take liquor in ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That has been abolished by the order in council to which I have just referred.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it to be the rule in future that, on application being made, wholesale licenses will be issued to the parties for the sale of liquor ? And if these are wholesale licenses, what conditions are made with regard to the retail sale of liquor ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No permission is given to the retailers to import. They buy from the wholesalers. The holder of a wholesale license may, on application, get a permit.

Mr. BENNETT. Do we understand that there will be indiscriminate sale by retail, and that all that will be necessary will be for a party to go to a wholesaler and purchase from him and sell ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The local council have a liquor license ordinance, under which they issue retail licenses, just as is done in any of the provinces, and parties holding these licenses will have the right to sell.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it necessary to the issue of a retail license that there should be a petition from the inhabitants of the locality, as in the case of the province of Ontario, Nova Scotia and perhaps, some others ? Or is it issued merely on application from the party who desires to sell ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Speaking from recollection, I do not know that there is any provision in the liquor licenses ordinance for a petition from the ratepayers. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will see that the conditions are not the same as in an older place, and that a petition there would not be the same safeguard that it would be here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Quite so, but I wanted to ascertain what safeguards there are with regard to the character of the person to whom a license is given, the manner in which he is likely to conduct his establishment and his observance of the laws generally. Does the council pass upon these matters without evidence of some sort, or do they make an inquiry, or do they depend upon their own knowledge ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Provision is made for inspection by an officer appointed for that purpose, and on that a license is granted. That is my recollection of the liquor license ordinance, though I have not read it for something like a year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any restriction as to the number of licenses granted in a particular district ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not recollect at the moment, but the ordinance was laid upon the Table of the House last session in pursuance of the statute in that regard.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was it printed ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think so, but, if not, I will furnish my hon. friend with a copy to-morrow.

Dominion Lands—Chargeable to Capital—Surveys, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, and including $13,000 for irrigation surveys, &c. Salaries of temporary officers and clerks may be paid out of this sum at rates exceeding $400 per annum, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act $240,000

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I made an inquiry the other day from the minister with regard to a survey that is required in the south eastern portion of Manitoba. We have a railway there which has been partly built and which is attracting the attention of the public, running from Winnipeg in a south-easterly direction. There is a large tract of land there that is still unsurveyed, while there are a large number of settlers who are seeking to settle upon these lands, but who cannot locate them for want of a survey. In fact, I believe the whole of that district east of the Red river, and between the river and the Lake of the Woods should be surveyed. It will all now be available for settlement, and it is only natural that when the settlers come into these districts they should be able to locate their lands. I hope that orders will be given to have all that part of the province surveyed before another season.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In the list of surveys provided for under this vote I have provision made for one part of that country. We have also a miscellaneous vote for unforeseen requirements to the extent of $18,000. I am quite satisfied that we shall be able, with the money which we have asked parliament to vote, to provide for the surveys to which my hon. friend (Mr. LaRivière) refers. Our object in dealing with the surveys as we do is to keep ahead of settlement. We cannot at all undertake the policy of a systematic survey of the whole country. We get the best information we can and send surveyors to those parts of the country into which settlers are going and in which, therefore, surveys are required. Our effort is to keep ahead of settlement.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I am sorry to say the hon. gentleman has not kept ahead of settlement in this case.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In some cases, we have not been able to do so ; but if my hon. friend will call my attention by letter to any particular part of the country where surveys are required for settlement, I think we can provide for the work that is necessary.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It is along the Canadian Northern Railway—the line that used to be the South Eastern.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Has the whole amount of the appropriation of last year been expended ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My deputy informs me that there was a small amount left over from last year's vote.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. In connection with this survey, I would like to call the attention of the minister to the fact that in some cases, cases that I have been apprised of, surveyors coming from the east hire people in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and they do not pay them. I know an instance where a man was employed by one of those surveyors who owed him $178, which is a big sum for a poor man. Upon inquiry in the office of the Surveyor General, I ascertained that this surveyor was paid in full, and, therefore, the amount cannot be collected either from the government or through the government. I think the surveyor who is responsible for such an act should not be given a contract in the future unless he pays his accounts. If the government contractors do not pay their men, I think the government might be liable. I hope the minister will see to it that in future no claim such as the one I have mentioned will have to be brought before the attention of the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If my hon. friend will give me the particu-

lars of any case, I will be happy to do what he says.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I have communicated with the officials of the hon. gentleman's department, and the correspondence is there. I do not care to divulge the facts before the House, but an official of the department informs me that this man has been paid in full, though he has not paid the men he had employed.

Mr. McCREARY. I regret the minister has not seen fit to put in a larger amount for these surveys. There were 8,000 homesteads taken last year, and suppose there are 40 homesteads in a township, 200 townships would require to be surveyed. I understand a surveying party can do in a season about five townships, consequently, they are not going to be able to keep up with the requirements of the people coming into the country. In my opinion, within two years there will be no surveyed lands ready for occupation, because, as the member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) has stated, not only have new surveys got to be made, but a great many of the old surveys, both east and west of the Red river, and in the North-west Territories, have got to be made over, because the men cannot find the posts, the fires have destroyed them. Even in surveys made only three or four years ago, it is almost impossible to establish the posts. Now, in one township alone there are twenty-two Swedes from the United States who have settled, and I am aware that many of them have built their houses off their own quarter sections. This is a great hardship. I understand last year the department had twelve parties in the field doing survey work upon homestead lands, whereas, to keep pace with the actual homesteaders coming in, even if the number should not be increased, it will require forty parties of surveyors to do five townships each. This ought to be taken into consideration before we reach that particular point that we cannot go any further, because a great many of those townships surveyed, or portions of them, are unfit for settlement. I would like if the minister could see his way clear to increase that amount. I think I drew the attention of the government to it when I was an official.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We had something over twenty parties at work last year, and we are preparing this year to send out thirty-one. I am aware that in the future we shall have to make preparation for more surveys to keep pace with increased emigration.

Mr. McEWEN. The hon. gentleman says that these posts were burned out two or three years ago; why should we not put down iron posts? Iron posts would be very nearly as cheap, and would not require to be renewed in consequence of fire.

Mr. WILSON. Last year there were 6,680 homestead entries. The report says there were 7,426, but you must deduct from that number 746 that were made in the previous year.

Mr. McCREARY. I have not got the report with me, but I think my figures are correct. I have got the figures for the months of January and February of this year, and there is an increase of 40 per cent over last year.

Salaries of inspectors, Dominion lands and Crown timber agents, sub-agents and clerks in the outside service $74,000

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman explain the reason of this increase of $8,500?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have been in the habit, for some time past, when there was a pressure of business, of employing temporary assistance. At present we are adding clerks in the following offices, but they are not permanent: One at Winnipeg, $480; one at Calgary, $480; one at Edmonton, $360; one at Lethbridge, $600, and a forest ranger for southern Manitoba, $900. We have had a system drawn up during the last four years, in consequence of the increase of settlement, under which we have had sub-agents. In order to make entries at the land agencies, settlers would have to travel a considerable distance, and we have inaugurated the practice of appointing sub-agents at points where a good deal of settlement is going on.

We have had the system of requiring the settlers to pay fees to these subland agents. We are abolishing that system and we propose to give the subland agents regular salaries, $300 being the largest salary paid. There are eleven of them altogether, and the total salaries will be $3,000. We have additional clerks to appoint at some of the land offices. There is an additional clerk at Yorkton at a salary of $900, an additional clerk at Red Deer at a salary of $720, an additional clerk at Regina at a salary of $900, and an additional clerk at Brandon at a salary of $1,200, making altogether $3,720. But $2,500 was provided for these items last year, thus making the net increase only $1,220. Then, increases have been given to the following clerks: Mr. A. J. Fraser, land agent at Lethbridge now, increase $105. He has been in the service for a great many years. Mr. B. H. Humphrys, in the commissioners office at Ottawa and, who has also been in the service for a great many years, will receive an increase of $128.75. Mr. Richard Breen, another official gets $120 increase. Mr. R. C. Kisbey gets $180 increase, Mr. E. W. Burley $200, Mr. E. Trudel $200, Mr. W. McMillan $200, and Mr. G. A. Hogarth $200, the increases in all amount to $1,333.75. The total of these items, $2,820, $3,000, $1,220 and $1,333.75, is $8,373.75. The salaries in the Dominion lands branch,

although the work is fully twice as much as it was in 1895-6, are not yet as large as they were then. The salaries then amounted to $82,500, whereas last year they amounted to $71,550.55. With these increases they will still not be as much as in 1895-6.

Mr. WILSON. I see there are eleven homestead inspectors. Would the hon. minister explain what the duties and salaries of these officials are ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The homestead inspectors are a class of officials who are provided for and have always been since the homestead system was introduced under the Dominion Lands Act. Their business is to examine the homesteads of such settlers in respect to the applications which they may make for their patents. When a settler finds that he is in a position to apply for his patent, having fulfilled the settlement duties, he notifies the nearest land office that he is in a position to make his application, and the land agent notifies the homestead inspector. The homestead inspector makes an inspection of the homestead and he has a printed form in which certain information has to be given. He makes his report to the land agent, the land agent makes a report and these reports are forwarded to the commissioner's office where the case is adjudicated upon. If the duties have been performed, the settler gets his patent. These are the principal duties of the homestead inspectors. In addition to that, wherever necessary, they act as forest rangers, taking precautions in regard to fires where the land is timbered. They also make valuations of land where they are required to do so by the department, and they do any additional work which the department may require them to perform. They get $1,200 a year each and actual expenses.

Mr. WILSON. Has there been any increase in the number lately ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Lately a man who was appointed a forester has also been appointed an inspector. His name is McMillan, and he lives at Treherne.

Mr. WILSON. The reason I asked this question was that from general report a very great number of people are going into that country, and I did not see how the same number of inspectors could be doing so much more work than they have been doing heretofore. I thought perhaps there had been an increase in their number. I do not know how many the hon. gentleman had before. They certainly appear to be well paid at $1,200 and expenses.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think the hon. gentleman will find in that evidence that these homestead inspectors are doing more work than they did formerly.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of the Interior if Mr. J. W. Thompson, homestead inspector of Marquette, the gentleman that the hon. minister induced to resign his position in order to contest Marquette with myself, was reappointed to his office as soon as the election was over, and if the hon. gentleman does not candidly think that he comes within the term of an active political partisan ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Thompson was reappointed. I have not under my hand the exact date when he was reappointed, but it was a couple of months after the election. I have no information before me that Mr. Thompson has acted the part of an offensive partisan since he was appointed, but I presume that he acted somewhat as a partisan when he contested Marquette with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche). I hope my hon. friend will not take it as an offence if I express some regret that Mr. Thompson was not more successful.

Mr. CLANCY. This is rather an extraordinary attitude that nothing has come to the notice of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sifton) to indicate partisanship. One of his own servants, a gentleman in the employ of his own department, resigns his seat, contests a constituency, is defeated, and then he is rewarded. A string is put on Mr. Thompson when he goes out in order that he will be able to go back in the event of his defeat. Mr. Thompson had nothing to lose by contesting this constituency, and I want to say to the hon. gentleman that he has set an example that does not contribute much to the public morals of this country. The hon. gentleman has his officials, occupying responsible positions throughout the country and living on the public funds, in training to be candidates for the hon. gentleman when the election comes on. I think there are several hon. gentlemen holding seats in this House who came in under such circumstances, who resigned their positions and who equally had a little rope upon them. I have no hesitation in saying that no more vicious principle could be thought of or adopted than the one which is now being carried on in the hon. gentleman's department. Just let the hon. gentleman picture the case of his own officials who are in daily contact with the people who go into that country and try to imagine the undue influence that a man is able to exercise under such circumstances. To say the least it is scandalous in its character. I say it is scandalous inasmuch as it is manifestly unfair and unjust and must detract from anything that one would consider in the light of justice, fairness, or right.

Let the minister look at the other side of the question, and see how it would operate. Why, the heads of officials who did absolutely nothing are falling into the basket every day. All that is necessary is to hatch up a charge against some innocent official,

and his head comes off, and there is not even the pretense of a trial. Yet, the minister (Hon. Mr. Sifton) brings out his own officials in a campaign and he brings them back and takes care of them when they are defeated. There is no defence of any kind for such a proceeding, and before these estimates go through the minister must explain whether it is the policy of the government, and his own policy in particular, to continue that state of affairs. Is he going to lay down the policy that an official may look forward to his promotion because he is the candidate of the minister ? I would like to know whether, under such circumstances, an official will serve his country or will serve his political master. He must serve the latter, and do as he is told, because he is not depending upon the merits of his service, but upon the smiles of his superior. I am bound to say that the Minister of the Interior has not been hard-hearted, and that he has rewarded his friends. Does he enunciate to this House that that is to be his policy in the future.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) is asking me to enunciate a policy upon a very large question. This particular gentleman was offered the nomination by a party convention and he accepted it and resigned his office. I was at the convention, but I had not the least idea that the gentleman had any intention of being a candidate. If he had I knew nothing about it. When I went to the convention I had not the least idea who was going to be nominated. I have had very little acquaintance with this gentleman, and I am not sure that I ever saw him before the occasion of his nomination. If I did I certainly had no particular acquaintance with him. So far as my knowledge goes, and so far as the knowledge of the department goes, he is a competent officer, and I do not see that the fact that he was a candidate in the election is any reason why he should not be reappointed. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) that if the department systematically went into the business of appointing candidates it would be objectionable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think that the minister (Hon. Mr. Sifton) has dealt with this question in the way it should be dealt with. We had an announcement of policy from the right hon. the Prime Minister as far back as 1897, in which he stated that if any public servant of this coutnry desired to be a politician he would give him every opportunity of doing so by dismissing him. The doctrine which the right hon. gentleman enunciated then is particularly applicable to this case. The Minister of the Interior says there is no reason for not appointing this official because he was a candidate at an election. That is not the point raised by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). What he denounces is the vicious principle of giving an opportunity to a public servant to resign his position for the purpose of being a candidate for one political party or the other, with the understanding that he will be appointed again if he is unsuccessful.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There was no understanding of that kind directly or indirectly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That may be, but I have a pretty strong opinion that this gentleman felt sure in his own mind that if he were unsuccessful he would be appointed again. At all events, it is not a good precedent to lay down, and the thing has a very suspicious look in the face of it. We have had many criticisms of offensive partisanship, made by hon. gentlemen opposite. Postmasters getting a salary of $50 or $60 a year have been dismissed by this government because they attended political meetings or something of that kind. For my part I never favoured any such action by one government or the other, because I think a man who gets $50 a year for discharging duties of that kind might very well take such part in public affairs as he thought fit. But the policy of this government has been to turn these men out of office for what they call political partisanship. The pretention of gentlemen opposite is that it is unpleasant to the feelings of Liberals that the man who gives them their mail in the post office should be a man who takes an active interest in public affairs. How much more is that applicable to cases of this kind ? Take a public servant performing the duties referred to in this case, and he may be using his office for three or four years, looking forward to a candidature, while the public, whether of one party or the other, are entitled to the services of that man without any bias. Are they likely to get his services without bias, if that official is looking forward to be a candidate with the expressed or applied understanding, or if you like confidence, that if he be unsuccessful he shall stand a good chance of retaining his office ? The Minister of the Interior might very well act upon the principle which his leader has laid down : that if any public servant in this country desires to be a politician he shall be placed in a position to devote the whole of his time to thaf particular business. That principle would not justify the minister in reappointing an unsuccessful candidate to this position.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The peculiar feature about this is that Mr. Cox, the predecessor of Mr. Thompson as homestead inspector, was dismissed because it was said he was an offensive political partisan, and the only thing Mr. Cox did—and he was a very successful and experienced

officer—was to write a letter to one of my committee stating that he was going into the Dauphin district, and that if he while there could do anything on the quiet to assist my candidature, so long as it did not leave him open to the imputation of being a partisan, he would do so. He wrote in words to that effect. This letter was stolen out of the office of one of my committee men, and it was sent to the Minister of the Interior, and, as the minister admitted on the floor of this House, Mr Cox was dismissed on the strength of that. There was no other charge against Mr. Cox. The minister (Hon. Mr. Sifton) admitted he was a first rate officer. No investigation was held. Mr. Cox offered to do something, but the letter was not even replied to. Mr. Cox did not lift his hand in my interest, but in this letter he showed his favour towards me, and therefore, he was considered by the government an active and offensive partisan, and his position was given to Mr. Thompson. Every person who lives in the town with Mr. Thompson, Liberals as well as Conservatives, know that there never is an election held, whether provincial or Dominion, without Mr. Thompson being one of the most active workers in the Liberal ranks. I told the acting minister last session that I could give him the name of a homestead inspector, if he wished, who had been most active in the last provincial election. Mr. Thompson has always been told off to look after the Scandinavian vote located some twenty miles north of the town in which he resides. He was sent up to look after that, and did look after it, while homestead inspector, one year ago last fall, at the time of the local election, and he openly stated that if there was a change in the Dominion government, he would not wait to be dismissed, but would resign ; he did not make any bones about it. Still, he can do all this and not be considered an offensive partisan. I presume the Minister of the Interior attaches the same meaning to that term that ex-Attorney General Cameron did in the local legislature, when accused of keeping in the government employ Mr. McDonnell, a member of this House, and an offensive partisan. Mr. Cameron's reply was : 'He was not offensive to us.' So, I presume the Minister of the Interior discriminates according to the particular party this man is offensive to. As I stated before, I would not bring this case up if it were the only one. Mr. Jérome, one of the hon. gentleman's forest rangers, was allowed to resign his position and run as a candidate for the local legislature. He was successful, and yet got his position back, and he is a member of the local legislature to-day. Is he not an offensive political partisan ? This homestead inspector will be using his position as a lever for getting votes for himself at the next election. I do not object to his being a candidate, because there is no other gentleman I would prefer to have as an opponent.

Mr. CLANCY. Surely the Minister of the Interior does not propose to sit silent in the face of a charge so grave—that he goes to a public nomination meeting by accident, that he did not know this gentleman, but that by his presence he gave his sanction to one of his own officials being a candidate. Yet, the hon. gentleman sees no wrong in it, and does not think it worth while to make a statement to this committee about it. It seems to me one of the most appalling things I ever heard of. The hon. gentleman cannot laugh this matter away. If he found his political opponents taking a course of that kind, there is no gentleman who would put more energy and heat into his protest than the hon. gentleman, and very properly too. My hon. friend cites a case of a gentleman being dismissed because he wrote a letter expressing his strong sympathy, and declaring what he would do under certain circumstances. The circumstances never arose, no proof was given that he ever acted, and yet he was dismissed. What followed ? The very gentleman who dismissed him puts up one of his own officials, who was at that time, as the leader of the opposition stated, paving the way for his own election, to be a candidate. No official need hereafter ask permission to run, because, from what has been stated to-night, we can see that it is the policy of the hon. gentleman to allow his officials to do that. I would again ask the hon. gentleman to say whether he disapproves of the candidature of Mr. Thompson, and whether he proposes in future to permit actions of that kind ? I think that is a fair question to ask, and the committee has a right to have a straightforward, unequivocal answer from the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not see that the hon. gentleman or any one else could prevent a government official resigning and running as a candidate for parliament. That is what the hon. gentleman is finding fault with.

Mr. CLANCY. No, I am finding fault with the hon. gentleman appointing him afterwards.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not see why he should not be appointed afterwards. If the leader of the opposition had said that I had gone to this man beforehand and asked him to be a candidate, and promised him, if defeated, he would be reappointed, there is no question that that would have been a very reprehensible transaction. I said to the hon. leader of the opposition that there was no understanding between Mr. Thompson and myself, directly or indirectly, in any shape or form ; and that Mr. Thompson had not the least reason to believe, from anything said by me or by my authority, or from

anything said by any person on my behalf or on behalf of the government, that he would be reappointed. When he made his application to be reappointed, he stood in the same position as any other applicant. He might or might not have been appointed. If he had not been appointed, there would have been no grievance against me.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Did the hon. gentleman appoint any one in his place while he was away during those two months ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, one of the officers of the staff went up and discharged his duties. Of course, I see the point my hon. friend desires to make, which is, that the fact that there was no permanent appointment made was due to my wish to keep the office open for Mr. Thompson. There was no idea of that kind in my mind, and no understanding of any kind that if he was defeated he would be reappointed. Mr. Thompson was offered the nomination and accepted it. When he made application for the position again, I appointed him. I had no obligation to do so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How long after the election was it before Mr. Thompson was reappointed ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. About two months, I think.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How long before the election did he resign ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He resigned on the same day he was nominated.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How long was that before the election took place ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The convention was on September 3.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). When Mr. Thompson was nominated, was the position promised to any other person ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. CLANCY. When the position was vacant, were there any other applicants for it besides Mr. Thompson ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot say positively, but I think I shall be safe in saying that there were a large number.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. gentleman did not touch on the other portion of the partisanship which I refer to, that is, the part he took in the provincial election.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I never heard of it. I was in that part of the country and took an active part in the provincial election, but never heard of Mr. Thompson doing so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was there not any one of those numerous applicants capable of filling the position ? There were a great many applicants after Mr. Thompson resigned and his resignation covered a period of two months before the election. Was none of these applicants capable of taking his place ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Speaking in a general way, there was a number of applications. I do not remember the names of any of the applicants, but I recollect receiving a great many letters from different people. At the time in British Columbia a couple of elections took place after the general election, and I went out to take part in those elections. As soon as I got back and learnt the details, the appointment was made. There were no delays but those which occurred in the natural order of things.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It was remarkably fortunate for Mr. Thompson that the hon. gentleman was so busy during these two months that he was not able to make the appointment.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am afraid my hon. friend is skeptical.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not at all. I am accepting his word and am simply mentioning how extremely fortunate it was for Mr. Thompson that the hon. gentleman happened to be so much engaged during these two months. I have no doubt that Mr. Thompson will always select an occasion of that kind when he again decides to resign, an occasion when the hon. gentleman will be too much engaged to deal with the numerous applicants for the position, and Mr. Thompson will thus be amply safeguarded. And when the matter does come up before the hon. gentleman afterwards, Mr. Thompson will have had his election matters disposed of and his name will be at the head of the list. There will, of course, be no understanding expressed or implied, but without any such understanding Mr. Thompson will always be moderately safe. On that account, I can rejoice on Mr. Thompson's behalf that things will be made smooth for him without any understanding expressed or implied.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Such actions as those will make every official in the North-west an active politician, because if he is not elected he will be sure to getting back his office. It is a very wrong thing to do, and I am very sorry that this government should have done such a thing.

Mr. CALVIN. Did this man receive any remuneration for any portion of his time after his resignation ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). There is another matter I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. gentleman. The land agent at Minnedosa is an over-worked official. He had an assistant, Mr. Jarvis, who was a very faithful official and occupied the position about nine years. In the North-west rebellion he met with an accident which entitled him to an annuity from the government. There was no charge of any kind ever made against him, but he was dismissed without cause, and his dismissal was justified by the hon. gentleman on the ground of economy. Yet, strange to say, the land office at Dauphin, the work of which was largely done through the Minnedosa office by Mr. Jarvis, required a new man, and instead of removing Mr. Jarvis to the Dauphin office the hon. minister appointed a green hand, from the same town, The treatment of Mr. Jarvis was certainly not fair. If he was not required in Minnedosa he should have been utilized at Dauphin.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When was he removed ?

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). In 1897, just when a new man was required in Dauphin.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The appointment at Dauphin was some time after that.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Hogarth was sent to Dauphin just about the time Mr. Jarvis was dismissed. Mr. Jarvis certainly should have been taken on at Dauphin instead of a new man who knew nothing about the business. Mr. Fletcher, the present land agent, has to get help from Winnipeg at the end of each month. Mr. Stevenson has admitted that Mr. Fletcher has too much to do and on more than one occasion said he would report it to the department. Mr. Thompson, the homestead inspector, has frequently to be taken from his regular duties and placed in this office to assist Mr. Fletcher, and Mr. Fletcher should be given permanent help.

Mr. HACKETT. It may appear strange that one coming so far from the east should inquire into what is going on in the North-west, but a friend of mine from Prince Edward Island went to the North-west some seventeen years ago and was appointed inspector of homesteads. He worked under the government for a number of years until the present administration came into power. He was a Frenchman, John J. Arsenault, a most capable man, and was dismissed without cause and without any investigation. I would ask the hon. minister to deal with him fairly and not have his head go into the basket without an opportunity of being heard.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The case of Mr. Arsenault is one I happened to be personally acquainted with. I do not think the hon. gentleman or anybody else could complain of his dismissal. He had practically been the election agent of the Conservative party in the part of the country where he lived for some years before his dismissal, and I do not think that his own political friends expected the government to retain his services.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the date of the resignation by the hon. member for Selkirk of the position he held prior to his election and the date of the appointment of a successor ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not remember the exact date. It was about the time he was nominated, and his successor was appointed a month ago.

Mr. BENNETT. Then his resignation was in at the time of the official nomination or a week prior to the 7th of November ?

Mr. McCREARY. I was nominated on the 25th December. I had not seen the Minister of the Interior for six months, nor had I any letter from him when I ran for Selkirk. I was appointed in 1897, and was mayor of Winnipeg, and had been alderman a number of years, and was requested to be mayor the following year. I had a salary of $1,200 which I resigned. During the entire time I occupied the position of commissioner of immigration—you will pardon my referring to it to-night, but I do so because it has been referred to by one or two members—during the three years that I occupied that position, not a Conservative in Manitoba or the Territories would venture to say that I took any part in politics. At a meeting of the whole board of trade, with over 400 citizens of Winnipeg present, Mr. A. M. Nanton and Mr. E. L. Drewry respectively, formerly president and vice-president of the Conservative Association—the deputy minister was present and will recollect it, and the papers of that time will bear out what I say—stated that I have never taken any part in politics while I held that office. And let it be noted that while I was in office I did not work under the civil service rule. It was not a case of going to the office at ten o'clock and quitting at half-past four. I was at my office generally at 8.30 in the morning, and I was there until six o'clock in the afternoon ; four out of the seven days of the week I was there in the evenings until ten o'clock; and we never had Saturday afternoons. The office of the commissioner is open every Saturday afternoon, and five or six of the staff are there for half the day on Sunday. It was not my intention when I accepted that office to remain for ever a civil servant. I had ambitions ; and when I was offered a county I accepted it. I did not know, twenty-four hours before, that I should be nominated. After I was nominated, my work being behind, I went to the office of the commissioner and remained

there for the following week or ten days, I think that my resignation took place on the 1st of October. I asked the deputy minister to credit me with three weeks holidays for each of the four years I had been a civil servant, and allow me salary for that time. He refused. I said to him: Why not allow me, then, for the extra hours that I have put in? But he would not do it. I do not think it any disgrace to be a civil servant, if one is a conscientious one, as are many in Winnipeg and the Territories. In that immigration hall, in the office to which I was attached, 95 per cent of the employees are as conscientious people as you could put into office.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Who said they were not ?

Mr. McCREARY. Well, reflections have been cast. If I, as a civil servant, earn fairly every dollar paid me by the government, and I say that I will retire and run for the Commons or for the local legislature, surely that is all right. And suppose I run and lose, and there is no blot on my record in any way, is it wrong for the minister to appoint me to another office ? If there is anything wrong in that, I would like to know it. For my part, as I see it at present, I do not know what there can be wrong in it, supposing, of course, that while a civil servant, I did not use my position in any way to advance my own political interest.

Mr. BENNETT. I am not reflecting on the hon. gentleman, and simply asked the question to know the circumstances of his resignation. First impressions are always lasting, and I think the impression the hon. gentleman has shown as to the chances or prospects of returning to a position in the event of defeat must certainly have been in his mind at the time for his resignation, and, no doubt, there were facts to bear out that impression.

Mr. McCREARY. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) that if I accepted any position or had it been offered to me I did not think that it would be the same position. If the hon. gentleman were as tired of a position as I was of that, he would not accept reappointment. When you handle from 25,000 to 40,000 people a year 8,000 or 10,000 of whom cannot speak English, you get pretty tired of it.

Mr. CLANCY. We have had splendid exhibitions of innocence. The minister is innocent, the officials are innocent. An hon. gentleman has declared that he resigned his position without the knowledge of his superior, but thought that if he failed in gratifying his ambition to become a member of the House he might be given a position again. I do not blame the officials who acted on that view, because they understood, without being told, just what the minister would do. I would like to know whether, supposing a Conservative official, one appointed under the late government, had thought fit to accept a nomination, and had been defeated, no matter how good an official he had been, he would have been appointed. The Minister of the Interior, I venture to say would not have consented to his resigning his position to allow him to be alternately an official in the department and a candidate in an electoral contest. I do not wish to misrepresent the Minister of the Interior. It is well that we should have his view embalmed in 'Hansard,' to use an expression of a former member of this House. He declared in most unmistakable terms that had he been a consenting party to Mr. Thompson's resignation and to his candidacy for election, and had he then appointed him after his defeat, he would have been guilty of a most reprehensible act. What, then, would be the difference in case he had found one of his officials nominated as a party candidate and had neither protested nor disapproved, or had written a letter declaring his full approval of that gentleman becoming a candidate, and then, after his defeat appointing him to another ? Was not this merely carrying on a sort of pantomime ? He did not make the arrangements in words, but acted it. Will any one say that Mr. Thompson did not understand that if he were defeated he would be reappointed ? And in this have we not a state of things that is far from creditable. I have not reflected upon those gentlemen who were formerly officials. If hon. gentlemen opposite wish to find shelter behind such a plea, they must set up that shelter themselves, for no one has alleged anything against these former officials. At the same time, I have not deprived myself, should the occasion arise, to consider the question, and to express my views as to whether these gentlemen were good officials or not.

But at this stage no such allegation has been made. The allegation has been made of unseemly conduct on the part of the government. I do not blame the hon. gentlemen who took advantage of it. They had the assent of their minister, and the minister to-day has made a statement that I think is a very alarming one. The hon. gentleman has been accused of permitting his officials to become candidates. Before they became candidates they must certainly have had the consent of the minister. I repeat that the minister might just as well have written a letter calling him into his office and saying to him: You may become a candidate, and if you are defeated, just come back to me and you will have your office again. I am glad the hon. gentleman has put himself on record, and the country will judge accordingly :

Inspectors' expenses, travelling expenses of commissioner, superintendent of mines and homestead inspectors, contingencies of Dominion lands and Crown timber agents, and at head office, removal expenses, stationery and printing, &c. $36,000

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman kindly explain the reason of this increase of $5,000 ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That consists of the following items : First, there are nine homestead inspectors and five forest rangers continually employed, and to provide for their travel and living expenses it is estimated that the sum of $8,000 will be required. It is proposed to make a more frequent inspection of the Dominion lands and Crown timber offices, which will cost probably $1,000. Provision has been made for temporary help at agencies, should there be a rush of work, $2,500; expenses of inspector of agencies, $1,000; expenses of superintendent of mines, $1,000; contingencies of Dominion lands and Crown timber agencies, $14,000; printing and stationery, $6,000; express and freight charges, $700; legal expenses, $600; temporary help, $1,200; miscellaneous and unforeseen, $1,000.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Who is the commissioner of Dominion lands ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. J. G. Turriff.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Is he in the city now ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, he is out west with one of the immigration agents of the department. He went about a week ago in company with an English journalist who is writing a series of letters in the English papers. Our immigration agent came across with him, and I sent Mr. Turriff along with him for the purpose of assisting him.

Mr. CLANCY. How many Dominion land agents are there and how many homestead inspectors ? How many perform the double duty of homestead inspector and Dominion lands agent ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am informed there is one homestead inspector in British Columbia, in the Kamloop district, who takes entries from settlers, but he is the only one. None of the other homestead inspectors are permitted to take entries.

Members of the board of examiners of Dominion land surveyors, including contingent expenses of board $300

Mr. SCOTT. On the previous item respecting surveys, I wished to ask a question, which I will ask now. I understand that representations were made to the department asking that further subdivisions be made of the Cypress Hills country, in the Medicine Hat district. I wish to ask if that work will be provided for this year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Provision is made for that survey.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the minister say how many extra clerks there are, and how much is paid for the clerks, and how much for advertising ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The increase in the salaries, $7,000, is made up altogether by the appointment of temporary clerks at the head office. I need not read the names, but I have the list here. There are two subjects especially which have caused a very large amount of work in the department. One is the issuing of half-breed script in the North-west, which has entailed a large amount of clerical work; the other is the issuing of patents for the railway land grants. The amount of clerical work that has to be done in connection with both is very large. These clerks have been appointed only lately, and we are taking a supplementary estimate for the purpose of paying them for the balance of the present year. We will require to keep them on during the next year. They are all known as temporary writers. There are thirty-two clerks. The total salaries will amount to $14,607.50; advertising, $2,392.50.

Protection of timber lands in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and tree culture in the North-west Territories $15,000

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is an item as to which, I understand, there will be some discussion, not so much in regard to the item as in respect to the subject it refers to. Possibly this particular item might be allowed to stand for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, I would be very glad to leave that over.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps we may go on with the next one.

To provide for extra service in connection with Dominion lands, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act $5,000

Mr. CLANCY. That covers, I think, somewhat the same service.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am asking for this vote in connection with the preparation of patents for railway land grants. The department will have to have some special assistance other than the young ladies who are hired as temporary writers. We will probably have to have one or two men of some experience in work of that kind.

Mr. CLANCY. This item involves a very considerable question, as a new service is being entered upon in regard to the work of reforesting the country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no objection in allowing the previous item to stand.

Mr. CLANCY. I take it that this item has no relation to the one provided for reforesting ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, none whatever.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I understand that the item respecting reforesting remains, and that the other item is adopted.

Mr. CLANCY. The item of $15,000 remains.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only one we reserve is that for the protection of timber lands, &c.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. Minister of the Interior has not stated what is the nature of the extra services that he requires.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This item has reference to the work of issuing patents for railway land grants. I have explained to my hon. friend that we will require some special assistance in connection with this other than that of those parties who are simply temporary writers. We will have to get, probably, the services of a solicitor, and possibly two, in order to check the work that is done by the others. We do not want to make permanent appointments, because this is not permanent work.

Mr. CLANCY. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that that $17,000 is additional to this sum for extra services ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am asking $5,000 separately, because there is a clause which says 'notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.' The other appointments are made under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Do I understand that the hon. minister intends to employ clerks who are already employed by the government for their services ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We will use the staff of the department to the extent we can, and then we will have to secure some additional assistance. There will be no extra pay to any officers of the department.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Then, why put in these words 'notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.'

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That will enable us to appoint a person at more than $400 a year. We cannot appoint a person and pay more than $400 a year, as we have no authority to do so under the law. The law requires that we shall start a temporary writer at $400. We do not want to make permanent appointments, because this is not permanent work. We simply want to appoint temporary help.

Some resolutions reported.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1900.—(Hon. W. S. Fielding.)

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, I would like to mention to the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that the meeting of the Public Accounts Committee, which has been called for to-morrow, has been postponed. We are desirous, for the purpose of expediting the business of the House, that that committee should meet at once, and I understand from hon. gentlemen who are more familiar with the work of that committee than I am, that they desire that there should be at least two meetings each week. I am not, I think, a member of the committee myself, and, therefore, I am not familiar with its work, but that is what I understand from hon. gentlemen who are familiar with its work and who know what it will be called upon to do. I would like also to mention, on behalf of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), that the papers respecting the pay of 'C' Battery have not been brought down. He desires that they should be brought down at an early date, so that they may be used for purposes connected with the estimates. I understand from the hon. Minister of Finance that we may look for the budget on Thursday.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the budget speech will be delivered on Thursday. In regard to the Public Accounts Committee, I may say that as the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee was out of town, I told my secretary, that if he could find whoever was acting in his place. I would be glad if it should be found convenient to postpone the meeting to-morrow, as I was anxious to be present. I received notice that the postponement had taken place. I may say, in regard to future meetings, that I do not anticipate there will be any difficulty after this week.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.10 Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 13, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 63) to amend the Franchise Act, 1898.—Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) asked for leave to introduce Bill (No. 64) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.

He said: This Bill provides for amendments to the section respecting the posting of proclamations in the Territories. It also provides that in the case of the deposit required with the returning officer, a certified cheque on a bank will be available as deposit. Then it provides for a change in the form of the ballot to obviate difficulties arising in certain sections of Ontario where some of the voters marked their ballots outside the space opposite the name. It also provides that in the case of manhood suffrage voters, those who move from one district to another will not lose their votes, and makes provision that in the event of manhood suffrage registration lists having been prepared under the Dominion Act within the year previous to a by-election, they may be available for that new election, and do away with the necessity of making a new list, as is the case now with the lists in force in the provinces.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does the hon. gentleman intend to make any provision for Mr. Thornton getting the seat to which he has been elected, and for the reference of cases arising out of little imperfections in carrying out the law, to a county judge, where speedy justice can be obtained, as in the case of a recount and in municipal election cases?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The paraticular election of West Durham is a matter which does not come within the purview of my powers, but within the powers of the House generally. The hon. gentleman's second point deserves consideration, and when the Bill comes up I will try to provide some short method of disposing of preliminary objections.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). All my hon. friend meant was whether the provision of the Bill with respect to a certified cheque would be made retroactive.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would have to ask my hon. friend's opinion as to the propriety of such retroactive legislation.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MEDICAL COUNCIL IN CANADA.

Mr. THOMAS G. RODDICK (Montreal, St. Antoine) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 65) to provide for the establishment of a Medical Council in Canada.

He said: I am very glad to have the opportunity of explaining this measure which, I think, is one of very considerable importance, and somewhat misunderstood in some quarters. Confederation had hardly been consummated when the medical profession of the four provinces, then constituting the Dominion, made up their mind that a mistake had been probably made in leaving the profession in the hands of the provincial governments. While common school education, grammar school education, and academy education, might well have been left in the hands of the provincial governments, it is questionable whether it was good policy or advisable to leave the professions, especially the profession of medicine, entirely under their control. Medicine, which is so cosmopolitan, it was thought, might well have been left to the central or Dominion government. In fact so thoroughly convinced on this point did the profession appear to be, that immediately after the British North America Act was passed, representatives of the profession from Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, met in the city of Quebec, as early in the history of confederation as 1867, the year of its birth. The president on that occasion elected was Dr. Tupper, now Sir Charles Tupper, and representatives of all nationalities and creeds were present. It was decided, after some discussion, to draft a Bill which should be presented to the Dominion government, to the effect that so far as the profession of medicine was concerned, the British North America Act should be amended so as to give the profession of medicine over to the central government. This Bill was worked up very thoroughly for two years, and in this city, in 1869, a meeting of the profession was held, then under the name of the Canadian Medical Association. This Bill was discussed at very considerable length during several days, but was not passed by the Canadian Medical Association and was practically killed. I believe that the want of success on that occasion was due to the fact that an attempt was being made to override the British North America Act by taking away from the provinces all power in connection with the medical profession and the granting of medical degrees. Another reason, I think, was that too large representation was asked by the universities. On that account the Bill was killed, and very little further was done in that direction. But, on many occasions, at the annual meetings of the Canadian Medical Association, this subject was brought up; and, at last, about seven or eight years ago, it was

decided to attempt to bring about a scheme of interprovincial registration. That means that the provinces should have an understanding among themselves that a man having a license to practice in one province should be allowed, on crossing the imaginary boundary line, to practice in the next province. This scheme went on fairly well until the Ontario Medical Council enacted that, before anything of that kind could be done it was necessary that a central examining board should be established in each province. Up to that time some of the provinces had no such examining board. Quebec never had from the very first. This central examining board was necessary according to the Ontario men, in order that the licentiates should receive recognition by the province of Ontario. There was a very strong feeling on the part of the profession in the province of Quebec in favour of bringing this about if possible, and establishing a central examining board in Quebec. The profession in that province went so far as to frame a Bill, which was presented before the local government at Quebec. But during that session of the legislature of Quebec, and when the Bill was about to come up, the heads of the three universities in the province of Quebec—McGill, Laval and Bishop's—appeared and opposed this Bill. They said that they could not allow their charter rights to be disturbed. According to the present usage, and from the time of confederation, it has been customary for the diplomas of these three universities to be accepted by the licensing body of the province of Quebec as sufficient to allow the holder to practice medicine in that province. Having discovered that it was impossible to meet the conditions of the Ontario Medical Council, and considering also that this provincial reciprocity would simply be a kind of understanding among the provinces which might have been destroyed at any moment, and also that it would stand in the way of a measure as general as we should like, thus preventing reciprocity with Great Britain and probably with France, the interprovincial scheme was dropped. Then, at a meeting of the profession in the province of Quebec three years ago, it being found that the scheme proposed was impracticable, the association representing the profession in the whole Dominion passed the following resolution :

> Your committee desire to recommend that further steps be taken to ascertain the practicability of further legislation leading to the establishment of a federal qualification which will also place the profession in Canada on an equal footing with that of Great Britain, and that Dr. Roddick be authorized to take the necessary steps in the matter.

On the same occasion another resolution was passed, appointing a strong committee representative of the various provinces to assist and strengthen Dr. Roddick's hands before the government. With this committee, Sir, I began to look about for a scheme. I consulted the law officers of the Crown, the parliamentary law officers and other legal friends, with a view to getting as much information as possible. I found that there were only two ways in which this parliament could interfere in this matter to gain what we sought. One was to bring about an amendment to the British North America Act. That, you know, Sir, is a large and heavy contract, and probably would never come to anything. An amendment to the British North America Act means that you must have, first or all, the assent of the two Houses of parliament in this country, then of the House of Lords and the House of Commons in Great Britain —and then, after all, the chances are, that when the matter was brought before the Privy Council it would be annulled and destroyed. So, that idea had to be given up. Then, I found—or rather, these legal friends found for me—another way out of the difficulty. Under section 91 of the British North America Act, the Dominion parliament has power to make laws——

> —for the peace, order and good government of Canada in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the legislature of the provinces.

Under this section, the Canada Medical Act and the Adulteration Act have been worked out since confederation. And I think you will agree with me, Sir, when I can prove, as can easily be done, that a medical man cannot cross the imaginary line between the provinces, cannot cross a river such as the Ottawa, without running the risk of being fined and, perhaps, imprisoned when he is atempting to save the lives of citizens of Canada, that the peace, order and good government of Canada are violated.

In order to bring about the change we desire, it will be necessary, of course, to get the co-operaiton of all the provinces. It would be a mistake, in fact, it would be suicidal, to attempt anything without that co-operation. The autonomy of the provinces must not be disturbed in any way, nor need it be disturbed if the method that I shall propose is pursued. It will be necessary, either before or after the passage of the Bill in this House, for the medical board in each province of Canada to have an amendment made in the Medical Act of the province to the effect that, after the establishment of a Dominion medical council and a Dominion examining board, any one having the qualification which that council and that examining board will give him may go to another province in Canada and ask for admission to practice medicine in that province. Each medical board will have to have a short enactment tacked on to the present Act in order that this may be carried out. Whether we have a permissive Bill here, a Bill which will anticipate or

precede the local enactment, or whether it shall succeed it, I think is a matter of very little consequence. There is one advantage in having it precede the local enactment, and that is, that it hurries up the local boards and the local parliaments in making their enactment. But, of course, it is a disadvantage in that it appears to be forcing the hand of the provinces, which I should be very sorry indeed to do.

Probably it does not occur to you, Mr. Speaker, or to other members of this House that it would be quite competent for this parliament to establish a Dominion medical board. It would be quite competent for the Minister of Militia and Defence to insist that every militia officer under the control of the Dominion government shall be examined before a Dominion examining board: it would be quite competent for the Solicitor General or the Minister of Justice to insist that every penitentiary surgeon shall pass an examination before a Dominion board; it would be quite competent for the Minister of the Interior to insist that his mounted police, those under his control, shall have a Dominion qualification; and in every new territory which is established by the Dominion of Canada under the control of this parliament, the same conditions might be exacted. Therefore, Sir, I think it is quite competent for this parliament to establish a Dominion examining board, and to pass a Dominion Act of this character. Of course, men who would have that qualification would, on the strength of that, have no right to practice in the various provinces, where provincial rights exist, and on that account it is too contracted in its character, and I should not advise that anything of the kind should be done.

Now, Sir, I think it can be proved that a Dominion medical council can be established. How is that council to be constituted? That is a very difficult question, and one which has given me more thought than any other. Shall this council be established on the principle of representation by population? Shall it be established on the principle of the province having the greater number of medical men being represented in proportion on that council? Worked out on a scheme of representation by population, it would mean a very large and unwieldy board. Ontario has 2,500 medical men; Prince Edward Island has only 90, so taking Prince Edward Island as a unit, Ontario would be entitled to 28 representatives on this board; Quebec with its 1,400 doctors would have 15; Nova Scotia with its 476 doctors would have 5; New Brunswick with its 243 doctors would have 2 and a fraction; Manitoba with its 344 doctors would have 3; British Columbia with its 214 doctors would have 2; the North-west Territories with their 95 doctors would have one and a fraction.

Now, Sir, would this be fair to the smaller provinces, considering the fact that we are not going to disturb the status quo, that the medical boards of the provinces shall exist as they have always done? There is no intention to disturb them in any way; they must exist under any circumstances for the purposes of discipline and taxation; because the federal medical council could have nothing to do with discipline, that must be left entirely to the provincial boards. Considering the fact that we are not disturbing the provincial boards, do you think it would be necessary for Ontario to have 27 representatives on this board, for Quebec to have 15, for Prince Edward Island to have one, and so on? I think not. I think a fairer way, under the circumstances, would be for each province to have the same number. That seems odd; but we know that when the American constitution was drafted, the little state of Rhode Island was given two representatives in the Senate of the United States, and the great state of New York only two, and that system still exists.

I think a scheme would answer every purpose under which there would be three representatives on this council from each province of the Dominion, including the North-west Territories, and making altogether 24. I would propose this method of electing them: The president of each medical council in each province would be ex-officio a member of this council, one would be elected from among the council, and one would be appointed by the Governor General in Council. That would give a representation of three from each province. Of course the question will be asked, why have a representative appointed by the Governor General in Council? I will give you my reasons for making this proposition. This board of 24 with three others to be added, as I will explain in a moment, should become and will become what the British Medical Council is to Great Britain, and what the Council of Hygiene is to France, namely an advisory board to the Dominion government, a board that can be called upon in case of dangerous pestilence or incursion of disease of any kind, to give the best possible advice under the circumstances to the health officers of the Crown, and to the health officers of the various provinces. Of course the best men should be selected, and I think we could trust any government to see to it that politics would not enter into the selection. I am satisfied that every government would feel bound, in recommending these men as their advisers, to select those who were eminent in their profession, men who were perhaps professors in universities, men who would possess special qualifications. Under this scheme of three from each province you have a board of 24. But I am satisfied that three men could do the work which is required as well as 30 men. They are only expected to see that the conditions are carried out which are mentioned in this Bill. They are to see that the standard of education is not lowered, that the examination is at least

as high as it would be in any province of the Dominion of Canada. Three men, who have their local board to fall back upon for advice and counsel will do the work as well as thirty. I think that three will be quite sufficient.

Besides these we require to have three more. A question which met me in working out this scheme was that the homeopaths and those who practice homeopathy in this country have certain rights in all the provinces and that these rights must be respected. On that account I would suggest, and the suggestion did not come directly from me but from the homeopathic body, that three homeopaths be added to this council. In every province in Canada they have rights ; of course these rights must be respected, and I think it would be only fair to give them three representatives. I would have these three representatives elected by the homeopaths themselves by ballot from the whole Dominion, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Wherever there are homeopaths let them have a vote and be allowed to select their three representatives on this council. They should also, besides that, have the right to examine in certain subjects which especially have to do with the practice of medicine, and they should have the privilege of having examiners. That will make a board of 27.

Mr. HYMAN. May I ask the hon. gentleman whether the homeopaths are satisfied with the provisions spoken of ?

Mr. RODDICK. This is their own suggestion. A prominent homeopath, Dr. Campbell, of London, the city which my hon. friend (Mr. Hyman) represents, himself drew up the resolution, which I will not read because it is long. This body, composed of twenty-seven medical men, representing all the pathies having rights in the country and all the provinces in the Dominion, would meet under the ægis, to begin with, of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). He has usually charge of matters of that kind, and to begin with, at any rate, he would have to be constituted the convener of this body. This body would meet in Ottawa, for instance, and with the co-operation of the provinces, would make arrangements for carrying out the scheme of examination. They would not be a teaching body ; they would only examine. They would appoint examiners, the best men to be found, to examine students having passed a certain curriculum; that is to say, that a medical student who expects to get a Dominion qualification, which will give him the whole Dominion to roam in, in fact the empire to roam in, would be expected and obliged to spend five years in the study of medicine. At present many of the provinces, in fact nearly all, with the exception of Ontario, exact only four years. but we think that five years should be spent in the study of medicine, the last year in the study of practical medicine, and besides it is necessary to have a fifth year in order to be admitted to practice in Great Britain and to get registration in Great Britain. I reach now the point where reciprocity with Great Britain becomes possible. Hitherto Canadians have been prevented. without taking at least a year's study in Great Britain and sometimes more, from receiving a license to practice in Great Britain or in any of the colonies of Great Britain outside of Canada. That, Sir, places a young Canadian medical man at a very great disadvantage. He has hitherto been unable to cope with the Australian, as I shall presently explain to the House, and has been prevented from entering the service of the empire. According to the British Medical Act of 1886 :

On and after the prescribed day, where a person shows to the satisfaction of the registrar of the general council that he holds some recognized colonial medical diploma or diplomas (as hereinafter defined), granted to him in a British possession to which this Act applies, and that he is of good character, and that he is by law entitled to practise medicine, surgery and midwifery in such British possession, he shall, on application to the said registrar, and on payment of such fee, not exceeding £5, as the general council may from time to time determine, be entitled, without examination in the United Kingdom, to be registered as a colonial practitioner in the medical register.

There is a definition which follows of the expression 'British possession,' which I should like to bring to the attention of the House.

The expression ' British possession ' means any part of Her Majesty's dominions, exclusive of the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands; and where parts of such dominions are under both a central and a local legislature, all parts under one central legislature are for the purposes of this definition deemed to be one British possession.

The British Medical Council in 1886 met us more than half way in arranging for the admission into the empire of our Canadian doctors. Australians, from the fact that they have had autonomous provinces up to this time, have been admitted and registered in Great Britain without further examination. The consequence is that you will find an Australian student, a graduate of an Australian university, coming to London and settling down in Harley street, or Piccadilly, or any other street, simply on the presentation of his colonial degree, while we, from the fact of our provinces being under one confederation, have been debarred. The British Medical Council says : We will not recognize provinces ; we will recognize only a qualification from the central or Dominion government. Therefore, I contend, this is another very strong argument in favour of this Bill becoming law. This would mean that to our young Canadian doctors the army and navy of Great Britain would be open without further examination. To them would be opened the colonial medical appointments, some of

which are well worth having, the West India medical appointments and the appointments in India and in every British possession over which the British flag flies. They are now debarred from these prizes, and I say it is hardly fair, considering that we have the students and graduates of another colony where the facilities for teaching are not any better, if as good as they are in Canada, enjoying these privileges. Of course, I cannot speak authoritatively, but in a conversation which I had three years ago with Dr. Charles Richer, who is well known as one of the ablest scientists in France, who is the professor of physiology in the University of Paris, and who is on the committee on constitution of the University of Paris, I had from him the assurance that if we had established in this Canada of ours, a Dominion board, qualifying for the practice of medicine, he had very little doubt indeed that he would be able to persuade his colleagues to accept those having that qualification. Therefore, not only would our English medical men have the British empire to roam in, but I feel satisfied from what I have learned that our French graduates would have France and her possessions for their field of labour. These are very strong reasons why this Bill should be well and favourably considered.

Of course, I am satisfied that the financial aspect of the question has to be taken into consideration. This medical council cannot be started, or at all events operated at the beginning, without some assistance, and when the matter is better understood I hope we will be able to persuade the right hon. the Prime Minister and his Minister of Finance that it would be nothing *outre* to give a grant towards this object at any rate for the first three or five years. This grant need not be very large; $3,000 or $4,000 would probably suffice. It would be necessary to pay the expenses of the examiners who shall be called on to hold examinations in the great centres of the country, and especially where there are hospital facilities. This being a Dominion measure and the government having practically the power to appoint one of these examiners, we may I think hope for some assistance from the Dominion treasury.

I have, of course, only glanced superficially over the provisions of the Bill, but I might further state that there is a clause which has reference to the profession of to-day. There is what you might call a retroactive clause in the Bill, to the effect that when any medical man has practised medicine for a certain number of years—the number of years has not been settled upon yet as to whether it shall be five years or seven years or longer—but when a man shall have been a practitioner of medicine in any province in the Dominion for a certain number of years he shall be allowed to take advantage of this legislation, and by paying the registration fee he will be allowed to practice medicine in any province he may choose.

Now, to sum up the advantages of the Bill. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that we may expect from it a higher standard of medical education, and from the fact of having five years to study, we may hope to get a better class of medical men than under a four years course. One great point to be remembered in connection with this measure is, that it is going to break down the barriers which at present exist, between the various provinces. It may not be known to every member in this House, that at the present time it is illegal and practically impossible for a medical man to step across an imaginary boundary line from one province to another to practice his profession. I know a doctor living at River Beaudette, who has been fined three times already for crossing the imaginary line into the province of Ontario to attend to his patients. That man cannot go out at night without entering the province of Ontario; his patients are in the province of Ontario and within sight of his own house, and yet it is practically impossible for him to avoid the operation of this existing law. It is the same way between Hull and Ottawa here. If you, Mr. Speaker, lived in the city of Hull, and for some personal or business reasons you were obliged to come to the city of Ottawa and to bring your family with you, it would be impossible for you to have your own medical man to follow you, unless he had a license to practice in the province of Ontario. That is unquestionably a very great hardship. Some one may ask me: why does he not get a diploma in the province of Ontario. The answer is: that it may have been impossible for him to do so. If a student begins to study medicine in one province by complying with the provincial enactment in reference to matriculation, he may be debarred for ever from getting into another province, so absurd are the regulations to-day. These barriers exist in no other country under the sun, and it is the object of this Bill to break them down. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that between the unfriendly countries of France and Germany, (and you know they are not very fond of each other), they have a neutral zone of fifteen miles on the frontier especially arranged for medical men to pass the sentries in the discharge of their professional duties; while here in this enlightened Dominion, a medical man is unable to cross an imaginary provincial boundary to save life. When you think how cosmopolitan medicine is; that a broken leg is a broken leg in Canada as in Russia and Siberia, and that pneumonia is treated on exactly the same principles here as elsewhere; it does seem hard that some more satisfactory arrangement cannot be made for our profession. I can understand that in law where you have the Code Napoleon in the province of Quebec and the English

civil law in the other provinces, it might be difficult though not impossible to have interprovincial reciprocity in that profession ; but such difficulties do not exist in connection with the practice of medicine. Another very great advantage of having a medical examining board empowered to give diplomas to practice in any part of the Dominion or of the empire, is, that you would relieve the congestion which no doubt exists in our profession in the Dominion. If all the fields for the display of energy which I have referred to were open to Canadians it would place our men in a far more advantageous position. Instances in connection with the South African war have been cited to me time and again, in which our Canadian doctors who accompanied the regiments were debarred from attending any but Canadian soldiers. They were good enough and as able as any other doctors in the field, but they could not attend any soldiers other than Canadians. That places the profession under a very great disadvantage. It throws a slur on our Canadian doctors. As I have stated, many of our Canadians were as capable as any medical men in the field, and it is too bad to think they were turned down simply because they did not have a diploma which they could not get, but which they will be able to get should this Bill become law. I hope that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister will consider this Bill of sufficient importance to appoint a committee of the medical men of this House to consider it. There are some thirteen or fifteen of us here now, all of whom would I am sure be pleased to assist in [illegible] a measure which would be satisfactory to all; and of course we would like to have them supplemented by others, especially members of the legal profession. I apologize to the House for occupying so much of its time.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). The Bill which the hon. gentleman has introduced raises the question of the benefits of a legislative union as compared with those of a federative union, such as we have in Canada. There are cases in which a federative union is a disadvantage ; and we ought to consider not only how best to cure the evil which has been pointed out in reference to the practice of medicine, but other difficulties which are constantly arising in this country ; for instance, the question of our divorce and marriage laws, and the definition of an insolvent, a creditor and a debtor. In each of these cases there are a number of definitions, one province adopting one and another province another. The day is coming when a way out of these difficulties should be found. It is absurd that a practitioner of medicine cannot practice in every province of the Dominion. I believe the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roddick) has found a solution of that difficulty ; but he has only touched the margin of a very important question. I do not think we can now ever come to a legislative union ; but I believe the cure will be found in appointing a royal commission of eminent men—say one of the judges of the Supreme Court, a man like the Clerk of this House, a representative of the Quebec judiciary, a representative of the Ontario judiciary, and so on, to study the question ; and when some kind of constitutional revision comes, as it must come in this country before many years, we shall have a fund of information collected which will be of the greatest value. There is something else coming. There is a great deal of talk, not only in this portion of the empire, but in every other portion, of the value and merit of Imperial unity. Imperial unity to my mind will have its value and its strength when the same laws obtain throughout the empire rather than in any kind of an Imperial federation. Why should there not be a code for the whole empire which would define, for instance, what a husband and a wife are, what a debtor and a creditor are ?

Mr. OSLER. That is a pretty tough thing.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, it is not. The right of a husband or a wife differs very largely in all the provinces of the Dominion. The same thing applies to the parties connected with a note and the parties connected with an insolvency. We will have to straighten out all these things in Canada, and some day throughout the empire; and when we have them straightened throughout the empire, and have an Imperial code that defines them in the same way in every part of the empire, then we shall have a bond of Imperial unity, uniting all the people of the empire together. It is an important question. But in regard to the particular matter before the House, the time has come when this parliament should deal with the question and enable a Canadian doctor to practice, not only all over Canada, but throughout the empire, just as doctors in the old country have a right to practice in Australia. I hope the suggestion made by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Roddick) will receive the consideration of the government ; that he will get the committee he asks for, and the assistance of the government and the legal gentlemen in this House in the direction of securing uniformity throughout the Dominion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

PRICES OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

At what dates were the changes made in the prices of binder twine during 1900, and what were the changed prices ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier). In the absence of the Solicitor General, I beg to answer. In January, 1900, the prices for twine were fixed as follows :—

Quantities.	Manila.	Mixed.	New Zealand.
In lots of 50 tons and upwards.	.12½	.09½	.08½
In car-load lots (less than 50 tons)	.13	.10	.09
In lots of one ton up to a car-load	.13½	.10½	.09½
In lots of less than one ton....	.14	.11	.10

Terms in all cases cash on delivery.

In June the prices were fixed as follows :—

Quantities.	Manila.	New Zealand.
In lots of 100 tons	.12	.07½
In lots of 50 tons	.12½	.08
In car-load lots (less than 50 tons)	.13	.08½
In lots of less than a car-load.	.13½	.09

Prices for mixed twine (Beaver) as follows :

Fifty tons and over	.09
Car-load lots	.09½
Ton lots	.10
Under a ton	.10½

On July 11, the prices were as follows :

Quantities.	Mixed Manila Beaver.	New Zealand Standard.	Pure Sisal.	Pure Manila.
In 50 ton lots..	.08	.06¼	.08¾	.10½
Car-loads	.08¼	.06½	.09	.11
Ton lots	.08½	.06¾	.09¼	.11½
Less than a ton	.09	.07	.09½	.12

MR. WM. MOORE.

Mr. CULBERT asked :

1. Has William Moore been dismissed from the position of caretaker of the public buildings at the town of Brockville ?
2. If so, when ?
3. When was he appointed ?
4. Were there any charges preferred against him ?
5. If so, by whom ?
6. Was there an investigation ?
7. Has a successor been appointed ?
8. If so, whom ?
9. Have any complaints been made against the present caretaker for neglecting his duties ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. Mr. Moore's services were dispensed with.
2. December 15, 1900.
3. January 8, 1896.
4 and 5. The minister satisfied himself that the dismissal of Mr. Moore was required in the public interest.
6. No.
7. Yes.
8. Wm. Purvis.
9. None, so far as known.

MR. J. GALLANT.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. From what place did F. Gallant, deputy returning officer at poll No. 6, West Prince, claim mileage fees for taking vote at said poll on November 7, 1900 ?
2. What was the amount of travelling fees claimed ?
3. Was the claim paid ? If not, why not ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. F. Gallant, deputy returning officer at poll No. 6, West Prince, P.E.I., claimed mileage from Chatham, N.B.
2. The amount claimed was $25.25.
3. The claim was not paid, because section 13 of the Dominion Elections Act provides that 'no person shall be appointed deputy returning officer, election clerk or poll clerk who is not a resident of the electoral district within which he is to act.'

ALBERTON, P.E.I.—POSTMASTER.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Who is the postmaster at Alberton, Prince Edward Island ?
2. When was he appointed and what is his salary with or without office room ?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND :

1. Mary Jane Clark is postmistress at Alberton, P.E.I.
2. She was appointed on April 1, 1900. Her salary is $450 per annum. She has also a rent allowance of $60 per annum.

SAFES TO POSTMASTERS.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

Is it the intention of the government to supply safes to postmasters at places of considerable importance, as Tignish, P.E.I., when salary of the postmaster is too restrictive to permit him to provide one for himself ?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. It is not the intention of the government at present to make any change in regulations hitherto prevailing, according to which postmasters in offices not located in public buildings have been required to furnish suitable protection for the mails under their charge at their own cost.

PORT COLBORNE.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. What was the total expenditure by the government on Port Colborne harbour since June 30, 1896 ?
2. What is the amount expended each year on said harbour since June 30, 1896 ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. Expenditure by Department of Public Works, $1,706.72.

2. In 1898-9, $598.43 ; 1899-1900, $340.25 ; to March 1, 1901, $768.04.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was the expenditure by the Department of Railways and Canals ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no further information. We will let the question stand.

LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Have tenders been asked for the construction or extension of the Montreal new lock of the Lachine Canal ?

2. If so, have any tenders been received, and from whom ?

3. On how many different occasions have tenders been asked for ?

4. What was the amount of each tender of each person tendering on each occasion ?

5. Has the contract been awarded to any person ? If so, to whom, and for what amount ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The contract has not been awarded.

MAIL CARRIAGE—SIMCOE.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

Have any contracts for the carrying of mails in the ridings of East, North or South Simcoe been renewed since the 15th day of July, 1896 ? If so, what ones were so renewed ? Have any temporary arrangements been made in any cases ?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. Some contracts have been renewed, but it would be quite impossible, with the staff we have in the department, to prepare the answer at the present time. If my hon. friend will move for a return, the whole information will be brought down.

MISS ELIZABETH CAYOUETTE.

Mr. MORIN asked :

1. Has Elizabeth Cayouette, formerly postmistress of Langevin, county of Dorchester, province of Quebec, been dismissed?

2. If so, for what reason ?

3. If dismissed, who is her successor ?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. She has not been dismissed.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copies of all petitions, papers, directions, letters and other correspondence relating to the change in the situation of the Pearl street subpost office in Hamilton, or to the age and reputation of the late postmaster, Mr. Hull, or to the situation of the new post office and the appointment of Mr. McDonell; also for copies of all communications and papers which led the inspector to make inquiry with regard to any of these matters.—Mr. Barker.

Copies of all correspondence, telegrams and reports of engineers, or other persons, referring to the improvements to be made at Grand Bend, on the east shore of Lake Huron, in the electoral district of North Middlesex.—Mr. Sherritt.

Copies of all specifications, tenders, &c., in connection with the contract for the Montreal harbour works, which was awarded to Messrs. Malone and Company, of Three Rivers, indicating what changes have been made in the contract as compared with the original specifications.—Hon. Mr. Haggart.

ANTICOSTI—CORRESPONDENCE WITH IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, telegrams and reports that have passed between the Dominion government and the Imperial government respecting the Island of Anticosti.

He said : In presenting this motion, I wish to draw to the attention of the House some correspondence that was placed in my hands with reference to the subject of the motion. A letter has been placed in my hands which appeared in the Montreal Witness of 10th January last, which gives a history of the Island of Anticosti which, I presume, very few have read before. The letter reads as follows :

Sir,—The establishment by Lloyd's of a signal service at Belle Isle to supersede the present signal station at the east end of Anticosti Island, 462 miles below Quebec, at this juncture, renders the question of the ownership of the Island of Anticosti a subject for the home as well as the colonial government, for two reasons. In the first place, the transference of this island, which has over 300 miles of seacoast, is about 140 miles long and about thirty-five miles broad in the widest part, with an average breadth of twenty-seven and a half miles, and comprising a territorial area of 2,460,000 acres, to private French ownership, thereby divesting British subjects of their rightful property, and, in the second, depriving the River St. Lawrence and its gulf of the most valuable natural harbours for naval defence existing at the front door of the great water highways of the Dominion of Canada, for the island possesses three harbours, one at Ellis Bay, a second at Fox Bay, and the other at South-west Point. The harbour at Ellis Bay at the upper end and that at Fox Bay at the lower end of the island, are capable of accommodating a large fleet of the largest sized sea-going ships and steamers with safety in all kinds of winds, having an excellent holding bottom of gravel and mud, and the other, South-west Point, could easily be made safe by the construction of breakwaters. These harbours offer peculiar advantages for purposes of naval defence, because all vessels bound up or down the St. Lawrence must pass close to the island. When it is mentioned that upwards of 2,000 vessels arrive from Europe in the season, embracing several of the finest lines of steamers afloat, besides a large fleet of coasting and fishing craft, all of which must necessarily pass within view of the island, the national importance attachable to the position and capabilities of these harbours for commercial and naval stations becomes apparent; and they are in the most convenient and central spot for

commanding with a few steam vessels or gunboats the two entrances of the river, and for the despatch of cruisers either up the stream or down to any of the gulf ports.

The whole Island of Anticosti was first granted by the Crown of France in 1680 to Louis Joliet, a Frenchman, in consideration of his discovery of Illinois, now the state of Illinois, and for other services rendered to the government. After the conquest of Canada by Great Britain it passed into the hands of wealthy English families, and for upwards of a hundred years the English heirs of Langan, Dunn and Stewart owned the island—the Langans one-half share and the others a quarter each—and in 1873 Captain Forsyth, late of the 7th Hussars, one of the heirs of Langan, made an organized attempt to settle the island, and during the next two years over 1,000 immigrants made their home there, a hardy race of Newfoundland fishermen settling at Fox Bay under the seigneurship of Captain Forsyth, whose policy was that all who applied for particular lots of land were told that they could occupy the land, and as soon as a survey had been made they would be granted the land at a reasonable rate. In addition to the settlers, there was likewise a floating population which visited the island during the fishing season, of some three or four thousand people. These people or their forefathers had visited the island for over a hundred years. During the season they occupied themselves in fishing and drying the fish they had caught. They were given the privilege of cutting what timber they required for their own use, and of shooting what game they needed. Stores and supplies of all kinds were established on the island, and the settlers and floating population were allowed the highest market price for fish, furs or anything they had to sell. Unfortunately for Captain Forsyth and the welfare of the settlers, his enterprise was ahead of the times, and having to bear all the expense, and the island being undivided, it was decided to bring it to licitation sale.

Four years ago Mr. Henri Menier, of French chocolate fame, purchased this island of Anticosti, which, as any one who will take the trouble to look at the map will see, commands the entrance to the River St. Lawrence. His object, as stated then, and many times since, was to provide for himself and his friends a game and fishing preserve where they might spend their summers with profit after the exacting operations of chocolate making in France. Mr. Menier acquired the island from an English company which had purchased it from a Mr. F. W. Stockwell, who in turn had bought it at the licitation sale, and Captain Forsyth claims that the licitation sale was illegal on the ground of conspiracy between the purchaser and the party who instituted the proceedings in licitation, and that judicial proceedings are not barred by the ordinary ten years' proscription, but come under the thirty years' statutory proscription.

However, Mr. Menier has got possession of this island, which, in the event of war between Great Britain and France, would be a valuable point for an enemy of Britain and Canada. While Anticosti was in the hands of good British subjects it was one thing; now it is in foreign hands, it is high time that the home government stepped in and demanded that the colonial daughter shall not forget her duty to the mother country by the alienation of any of her territory from British relationship. And this has been painfully emphasized by Mr. Menier's actions. His first act, what was it? To warn the English-speaking people on the island that they must move; that they no longer had any rights there; that all their years of labour in making a home for themselves and their families must go for nothing; and so he appointed Mr. Commettant governor, who cruelly evicted from their peaceful homes the English-speaking settlers of Fox Bay. It was nothing to him that these poor people had made their homes out of the wilderness of this once barren island, that their children had been born and their parents sepultured there. It is true the courts decided in Mr. Menier's favour as against the settlers, and so the provincial police were requisitioned to expel these people from the island and to tear down their houses, not because they were pirates or invaders, but because they could not be subject to Mr. Menier as absolute sovereign of the island and its waters. He demanded not only seigneur's fee of right of occupation, but they were forbidden to trap or shoot, or take any fish excepting codfish. He forbade any one to leave the island or to land upon its shores without his permission. He forbade them to trade with the outside world, or the outside world to trade with them. They must sell all to him and buy all from him, or forfeit their residence on the island. After twenty-seven years' freedom on Canada's free soil, they refused to sacrifice their manhood to be made serfs to a foreigner coming in and claiming what no citizen of Canada ever claimed in any part of this Dominion—an extensive right of ownership, as if he were the irresponsible king or the autocratic sovereign of that possession.

The Imperial government has already recognized that there is something of national importance to this Dominion, this celebrated Frenchman getting possession of the entrance to the St. Lawrence. The whole case is one of hardship and of interference with the rights of Canadian citizens and British subjects settled upon British soil, as was amply proved by the testimony of Edward Osborne and Hoyles Whiting, of Fox Bay, who were delegated by their brother-settlers to appear for them in the court at Murray Bay to show cause against eviction, and corroborated by the Rev. A. B. Argue, a resident missionary. Whether ultimately the Menier right of ownership be confirmed or upset by the courts, the question paramount to-day is, 'Shall the open door to the great River St. Lawrence be closed at the mere caprice and whim of an alien to Great Britain and the Dominion of Canada?' It is absurd to urge that merely because Mr. Menier has paid a mere bagatelle for and taken possession of the Island of Anticosti, he cannot be disturbed. Under the Militia Act of Canada the island can be expropriated by the Dominion government for military purposes, and with modern guns mounted on suitable sites no vessel could enter the St. Lawrence, for they could knock out anything attempting to go up or down this waterway.

This is a burning question to-day in Canada. No one here desires to dispossess Mr. Menier without compensation; the provincial government is impotent to move in the matter; the Federal government would like to do so if certain of national approval; therefore, the home government should lose no time in bidding the Dominion parliament to expropriate the island, place it in a condition of strong and ample defence, both from a naval and military standpoint, and so restore British soil to British possessors, who will see that its colonists live in peace and contentment. Canada, uninvited, went to the succour of the mother country; now the mother country can well afford to reciprocate in the direction indicated in this article.

In an interview with the writer, Captain Forsyth said: 'I am personally very fond of the French, and admire them as a great military nation, consequently I do not think it right to throw temptation in their way by permitting Mr. Menier to control such an important strategetical point as the Island of Anticosti. I am not acquainted with Mr. Menier, but judging from his treatment of the Fox Bay settlers, which from a rational view of the case was quite as bad, if not worse, than any Irish eviction, and the arbitrary policy he has adopted towards the fishing population in general, I see trouble and danger ahead. Indeed, had the evicted settlers not been a law-abiding and God-fearing class, instead of the pirates and wreckers he and his abettors tried to make the public believe they were, Mr. Menier and his agents would assuredly have been shot or thrown into the sea.'

That letter is signed by W. H. C. The Montreal Witness of the 5th of January, published this letter, and the following editorial concerning it :

We cannot add a word to the singularly clear and extremely interesting statement of the position and the history of the Island of Anticosti, which appears in another column of this paper under the signature of 'W. H. C.' We do not think the writer has attached any false seriousness to the national and Imperial aspects of the case, which he has so ably set forth. Assuming Mr. Menier's title to the island in fee simple to be perfect, though that is disputed by Captain Forsyth, and assuming that the limitations which he has placed upon residents by arbitrarily dispossessing English-speaking settlers, upon fishing off the shores and upon traffic with the island to be all within the law, it must still be admitted that there are national interests connected with so vast a domain in so prominent and strategetic a position, that are in no wise wiped out by the mere fact of private ownership. Nor is the fact that the ownership is foreign, and, under possible circumstance, anti-British, entirely without significance. It seems to us, therefore, the part of statesmanship, both Canadian and British, to give careful consideration to the facts presented, and if the proposal made by our correspondent fails to meet with approval, to inquire how otherwise the public interests of Canada and the empire may be safeguarded from possible damage.

That is an editorial of the Montreal Witness dated the 5th of January, stating that it is the duty of this government and of the British government immediately to expropriate the Island of Anticosti, and to take it into the hands of British people, so that it may not be a menace in future. I could read editorials from the Yarmouth Times, which are pretty strong, but I will not do so. However, I will refer to an interview which was copied in the Montreal Star of the 23rd of February, taken from a Paris correspondent under the same date. Mr. Menier, being interviewed, made use of this language :

Henri Menier was interviewed yesterday regarding the statement that a petition had been addressed to Mr. Chamberlain asking that Mr. Menier should be expropriated from Anticosti, and that the Colonial Secretary had referred the matter to the Canadian government to take such action as the interests of the empire demanded. Mr. Menier declared that the first information that he had in regard to this was in a telegram to the Daily Mail.

He is, he declared, on the best terms with the Canadian government and British authorities and is convinced that the incident is a very common place one, and that Mr. Chamberlain has nothing to do with it. 'He has,' said Mr. Menier, 'probably received, as has happened before, a petition from one or two of squatters of Fox Bay, who cannot console themselves for having been expelled from Anticosti, and has confined himself, according to his custom, to sending it to the proper quarter to be examined. It is just as if I had received from one of my workmen, which I would send to the manager of my factory to see what could be done with it. But the people of Anticosti since expulsion by the government——

That is the way that Mr. Menier puts it. He says that the people of Anticosti were expelled by the Canadian government, which, under cover, in my mind, was the fact because the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), after making his visit there, came back and said that the government should confirm Mr. Menier in his title to Anticosti. Mr. Menier continues :

But the people of Anticosti since expulsion by the government, of the squatters who wished, in spite of my rights, to take up their residence there, are quite reassured as to their position, on which the courts have pronounced several judgments, judgments which affirm my rights. Neither Mr. Chamberlain nor the Canadian government with which, I repeat, I am on the best terms, has, I am sure, any arrière pensée in the matter, and the incident is without importance.

That is what Mr. Menier says. He says that he is on the best of terms with the Canadian government. I fancied so when the question was put the other day as to how many licenses for catching lobsters were issued for the Island of Anticosti, and the answer was given that one had been issued at a fee of $100 to Mr. Dagget who is, I presume, one of Mr. Menier's men on the Island of Anticosti. This is a question of importance both to the British Empire and to Canada, as is stated by the writer of this letter who signs himself W. H. C. That island, if owned by a foreign power, or by a party whose interests are opposed to those of Canada, as no doubt Mr. Menier's are, could, with very little expense, be so fortified that no boat could pass up or down the River St. Lawrence. I am anxious to see what the correspondence is that has passed between the British and Canadian governments in reference to the matter of expropriating that island and taking possession of it. When once taken possession of I think these Fox Bay settlers who have been ejected from that island by this government should be restored to the lands that they have occupied for over 100 years. I think it is a case of hardship, and I will always think so. The people of Fox Bay were treated unfairly from first to last. I have

another motion on the paper upon which I will deal with that question more fully. At present I confine myself simply to getting the correspondence in order to see what has passed between the British and Canadian government in reference to the island.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, there is certainly no objection to bringing down the correspondence that has passed upon this question between the British government and the Canadian government. So far as my memory goes at present, I do not think there has been any correspondence exchanged as to the expropriation of the Island of Anticosti from Mr. Menier. There have been some representations made which will be brought down. The Imperial authorities, however, have never thought of calling our attention to the fact that Mr. Menier's property should be expropriated on the ground that there is danger in his possession of it to the British Empire or to Canada. Notwithstanding what the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) may say, that, if batteries were placed on the Island of Anticosti no vessel could enter the St. Lawrence, I must say that the wildest stretch of imagination could not support such a statement. I am not very familiar with the Island of Anticosti, but I believe there is, on each side of the island, an open channel at least sixty miles in width and certainly no batteries could command sixty miles of water. It is preposterous to think that the Island of Anticosti could be so fortified as to command the channels on both sides of the St. Lawrence. That it is of strategic importance is without doubt, and if, unfortunately, we were to have hostilities, it might be a point to consider whether or not we should take possession of it, but to say that this action ought to be taken to-day is out of the question altogether. At all events, as I said a moment ago, I do not remember at this moment that the Imperial authorities have ever made any representations of that character. That would be enough for the motion of the hon. gentleman, but, let me say, in passing, that he makes in regard to Mr. Menier, some observations which it is just as well for me to notice and to answer, not because we are on the best of terms with Mr. Menier, but simply because the remarks of the hon. gentleman may prejudice the public mind against Mr. Menier. Mr. Menier is a French citizen, and he says he is on the best of terms with the government. I do not say that there is anything wrong in that at all, either on the part of Mr. Menier, or the government. We cannot but be on the best of terms with all citizens of this country and with all those who have interests with us. I do not know that the terms upon which we are with Mr. Menier are better than the terms upon which we are with any other citizens. I do not think that I ever exchanged a single line with him and I am not aware that he has had any communication other than the official communications he has had to exchange with the government as being a citizen of another country having interests in Canada. In regard to the statements made by the hon. member for Leeds that Mr. Menier has arbitrarily dispossessed British citizens and that they have been expelled by the government, let me say that Mr. Menier, and I want the hon. gentleman to take particular notice of what I say, has treated all the squatters on the island whether they were English or French, in the same way. He has asserted his rights to the property against them all, against the Fox Bay settlers, who happened to be of British origin and against those who settled at L'Anse aux Fraises, who happened to be of French origin. He took legal proceedings against them all. The Fox Bay settlers were the only ones to resist the process of law. All the others came to terms and the terms to which they agreed were that Mr. Menier required from all the squatters that they should acknowledge his authority, that they should take a lease from him and he paid every one of them for the improvements they had made upon the property. The Fox Bay settlers would not accept these terms. They went to law and lost their case. They were expelled, not by this government, but under the authority of the courts and this government came to their rescue so far as they could. We gave them transportation from Anticosti to the city of Quebec, and from Quebec the Canadian Pacific Railway gave them transportation to the North-west Territories, where they are now settled. That is all there is about the Fox Bay settlers. My hon. friend stated a moment ago that the Fox Bay settlers had been in possession of their land for more than 100 years. The Fox Bay settlers, if they had been in possession of their land, not for 100 years, but only for thirty years, would still have remained in possession, because, under the law of the province of Quebec, thirty years' possession is equivalent to a title. They had been in possession only twenty-five years, and they were expelled by the courts. It was a very hard case, I admit, but a case of expulsion is always a hard one. However, there was nothing else in that case than must take place in every civilized country where a citizen choses to assert the rights which he is possessed of under the laws of the country in which he lives.

Motion agreed to.

THE LAW OF DIVORCE.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston) moved :

That the House is of opinion that the present practice of applying to parliament for a divorce is in many ways objectionable, and virtually gives in certain cases redress to the wealthy which is denied to the poor.

That jurisdiction should be given to some one court of each of the provinces of the Dominion, or a court should be established in each of the said provinces for the trial of cases for divorce, and that such court should have exclusive jurisdiction to decree a dissolution of marriage.

He said : There is no need of any apology or excuse for again bringing this most important subject, namely, 'Divorce in Canada,' to the attention of parliament. It affects the well-being of society ; the personal happiness of many in Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It touches home-life. It involves the services of obedience to, or violation of law. Connected with it are parental duties, and the rights of women and innocent children ; their rights to property, and their rights to social position and recognition.

I do not intend to treat this subject exhaustively, nor do I intend to speak so long as to weary the House if I can help it. This question has been dealt with in a book which is to be found in the library, written by Mr. Gemmill, barrister, of Ottawa, and after reading that book with a good deal of care I can commend it to any one who is interested in the subject. There is in that work a collection of cases that have been before parliament, as well as a digest of the laws of the various provinces, and a little treatise on the origin of divorce courts in England ; the whole giving information well worthy of perusal. There is a prefatory note to that work by Sir John Bourinot, and of course it goes without saying that what Sir John says on matters of this kind will be read with interest, and a good deal of importance will be attached to it. Now, what is the law of Canada at present in reference to divorce. The whole subject of marriage and divorce is given to this Dominion parliament by the British North America Act, and we have exclusive legislation, or rather the authority to legislate on that subject. Of course, as every one knows, some of the provinces on coming into confederation had divorce courts established, and these are continued. Section 129 of the British North America Act deals with that matter as to provinces entering the union at confederation, and section 146 extends to other provinces which may afterwards be brought in. I shall not discuss the constitution of these divorce courts existing in certain provinces at confederation, nor as to how they have exercised their jurisdiction. There was a divorce court in Nova Scotia at confederation, and from the date of confederation up to 1888, I am informed that 52 divorces were granted by that court. There was then and there is a divorce court in New Brunswick, and from the date of confederation to 1888, it granted 40 divorces. There is a divorce court in the province of Prince Edward Island, and that court is singularly constituted. It is a court of the Governor in Council, as I understand it, and a legal question arises as to whether its jurisdiction is to be exercised by the Lieutenant Governor in Council or by His Excellency the Governor General in Council. Whether because of this difficulty as to its jurisdiction or not, I am unable to discover the number of cases, if any, that have come before it from the date Prince Edward Island entered confederation down to 1888. There is also a divorce court in British Columbia and there is a divided opinion amongst the judges as to the jurisdiction of that court. There are strongly expressed opinions against the validity of the decisions of that court. I express no opinion myself. I only say that there is an important question as to the validity of the divorces which this court has assumed to grant, and 15 cases have been dealt with by the court in British Columbia. The province of Ontario, the province of Manitoba, and the North-west Territories have no divorce courts. It so happened that the laws introduced in the province of Ontario were the laws as they existed in England in 1792, and at that time the courts in England had no jurisdiction in divorce cases. Prior to confederation the province of Ontario never assumed to deal with the question ; since confederation it has no authority to deal with it, and hence no court in Ontario has authority to dissolve the marriage tie. The courts in Ontario have assumed jurisdiction in cases where the allegation was that the marriage itself was a nullity, where fraud was practiced on one of the parties, or in cases of lunacy and such where the marriage was void ab initio. In Ontario, Manitoba, the North-west Territories, and, of course, in the province of Quebec there is no court with power to dissolve the marriage tie, although the courts in Quebec deal with the question as to whether or not the marriage was validly solemnized, and that question is now under discussion in the Delpit case which is watched with a great deal of interest throughout the Dominion. In these provinces I have mentioned, there is no divorce court at present except the court of parliament which is a legislative divorce. Every one who has studied the question knows that prior to 1888 the proceedings in order to get a divorce from parliament were of a most cumbrous and expensive character. They are so yet, in my opinion, but they are less so since the new rules adopted by the Senate in 1888. But even yet the dealing with the subject by parliament is difficult and expensive. Sometimes cases are disposed of by caprice, if I may use such a word with regard to so august a body—not disposed of, as the senators say, on their merits ; and some new plan ought to be adopted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Can the hon. gentleman give us any information as to the ordinary cost of procuring divorce through the Senate ?

Mr. BRITTON. I will speak of the cost before I get through. When I had this matter in mind, I noticed that there was something on the subject by 'Bystander' in the Weekly Sun of the 20th of February. It is not necessary to say who 'Bystander' is; his opinion on any such subject always commands attention. He says:

It is surely time that the marriage and divorce law of Canada should be placed on a rational footing and administered by regular courts. Marriage is a civil status. By the state its rights and privileges are guarded and its duties and liabilities are enforced. For the civil power, not for the churches or the clergy, it is to determine by whom and how matrimony may be lawfully contracted; in what cases, when contracted, it may be lawfully dissolved. At the same time the union has a spiritual aspect, in virtue of which cognizance may rightfully be taken of it by a church. A civil marriage, constituting and regulating the connection in the eye of the civil law, ought in the first instance to be universally required. A religious ceremony might follow, such as the parties desired and their church required; and the church would be at liberty to withhold its benediction in case the union were at variance with its spiritual law. Divorce, in the same way, ought to be in the jurisdiction of the state so far as its legal validity and consequences, including the liberty of legal remarriage, are concerned. The church would still be at liberty to withhold her sanction from the divorce and to refuse to recognize remarriage as a title to continuance in her membership and participation in her rites.

Divorce by the Senate is preposterous and belongs to a bygone age. It is the ghost of the old law, or rather of the old mockery of the law, in England, where in former days you could be divorced only by an Act of parliament originating in the House of Lords. Judge Maule, the laughing philosopher of the Bench, had to try a poor man for bigamy. The man was proved guilty, but pleaded the unfaithfulness of his wife. 'Prisoner,' said Maule, 'you are to understand that in this country there is not one law for the rich and another for the poor. If your wife was unfaithful, your proper course was to bring a suit in the Ecclesiastical Court for divorce "a mensa et thoro." Having gained this suit, you should have a bill brought into the House of Lords for a divorce "a vinculo." This proceeding would have cost you at least a thousand pounds, and you probably in the whole course of your life never possessed a thousand pence. You see then how in this country there is not one law for the rich and another for the poor. The sentence of the court upon you is, &c.' It was thought that this joke had not a little to do with the establishment of the present divorce court. If we are to have no divorce court in Canada, the result may be increased resort to the wild-cat divorce courts of some of the American states.

After I put the notice of motion on the paper, I found that a good many persons had been thinking of this subject, and I have received many communications with regard to it. I do not propose to trouble the House with all or one tithe of what has been said to me; but there is one letter from which I propose to read some extracts, because it is written by a lawyer of Toronto, named Mr. Heighington, who appears to have considered the matter, and therefore his opinion ought to be worth something. He published a letter in the Toronto Globe of the 2nd of March, in which he said:

A Divorce Court for Canada.

I have noticed with great pleasure that Mr. B. M. Britton, the hon. member for Kingston, is about to introduce in the House of Commons a resolution which is to test the opinion of the House upon the advisability of establishing a divorce court in Canada. I hope the expression of the House will be in favour of such a course, and that when the resolution has been carried, it will be followed by the introduction of a Bill to establish a divorce court in this country during the present session.

I believe that the country is ripe and ready for the introduction of such a measure. It is one which will contribute in no small degree to the domestic welfare and peace of many homes in this wide Dominion, which at present are divided and unhappy and must remain so until relief is given by a divorce court, where a person of ordinary means shall be able to obtain a divorce at the same outlay as in ordinary law suits.

Although this is an important measure, there is no reason why it should not be brought forward at the present session. We have a remarkable precedent for such a course. The Bill establishing the divorce court in England was introduced into the Commons for its second reading on the 30th of July, 1857, and became the law of the land on the 28th of August following, less than a month. The reason for that was that the country was ready and looking for it. It did not raise any party question and the issue was never doubtful. It is a question of domestic economics and good government. I believe the proceedings in committee were very spirited, and although Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli both opposed it on religious grounds, and that the Bill was being pushed forward with 'unprecedented levity,' the Bill passed. . . . .

It has been my lot to draw a great many deeds of separation, beginning, 'Whereas, certain unhappy differences having arisen,' &c., but it has also been my lot to settle and adjust many of these marital differences by a little judicious advice, but still I know of many husbands who are bringing up their children without a mother, and I know also of wives who are living a life of desolation and loneliness worse than widowhood who would rejoice if it were made possible, by means of a divorce court, to obtain release from their legal bondage. My experience is doubtless that of many other solicitors in active practice, who could endorse the position I am taking. As to the particular form the court should assume and the procedure which should be followed therein, I would leave in the hands of our able and experienced Minister of Justice.

We already admit the principle. We do grant divorces in Canada, but in an antiquated and primitive fashion before a committee of the Senate. But the cost of this procedure is so great as to be practically prohibitive to a great many. What is the result? Our people go to the states in scores and seek and obtain divorces in the mistaken idea that they are valid here. Many remain there and others come back and take their chances. All this is productive of

evil, scandal and disgrace. To a lawyer it seems only reasonable that when we do grant divorces that we should do it by the procedure and machinery of a decorous and dignified court of justice. I would be the last person to rob the marriage relationship of any of the sanctity which now surrounds it, but is it not infinitely worse for people to continue to lead lives which are a living lie and contradiction to every sentiment of the marriage tie? Why should there be one law for the rich and another for the poor? With judicious and wise discretion kindly exercised, and with proper restrictions as to the publicity of its procedure, a divorce court can at a small cost dispense justice by affording speedy and effective relief to many of our suffering and unfortunate people.

Without reading what has been written by others, I may say that there is an unanimity of expression on the part of the legal profession in favour of the establishment of a divorce court. My information may not be correct, but I am told that there are forty or fifty persons in Toronto who, if the law were rigidly enforced, would be prosecuted for bigamy. But the law is not rigidly enforced, and simply for the reason given by Mr. Justice Small in the case cited in the paper I have just read. In these cases the property question comes up, the parties holding property, dealing in and transferring the same, when as a matter of fact they have no legal right to do so. Other questions also arise in this matter, as any one can easily see.

What is the objection to a divorce by the Senate ? The objection is not only the question of extent, but the trouble in dealing with cases before that body. First, there must be, for what reason I know not, six months' notice given of the intention to apply for a divorce—given not only in the Canada Gazette, but in two papers, and in the province of Quebec and Manitoba, the notice must be published in French as well as in English. Then, after the six months have elapsed, you have to deposit an amount sufficient to print six hundred copies of the Bill in English and 200 in French, and you have also to deposit with the Clerk of the Senate $200. Having done all that, which will exhaust the resources of most ordinary people, you have, if your petition is entertained and the Bill introduced and referred to the Senate committee, to bring your witnesses to Ottawa, from no matter how remote a distance, to appear in person before the committee and give evidence. Some witnesses may come perhaps without being paid the exact amount to which they are entitled, but if they get the amount to which they are entitled, a large item of the expense depends on the distance they have to come. But apart from the witness fees, the amount paid in for printing and the counsel work preparatory to submitting the Bill, will not be less than $500, and if the witnesses come a long distance, the average expense would not be less than $1,000 in any ordinary case.

If hon. members should be opposed to the establishing of a divorce court in every province or giving jurisdiction to courts already existing—suppose they think it is better to safeguard this whole matter by leaving it to parliament, what objection can there be to allowing the judges or other judicial officers in each province to act as referees before whom the evidence could be taken and forwarded to the Senate committee. A great deal of expense would thus be saved, and it seems to me that if the government is not willing to go the whole length of the reform asked for, they should go the length of having the evidence, in cases where the parties reside at long distances from Ottawa, taken by competent judicial officers and forwarded to Ottawa.

I am not bringing this matter before the House for the first time, and I am aware that in years gone by it was dealt with in some instances in rather a summary manner. In 1870 the question was brought before the House by the late Sir John A. Macdonald, who introduced a Bill to provide for the absence of a judge of the court in New Brunswick. The whole question was then opened and discussed in such a way that after a lengthy debate, the Bill was withdrawn. In 1875 the matter was brought up again. A motion similar to the one before the House was introduced and defeated by a very large vote. In 1879 a motion was made for leave to introduce a Bill to enable the Court of Chancery in Ontario to dissolve the marriage tie in certain cases. It seemed to be favourably considered at first, but the then Speaker took the point that it was introduced too late in the session to be properly discussed, and the government taking the same view, it was voted down. In 1888 discussion took place to which I wish to make a little more lengthy reference, because that debate was taken part in by Mr. Jones and the Hon. Sir Louis Davies, and the latter gentleman, now being in the government, will be able to argue the convictions he then entertained, and give effect, if possible, to the views he then held, and which I am now advocating. That debate will be found in the 'Hansard' of 1888, pages 1414 and 1415. Mr. Jones, of Halifax, objected to the Bill on principle, and objected to the evidence that was published in reference to it. Sir John A. Macdonald rather poked fun at him for having read the evidence, and made one of his characteristic jokes, which any one who cares can read. The Hon. Sir Louis Davies replied to Sir John A. Macdonald as follows :—

I differ with the hon. gentleman. I think the arguments he has used to-night are the strongest I have yet heard in favour of the establishment of a divorce court. We are asked here to grant divorces, as we pass any Act of parliament, and the hon. gentleman says that we grant these without reading the evidence. Can anything be conceived more pitiable than the

fact of this parliament passing a vote on a serious case of this kind, where the matrimonial bond is to be dissolved, without, as the leader of the government states, anybody reading the evidence in regard to it. . . .

The hon. gentleman suggested that one hon. gentleman who had read the evidence had done something which was improper, and he took credit to himself for voting without reading the evidence. If the leader of the government has done that, what may be expected from the rank and file? I was led to the conclusion, which I have expressed, very largely by the discussion in the other Chamber on the case which we have just voted upon. I read the speech of the leader of the government in the Senate, and I found that he argued that the Senate was not to be bound by any of the rules adopted by the House of Lords before the divorce court was established in England; that there was no legal rule guiding their decisions to which any ordinary member could look, or under which he could act, pro or con; that every man could use his own judgment and do what was right in his own eyes; that the decision was to be an arbitrary decision in every case; in fact, that the man or the woman who canvassed the hardest in the lobby was the one who would win. After reading that, I judged that there was no rule guiding the Senate, and I came to the conclusion that a rule should be adopted and that a tribunal should be established which would be guided by fixed principles, in the hands of judges, so that in this very important matter we might know what we are doing. I know that there is a large section, a religious section of our people, who are opposed to the granting of divorces altogether, but it must be evident to them that at present divorces are granted year after year, not because facts show in the greater number of cases that these should be granted, but because the parties on one side or the other have evoked a certain amount of sympathy: that they are granted, not because of the evidence taken, but simply because those who are promoting the Bill are more or less active. I think it would be far better that we should leave these questions to trained judges and trained lawyers. Draw the line as closely as you like, but leave it to these trained men to carry it out. If that system were adopted we would not see the absurdities which I have seen during the short time I have been in this House, and which we witness year after year. I venture the assertion that there are not a dozen gentlemen here who have read the evidence in this case from end to end; I doubt if there are half a dozen; and yet we are voting pro and con on the question of whether this divorce Bill shall be passed or not.

This discussion in the Commons and the Senate led, apparently, to the making of the new rules which I referred to as having been adopted in 1888. I suppose it was that discussion, though, I may be guilty of anachronism in that. It happens to be the same year, and I have drawn that inference, but I may be wrong. In 1891 Senator McDonald introduced a Bill, which, however, did not get beyond its first reading. The object of this Bill was to give jurisdiction to the different courts of the provinces I have mentioned—leaving out the province of Quebec—the High Court of Justice in Ontario, the High Court in Manitoba and the High Court in the North-west Territories, to deal with matters of this kind. There was a very little debate on the Bill apparently, and the matter dropped. Now, we have arrived, it seems to me, at a stage when something should be done. Parliament considers it to be its duty to grant the relief in certain cases. It is not a question of religious sentiment as to whether divorces should be granted or not—we do grant divorces; and I assume that it is right to grant them. It is, then, only a question where the jurisdiction for the trial of these cases and their proper disposal should rest. I am not asking any extension of the rule, any opening of the doors or loosening in any way of the marriage tie. I am not asking that we should bring about the condition of 'divorce made easy,' such as is said to exist in some states of the union. I am only asking that in those cases, in which parliament grants divorces, the jurisdiction should rest with the courts, and that these matters should be disposed of by the courts instead of by a Bill introduced in the Senate and disposed of in the first instance by a committee of the Senate. I think the time has come when a person who is not able to bring witnesses, say, from the North-west Territories to Ottawa, but who has a just cause to claim a dissolution of the marriage tie, whether that person be man or woman, should be given relief—when relief should not be confined to those who are able to meet the requirements now demanded of such people. We ought to try to stop a state of affairs under which people from Canada go, as they do from all our provinces, to the United States, become domiciled and live there long enough—or say they do—to get a divorce. Their divorces are not recognized by our courts under such circumstances, but they recognize them and they come back to this country and marry. That state of things exists to a greater or less extent in the country, and it is to remedy this that I introduce this resolution, in the hope that the government will see their way to dealing with it in a different manner from that in which it has been dealt with hitherto. The divorces granted by parliament up to 1888 were 23 for the one statutory cause and two for other causes. Parliament also granted the relief of separation in one case without granting a divorce. The applications rejected number 10. Since 1888, 35 divorces have been granted by parliament. Thus, while 25 divorces were granted in the 21 years after confederation, that is from 1867 to 1888, there were 35 divorces granted in the next 12 years. And the applications are on the increase. Why is that? The inference I draw—perhaps I am wrong—is that the same cause exists, but, in the increasing population and increasing number of people who are financially able to seek the redress provided, more applications are made to parliament. I am not putting forward the argument that this shows a greater demand

for the remedy that I am asking, though I think it would show that to some extent. The argument that I use is that there is no reason why this particular subject—admitting the right to have the divorce—as distinguished from all others, should be dealt with by parliament instead of by the courts. There seems to be no logic in it and no reason in it. In the absence of reason to the contrary, this, like all other matters of contract, should be dealt with as I suggest. We cannot draw much of an argument from what is done in the United States. Every state of the union has its own divorce law, and the laws are administered differently in the different states. Divorce is comparatively easy to obtain in some of the western states, while it is not so easy in New York and some of the eastern states. The fact that there has been an abuse in the administration of the law in some states ought not to prejudice the case I am trying to make for the administration of the law by our courts in the different provinces. It will be borne in mind that I am not touching the question as to marriage, but simply dealing with the question of divorce and how divorce ought to be granted. If the remedy should be allowed at all, it should be allowed without the burden of expense and the great delays that result from coming to parliament under the rules of the House and under the law as we have it. I commend this matter to the favourable consideration of the House.

Mr. MACLEAN. This is just one of that class of cases I referred to an hour ago when the proposition of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Dr. Roddick), was up in regard to the practice of medicine. There must be a remedy found for the grievance mentioned by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton). It is a grievance that is felt all over this country, and we must take up not only the question of divorce, but also the question of marriage. I believe that both these questions, so far as we have jurisdiction in this House, ought to be put on a satisfactory basis before the whole country. If we do not deal with the question as it ought to be dealt with, we will ere long find ourselves in the same condition of confusion that prevails in the United States to-day. The greatest social discord that exists in the United States to-day arises from the laxity and the diversity of laws in the various states in regard to marriage. I have been reading recently the deliverances of some of their leading men upon this subject, and they all point out the absolute necessity of a federal law dealing with marriage and dealing with divorce, defining the rights of the husband and of the wife, of the parent and of the child, so that one law shall apply all over that country. It is a fact that more social disorder lies ahead of the people of the United States by reason of the laxity of their divorce laws than from any other source, and the trouble will extend to this country. Of course we will not have the same variety of laws that they have, because the provinces cannot deal with this subject; but we have trouble coming, and unless we deal with it in a large and broad way, in a manner such as this parliament has power to deal with it, social disorder will come. Now is the time to deal with it, and I hope the resolution before the House will receive due consideration, and that later on we will have a law dealing with the whole question. I am not saying on what ground divorce ought to be granted, that is a question to be considered; but, as the member for Kingston has pointed out, the law as it stands to-day is very unsatisfactory, and worst of all, it is not fair to the poor man or to the poor woman.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The House, I am sure, will feel obliged to the hon. member for Kingston for again calling attention to a subject which, from time to time, has engaged the deliberations of parliament ever since confederation. My hon. friend has related the different attempts which have been made since 1867 to have a divorce law in this country, but those attempts have never been prosecuted with very much vigour. Evidently public opinion is not much in sympathy with attempts to have a divorce law introduced into Canada. It may be that the facility with which divorces are granted in the United States has produced in this country a sentiment rather hostile than favourable to divorce. If I remember the figures given by my hon. friend, he says there have been thirty-five divorces granted since the beginning of confederation. Confederation has now lasted thirty-three years, that means one divorce a year, or thereabouts. These figures show that the population of Canada is not much in sympathy with divorce. I do not know if there have been any divorces granted in the divorce courts of the other provinces, but I know that in New Brunswick, where they still have a divorce court, divorces are very few, less than one a year, according to the information I have.

Under such circumstances, the question arises, Would it be advisable for us to depart from the policy which we have hitherto followed? Would it be advisable for us to change the system we have, cumbrous though it is, difficult though it is, but which has the advantage of discouraging divorce? The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), who is a stalwart in everything, is perhaps a stalwart in this also—though I do not know he would particularly favour a divorce court; but he will agree with me at all events that divorces are not to be desired. For my part I would rather belong to this country of Canada

where divorces are few, than to belong to the neighbouring republic where divorces are many. I think it argues a good moral condition of a country where you have few divorces, even though they are made difficult—a better moral condition than prevails in a country where divorces are numerous and made easy by law. These are, at all events, the views which I hold, and I think I am simply echoing the public opinion of Canada. Divorces are not looked upon with favour as a rule in the province of Quebec from which I come, and in the church to which I belong. In other religious denominations of Canada where divorces are allowed, I am glad to say that as a rule they are not favoured, that they are discouraged, and that fact speaks well for the moral condition of our people.

Of course divorces are difficult and expensive. I do not know that they are much more expensive in the Senate than they would be in any other court in Canada. The chief item of expense which perhaps is greater in the Senate than it would be in other courts, is the necessity of bringing witnesses to the seat of government from long distances. My hon. friend has suggested that that difficulty might be got over by authorizing the judges to take evidence in the different localities and report this evidence to the Senate, and then the Senate might take action upon it. That is a view which can be taken, and it might be adopted by altering the rules that now prevail in the Senate. I must, however, say frankly to the House that for my part I am not disposed to favour much any alteration from the present practice that we have had since confederation. My hon. friend from East York will excuse me if I do not adopt the views with which he has favoured the House. For my part, so far as the work of confederation is concerned, I am a Conservative of the Conservatives, though a Liberal; I do not want to touch our constitution except in cases where the defects have become absolutely glaring and must be remedied at all costs. I think it will be better to suffer some little inconvenience than to commence to alter the constitution. My hon. friend from Kingston, I think, will agree with me in this respect, and for this reason, though the government would be willing to consider all the views which he has presented, I would advise him not to press this motion, but rather to withdraw it for the present.

Mr. BRITTON. I suppose I have got to bow to the First Minister in matters of this kind, because I cannot carry the motion without his consent. Let me say, however, in asking leave to withdraw the motion, that the number of divorces granted in Canada since confederation is sixty.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is only two a year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. MACLEAN. How many Canadians have gone over to the States to get divorces because they could not get them in their own country?

Mr. BRITTON. A great number. And what trouble it is causing in this country because our people have to go over there to get divorces.

Mr. MACLEAN. The Prime Minister did not touch that point.

Motion withdrawn.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 66) to amend the Canada Evidence Act.—Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick.

PAYMENT OF FISHING BOUNTY.

Mr. EDWARD HACKETT (West Prince, P.E.I.) moved for:

Copies of all letters, papers and other correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and J. Albert Brennan, of Tignish, Prince county, P.E.I., regarding the payment of a fishing bounty cheque, made in favour of one Joseph Reilly, and for which the said J. Albert Brennan held the order of the payee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in making this motion I desire to say that it is a very important one, as it refers to the distribution of the fishing bounties in the maritime provinces. In the year 1882, the Dominion government set aside the sum of $150,000 to be distributed annually amongst the fishermen of the maritime provinces. This sum was supposed to represent the interest on the amount received from the United States in consequence of the fishery award. You will remember that under the Washington treaty, the subject of Her Majesty, including Canadian fishermen, were allowed certain privileges along the coast of the United States, while American fishermen were allowed to pursue their calling in the inshore waters of Canada. This lasted for twelve years. At the same time the treaty provided, that, inasmuch as the privilege granted to American fishermen to fish in the inshore waters of Canada was greater than that accorded Canadians fishing in American waters, the commission should decide the amount of the difference to be paid. The commission sat at Halifax, and $4,500,000 was awarded to Canada for the use of these inshore fisheries. During that period of twelve years, commencing with 1870, the purse seine was largely used in the inshore fisheries by the American fishermen. The use of this engine of destruction resulted in driving from the coastal waters one of the most valuable fish that resorted to these waters, the mackerel, and the fishermen found that while, in 1870, and up to 1874, an abundance of this fish inhabited the coastal waters, by the use of the purse seine for so many years they were driven away and the fishermen were obliged to

resort to other fisheries to make a livelihood for themselves and their families. They were deprived, to a certain extent, of the means that they had previous to the year 1870, of earning a livelihood, and as a consequence of this $4,500,000 coming from the fisheries of the maritime provinces, it was considered only right by the government of the day that the money should be returned to the fishermen whose waters had been depleted and who had been deprived, to a large extent, of the means of earning a livelihood for themselves and their families. The money was granted and an amount was to be distributed annually under regulations to be made by the government from time to time, these regulations to be by order in council. We know that at the time this money was granted, when, I had the honour of being a member of this House, it was opposed by the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the treasury benches. It was opposed in the country by their supporters and opposed because they said it would be of no advantage to the fishermen. I remember, while contesting my county, in 1882, my opponent declared that the money to be distributed to the fishermen would not buy each of them a fig of tobacco. The regulations were to be enforced and the money distributed, and now we find after an experience of eighteen years that the supporters of those people who were so much opposed to the distribution of this money, those gentlemen who vote the Liberal ticket, tumble over each other to share in the amount to be distributed. They come in a grand rush to get this money. While they are acting in this way a great many of them have no claim to it. While they cannot pretend to have any right to it they file fraudulent claims to share in the bounty thus preventing honest fishermen from getting fair-play. They are using it, as I will show the House for advancing the political interests of their own party. In regard to the question under consideration at this moment, I want to read part of a correspondence that has taken place between Mr. J. Albert Brennan, of Tignish, P.E.I., and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, in connection with a claim for payment of a fishing bounty on the order of the payee. Mr. Brennan is a merchant in Tignish, and when a young man was leaving the village, being short of money, Mr. Brennan bought his bounty cheque and advanced him a certain amount taking his order for the cheque. The young man went away, became sick and died, and Mr. Brennan supposed that he was the legal representative of this man who had given him an order for his bounty cheque. But, he found that when the fishery officer came to Tignish the organizer of the Liberal party, W. W. Wickham, had seen the fishery officer before Mr. Brennan saw him and had received from him the cheque without the order or authority of Mr. Brennan who held the order of the payee. Mr. Brennan very naturally complained of his conduct and he wrote to the Department of Marine and Fisheries in this way :

Tignish, P.E.I., April 10, 1900.

F. Gordeau,
Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I desire to bring to your notice the manner in which I have been used by John Davidson, the fishing bounty officer, and Dr. Wickham, of this place, with regard to cheques for bounty which I claimed. The facts are as follows :—Joseph Reilly, a fisherman, who had filed his claim for bounty in last season, was obliged to go away, and before leaving gave me an order for his cheque. This man since then died in the hospital. When Mr. Davidson came here to distribute the cheques a few days ago, I presented my order and was told by him that the cheque was given to Dr. Wickham, who had no authority to receive the same. I have, therefore, through the collusion of those parties, been deprived of this cheque to which I am honestly entitled. I want to complain generally against John Davidson and Dr. W. W. Wickham in connection with the distribution of bounty cheques this season. I have been caused great trouble in obtaining my rights in the matter of bounty cheques, and consider in justice the matter should be fully investigated. With regard to Reilly's cheque, I still hold the department for it, and trust that you will see that I obtain my just rights. As Dr. W. W. Wickham seems to have charge of the bounty distribution and gives or withholds cheques at his own pleasure without any authority whatever, the people here are naturally very indignant. I may say that Mr. Davidson seems to be only a figurehead in the matter. I make those charges fully conscious of their gravity to officers of your department, and demand the fullest investigation. My legal rights in this bounty claim question are beyond dispute.

Yours truly,

J. ALBERT BRENNAN.

The department replied that the instructions of the fishery officer were to the effect that he could not pay the cheque on an order. Mr. Brennan replied in another letter, and I am not going to weary the House by reading all the correspondence; I will hand it into the reporter because I want to have it placed on record.

Mr. HAGGART. You cannot do that unless you read it.

Mr. HACKETT. Well, then I shall have to go through all the correspondence. The following letter was sent to Mr. Brennan in reply :

Ottawa, April 24, 1900.

Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 10th instant, complaining that Mr. John Davidson, the fishery officer for Prince county, refused to deliver to you the fishing bounty cheque of John Reilly, for which you say you hold an order from the payee, I may state that in withholding the cheque the officer was acting in accordance with his instructions, which prevent him from recognizing orders or assignments of any kind in the matter of the distribution of the bounty.

As an order conveys no authority to the person to whom it is given to endorse a cheque,

the department cannot recognize your claim to Mr. Reilly's bounty.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
JOHN HARDIE,
Acting Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

J. Albert Brennan, Esq.,
Tignish, P.E.I.

Mr. Brennan wrote in reply :

Tignish, May 3, 1900.

John Hardie, Esq.,
Acting Deputy Minister
Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 24th ultimo, No. 2370 F.B., having reference to my fishing bounty cheque not paid me in accordance with the regulation governing the delivery of similar cheques at this place. I am surprised to learn that the officer's instructions from your department are not to deliver such cheques on an order from the payee, as he has grossly violated the same in the delivery of cheques here. I may say that I have received large numbers of cheques on orders both this season and last, and so much has this been the rule that every business man here received them under the same conditions. I do not complain at all at this manner of their disposition, as under the prevailing conditions here, I believe this to be the most feasible way of delivering cheques. What I do strongly object to is the fact that the cheques for which I had an order for money advanced to a sick man on his way to the hospital, and who died there, was delivered to Dr. W. W. Wickham, who had no order or other authority to receive the same. Another complaint I wish to make in this connection is that I held an order for the cheques of Mr. Lawrence Gallant, of Tignish, and this cheque was also delivered to the aforesaid Dr. Wickham, who had no order, and Mr. Gallant had great trouble in finding Dr. Wickham and obtaining the cheque for me. This conduct of the official is evidently a flagrant violation of his instructions, as well as a great injustice to me. In view of the fact that the man Joseph Reilly is deceased, and I am the only legally authorized person to receive the cheque in question, I must ask the department to forward me the amount. If you do not deem the above sufficient, I request an investigation by a responsible official of the department, when I will substantiate all the statements herein made. In this connection, I would suggest that Mr. A. Lord, agent of the department at Charlottetown, be appointed to investigate the matter.

I am, yours truly,
J. ALBERT BRENNAN.

To that letter he received the following :

Ottawa, May 14, 1900.

Sir,—I am to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 3rd instant, in which you ask to be paid the amount of James Reilly's fishing bounty for 1899, for which you hold an order from the payee.

In reply, I have to state that as the order has no legal validity, the department cannot comply with your request.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
JOHN HARDIE,
Acting Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

J. Albert Brennan, Esq.,
Tignish, P.E.I.

To this Mr. Brennan replied :

Tignish, P.E.I., May 26, 1900.

John Hardie, Esq.,
Acting Deputy Minister
Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 14th inst., No. 2370 F.B., and am surprised at its contents. In reply to my letter of the 3rd inst., you say that the order received by me from Mr. Joseph Rielly, since deceased, is not valid, and the department will not deliver me his fishing bounty cheque. If my order is not valid, how can the department justify the handing over of this cheque to Dr. W. W. Wickham who had no order or authority of any kind to receive it. As the legal representative of Joseph Rielly, I claim that I am entitled to his fishing bounty cheque for season of 1899, and before relinquishing my rights I intend having the matter thoroughly investigated. In my last letter to you, I charged Mr. John Davidson, the bounty officer, with having paid this same W. W. Wickham several cheques without authority, and that the parties entitled to said cheques had great difficulty in obtaining the same. It appears to me to be outrageous that the department should attempt to shield one of its officers in conduct of this kind. If, as you say, my order is not valid, how do you justify your officer in delivering cheques on similar orders, and as I have shown above, even delivering the cheques to Dr. W. W. Wickham without an order or authority of any kind. I have again to ask that you order an impartial investigation into this matter, and see that justice is done. As a citizen of Canada, doing business here, I claim this as a right, and trust the department will see that my claim is paid.

I remain, yours truly,
J. ALBERT BRENNAN.

The House will see that Mr. Brennan, simply because he was a Conservative, was deprived of his bounty check. Dr. Wickham, who was the organizer of the Liberal party in the village of Tignish, went to the fishery officer immediately on his arrival in the village to distribute the cheques, and got from him this cheque without authority, without an order, having no claim whatever to it, and Mr. Brennan, who was the legal representative of Joseph Rielly, the man who died away in the hospital, could not get his bounty cheque. It was done for the purpose of placing in the hands of this organizer of the Liberal party certain funds to use as he might think best. This went on and other parties were treated in the same manner. Men who had orders for the bounty cheques were told that Dr. Wickham had the cheques and that they should go to him and receive them. Mr. Brennan asked in his letter that there should be an investigation held by an impartial disinterested and responsible man, and that he would substantiate on oath every statement made by him in connection with this cheque and others. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, previous to the 7th November a very hard fight was put up in the maritime provinces and especially in the province of Prince Edward Island. There were all kinds of attempts made by the government to deprive me of the vote

of the people. The Railway Department, the Fisheries Department, the Public Works Department, had their agents all through the riding previous to the 7th November endeavouring to influence people to vote against me. I was elected by a majority of only nine votes after my opponents, who had asked a recount, had stolen a ballot box in which I had a majority of 33, and tried to deprive me of my seat. But I had a just judge ; Judge MacLeod, of the county court, and he said : I am going to count the vote of that polling district. I will take the statement turned out by the returning officer on the evening of the election, and although it is only secondary evidence as the ballot box has disappeared and the ballots are not before me, I will declare Hackett elected. I was declared elected then for the second time. I was petitioned against. I say, Sir, that it is a disreputable thing to use this money that belongs to the people of Canada, which belongs to the honest fisherman, to the man who toils and is entitled to it ; it is a disreputable thing that this money should be used by the government of Canada to debauch the electors. My opponent McLellan, against whom I have nothing to say, petitioned against me and after I had been petitioned against an honest fisherman came to me and said : You have been petitioned against, you had a hard fight, you beat them notwithstanding they stole your ballot box and if you desire to petition against your opponent I can give you such evidence as will disqualify Mr. McLellan. I replied to him : Mr. McLellan and myself have gone through this election campaign as men ; we came out of it as friends and I have no desire to pursue Mr. McLellan further, but you can tell me your story. He said : I will, and this is the story he told : A month previous to the election of the 7th of November I was passing in front of Mr. McLellan's premises and he came out and accosted me. He knew I was a Conservative and he asked me to vote for him. I told him that he knew I was a Conservative, that my friends were Conservatives and had always voted that ticket, and I saw nothing that had been done by the present government to induce me to change ; and moreover, I am a Conservative fisherman, I have earned the fishery bounty and your party have deprived me of my just claims to the bounty during the last few years, and I cannot think of voting for the candidate of a party that would not do me justice. Mr. McLellan said : I am sorry to hear you have lost your fishery bounty, but I will try to have it rectified, and if I do you will vote for me. The fisherman replied : I will see about voting, but this is only the same talk as we have heard before, and the same promises not fulfilled and I will not take your word. Mr. McLellan said : I will arrange it for you. Now, Mr. McLellan's house is not far from the church, he being a good church-goer, and on the Sunday before the election this fisherman was at church and he was called aside by Mr. McLellan who asked him to come to his house. Mr. McLellan took him into his house and took out of his pocket-book a bounty cheque for $3.50 that was sent to him by the Fisheries Department at Ottawa. Mr. McLellan said: Here is one cheque for the year 1898 and you will receive a cheque for the year 1899 in a short time when the fishery officer comes to St. Louis station on the line of the Prince Edward Island Railway. In about a week Mr. Davidson came with a bounty cheque and this fisherman received the two cheques, the one paid by Mr. McLellan of which he was deprived for two years, and the other paid by Mr. Davidson, both of which he had been deprived of because he was a Conservative and which were only given to him when they tried to bribe him. If you give this investigation demanded by Mr. Brennan, I am prepared to produce evidence to substantiate every word I have said in this House to-day. But, notwithstanding that the government played with loaded dice in the last election and expected to win the game, I am proud to say that the intelligent electors of West Prince saw through the schemes and tactics of the present government and returned me here to represent them. I am in parliament in the interest of these fishermen ; these men who toil from early morn until late at night going with their small boats out to sea endeavouring to make a living for themselves and their families. The fishing bounty paid by the government is only the interest on the award that was given to the government in consequence of the depletion of our fisheries by the American people, and whether he be a Liberal or a Conservative the man who proves his claim before the official should receive that bounty. It is a nefarious act on the part of any government to deprive the honest fisherman of his just claims in this regard. I demand, in the interests of justice and fair-play, that a disinterested and responsible man be appointed to go down to Prince Edward Island and investigate these transactions. I am prepared, as I said, with the best of evidence to substantiate every statement I have made.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—Mr. Parmelee.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 8) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Geoffrion.

On section 5,

Mr. GEOFFRION. It has been asked by the company that the words 'interfere with or' be struck out, as they are completely useless, and may interfere with the effect of clause 6; so that the clause will read: 'This Act shall not lessen the borrowing powers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company,' &c.

Amendment agreed to; Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Canadian Mutual Aid Society.—Mr. Sutherland, (Essex).

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Clergue Iron and Nickel-Steel Company of Canada.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 52) respecting the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company.—Mr. Maxwell.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Manitoba and North-west Loan Company (Limited).—Mr. Britton.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Fort Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Arnprior and Pontiac Railway Company.—Mr. Lemieux.

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Crow's Nest Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 58) to incorporate the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 59) to incorporte the Similkameen and Keremeos. Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 61) respecting W. C. Edwards & Co. (Limited).—Mr. Rosamond.

THE BUDGET.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, would the right hon. leader of the House tell us whether the budget is to be down to-morrow or not?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Yes.

Mr. HACKETT.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman when I may expect the return in reference to the Halifax and St. John elevators, that I moved for on the 13th of February?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will make a note of it.

MONEY-LENDERS.

On the order:

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 3) respecting Money-Lenders.—Mr. Madore.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Madore), I beg to move:

That the Order of this House that it go into Committee of the Whole to consider Bill (No. 3) entitled an Act respecting money lenders, be revoked, and that the same be referred to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

I understand that at the last consideration of this Bill it was understood that the hon. member for Hochelaga would either move that the Bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, or that it be referred to a special committee. He chose to have it referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, so I beg to move this motion.

Motion agreed to.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT.

On the order:

House in Committee on Bill (No. 10) to amend 'The Weights and Measures Act.'—Mr. Smith (Wentworth).

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). As there are a number of hon. gentlemen who would like to discuss this Bill, I would ask that it be allowed to stand.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This is a very important measure, and perhaps the House will understand, if convenient to my hon. friend (Mr. Smith, Wentworth), that the Bill may be taken up this day week, next Wednesday evening.

Order allowed to stand.

VICTORIA DAY.

Mr. E. H. HORSEY (North Grey) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 33) respecting Victoria Day.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of the Bill entitled 'An Act respecting Victoria Day.' As I explained when asking the permission of the House to introduce it, this Bill provides for the setting apart of the 24th of May—the birthday of Her late Majesty Queen Victoria, as a permanent public holiday throughout Canada.

I desire to trespass upon the patience of the House for a short time only, in order that I may state some of the reasons which, it has appeared to me, would amply justify this parliament in making permanent the holiday which heretofore—to as remote a day at least as the memory of any one present can well revert—has been considered the holiday 'par excellence' of Canada.

So far as the present generation is concerned, we who have been the personal subjects of Her late Majesty, who have been witnesses of the exercise of Her many good qualities of mind and heart, and who have felt the better for having lived contemporary with her. I take it, Sir, that we need no argument in order to agree that nothing we can reasonably do to honour her memory, should be left undone.

At the same time, it is right that we should realize that in passing this Bill we are legislating not only for ourselves, but for posterity as well, and therefore, in thus seeking to honour the memory of our late sovereign, we should, I think, satisfy ourselves of two things; that the process by which we propose to honour her memory, and the memory of the era in which she reigned, should be such as will, with reasonable certainty, be commendable to the good sense and convenience of future generations, as well as of our own, and we should also, I think, satisfy ourselves to the same degree of certainty, that the personality of the monarch, and the achievements of Her era will in the light of historic perspective stand out in sufficiently bold relief, and with a sufficiently unique grandeur that posterity will agree with us in saying that great was Victoria and glorious was her era. With regard to my first point—the fitness of the manner proposed in the Bill for the commemoration, I have only this to say, that in passing this Bill we are not attempting to force upon the people of this country any innovation the expediency of which may be doubtful. Not at all—for more than sixty years the people of Canada have enjoyed this holiday, and I think I am within the mark in saying that with each succeeding year it has grown in favour with them, until to-day the great masses of Canada could better afford to have any other holiday struck from off the calander than the 24th of May.

I do not think I am saying anything disrespectful to His Majesty the King, in stating, as I do, that from the very nature of things, the 9th of November can never take the place of the 24th of May in the hearts of the people of Canada. The season is not one so favourable for all the outdoor pastimes with which tradition in this country has associated the Queen's birthday.

And just here, Sir, I might pause to ask how hon. gentlemen who may oppose this Bill, propose to square themselves with the rising generation of both sexes, and with the picnickers, the excursionists, the devotees to our national and other games, and with the amateur fishermen as well. It will be no laughing matter, Sir, if hon. gentlemen antagonize these classes who constitute the overwhelming majority of our people. But to be serious, Sir. In passing this Bill we are not laying down any cast iron law by which the whole mass of the people will be obliged to celebrate, whether they will or no. The law will only apply strictly to public institutions and public offices, the will of the people will still decide with what measure of unanimity the day will be observed. All we ask is that by making it a legal holiday, the will of the people may have the opportunity of asserting itself. As to its probable fitness for future generations, I have only to say that every advance in science heretofore which has made locomotion and travel cheaper, easier and quicker, has added to the sum of human happiness derived from the day, and we may reasonably hope that the still greater progress yet to come along these lines, will make the day more necessary and more enjoyable even than it has been heretofore. The objection may be raised that we have enough holidays already in Canada. I answer that in two ways. In the first place I am not so sure that we have enough, for the whole tendency of the age is to keep humanity at high pressure—necessitating more breathing spells, and if that do not suffice, I answer it is unnecessary to make it an extra holiday, as no more suitable day than the King's Birthday, November 9th, could be had for our annual thanksgiving.

I have heard it suggested that we should not legislate in this matter until we learn what the home government proposes to do regarding it.

If, Sir, it were purely a matter of sentiment I could understand the force of the suggestion that the initiative should come from the heart of the empire. But combined with the question of sentiment there is also the question of expediency, and therefore, because in this country the day has always been kept as a holiday by the whole people in a way entirely unknown in England where it was simply a formal holiday observed by public institutions only. I do not see why we should await the initiative of the home authorities. The unanimity with which it has always been observed in this country demonstrates its usefulness and its suitability to the people and conditions of Canada. And, now as to my second point—the fitness of the personality and the era for so important a commemoration. It is not my purpose to attempt to add one word to the splendid panegyrics which have been uttered in this House and elsewhere throughout the world upon the life-work and character of Her late Majesty. I think that on this point Lord Roseberry exhibited even more than his usual propinquity, when

he said the other day in Edinboro that 'All that can be said on this subject has been said and what yet remains to be spoken is apt either to be fulsome or to partake of platitude.' But, I submit this proposition to the judgment of this House, that what has been already said—and truly said—is ample to justify us in deciding—with reasonable certainty—not only that in all history heretofore, her personality and her life-work have been superbly unique among all earthly monarchs, but also that for long years to come hers will be the standard by which others in high places will be judged, and those approaching nearest to which will be deemed to have done themselves most honour and their country most good.

Nor do I intend to say anything in reference to the greatness of the achievements of the Victorian era as compared with those of any other former time, I do confess the theme a most inviting one, one which, I am bound to admit, I have had difficulty in restraining myself from entering upon ; but I have thought, that, after all, even though I succeeded in further convincing some hon. gentlemen of the supremacy of the Victorian age over all former periods in the world's history, I would probably have accomplished little that would be germane to my argument. Such a review would come with more reason from one who might be advocating the convocation of a national festival for the purpose of celebrating once and for all the great achievements of the Victorian age. My object, I confess, is more far-reaching, and therefore it is better that I should invite your attention, rather to those features in the achievements of Victoria's reign, which may make it worthy of special honour in future years, when all the recent progress in the sciences and in the arts will be as nothing in comparison to the inevitable marvels which will yet be revealed by man to men. I propose to refer to only three events in this connection, one more particularly confined to Canada, one to the empire and one to mankind at large. This portion of my task I confess to be the difficult one. In order that we should feel the necessity for the exercise of care in attempting to forecast what will in future years be considered the really great events of the Victorian age, we have only to recall one of the most elementary facts of historical teaching—that very often names and achievements which in their own day were considered truly great and imperishable have, by the sifting process of time, gradually lost their importance and their lustre, and have, in many cases, been consigned to innocuous and, in some, to dishonourable oblivion. I would, therefore, hesitate to suggest any particular achievement as having the necessary historic vitality for my purpose, but that I think a rule may be laid down by which, with reasonable precision, those achievements which will surely live in history may be separated from those which may not survive. It will, I think, be found that in almost every case those achievements which, in their own day, were judged really great, and whose reputation failed to successfully withstand the impact of time have been such as have appealed more especially to the tastes and opinions of their own day ; while, on the other hand, no achievement in history, I think, which has tended to the uplifting, to the ennobling or to the emancipation of mankind, which in its own day was considered really great, has ever in any history been entirely lost sight of, however its relative prominence may have been modified by historic perspective.

There are, I think, no more enduring landmarks in British history than those which mark the slow and painful progress of the British people from their condition of serfdom, prior to the days of John, down to the constitutional freedom we enjoy to-day. Magna Charta, the Bill of Rights, Habeas Corpus are historically imperishable, and therefore it is that I suggest, with considerable confidence, to this House, an event in Canadian history, which, I believe posterity will agree with us in saying was a great event—great because of its splendid effect upon the feelings and aspirations of the people and great still more because it marks the finish of the great struggle which, commencing with Magna Charta that guaranteed some few limited rights to the people at home terminated in so signal a triumph for freedom, as to secure, not only for the people of the parent state, but for their colonists as well the utmost limit of self-control. I refer to the establishment of responsible government in Canada.

In the wider sphere of British affairs the Victorian age will perhaps be deemed by posterity as worthy of very special recognition not only because it marked the end of the struggle for constitutional government, but also, and it may be still more, because it was in this age that the first germs of an Imperialism took root, which, I think, we may reasonably hope will be all powerful for good throughout the world based as it is upon the broad principle of democracy and backed up as it is by the united force of every British commonwealth. An Imperialism sufficiently strong to unite all parts of the empire in matters of common interests and questions of common good, and at the same time sufficiently elastic to permit of absolute freedom of action on the part of each portion of the empire in the local concerns of each.

And in the still wider field of universal human effort it may be stated that in days to come the era just closed will be recalled as that in which the philosophy propounded by Bacon was first practically applied to science and art, which, after all, is perhaps responsible not only for the marvellous ad-

vance in the sciences and arts in recent years, but which must, in the nature of things, be deemed the ultimate exciting cause of all future progress as well even to the time when everything will have been laid bare even to the uttermost limits of the finite. On this account it may be, though in this I hazard a guess only, that the nineteenth century will for all time, irrespective of what marvels the future may have in store, be looked upon as the greatest era in human affairs. The era in which human effort was first guided by a trained and progressive intelligence.

These are the only matters which I intend bringing to the attention of the House to-night. I recognize fully, none more than I, how inadequate my argument has been to the purpose, but for this I am sure you will not have far to seek the cause. I am very grateful for your kind indulgence to me a novice to these environments, and before I sit down let me recapitulate my reasons for asking the favourable consideration of the House to this Bill. The Bill should, I think, pass because the events of the Victorian era, in Canada, in the empire, and in the world at large are in many ways worthy of special commemoration, because the person of Her late Majesty, whose name it is proposed the day shall bear, is held in affectionate remembrance by us all and will for many years to come be the model for future monarchs, and is worthy of special commemoration, and because the way suggested of commemorating is one which suits the tastes and convenience of the Canadian people, and lastly, but by no means of the least importance, because the people of this country, I believe, want it so. I beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am altogether in sympathy with this Bill, if for no other reason than that it recalls to me boyhood recollections when we used to say at school :

The 24th of May is the Queen's birthday,
If you don't give us a holiday, we'll all run away.

And the hon. gentleman who proposed the Bill said that is one reason why we ought to have it. The children of this country think more of the Queen's birthday than of any other in the history of Canada. The 24th of May is really the May-Day of Canada. They have their May-Day in England, and the Queen's birthday in this country has been our May-Day, and I would not like to see that disappear. But I have heard another reason within the last two or three days why the number of holidays ought to be increased in this country, and that is because it would add another day of grace to those who have notes coming due. But there is one thing that we ought to bear in mind and which I hope the government will take into consideration, and that is that the King's birthday will now come in November. Thanksgiving Day comes about the same time, and there will be something of a clash between those two holidays. There will be a good deal of inconvenience to the business community if they have to celebrate the 9th of November and Thanksgiving Day about the same time. I hope the government will keep that in mind when they make their proclamation for Thanksgiving Day, and make it at least a month before or after the 9th of November. The feeling of the country is that Thanksgiving Day has been too late in the season, and ought to come earlier, probably early in October.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have nothing to add to the eloquent remarks with which the House has just been favoured by my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Horsey). The sense of the House seems to be in favour altogether of such a Bill being enacted, and that we should continue henceforth as in the past to celebrate the 24th of May. There is a good deal of force in what my hon. friend said a moment ago that we have been accustomed to look upon that day as almost sacred—not only by children but by men and women also. I will allow the second reading to take place to-day, but I would suggest to my hon. friend not to press his Bill to the committee stage until another sitting because its phraseology may require to be looked into.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

On motion of Prime Minister, the House adjourned at 8.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 14, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Quebec Terminal and Railway Company.—Mr. Malouin.

QUESTIONS.

P.E.I.—AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY, ETC.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Who recommended a Mr. Kinsman as a scientific horticulturist to work in Prince Edward Island during the summer of 1899 ?
2. What amount did his mission cost ?
3. Was the minister satisfied with the result of his work ?
4. What is the government doing in order to secure steamships with proper cold storage for

Prince Edward Island exports to Great Britain the coming season ?

5. Has the government any special plan for the aiding of agriculture in Prince Edward Island this year ? If so, what ? If not, why not ?

6. Has the government decided to do anything to prevent the impending loss of our forests or to arrange for restoration in sections already almost denuded of woods ? If so, what ? If not, why not before it is too late ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney A. Fisher) :

1. Mr. Kinsman was recommended by gentlemen whose acquaintance with him was sufficient to justify their recommendation and in whose judgment I have confidence.

2. His work cost $563.43 for expenses, and $304 for salary.

3. The report which he gave of his work was satisfactory.

4. The matter is under negotiation at the present time.

5. The government has no special plan for Prince Edward Island, but is dealing with it along with other parts of the Dominion.

6. The forests in Prince Edward Island are upon Crown lands or private property and thus are under control of the local government.

POSTMISTRESS OF DRAYTON.

Mr. McGOWAN—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What was the date of the appointment of Miss Schneider as postmistress of the village of Drayton, Centre Wellington?

2. What was the date of Miss Schneider's dismissal ?

3. What were the reasons for such dismissal ?

4. Were any complaints made to the department as to Miss Schneider's management of said post office ? If so, was any investigation held as to such complaints ?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND :

1. Miss M. E. Schneider was appointed to the postmastership of Drayton, county Wellington, C.R., on the 30th June, 1896.

2. Miss Schneider was removed from the postmastership of Drayton on the 13th October, 1898.

3 & 4. It was deemed in the public interest that the change should be made, and the Postmaster General accepts full responsibility therefor.

MAIL CLERKS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked :

Whether it is the intention of the government to reward Messrs. T. B. Beddell, of New Brunswick, K. H. Murray and Captain W. R. Ecclestone, of the province of Ontario, Joseph Lellier, of the province of Quebec, and Rowan Johnston, of the province of Manitoba,—all five of them mail clerks, who served in South Africa, as forming part of the Canadian postal service for the several Canadian contingents, by promoting them to first-class positions in the civil service?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. The matter has not yet received the consideration of the government.

DUNDAS RIFLE ASSOCIATION.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth) asked :

Why has the annual grant to the Dundas Rifle Association, for which appropriation was made, not yet been paid, though heretofore usually paid in September or October ? When may the association expect it ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). There is no association known as the Dundas Rifle Association in receipt of an annual grant from this department.

If the 77th Regiment Rifle Association is meant, this association was paid its annual grant last year.

CONTRACT WITH THE B. C. EXPRESS CO.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. What is the present contract price per annum paid to the British Columbia Express Company for carrying the mails from Ashcroft to the several places in Cariboo District ?

2. What mail routes does this contract cover, and how many trips per week are called for on each route ?

3. Had the previous contract expired by efluxion of time when the present contract was made ?

4. On what date was the present contract signed, and for how many years was it ?

5. For what reason was the contract renewed on October 1, 1899 ?

6. Were public tenders called for, or were any parties asked to tender other than the British Columbia Express Company ? If so, who ?

7. If not, why not ?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND :

1. $23,250 a year.

2. Between Ashcroft and Barkerville—287 miles—semi-weekly from 15th May to 31st October, weekly for the remainder of the year.

Between Ashcroft Station and Clinton—32 miles—semi-weekly from 1st November to 14th May, weekly for remainder of the year.

Between Ashcroft and Lillooet—63 miles—weekly throughout the year.

Between Alkali Lake and Clinton—90 miles—weekly throughout the year.

Between 150-Mile House and Horsefly—40 miles—weekly throughout the year.

Between 150-Mile House and Keithley Creek—80 miles—weekly throughout the year.

Between Soda Creek and Alexis Creek—90 miles—weekly throughout the year.

3. No.

4. The contract was signed by the British Columbia Express Company on the 9th October, 1899.

5. Because the department had secured contractors who were performing the work in a satisfactory manner and at a reasonable rate, the amount previously paid being $27,445, and as they were willing to continue the service on the same terms and conditions, it was thought to be in the interest of the service, as prices were get-

ting higher, to continue the contract with the same contractors.

6 & 7. Public tenders were called for in 1897, and the present contract is a renewal of the one made on the 1st July of that year.

MADOC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. CARSCALLEN asked :

1. Who is the contractor for carrying the mails from Madoc village to Central Ontario Railway station at Eldorado ?
2. When was the contract entered into, and for what length of time?
3. What amount is paid for the service ?
4. Were tenders advertised for, and for how long were such advertisements posted ?
5. Were any tenders received, and the amount of tenders, if any ?
6. Did the lowest tender receive the contract ?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. The service is performed by Mr. Joseph Vassau under a temporary agreement entered into on the 1st July, 1900. Mr. Vassau's contract expired on the 30th June, 1900, and it was proposed to put the service up to tender, but it was represented to the Postmaster General that the Eldorado Railway would be reopened within a short time, and that it would be better to postpone the making of a new four years' contract until the question of utilizing the railway for the conveyance of mails could be considered ; and the service has been performed since that time on the terms and conditions of the former contract.

The service is semi-daily, distance 7 miles, and the rate of pay $400 a year. The inspector in reporting on the service stated that the rate of pay was reasonable, and that the service had been satisfactorily performed.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

He said : Mr. Speaker, for several years in succession, on occasions similar to this, I have had the good fortune to be able to congratulate the House and the country upon periods of great and steadily increasing prosperity. I rejoice to know that I am at liberty to make a similar statement to-day with respect to the affairs of Canada for the past year. In almost every department of industry in which the Canadian people are engaged there was a gratifying activity, and trade, commerce and manufactures flourished. Here and there, as may always be expected in a country of such vast extent and varied interests as prevail in Canada, some local condition was unfavourable, some drawback may have occurred. But in summing up the affairs of the country, we are able to describe the year as one of unexampled prosperity. Prosperity in trade and manufactures has brought prosperity to our national finances, and enabled me at the close of the year to announce results which it is not too much to say formed the most satisfactory financial statement that ever fell to the lot of a Minister of Finance to make in the Dominion of Canada. At a time of very considerable financial stringency, at a time, too, when our expenditures were being conducted on a very liberal scale, we found our revenues so generous that we were able to provide for all our needs without having resort to fresh loans, or even to an issue of treasury bills.

A glance at the receipts and expenditures in comparison with the previous year will show that there was a general increase all along the line. I have the honour to present this statement :

	1898-9.	1899-1900.	Increase.
Customs	$25,316,841	28,374,147	3,057,306
Excise	9,641,227	9,868,075	226,848
Post office	3,193,777	3,205,535	11,758
Miscellaneous	8,589,404	9,582,237	992,833
	$46,741,249	$51,029,994	$4,288,745

It may be remembered that in speaking of the prospects of the year in the budget speech of last March, I expressed the opinion that the receipts for the year would pass the $50,000,000 mark ; the figures I have just given will show that that anticipation was realized, the receipts of the year having been over $51,000,000. The chief increase, as may be readily understood, was in customs. That increase, to some extent, was due to the increased imports, and to some extent, no doubt, to the higher values which prevailed. We have increases in the post office which are very gratifying. Of course it is well known that a year or two ago the post office revenues fell off—not a matter of regret altogether, because we know that that falling off was caused by the very important reform brought about by my hon. colleague the Postmaster General, who is now absent, wherein he established a two-cent rate instead of a three-cent rate, one of the most important reforms in the Post Office Department, and one which I am sure the country has fully appreciated.

If, for a time, therefore, our revenue from that source fell off it would not be altogether a cause for regret. I am glad to be able to say that we have now reached the point where we shall be able to make comparisons with previous years under the three-cent rate. In January last past, we had turned the corner in that respect. Up to that date, our revenue was, under the two-cent rate not quite so large as it was under the three-cent rate ; but, in January, 1901, under the two-cent rate, the revenue of the Post Office Department was $398,289, while in the corresponding month of

January, 1898, under the three-cent rate the revenue was $368,941, showing that now, under the two-cent rate we are receiving more money in the way of revenue in the Post Office Department than we formerly received when the three-cent rate prevailed. Under the head of miscellaneous revenues there is a considerable increase, the largest item being in respect to railways. There is an increase of $828,344 under that head. It is well to remember that, while we are spending largely increased sums upon the Intercolonial Railway in particular, we are also having largely increased receipts, and it may be well in this case to make a comparison between 1896 and 1900. The revenue of the Intercolonial Railway in 1896, being the year ending the 30th June, was $2,957,640. The revenue for last year was $4,552,071, showing an increase in the receipts of the Intercolonial Railway between 1896 and 1900 of $1,594,-431. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) has to come to the House frequently for increased appropriations for this road, and it is well that when he shall do so we shall keep these facts in mind, and realize that owing to the greater development of the Intercolonial Railway, and of the trade of the country generally, the receipts of that important public work are now much larger than they were before. Our total revenue for the year which has passed was $51,-029,994.02. Our total expenditure, chargeable to consolidated fund account, that is our total expenditure for what may be described as the ordinary purposes of government, was $42,975,279.51, showing a surplus on the year's operations of no less a sum than $8,054,714.51. This surplus, Mr. Speaker, was the largest that has ever been known in the history of the Dominion of Canada. I have prepared a statement showing the surpluses and deficits for the last four years, and the following are the figures :

In 1897 there was a deficit of $519,981.44, in 1898 there was a surplus of $1,722,712.33, in 1899 there was a surplus of $4,837,749, and in 1900 there was the surplus that I have just mentioned of $8,054,714.51. Our surpluses thus have aggregated $14,615,-175.84. Deduct $519,981.44, the deficit for the first year, which was, however, hardly under our control, but we will pass that point now,—deduct the deficit of that year from the surpluses of succeeding years, and we find that there has been a net surplus for the four years as between the revenue and the ordinary expenses of government of $14,095,194.40. So far I have dealt with what we call the expenditure on consolidated fund account, which represents the ordinary expenses of government. There is, of course, another class of expenditure which figures in our account, which is commonly called capital expenditure, including public works, railways, railway subsidies and various special items of an unusual character. These expenditures for the year ended June 30, 1900, were as follows :—

Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways	$3,308,894 31
Canals	2,639,564 93
Public works	1,089,827 29
Dominion lands	199,470 09
Militia	230,850 51
Canadian Pacific Railway	236 11
Total	$7,468,843 24

To this must be added for railway subsidies, including $340,000 paid during that year to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, $725,-720.35, and there is a further item to be added, being the expenses of the South African contingent and the Halifax garrison, amounting to $1,547,623.74. These capital and special expenses for the year amounted to $9,742,187.33. Now, with these large expenditures for the liberal maintenance of the public services, with large expenditures for railways and public works, and with special expenditures in connection with the South African war, it would not have been a matter of surprise if it had been necessary to increase the public debt. Yet, we have the gratifying statement that we have provided for all these large expenditures, and that we have been able not to increase the public debt, but actually to reduce the public debt to the extent of $779,639.71. The net debt on June 30, 1899, was $266,273,446.60 ; the net debt at the same date in 1900 was $265,493,806.89, showing a decrease of $779,-639.71, as already stated.

Now, that is a very gratifying statement, but it is one which it is only possible to make in very prosperous times. In only two years prior to this, in the history of the Dominion of Canada, was the Finance Minister able to make the statement that there had been a reduction in the public debt. This occurred in the year 1871, when my predecessor in office was Sir Francis Hincks, and it also occurred in 1882, when Sir Leonard Tilley was Minister of Finance, and when there was a reduction in the public debt of a very considerable sum. It is not therefore reasonable to expect that this reduction in the public debt can frequently occur. In a country like Canada, which after all is a comparatively new country in which there will always be demands for public works, and in which there will be expenditures outside of what may be called the ordinary expenses of government, it is only reasonable to suppose that we shall incur obligations which will necessitate occasionally some addition to the public debt. I think that if the addition to the public debt should only be a moderate one we will have no reason to complain.

Turning now to the affairs of the current year, which is to close on the 30th June next, I find that our revenue up to the

10th March was $34,942,177.95, an increase over the corresponding date last year of $1,227,693.01.

The customs revenue, which is always an item of chief importance, remains up to date substantially the same as it was a year ago, and I do not expect that from this time forward we can expect any material increase in that item. In railways and post office and excise there has been a considerable increase, and we anticipate that there will be some further increase before the year closes.

Mr. WALLACE. How much increase in the excise ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the figures at hand, but I will give them to the hon. gentleman later. I estimate that the total revenue for the current year, to end on June 30 next, will be $52,750,000, or an increase of $1,720,000 over the revenue of the previous year.

Coming now to the expenditure account for the current year. The expenditure up to March 10, on consolidated fund, was $27,731,602.04, so that, if we had an increased revenue, we have also had some increase in expenditure as well. We have some supplementary estimates yet to bring down for the current year which will, of course, swell our existing appropriations. I estimate that when the year's affairs are closed, including these supplementary appropriations, we shall find the expenditure chargeable to consolidated fund amounting as near as may be to $46,400,000. With an estimated revenue of $52,750,000, and a probable expenditure of $46,400,000, I reach the conclusion that at the close of the present year we shall be able to show another surplus amounting to $6,350,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This, Sir, is not so large a surplus as that of the past year, but I think we shall all agree that if the accounts when closed will show a surplus as large as that, it may be regarded as very satisfactory.

The capital expenditure of the current year, to March 10, was $6,584,309.42. We have still to pay very considerable sums on account of railway subsidies, canals, and so forth, and I estimate that the total expenditure chargeable to capital for the current year will reach $10,700,000. If we deduct from this our surplus and our sinking fund, I am of opinion that we shall have to make some addition to our public debt, but I think it will be a very moderate one, and will not exceed $1,800,000. That is not a very large sum, especially if we take into consideration the additions to the public debt in days gone by. Our administration is four years old, and as one naturally wishes to prepare a statement concerning the period of his own government, I have prepared a statement of the state of the debt in these four years.

Debt statement for four years.

	Increase.	Decrease.
1896-7	$3,041,163	
1897-8	2,417,802	
1898-9	2,317,047	
1899-1900		$779,639
	$7,776,012	$779,639
	779,639	
Total increase in four years..	$6,996,373	
Average increase for four years	1,749,093	
Average increase for 18 years, 1878-1896	6,563,075	

Therefore, deducting the decrease, we find that in the four years we have increased the public debt to the extent of $6,996,373. The average increase for the four years is therefore $1,749,093 per annum, against an average increase in the previous eighteen years of $6,563,075 per annum.

With regard to the next fiscal year, beginning on 1st July next, it is too soon for us to attempt to make anything like a close estimate. I have already submitted to parliament estimates on account of consolidated fund amounting to $44,102,323.56, and on capital account amounting to $6,296,500, making a total of $50,398,823.56, including both capital and consolidated fund. We have supplementary estimates yet to come which must considerably add to these appropriations, and there are special expenditures likely to come upon us in the next year of which we must take note. We shall have to provide, in addition to considerable expenditures in the usual way on railway subsidies and so forth, for a very considerable sum in the shape of bounties on iron and steel. Hitherto these bounties have not in any one year amounted to any very great sum, but hon. gentlemen are well aware from what we have seen in the public press as well as from the discussions in this House, that the iron and steel industry is now being developed on a very large scale and as a consequence of that we shall be called upon to pay a very considerable sum as bounty. It is difficult to form any definite opinion as to what this will amount to. We know the amount of bounty that is to be paid per ton, but the quantity that will be produced is of course a matter concerning which we have no means of knowing definitely. I assume, however, that we shall have to pay next year at least $1,000,000 in bounties on iron and steel, and I shall not be surprised if the sum has to be somewhat larger. Therefore, we shall be obliged to provide for a very considerable expenditure for the coming year. As to revenue, I do not expect that we can keep on at the rate of increase which has been so marked during the past three or four years. I think we have probably now reached about the

crest of the wave of prosperity. I do not expect that we shall have any serious reverses. I think the business of Canada has been developed during the past four or five years upon very safe and sound lines. I think there has been to a very large extent an absence of that inflation which is so apt to mark a period of good times. I am of opinion that the business of the country as a whole has been so carefully conducted and is on such a sound basis that we are not likely to suffer any serious reverses, but I do not think it is reasonable to expect that we can go on increasing our business as rapidly as we have during the past few years. What may happen is that we might suffer a check. Perhaps it might be best described as a period of rest, not of going backward, when Canada like a young giant will gather new strength and advance again by leaps and bounds as she has during the past four years. Perhaps, I will be pardoned if I give somewhat hurriedly a few of the leading facts which mark the great prosperity of the past year. These facts can, of course, be obtained by those who take the trouble to go through the Trade and Navigation Returns, but, they may be conveniently presented in a condensed form in the budget speech. It was indeed a banner year so far as the trade and commerce of the country is concerned. The aggregate foreign trade of the year 1900 was $381,517,236. In the previous year it was $321,661,213. The increase in the aggregate foreign trade of Canada over the previous year was $59,856,023. When I remind the House that the increase in the whole eighteen years of the national policy was only $66,000,000, and when I show that in one year only of the present administration, the increase was over $59,000,000 and nearly $60,000,000, hon. gentlemen will be able to measure the vast progress that has been made in trade of the country.

Mr. COCHRANE. When you abandoned the national policy.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, our hon. friends opposite have been abandoned; we are still here. The following summary is interesting and instructive :

Aggregate foreign trade, 1900.....	$381,517,236 00
" " 1899.....	321,661,213 00
Increase in 1900	$ 59,856,023 00
Imports entered for consumption, 1900	$180,804,316 00
Imports entered for consumption, 1899	154,051,593 00
Increase in 1900	$ 26,752,723 00
Exports of produce of Canada, 1900	$170,642,369 00
Exports of produce of Canada, 1899	138,462,037 00
Increase in 1900	$ 32,180,332 00
Exports, the produce of Canada to Great Britain, 1900	$96,562,875 00
Exports, the produce of Canada to Great Britain, 1899	85,114,555 00
Increase in 1900	$11,448,320 00
Exports, produce of Canada to United States, 1900	$59,666,556 00
Exports, produce of Canada to United States, 1899	40,426,856 00
Increase in 1900	$19,239,700 00
Exports, Canadian Mines to all countries, 1900	$24,580,266 00
Exports, Canadian mines to all countries, 1899	13,368,150 00
Increase in 1900	$11,212,116 00
Exports, Canadian fisheries, 1900..	$11,169,083 00
" " 1899..	9,909,662 00
Increase in 1900	$ 1,259,421 00
Exports, Canadian forests, 1900...	$29,663,668 00
" " 1899...	28,021,529 00
Increase in 1900	$ 1,642,139 00
Exports, animals and their produce, the produce of Canada, 1900.....	$56,148,807 00
Exports, animals and their produce, the produce of Canada, 1899	46,743,130 00
Increase in 1900	$ 9,405,677 00
Exports, agricultural products, the produce of Canada, 1900.....	$27,516,609 00
Exports, agricultural products, the produce of Canada, 1899	22,952,915 00
Increase in 1900	$ 4,563,694 00
Exports, manufactures of Canada, 1900	$14,224,287 00
Exports, manufactures of Canada, 1899	11,706,707 00
Increase in 1900	$ 2,517,580 00

In view of the discussions which have occasionally taken place in the House with regard to the increase of the imports from Great Britain for home consumption, I have placed together the figures for a series of years :

1895.....	$31,131,737
1896.....	32,979,742
1897.....	29,412,188
1898.....	32,500,917
1899.....	37,060,123
1900.....	44,789,730

It will be observed, Sir, that the imports from Great Britain had been declining steadily when the policy of the present government, including the preferential tariff, was adopted. That decline was immediately arrested, and from that time on the imports from Great Britain began to increase, so that now, as compared with 1897, they show an increase to the extent of about 50 per cent.

I confess that I hardly know just how this increase of imports may be viewed by

some of our hon. friends opposite. Sometimes the criticism is that by our preferential tariff we have allowed goods to come in from Great Britain and have thereby injured our own manufactures.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hear, hear, says my hon. friend opposite. But at other times the argument is that the preferential tariff has made no difference in the trade with Great Britain, but that trade has increased generally and that the imports from Great Britain have only kept pace with the general increase of business throughout the world; and when we have contended, as we have, that the preferential tariff has been an instrument in increasing the imports from Great Britain, we have met the reply that it has not had that effect at all, but that the increased trade with Great Britain has come about by means altogether irrespective of the preferential tariff.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman give the increase of imports from the United States during the same period?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, Mr. Speaker, but if it will help my hon. friend very much, I will make an admission at once. We import from the United States a large quantity of the things we require, not to please the United States, but to please ourselves. We import the raw materials from the United States, which go to make the manufacturers of Canada prosperous. If it be the policy of our hon. friends opposite to keep out the raw materials which our manufacturers require, that is not the policy of the present government.

In this connection perhaps I may be permitted to say a word as to a contention which has been advanced at times, and which has found a suggestion this session in the form of several questions by our hon. friends opposite. The argument has been used sometimes in the public press, and sometimes on the floor of this House, that our preferential tariff is admitting a large quantity of foreign goods—goods which are not British at all. Now, that is a fair matter for investigation. It was no part of our intention to extend the benefits of the preferential tariff to these foreign nations. The intention was that goods coming from Great Britain and purporting to be British goods should be bona fide products of Great Britain. But, of course, we have to remember that Great Britain imports great quantities of raw materials and articles in the first process of manufacture, and improves or finishes them; and then she is the great shipping mart for those goods throughout the wide world; and it has been suggested by a question put by one of our hon. friends opposite that perhaps we ought to provide that the preferential tariff shall apply only to British goods, meaning materials which are grown or produced in Great Britain and undergo all the processes of manufacture in Great Britain. I had to reply that such a policy would amount to a practical repeal of the preferential tariff, because Great Britain has to import large quantities of materials out of which she produces her manufactured goods. But it has been represented that the preferential tariff is evaded, and that goods of Belgian or German or other foreign origin are brought in under it. I want to say that if any information can be furnished by any hon. gentleman in the House or by any gentleman outside, it will help us to investigate that matter; for we have every desire to see that the intentions of the preferential tariff in that respect are carried out in good faith. As to whether our present regulation for distinguishing between British and foreign goods is sufficient may also be a fair matter of inquiry. We think we have probably reached a sound conclusion in that respect when we have determined that 25 per cent of the value of an article being of British labour or industry shall give it the stamp of a British manufacture and entitle it to the benefits of the preferential tariff. But while we think we have probably reached a sound conclusion in that regard, I quite admit that it is a matter for investigation and inquiry; and if any information can be furnished which will lead us to believe that the intention of the government with respect to the preferential tariff is being evaded, either through fraud on the part of importers or through error in our own calculation as to the proper proportion of British labour, we shall deem it to be our duty to give the matter every consideration. I have a statement here, again taking a period of four years for convenience, showing the exports of the produce of Canada for two periods of four years each, and have classified them so that the exports of each class are shown. The statement is as follows:—

Statement showing Exports the Produce of Canada for four year periods.

	Four years, 1893 to 1896.	Four years, 1897 to 1900.
Mine	$ 26,173,776	$ 63,710,587
Fisheries	41,615,754	42,234,729
Forest	103,782,210	115,455,465
Animals and their produce and agricultural ducts	204,043,511	287,954,114
Manufactures	32,520,973	46,131,324
Miscellaneous	364,222	432,175
Coin and bullion and short reported	14,459,930	22,740,235
Total	$422,960,376	$578,658,629
		422,960,376
Increase last four years		$155,698,253

The question of the rate of taxation under the customs tariff has been frequently discussed, and perhaps a word or two concern-

ing it, based upon the figures of the past year, will not be out of place. If we take the imports for home consumption and the duty collected, we will find that the proportion of duty in 1896 on all imports for home consumption was 18·28, and by the same statement for 1900, it was 15·98, making a difference of 2·30 or one-eighth of the whole duty.

If that were to be taken as a correct statement of the whole matter, it would show that the difference between the operation of our tariff on the imports of last year and that of the old tariff, were it still in operation, would have amounted to $4,161,918.

But there is a point concerning which we have occasionally had a discussion here with regard to the imports of corn, and I wish to qualify the statement I have just made in the light of what has happened with respect to our trade in corn. Under the old tariff corn was dutiable, and consequently it was important that the man handling it should discriminate very carefully between the corn for home consumption, which paid a duty and that in transit for exportation, which paid no duty. But when corn was made free the necessity for that careful discrimination no longer existed. There being no duty, the man who imported the corn might enter it at the customs for home consumption and export it a week later. If we take the quantity of corn exported and thus try to obtain a fair comparison with the former condition of affairs and make allowance in that way for the portion of the corn which increased the value of our imports, when in reality it was sent abroad and did not enter into home consumption—making allowance for that, we shall find that the average rate for last year was not 15·98 but 16·41, and I am content to take that statement instead of the former one for the purposes of comparison. Taking the rate 16·41 as the rate for the past year as against 18·28 in 1896, we shall reach the conclusion that if the old tariff had remained in operation and been applied on the imports of last year, the duty levied would have been larger to the extent of $3,292,230. In other words, if the old tariff had been in operation as applied to the imports for home consumption last year, it would have levied and taken from the pockets of the people $3,292,230 more than was taken by the tariff of the present government.

I am going to ask the House to bear with me a few minutes while I present some statistics which are likely to be tedious, but which will bear study.

It will be remembered that on several occasions in connection with budget speeches, series of diagrams were published which served to show very graphically the growth and progress of the business of the country from year to year. I have not done that this year. An attempt to make a statement following up the growth of business every year since confederation would be very tedious. But I am quite sure that in the convenient form of a budget speech, we should like to have some figures which would give an idea of the progress Canada has made since confederation to the present day, and if I can do that in a condensed way, it will be useful. Instead of giving a yearly statement, I propose to take leaps of five years and only make the statement for every fifth year.

One measure of the growth of the business of the country is commonly considered the circulation of Dominion notes of all denominations.

	Circulation Dominion notes.	Increase over fifth year previous.	Decrease under fifth year.
Oct. 31, 1870.....	$ 7,450,334		
1875.....	11,119,485	$3,669,151	
1880.....	14,693,744	3,574,259	
1885.....	18,072,355	3,378,611	
1890.....	16,760,789	.....	$1,311,566
1895.....	22,893,259	6,132,470	
1900.....	28,113,229	5,219,970	

I have given the circulation of Dominion notes generally, but the small notes of one dollar and two dollars are supposed to be perhaps the very best standard by which to judge of the business of the country, because as business increases there is an increased demand for these small notes.

Circulation of Small Notes ($1 and $2) at the dates named.

		Increase.
Oct. 31, 1875.....	$3,489,830	
1880.....	3,999,452	$ 509,622
1885.....	5,602,514	1,603,062
1890.....	6,905,079	1,302,565
1895.....	7,312,917	407,838
1900.....	10,236,116	2,923,199

Total Circulation of the Notes of the Chartered Banks of Canada at the dates named.

	Notes in Circulation.	Increase over fifth year previous.	Decrease under fifth year previous
Oct. 31, 1870.....	$18,642,895		
1875.....	25,599,331	$6,956,436	
1880.....	27,981,567	1,382,236	
1885.....	34,576,246	6,594,679	
1890.....	36,480,649	1,904,403	
1895.....	34,671,028	.....	$1,809,621
1900.....	53,198,777	18,527,749	

Let me now give statements showing deposits in government and post office savings banks and banks :

Statement of Total Balances at Credit of the Depositors in the Government and Post Office Savings Banks.

	Balances.	Increase over fifth year previous.
June 30, 1869-70.....	$ 3,337,072	
1874-5.....	7,171,181	$ 3,804,109
1879-80.....	11,052,956	3,881,775
1884-5.....	32,979,076	21,926,120
1889-90.....	41,012,465	8,033,389
1894-5.....	44,450,498	3,438,033
1899-1900.....	53,149,722	8,699,224

Statement of Deposits by the Public in the Chartered Banks at the dates named.

	Deposits.	Increase over fifth year previous.
June 30, 1870	$ 54,074,760	
1875	61,094,860	$ 7,020,100
1880	76,244,065	15,149,205
1885	95,030,429	18,786,364
1890	128,631,455	33,601,026
1895	182,688,227	54,056,772
1900	277,256,716	94,568,489

The following figures will show the exports of Canadian produce by five year terms in the same way :

Statements of Exports of Canadian Produce for the years named.

	Exports.	Increase over previous fifth year.
1869-70	$ 67,045,868	
1874-5	70,749,660	$3,703,792
1879-80	74,671,452	3,921,792
1884-5	81,158,715	6,487,263
1889-90	87,697,368	6,538,653
1894-5	103,085,012	15,387,644
1889-1900	170,642,369	67,557,357

Statement of Total Imports for Home Consumption for the years named.

	Imports.	Increase over fifth year previous.	Decrease under fifth year previous.
1869-70	$ 71,237,603		
1874-5	119,618,657	$48,381,054	
1879-80	71,782,349		$47,836,308
1884-5	102,710,019	30,927,670	
1889-90	112,765,584	10,055,565	
1894-5	105,252,511		7,513,073
1899-1900	180,804,316	75,551,805	

Statement of the Total Trade of Canada for the years named.

	Total Trade.	Increase over fifth year previous.	Decrease under fifth year previous.
1869-70	$148,387,329		
1874-5	200,957,262	$52,569,933	
1879-80	174,401,205		$26,556,057
1884-5	198,179,847	23,778,642	
1889-90	218,607,390	20,427,543	
1894-5	224,420,485	5,813,095	
1899-1900	381,517,236	157,096,751	

I thought, Sir, that, in the absence of diagrams, these condensed statements would give us a hurried review of the progress of Canada in these various departments from the time of confederation down to the present.

So much has been said about the Yukon, that I am sure that the House will be interested in knowing something about the receipts and expenditures of that district. I have first made a statement of the royalties, because that is a special item, and, perhaps, should be separated from the general receipts :

Royalties—Yukon.

1898	$287,423 55
1899	575,812 79
1900	730,771 99
Six months to Dec. 31, 1900	446,184 28
	$2,040,192 61

Showing that in the three and a half years, we have received in the way of royalties alone from the Yukon the sum of $2,040,000, I have had a larger statement prepared, however, which is not confined to royalties, but will show briefly the receipts and expenditures of all classes on account of the Yukon territory :

YUKON TERRITORY.

REVENUE.

—	1896-7.	1897-8.	1898-9.	1899-1900.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
*Interior	8,593 00	735,485 09	1,261,816 30	1,130,965 49	3,136,859 88
Post Office	50 00	2,083 50	9,461 28	21,550 99	33,145 77
Customs	9,873 24	63,185 39	482,098 55	613,191 97	1,168,349 15
Public Works				33,716 88	33,716 88
Fisheries				4,601 48	4,601 48
Total	18,516 24	800,753 98	1,753,376 13	1,804,026 81	4,376,673 16

*Including royalty, miners' certificates, mining fees, land sales, rentals, timber dues, placer grants, &c.

It is but fair to state that the Yukon should be credited, I think, with a further sum. These figures represent only the actual collections in the Yukon. But we all know that a very large proportion of the goods imported at Vancouver or Victoria, or, for that matter, in the eastern cities also, while paying duties at these respective ports of entry, are afterwards shipped to the Yukon, and, in that way, I have no doubt, the Yukon has added very largely to our revenues in addition to the sums I have stated. As to expenditures, the following table will give the figures :

EXPENDITURE.

—	1896-7.	1897-8.	1898-9.	1899-1900.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Interior	5,998 47	47,026 65	223,526 24	331,850 21	608,401 57
Post Office	40 00	43 33	21,950 39	112,368 57	134,402 29
Customs	3,938 78	3,239 09	28 931 88	30,561 84	66,671 59
Public Works		14,000 00	68,619 32	118,544 05	201,163 37
Railways and Canals		4,996 00	55,952 92	24,457 50	85,406 42
Justice		933 97	12,646 98	22,673 56	36,254 51
Mounted Police	22,134 76	495,770 08	874,852 72	492,427 52	1,885,185 08
Militia		99,975 75	387,763 41	173,266 21	661,005 37
Marine				800 00	800 00
Total	32,112 01	665,984 87	1,674,243 86	1,306,949 46	3,679,290 20

Excess of receipts over expenditure on consolidated fund	$697,382 96
Public Works capital	568,874 90
Excess of receipts over all expenditure	$128,508 06

Thus we find, if we take all the expenditures chargeable to consolidated fund and this extra sum chargeable to capital, our revenues from the Yukon, without counting the indirect revenues I have referred to, amount to $128,508.06 over and above all expenditures in that district.

Now, it was the policy of the government, at the beginning—to use an expression which has become current—to make the Yukon pay for the Yukon; and that has been carried out. And, now, Sir, in view of this very handsome financial statement to the credit of the Yukon, and in view also of the desire of the government to encourage the development of mining in the Yukon as a permanent business, now that the first rush for rich creeks has passed, my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has been able to announce a very important step—that is, that the royalty in the Yukon district instead of being 10 per cent, shall hereafter be 5 per cent. That, I have no doubt, will be a very important concession for the development of the country. We do not think that a reduction was needed earlier. So long as the first flush of the Yukon excitement was on, the people were ready to go in and pick up their nuggets and pay the royalty cheerfully. But that is over, and, if that is to be a permanent mining district, mining must be carried on under better conditions than heretofore. Everything that increases the cost of mining is a disadvantage to the miner and to the development of the district. So, my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has concluded to advise that this reduction should be made and we have accepted it. This does not necessarily mean that the revenue will be reduced by half. For my part, I am a great believer in the idea that you can sometimes get as much money out of a low duty as out of a high duty. I am not prepared to say that it will be so in this case, but, undoubtedly the tendency of high duties is to lead to smuggling. Therefore, with a less royalty than we have heretofore had we shall be able the better to collect the revenue, and I trust we shall not have so great a falling off in the revenue from that source as might seem probable from the mere announcement of the reduction of the duty.

The House will be glad to be informed as to the expenditure on the South Africa contingents and the garrison at Halifax. We appropriated two millions for the war in South Africa, and the probability is that that will just about cover our expenditure.

The following figures show the expenditures upon the contingents :

Expenditure on South African Contingents.

1899-1900—	
First contingent	$ 305,503 57
Second "	946,714 48
General	185,387 77
	$1,437,605 82
Less refunds	8,247 22
Total expended 1898-1900	$1,429,358 60
Expended to Feb. 26, 1901, from June 30, 1900	539,356 77
Estimated further expenditure	35,000 00
Probable total expenditure	$2,003,715 37

Thus it will be seen that the expenditure will probably be very slightly over the amount already appropriated. Over and above that, however, we have made provision for a special item with respect to the garrison at Halifax. It will be remembered that it was the desire of Her Majesty's gov-

ernment to withdraw the Imperial regiment from Halifax in order that they might take part in the war, and the suggestion was thrown out that Canada might garrison Halifax. That was very cheerfully done. What may be the future of the arrangement we have yet to know and to announce to the House. The following figures will show the expenditure on the Halifax garrison :

Halifax Garrison.

1899-1900	$116,265 14
Expended between June 30, 1900, and Feb. 26, 1901	184,711 73
Estimated further expenditure, 1900-1901	85,000 00
	$387,976 87

Recapitulation—South Africa Contingents and Halifax Garrison.

The expenditure on the South African war and Halifax garrison may be summarized thus :

Expended in 1899-1900 for South Africa contingents and the Halifax garrison	$1,547,623 74
Expended from June 30, 1900, to Feb. 28, for South Africa contingents and Halifax garrison	724,068 50
Estimated further expenditure to June 30, 1900	120,000 00
Total	$2,391,692 24

So that at the close of the fiscal year the account will probably stand, $2,000,000 expended for the contingent in South Africa and $387,000 expended on account of the garrison at Halifax. I am glad to be able to make a very satisfactory statement with regard to the credit and standing of Canada abroad. Happily, under all governments Canada's credit for a long time has stood strong, and we have reason to congratulate ourselves that during the past two or three years circumstances have helped us to add to that strength. The House will remember in the last parliament we passed an Act whereby, in conjunction with an Imperial Act, arrangements were made for placing Canadian securities upon what is called the Trustee List of England. It has happened that during the past year or two the condition of the money market in England has been one of considerable severity. If we were merely to look at the quotations for our loans without reference to the conditions surrounding them, we might easily reach the conclusion that Canada had merely held the credit she had several years ago. I think, however, we can comfort ourselves in the belief that we have strengthened our position somewhat. Our 2½ per cent loan, which I had the pleasure of placing in London in 1897, was issued at a little more than 91½, £90 10s. and a fraction. These stocks went as high in 1898 as 94½, and they have been as low at times as 89. In the latest quotations our Canadian 2½ per cents are quoted at 92, which is only a fraction better than they were when they were placed on the market in 1897. But if we would correctly understand our position in this respect, we will look at the price of standard British securities, the consols, as they stood in 1897, and as they stand now. We find that in 1897, when our loan was issued at 91½ and a fraction more, British consols were quoted as high as 113⅞. To-day Canada's securities stand a fraction better than they did when they were placed on the market in 1897, but British consols, which were quoted as high in that year as 113⅞, in consequence of the stringency of the money market and the difficulties arising from the war, have fallen as low as 97¾. So when you come to compare the conditions as they were in 1897 and the conditions to-day, you will discover that while in the actual condition of the money market all securities have fallen to a considerable extent, while the standard security of all British consols has fallen in a very marked degree, the securities of Canada have held their own and stand to-day a fraction better than when the loan was placed in the year 1896.

I have referred, Mr. Speaker, to the question of the bounties on steel and iron. There is a matter in connection with that subject which I should now mention to the House. The policy of paying bounties on steel and iron was adopted a good many years ago, and by some strange process, the exact reason for which one cannot easily find, that was never made a direct payment from the treasury. A curious process was adopted whereby these payments were treated as refunds or drawbacks in the Customs Department. Now, if a man pays duties under an error and has to have a refund, that is right ; the amount should be deducted from the customs revenue, because it affects the customs revenue. But the payment of a bounty on steel and iron was certainly not a refund, because the money never went into the treasury, and why it should come out of the treasury in the form of a refund or payment in that way, I have not been able to ascertain. However, that was the method established and we have followed it up to the present time. The consequence has been that our actual revenue for customs has been stated somewhat less than it really was, because it was charged with these sums. Hitherto they have not been much, they have been much in the aggregate, but in any one year up to the present time the amount has not been large enough to become a matter of any considerable consequence. But with the prospect of having to pay very large sums now and for several years to come for that service, I think the House will agree with me that it is time there was a change in the method of book-keeping. I propose, therefore, that hereafter, beginning

with the 1st of July next, whenever payments are made in the way of bounties on iron and steel, they should be paid directly from the treasury and should be shown in the public accounts in that way, instead of appearing in the Auditor General's Report, which is the only place you can conveniently find them, as a refund of duty, which is of course entirely incorrect. Now, I think the House generally will agree with me that this is a wise policy. There is one other point in connection with the matter. If these bounties were to be paid continuously from year to year as part of our ordinary expenditure, we should of course have to charge them against the revenue of the year, they would have to be charges against income. But the House is aware that we are treating this as a temporary subsidy for the establishment of a great industry, and we propose that that should cease to exist this year in a short time—in six years from the 1st of July next. We propose, therefore, to treat this precisely as we do a railway subsidy, and that it should appear in a statement of the public accounts exactly as a railway subsidy now appears. That will make a slight change in some comparisons that are occasionally made. If we want to be absolutely exact in our calculation with respect to customs revenue and with respect to surplus and deficit, a careful note must be taken by those interested in such discussions, and it will be admitted that it is better that we should make a change in the way I propose than that we should go on paying large sums of money, one million, two millions, some persons say three, four or five millions, in the way that it has hitherto been paid, thus diminishing our apparent customs revenue, instead of paying it as a direct charge upon the country.

Mr. WALLACE. Will it be charged to consolidated revenue fund ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will not be charged to consolidated revenue fund.

Mr. WALLACE. Why ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will be treated as a railway subsidy. We have treated railway subsidies, not as chargeable to the ordinary revenue of the year, but to a special revenue, and not as if it were to become an ordinary and annual charge. If it were a continual charge it would be perfectly right to charge it against the consolidated fund, that is, against the ordinary expenditure of the country ; but as it is to be a special charge, existing only for a short period and designed as a subsidy for establishing a great industry, we propose to treat it exactly as the grant of a similar sum of money for the encouragement of a railway.

Mr. WALLACE. Then we understand it will be charged to capital account ?

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, the book-keepers make a fine distinction, which perhaps neither my hon. friend nor myself clearly see, between capital account and railway subsidies. Perhaps the theory upon which that has been done is this : That if you make a public work, even though it is only a hole in the ground, it belongs to the Dominion, but a subsidized railway does not belong to the Dominion. That is the theory, at all events. We do not call it, technically, capital account. It is charged to a special account, but in the sense which the hon. gentleman has in his mind it is capital account, inasmuch as it is not charged in the ordinary expenditure of the year.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to make any changes in the tariff. In saying that I do not for one moment assume that the tariff is perfect, I quite realize that imperfections may be shown, I realize that here and there some special interest would be pleased if we were to make some change. I am not prepared to say that there are not some cases in which there are inequalities which might better be remedied. But there are not many items in the tariff which can stand absolutely alone. Occasionally, a man comes to me and says : Mr. Fielding, I entirely agree with your policy in having a stable tariff ; we do not want to make changes generally, but we want you to make this particular change, and everybody will be perfectly satisfied. But I have not found that everybody would be satisfied with the particular change which my particular friend would desire. As a rule, the tariff items have relation one to another, and it is not easy to make any considerable number of changes without opening the door to a wide revision of the tariff. I think the business men of the country have appreciated the value of some measure of stability in the tariff. I have again and again expressed the opinion that it was better we should bear some imperfection and some inequalities than to be constantly engaged in the process which is irreverently described as tariff tinkering.

Therefore, we say, considering the tariff has only been in force for four years, that we think it is not unreasonable that it shall continue for the present without the changes that some desire to have, for some will always think that it might be a little better for them, and they are patiently waiting for the day to come when there shall be a wider revision than is possible to-day and when possibly we may be able to do some of the things that they desire to-day. I think, that, while, here and there, some particular set of people, or some particular interest, would prefer that we would make changes, the judgment of the country will be that it is better to have some stability about the tariff and not make any changes at the present time.

I have stated that we shall make no changes, but that is not strictly correct, and

I shall qualify that statement in respect to one item, which is scarcely in the nature of a change but rather in the nature of an explanation of a feature of the tariff adopted last year. We have been asked to consider the question of establishing the beet-root sugar industry in this country. We have been asked to grant bounties to that industry and we have not been able to comply with that request. We found that the bounty system, adopted some years ago and put in operation, was not successful, and we are not quite satisfied yet that we would be justified in granting bounties to revive that business. In saying that it is not my wish to discredit, if I could, and I could not because my knowledge would not permit me to do so, the statements of gentlemen who have represented to us that the conditions in the province of Ontario to-day are much better than the conditions were in the province of Quebec and that, therefore, they could probably make the industry a success. We think, at all events, that we have not yet reached the point that would justify us in reviving the bounty system, which was tried before and which was a failure. At the same time, we, last year, made a concession to this industry in the form of free machinery. It was represented to us that they were hoping to secure a bounty from the Ontario legislature, and that if, in addition to that, we could grant them exemption from duty on the machinery, it would be a very valuable concession, inasmuch as machinery is a very large item in the cost of a beet-root sugar factory. Responding to that wish—of course, there are many who would have been pleased had we gone farther, but, responding to that extent—we introduced an item into the tariff for the purpose of making machinery free, but it was qualified with the words that the machinery should be of a class not made in the Dominion of Canada. That is the usual condition of any exemption of that character. It has been represented to us that that qualification, as respects the machinery being made in Canada, prevents the concession becoming of any substantial value to the promoters of this industry. It is represented, and it seems to me to be reasonable, that a beet-root sugar plant is a somewhat delicate piece of machinery and that it is important that it should all be made, or controlled, by one manufacturer or contractor, so that he may be held responsible for the equipment of the whole factory, and if he is obliged to buy one piece of machinery in Canada and another in the United States there is an absence of that harmonious co-operation that is essential to success. Taking that into consideration, we have concluded to interpret our Act of last year, and to introduce an amendment which will make it clear that for one year, reserving the question as to whether circumstances will warrant us in continuing it, we will permit the free admission, under any regulations that may be made by the Customs Department, of machinery of every kind imported for the purpose of equipping a beet-root sugar factory into the Dominion. We think, if the industry is to be put on a basis of business, if the industry is as promising a one for the Dominion as it is said to be, with the bounty which is allowed by the legislature of Ontario, and with this valuable concession, for it is a valuable concession, in respect to the machinery, an opportunity will be allowed for giving that business a fair trial in the province of Ontario. Such, however, is our hope, and I have no doubt my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) will be able to lend the assistance of his department. I am told that one of the greatest difficulties that they have to contend with in this business, is, in the cultivation of a beet of the proper strength and of the proper quality. That is a matter coming particularly within the authority of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and I have no doubt that he will be glad to lend the assistance of his department in the way of instruction, information, lectures, circulars and literature, or in any direction that tends to improve the cultivation of the beet.

Now, a marked characteristic of the present session has been short speeches and I desire to have the budget speech respond to that general feeling. After all, the only question of real importance in the budget speech, outside of the general information it contains and which may be interesting, the thing that always interests people in the budget speech is the question of tariff changes, and as we have no tariff changes to announce, there is no reason why I should occupy the time of the House with an extended speech. The tariff policy we have to offer to-day is the tariff policy which we adopted in 1897 and which we have continued up to the present time. It is a tariff policy based upon the necessities of our revenue, a revenue tariff, which incidentally affords a very considerable degree of encouragement to those engaged in Canadian industries, and having as its leading principle the principle of the British preferential tariff. I am afraid that on that question we are as wide as ever from our hon. friends opposite. Perhaps it is not easy for me to determine how wide the difference is between us, in view of some of the conflicting statements hon. gentlemen have made from time to time, but I suppose I shall not be wrong if I say that the ground taken by hon. gentlemen opposite is, that while they are in favour of the principle of a British preferential tariff, they are opposed to what they call a one-sided preference.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hear, hear ; I am glad to receive these hear, hears, because they show that I have correctly de-

scribed, as I desire to do, the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite. They say that they are opposed to a one-sided preference and they say our preference is a one-sided one.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hear, hear; and again I am glad to have it. Surely if a one-sided preference is bad, and if our preference is a one-sided one, there is only one thing for hon. gentlemen to do, and that is to bring down a resolution to repeal the British preferential tariff.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am bound to believe that they will do so, and if so, of course we will have at once the issue joined between us. We can respect their view although we differ from it. But, we will know exactly where we stand and we will know where they stand. They have held that we did wrong in granting a preference to the goods of Great Britain without demanding a preference for Canada in the markets of Great Britain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Again, those comforting hear, hears, which show that I am correctly giving the views of my hon. friends. They have been pleased to try to persuade themselves and try to persuade the public that the preference in the English market, which they desire, can be had for the asking. Year after year they have endeavoured to persuade themselves of that. I suppose, that, like a man who tells the same story again and again until he persuades himself that it is true, many hon. gentlemen opposite have persuaded themselves they can easily obtain that preference in the English market. We thought that the utterances of the English press, the articles published in the great British journals, the statements of the leading public men in both political parties, and most of all the statements of such men as Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach and the Duke of Devonshire, made it perfectly clear that that preference, which hon. gentlemen opposite believed it was so easy to get, could not be obtained in the English market, and that view we still hold. The only new incident that has occurred that I can recall since I last discussed this subject here, was that which occurred in connection with the meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce in London last summer. There the question was raised in a very gentle and modest form; in the form of a resolution asking Her Majesty's government to appoint a royal commission to inquire into the question of Imperial trade. But even in that innocent form, so innocent and harmless that it is difficult to see how any one would oppose it, we find that when they asked a hearing before the British Prime Minister to present their resolution, he stated that the time was not opportune to consider it and he declined to receive the deputation. And then, discouraged and discomforted by the illustrious Prime Minister of Great Britain, they went to the Colonial Secretary. They made a visit to Mr. Chamberlain, who, I have no doubt, received them with that great courtesy and consideration which he always extends to Canadians. They tried to persuade Mr. Chamberlain that his preference should be granted, and their own records and reports show us—and can be quoted if necessary—that Mr. Chamberlain told them courteously but firmly and emphatically, that the thing could not be entertained for a moment unless they were prepared to give up their tariff protection against Great Britain. That was the basic principle of Mr. Chamberlain's statement, and these gentlemen were not prepared to give that up, nor would I have been prepared to give it up if I had been in their place.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Chamberlain may have to change his mind like others.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Possibly. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) will do me the justice to say that I am dealing with things of the past and present, and we will not say too much of the future, but I say that as respects the past, in the year 1897, when we adopted our tariff, that policy of a preference in the English market was not possible. It was not possible in 1898; it was not possible in 1899; it was not possible in 1900, when the Prime Minister of Great Britain refused to even receive a deputation to talk about it; it was not possible when the distinguished Colonial Secretary told the deputation that he could not entertain the matter unless they were prepared to abandon the tariff against Great Britain.

Mr. KEMP. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) where he got his information in reference to his observation that Mr. Chamberlain refused to receive the deputation?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) has misunderstood me. I did not say that Mr. Chamberlain refused to see the deputation. I am aware that the deputation of which my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) was a member, called on Mr. Chamberlain. What I did say was that the Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, refused to see the deputation which only asked the privilege of presenting this bald and not very strong resolution.

Mr. KEMP. There was no deputation to Mr. Chamberlain.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Do you say there was no deputation to Mr. Chamberlain ?

Mr. KEMP. Not this last summer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hold in my hand the report of the delegate of the Ottawa Board of Trade, who was one of the deputation which called upon Mr. Chamberlain, and who describes Mr. Chamberlain's reception precisely in line with the statement I have just made.

Mr. KEMP. A deputation from the Chamber of Commerce did not call on Mr. Chamberlain.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, now, my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) is a new member, and he surely does not mean to distinguish between a committee formally appointed by the Chamber of Commerce and a number of gentlemen who were members of that body. But if it was not a deputation of the Chamber of Commerce, what have we to think of the Ottawa delegate who gives a full report of the whole proceeding, as a part of the proceedings of the Congress of Chambers of Commerce in London ?

Mr. KEMP. Do I understand the Minister of Finance to say that the deputation which called upon Lord Salisbury also called upon Hon. Jos. Chamberlain ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) is mistaken again. I did not say that. My hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) tries to draw a distinction between a deputation formally authorized by the congress, and a number of gentlemen who were members of that congress, and who, I suppose, were not formally appointed for the purpose of waiting on Mr. Chamberlain. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp) will ask us to treat that distinction as serious. I have here the report addressed to the president and members of the Board of Trade of Ottawa. It is of very great length, and the House would not justify me for delaying them by reading very much of it, but I think I will have to give a passage. This is the report of Mr. Thomas Macfarlane, the delegate from the Ottawa Board of Trade.

Mr. WALLACE. Is that the Dominion analyst ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think likely. He seems to have analysed this question over there very well.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. He did not represent the commercial men of Ottawa very much.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He was appointed by the Board of Trade of the city of Ottawa to represent them, and my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) is not treating that body with very great courtesy when he says Mr. Macfarlane did not represent them. I presume if he was delegated by them that he fully represented them. This report recites the story of the failure of the deputation to obtain a hearing from Lord Salisbury, and then it goes on to say :

Chamberlain interview.

Quite as interesting as the proceedings of the congress itself were certain events which happened after its close, and in which some of the delegates took part. Most of them received a copy of a printed circular containing the letters from the Premier and the President of the Board of Trade in which they declared the time to be inopportune for discussing the subject of increasing and strengthening trade relations between the different portions of the Empire. This was a great disappointment, and it was, I believe, in order somewhat to make amends for it, that Lord Strathcona arranged with the Rt. Hon. Mr. Chamberlain that he should informally receive some of the Canadian delegates.

My hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) will see that they did not go formally. They were not formally delegated by the Chambers of Commerce to go, but a number of the Canadian delegates went to Mr. Chamberlain, and I think they did quite right to do so.

Mr. KEMP. That does not say what Mr. Chamberlain stated.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) is too hasty. He had better wait. I trust the House will pardon me if I have to read a somewhat lengthy extract. The report goes on to say :

This interview took place on the 10th July, when, besides the Colonial Secretary, Lords Selborne, Ampthill and Strathcona were present. Of delegates : Mr. Kemp of Toronto, Mr. Cockshutt of Brantford, Dr. Parkin, General Twigge and I attended, who all had an opportunity of pressing upon Mr. Chamberlain our views regarding trade relations. Messrs. Kemp and Cockshutt spoke generally of the advantages of preferential trade, and Dr. Parkin tried to show the necessity of having the subject properly investigated by a commission of experts. Mr. Chamberlain replied in a quiet conversational way and endeavoured to show that no progress could be made until the colonies abandoned protection as against Great Britain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. KEMP. Will the hon. minister allow me to say, that I understood the Finance Minister to state that the deputation which desired to wait on Lord Salisbury, also wished to wait on Mr. Chamberlain. That

is what I meant, but perhaps I did not make my point very clear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) that the deputations were not necessarily the same, but the only point of my remarks was, not exactly what the board of trade did; not what any particular delegate did, but what Mr. Chamberlain said and did. I cannot understand how the force and effect of what Mr. Chamberlain said and did is in the smallest degree touched by the circumstance as to whether the delegation went by one street or by another. I thank my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) who interrupted me, because I know he was present, and I think he did quite right in going to Mr. Chamberlain. The point I desire to make in all sincerity is this: that these hon. gentlemen who have persuaded themselves that this getting of a preference in the English market was an easy and simple thing, have been mistaken, and they must know it now from the highest possible testimony. Again and again it was suggested that Mr. Chamberlain in some mysterious way had given them some encouragement, but here is the latest utterance of Mr. Chamberlain quoted by a gentleman who is known to be an enthusiastic advocate of that kind of preferential trade, and Mr. Chamberlain says distinctly that you cannot get that kind of preferential trade unless you will take down your tariff altogether against England. My hon. friend from Toronto would not be willing to do that, and I am frank enough to say that I would not be willing to do it either.

Now, I have said all this concerning the past. We do not deny that if we did get that preference in the English market, it would probably be of some advantage to the Dominion of Canada; but we say that is a question for the Imperial authorities rather than for us. If we could get that preference, we are as willing to assist in availing ourselves of any advantage which might come to Canada through it as any of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The only difference between us is as to the possibility of getting it and as to the means of getting it. I do not believe, Sir, that it can be obtained to-day. I do not believe, notwithstanding all that one reads in the telegrams from the other side, that we are likely to have a change of front immediately on the part of the Imperial government on the trade question. Yet I would not speak of the future. We live in times of great movements and great changes. I will not say that at no future time in the history of the empire, and the early future possibly, shall this preference be given. Again and again I have stated in this House that that is a question which we must be content to leave to the future. We have believed that the true policy of preferential trade was, not to make demands on the Imperial government which we well knew they could not afford to yield to us. The true policy was to give to Great Britain this preference freely and openly, leaving the Imperial government and parliament to adopt that trade policy which in their judgment was best adapted to the interests of the English people. But, if this preference, which my hon. friends opposite desire to obtain, is ever to come, I beg them to accept my opinion, my assurance, which I give them in all sincerity, that they will never obtain it by the methods they have employed—that they will never obtain it by demands on the home government which are obnoxious to the great mass of the English people. We have much to hope from cultivating the good-will of the English people. I venture to say, as I have said before, that if the time ever comes when we are to receive that preference, we shall not receive it as the result of any huckstering or bargaining between England and the colonies, but as a result of the development of that Imperial sentiment which may override questions of political economy, and in the creation and development of that Imperial sentiment a large and important factor has been the British preferential tariff of the Canadian government.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the Finance Minister and the government, as I congratulate the country, upon the statement of prosperity which the hon. gentleman has been enabled to show to Canada to-day—a prosperity which we one and all delight in, and which the Conservative party claim to have had a very considerable hand in promoting, by means of the policy which they adopted in years gone by. This claim, however, the Finance Minister and the government dispute; they take issue with us on the question of protection and free trade. We as a party claim that protection has materially advanced the interests of Canada. We contend that without protection the interests of Canada would be very seriously impaired, no matter how bountifully Providence might bless us with crops or how rich our mines might be.

The Finance Minister, I am glad to say, has been able to make a very short budget speech. He has quoted comparatively few figures; and I do not propose to object to or in any way challenge the figures he has quoted. Our trade has very largely increased; our imports, our exports, our revenue and our expenditure have all increased. The government are trustees for this country. They are not spending these enormous sums of money, or should not be spending them, as their own, but should be spending them for the benefit of the country. In the last four years they have had a revenue amounting to $30,980,000 over and above the revenue of the preceding four years. This amount they have taken in

direct taxation out of the pockets of the people over and above the expenditure. This surplus of revenue over expenditure should be treated in one of two ways: it should go either to reduce the taxes or to reduce the debt of the country. What indication has the Finance Minister given us that he has treated this surplus in either of these ways? He has spent it with a free hand. He has not been able to show us a decrease in the net debt of the country; but, on the contrary, in the last four years he has increased the debt to the extent of $6,900,000, notwithstanding the enormous increase of revenue which he has had at his disposal.

The hon. gentleman boasts of the increased trade of this country with Great Britain. He was asked how the exports of the United States to Great Britain stood. He had not the figures at hand. The exports from the United States to Great Britain show an average increase in the last four years of $105,000,000 a year. Naturally our imports from Great Britain should show an increase; but they have not increased in any greater proportion than the imports of the United States from Great Britain, notwithstanding our boasted preference.

I agree with all the figures which the hon. gentleman has given us as to the increased deposits in our banks and the increase in the circulation of Dominion notes. I give him credit for all the figures he has given as bearing on the prosperity of the country. I give him full credit for the surplus he claims, but I deny that the government have made a good use of that surplus. I agree with the hon. Minister of Finance that we are perhaps on the crest of the wave of prosperity and that it will continue for some time to come. When we have to face a falling revenue, however, how are we going to meet it? It is a very hard matter to cut down expenditure. We have increased our expenditure over the sum which the Finance Minister in the Mackenzie government stated was ample: we have added to that by millions of dollars, yet that hon. gentleman's voice is not raised against it. We have been spending money freely.

The hon. gentleman has no thought for the morrow. Is he going to make no endeavour to restrict the amount of our debt? He tells us that the bounty to be paid on iron he will not consider as a payment out of revenue, but will add it to our debt. Is there to be no limit to this method of conducting business. Where are all the professions of economy and all the platforms of the present government when in opposition, which many of us thought were good platforms. They proposed to reduce expenditure, they proposed to cease bonusing railways and other works which they thought should not now require public money. For many years before I became a member of this House, I protested, whenever the occasion presented itself, against this continued bonusing of railways. That system has become a channel for the wasting of public money. If hon. members will turn to page A—75 of the report of the Auditor General, they will find instances to illustrate my contention. On that page there is some interesting correspondence regarding the subsidy to the South Shore Railway bridge at Sorel, which was given a bonus of 15 per cent on its cost. A claim was made upon the government for $35,000 as the amount of the bonus, but the Auditor General, suspecting that something was wrong, objected, and he apparently had very great difficulty in preventing the payment of this $35,000. He finally obtained reports from the chief engineer of the government and Mr. Keefer on the cost of this bridge. The chief engineer reported that it cost $98,000, and Mr. Keefer reported that it cost $112,000. On the other hand, the company allege that it cost $210,000, or more than double the estimate of the government engineer. The Auditor General then goes on to say:

> I should tremble on account of my responsibility in passing your expenditure if much of your course of action were permeated by a similar complaisance. The views of an interested creditor are not the most reliable help in the interpretation of a statute under which he is to be paid. I was told by one of the gentlemen named, without my seeking his opinion, that in endeavouring to determine the value of the work I was giving myself much unnecessary trouble. There is a name to this kind of advice, but I do not need give it.

Apparently the Auditor General had the greatest difficulty, judging by this correspondence, with the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, in preventing the governmen paying out fraudulently $35,000 of a bonus on that bridge, or 15 per cent on an estimated cost of $215,000, when the bridge really cost only $90,000. Let me further draw attention to the fact that that same bridge was bonused by the Quebec government and the town of Sorel. The Quebec government had paid its $15,000 subsidy and the town of Sorel had also paid the amount of its bonus, and if this government had paid the $35,000 asked for, it would have paid $12,000 more as a bonus than the total cost of the bridge.

Is it not evident, when we have such an instance before us—and judging by the Auditor General's correspondence, it would appear that it is not the only instance—to call a halt in this system of bonusing railways and squandering the public money in the bonusing of railways and other public works. I say it is the duty of the government to cease giving bonuses for the building of railways or other public works in the older provinces. What would be thought of a railway company that would apply to the state of New York or Minnesota or Illinois for a bonus towards building a railway. Yet such an application is equally unreasonable in our older provinces, because

if public works of this character are needed private enterprise will be found to build them, just as private enterprise undertakes their construction in the United States. In my opinion, we are quite as able as most of the states of the American union, to build our own railways and public works without government assistance.

It is, of course, only natural that our expenditure should increase as our trade increases, but this increase in expenditure is far outrunning any increase in revenue, and there is not the slightest attempt on the part of the government or any member of it to keep our expenditure within our means. Has the hon. the Finance Minister ever thought what would happen to this country if he should go on as he is doing for the next twenty-five years ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I have.

Mr. OSLER. Does he propose going on borrowing as long as he can in the English market ? It seems to me he would do better to try and take advantage of a flourishing revenue to reduce our capital debt and not go on losing all the benefit of the increased revenue by continuing this system of lavish expenditure.

We have in this country one instance of a railway built without government aid, and that is the Ontario and Quebec road, running between this city and Toronto. When that road was built, the country, in the section traversed, was pretty barren, and we were not then as well able to build railways as we are now. Bonuses to the extent of $1,000,000 had been granted it when its charter fell into the hands of people controlled by the Grand Trunk Railway. They refused to build the road and fought hard to prevent it being built, but private enterprise stepped in and supplied the money to carry through the undertaking, which cost $5,000,000. Not a cent in bonus was asked for from this government or from any municipality, although that is one of the most expensive roads built in the country. This shows clearly that private money is forthcoming to prosecute any public enterprise when the necessity is clear.

I submit that all local roads in the older settled parts of the country should be built with private money. There is a very flagrant instance of the abuse of the bonusing system in Essex county, where the government bonused a road four or five miles long, running through a district as rich as any in Canada.

Mr. COWAN. There was no road bonused in the county of Essex last year.

Mr. OSLER. I meant the county of Elgin. A road was bonused by this government which went through that county, one of the richest in this country, and which is paralleled along a distance of forty miles by another railway. That bonus was certainly not given for the good of the country, and I leave it to be inferred by hon. gentlemen what was the sinister influence brought to bear to obtain such a bonus.

There is another matter in which the government have been very remiss. The issuing of scrip to half-breeds in settlement of their claims was begun, I know, under a Conservative regime, but I have always entertained the opinion that that was a most pernicious policy, and why it should be continued I cannot possibly conceive. Last year, from the 1st of July, 1900, to the 28th of February, 1901, the government issued scrip to the half-breeds and others to the extent of $799,798, but almost immediately on receipt of that scrip the half-breeds sold it to the agents and brokers who followed the government agents who were distributing that scrip, and I have no doubt that those who received the scrip from the government did not get on an average 40 cents for it. That would be the outside price paid. Since that scrip has been issued it has been taken in payment of lands by the government at par from the 1st of July, 1900, to the 28th of February, 1901. The government took in $268,990 of that scrip at par.

So, they sold their bonds at a discount of 60 per cent. The hon. Finance Minister says that the credit of this country is good, yet he is authorizing and permitting the issue of government bonds redeemable by the government at par in payment for coal lands and Crown lands generally, and he has sold as much as a million dollars of those bonds to Indians and half-breeds and others at forty cents on the dollar. And he has already retired nearly $300,000 of them at par. Now, either the credit of Canada is not very good in the North-west, or the hon. minister's way of settling with the half-breeds and others who claim scrip is not very profitable to this country.

The government claims all credit for prosperity. I would like to quietly analyse the case and find out what it is the government have done in the last four years for this country. They have made many attempts to improve the trade channels of this country—so they tell us. They have given us —so they say—a fourteen-foot channel from the lakes to Montreal. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) says he knows there is a fourteen-foot channel, because it is marked on a map in his office. But the captains of vessels who go down to Montreal tell us that they cannot find that channel. The minister says in reply that they must be in conspiracy against him and in league with the forwarding companies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. Mr. Blair). Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) give the names of the captains to whom he refers.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. minister says that the channel must be there, but the captains cannot find it——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Name your captain.

Mr. OSLER. I refer to what the hon. minister himself said the other night. He said that some captains complained, but they must have a spite against him, or were in league with the forwarding companies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think I said that.

Mr. OSLER. If the hon. minister will refer to his own statement, I think he will find that I am quite right.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think you are.

Mr. OSLER. I think so. Now the harbour of Montreal has not been very much improved. We have not had the cheap transportation nor have we had the increased volume of trade going through the Canadian channels that we were promised. We have not had cheaper navigation nor cheaper transportation from this country than we had before.

Now, there is one thing that the Finance Minister claimed credit for on behalf of the government, and I think it is the only thing that they have done, though whether they should ask credit for it is another matter. I refer to the preferential tariff. There is room for difference of opinion as to whether the preferential tariff is a wise thing or an unwise thing. Let us see how it works out. The government first gave a 25 per cent preference. They were so pleased with that that, having nothing else to suggest, they said: Let us go one more, and make it 33⅓ per cent. So, they have given the preference at that rate, which admits German, Belgian or Italian goods, the produce of cheap labour competing with our Canadian labour, the only condition being that it shall be sent to Britain and 25 per cent of British labour added to it. Then the whole amount, of which ¾ is made by foreign cheap labour, comes into this country under a preference of 33⅓ per cent. In reality therefore, this preference works out to give the German and other cheap continental manufacturers a much greater advantage than is given to the manufacturers of Great Britain. But, let us see how it works out the other way about. One result of giving this preference to Great Britain is that Germany at once discriminates against Canada. Let us see what effect this has indirectly, and even directly, upon the farmers of Canada. We were building up a very large export trade between Canada and Germany before this preferential tariff came into effect. That trade is largely increasing in the United States. The American farmers are now shipping large quantities of wheat and other grain to Germany. Now, when the American farmer ships his grain to Germany in competition with the Canadian farmer, the Canadian farmer finds that he must pay higher duties than his competitor. Here are the figures showing how much more the Canadian has to pay on various kinds of grain than the American:

Wheat	9·82	cents per bushel.
Rye	9·16	"
Oats	4·19	"
Barley	1·31	"
Corn	3·27	"
Buckwheat	2·45	"

Now, that is a very nice little bonus for the Canadian farmers to receive as one of the consequences of the preferential tariff. Yet, I do not see that they are paying lower prices for anything they buy. Are they buying their clothes, their agricultural implements, their tea or other groceries, at lower figures than they did four or five years ago? As a rule, they are paying more for what they buy. The benefit they get from Liberal rule is that they have to pay more for what they buy, while that which they have to sell they get less for. In theory, preferential trade is very nice; it looks and sounds very patriotic; but in practice it works out very badly for the unfortunate farmer.

There is one question that, perhaps above all others is interesting to us, and ought to be so, because it is of vital importance to the people of Canada—the question how to get our produce to the port on this continent whence it is to be sent to England, Germany or elsewhere. The government have done their best—and if they had gone about it they could not have done better than they did by bonusing the Grand Trunk, rebuilding their bridge, helping them to double-track their line and put on fast trains—they have deliberately set to work to divert trade from Canadian ports to foreign and rival ports.

Mr. COWAN. How about the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. OSLER. I am not talking about individual corporations, but about the government and what they have done. Individual corporations will go where they can get the best. But if the government can force them to take trade through Canadian channels, so much the more do the government do their duty and so much the more does Canada benefit. Now, the government have been, for years past, spending money on the inland waters. They are proposing to enlarge Port Colborne harbour, with a possible expenditure of four or five millions. They are spending large sums of money on Mid-

land harbour, Collingwood harbour, Depot harbour, and all the channels through which grain comes from our great North-west.

They are trying to get the St. Lawrence canals deepened, they are trying to cheapen transportation to the sea, but they have not yet apparently made up their minds as to whether the future seaport of this country is to be Quebec or Montreal. Let us face that question squarely. Personally, and I think I may speak for all the members on this side of the House, if Montreal or Quebec can be made through Canadian ports from which we can send all our produce, any expenditure the government may ask for that purpose will be ungrudgingly given and endorsed by members on this side of the House. But first let the government find out which port it is to be. The hon. member for Quebec West (Hon. Mr. Dobell) says that Quebec is the best port, others say Montreal is the best port. Now, if Montreal is to be the port of this country, then we must spend enormous sums of money upon it and upon the approaches. It is impossible that Montreal can successfully compete with the American ports unless you have an absolutely safe channel, a channel well lighted, so that an insurance company will consider it safe enough to justify them in insuring a vessel passing through the St. Lawrence at the same price as they would insure a vessel coming to Portland or other ports. The government must face that question. But instead of doing that, they are spending little sums here and there, though large sums in the aggregate, in enlarging a lock or building a dock, which will in no wise contribute to the promotion of the great scheme of making Montreal a great port, if the government have such a scheme in view. It may be found that Montreal cannot be made the port of Canada—I know nothing about its capability except what I may have learned as a layman, but I am beginning to entertain a strong feeling that we shall have to go to Quebec, and that Quebec will be the port of Canada for all time to come.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One of them.

Mr. OSLER. Now, if it is to be one of these ports, let us find out which, and let us not go on spending all this money here and there, frittering it away, instead of using it for the purpose of building up a national port. We are wasting money on little local railways that will benefit no one except those who receive the bonus, while at the same time that we have no intelligent idea of what is going to be our national port. So far, the result of the action of the government has been to divert trade from our Canadian ports, and to build up American ports; I make the assertion, Mr. Speaker, that the government have materially contributed to that end.

Mr. OSLER.

Mr. HYMAN. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to explain his position, and tell us his ideas with regard to a summer port?

Mr. OSLER. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose, as I said in the beginning, to enter into a criticism of the figures with which the Minister of Finance has presented the House. I think, as a rule, his figures are all right; but I join issue with him upon the causes which have enabled him to present so favourable a statement. I do not think he is entitled to congratulate himself and his fellow-ministers, or to take any credit for the prosperity with which this country has been favoured during the past three or four years. I contend that the government have entirely misused that prosperity, they have taken advantage of it to inaugurate a rule of extravagance. In no single instance have they attempted to practice economy. They do not seem to have made up their minds as to what they should do with their surplus. I hope that if another year of prosperity should follow, such as we are now enjoying, and if the Minister of Finance is able to congratulate himself upon an enormous increase of revenue, he will also be able to say that he has reduced the burden of taxation upon the people of this country, that he will point out that while our revenue increases, it is the duty of the government in charge to lighten the burden of the people, either by reducing taxation on the necessaries of life, or by reducing the public debt.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, we rarely witness the spectacle we had this afternoon in regard to this debate, probably one of the most important debates during the session, the one in which the public will take more interest probably than all others. When the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) had delivered his budget speech, when he had settled so far as the expectations of the people were concerned any question that may have arisen in regard to the tariff, when he had generally entered upon a discussion of the finances of the country during the past year, and when an hon. gentleman on this side of the House had risen in his place and replied to him, we found, for the first time in the parliament of Canada, I will venture to say during the whole history of the parliament of Canada, hon. gentlemen put on that splendid, but ill-concealed disdain and refused to make reply to the hon. gentleman who answered the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance. What have we now? The House is barely graced with the presence of the right hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is not another minister of the Crown in his place.

Mr. BENNETT. They are in cold storage.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) says that they are in cold storage. I hope that they are in some place that will cure them. I shall not enter upon a discussion of a matter that is not the subject fairly of debate, namely, whether we are living to-day in a period of very great expansion, whether we are living in, to use a common phrase, good times. This has not been at all a matter of dispute. It is a proposition to which both sides of the House will assent and I, therefore, am not going to discuss that phase of the question, nor am I going to discuss the question whether hon. gentlemen opposite have been the authors to any extent of this condition or whether they have been, on the other hand, the means of preventing it. If I should have anything to say in that regard it would be that hon. gentlemen have not made the most of their advantages. Now, Sir, just let me say that there seems to me to be no more critical period in the history of any country than a period of great expansion. What is the effect of great expansion ? The hon. Minister of Finance very aptly said this afternoon : 'We will have periods of depression, but these are periods of recuperation. They are periods for what purpose? There are those periods that must follow periods of great expansion for the purpose of catching up. In other words, we have been discounting the future and I am not disposed to take that rosy view of it that the hon. Minister of Finance took when he was asked if he expected the present state of things to continue and if he would go on with the same expenditures and the same taxation. The answer of the hon. gentleman was that he did propose to go on with the same expenditures and the same taxation. I think the hon. gentleman has given a distinct note of warning to the country that he will take no notice of that state of things, to use a very happy phrase of his own 'when the pendulum swings the other way.' No one can doubt the fact that we will have after this expansion a period of depression. If that were not the case it would be to set aside the rule that has so long prevailed in all countries and nobody would attempt to consider whether that would be a recurring incident in Canada as it has been in other countries and as it has been in Canada. What is the duty of a government during a period of great expansion ? Is it to maintain taxation, is it, professedly under a revenue tariff, to extract large sums from the people and find means of expending them ? We still have a policy of high taxation. When hon. gentlemen opposite had a splendid opportunity to redeem their pledges to the country, when they could have lowered the tariff, when they could have made decreases to a considerable extent in the taxation, what did they do ? They, in the face of every pledge made, turned their backs upon these pledges.

and they are to-day collecting more taxes than ever were collected from the people of Canada. They are boasting of their surplus and they are doing this in the name of a revenue tariff. In 1896, the then Minister of Finance collected from the people under what was said to be a high protective tariff $36,618,000, and in 1900, the present Minister of Finance collected, under a so-called revenue tariff, $51,029,000. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he considers now that he should still maintain the name of a revenue tariff ? The increase, comparing these two years, in the taxation collected amounts to some $14,411,000. The hon. gentleman received a very generous measure of applause this afternoon when he told the House and the country that he had a surplus of $8,000,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite are on record in this House as to the value of surpluses. Hon. gentlemen, both in and out of this House, set their faces against surpluses and told the people that when you take large sums of money from the people it means that you have taken money out of the people's pockets which should be there. If hon. gentlemen were prepared to say that they had taken less money, that, by economy, or the proper expenditure of money, they had been able to have a surplus after having fairly met all the proper services of the country, that would be a proper boast to make, but hon. gentlemen have taken the opposite course. It does seem extraordinary that they should be found boasting of their surpluses. I do not see the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) in his place, but this is what that hon. gentleman had to say.

Mr. TAYLOR. He is in North Bruce.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) says that he is in North Bruce. Well, he was here at one time, and in 1883, referring to the surplus, he said :

> Sir,—This surplus business is quite understood by the people of this country. If the surplus was paid by the minister himself, if he had some means of taking it out of his own pocket and putting it into the public treasury, or if the combined supporters of the ministry had some means of putting that money into the treasury, then we would hail them as benefactors of their country. But, when the hon. Minister of Finance has put his hand into your pocket, and my pocket, and the pockets of the people of this country, and taken therefrom this $16,000,000, then we claim that he has not accomplished any great feat though backed in his act by the parliament of this country.

I am going to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if that language applies to him. I am going to ask him, if one of his colleagues used that language on one occasion, what is his position to-day ? The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) criticised with great ability the finances of this country. That was precisely the position the hon. gentleman took, and if that is the position he took in the

past, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to explain to-day why he takes precisely the opposite position. Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen may ignore the past, they may turn their backs upon their pledges, but the facts remain just as they were in 1883, when this speech was made and afterwards when several speeches were made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. I leave hon. gentlemen without further discussion to settle that with their own consciences. Let the public read what hon. gentlemen said in the past under precisely similar circumstances, and let them observe the conduct of those who are charged with the affairs of the country now. I expected that the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) would sing the old song and claim credit to his government, that if the good times were not wholly to be attributed to the administration they were at least in great part due to the wisdom of himself and his colleagues. It is just as well that I should call the attention of the House to this phase of the question, so that the government may know something about their past record on this matter. In 1883, there was a period of phenomenal expansion in trade following one of great depression, and this is what the Minister of Customs then said in regard to the condition of the country :

> The Minister of Finance did not raise the price of cheese or butter in Liverpool. That is a matter outside and beyond him. That is the work of the grand eternal law of nature and the law of supply and demand. It was due to the scarcity in foreign countries. We had the articles to sell. The price went up, and the result was that the increased wealth was given to us. Then, Sir, take agricultural products, and what do we find? Why, Sir, we find that in the year 1880 we exported of these products $2,000,000 worth, and in the next year we exported $16,000,000 worth, and last year we exported $11,000,000 worth, or in these three years, as a result of the increased sale at higher prices, we brought back in gold into this country $15,712,000 more than in 1879. Well, Sir, will the hon. gentleman claim, will he dare to say that he was the cause of the rain falling and the sun shining on our fields, that he was the cause of the abundant harvest of 1882. No, Sir, he will not venture to do so. Will he seek to claim that he stands in the room of Providence, and causes the rain to fall in superabundance in England and Ireland and Scotland, rotting the crops, producing a scarcity of them and increasing the price of the articles we have to sell. Sir, he will not dare to say that he was the cause of Providence smiling on us in this land, and by which we are able to show $15,000,000 more of a result.

Does not that language apply precisely to the condition of affairs to-day. The hon. gentlemen opposite were fortunate to come into power on the eve of a great expansion in trade, and to this and not to anything they have done is due whatever prosperity there is in this country. I shall leave that also to hon. gentlemen opposite to settle amongst themselves.

Now, with regard to the value of this preference to England. The Minister of Finance challenged this side of the House, that if we were not in favour of the preference, that the only course left open to us was to introduce a resolution demanding its repeal. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) was sincere in that challenge, nor do I think that on reflection he will consider it a fair challenge. What is the position of affairs to-day ? Why these hon. gentlemen opposite have entered into what we have very properly called a one-sided trade relation with Great Britain ; a trade relation that has not a single redeeming feature, as is shown by the experience we have had of it, a trade relation that imposes $2,000,000 more burden on the people on account of the decreased revenue it brings about, and which $2,000,000 must be recouped from some quarter. The government have entered into this trade relation without getting the slightest return from it. I in my turn will challenge any gentleman opposite to point out some specific instance where Canada benefits to-day by the preference which we give to Great Britain. It is all very well for the hon. gentlemen to make general statements about this, but let us pin them down to laying their hand upon one example from business experience, in which this country benefits, and they cannot do it. They will tell us : Oh, we have gained the sympathy of Great Britain ; we have touched the hearts of the English people and they are yearning to buy our goods. Well, Sir, it does seem to me that such an argument should not emanate from the brains of sensible men. It is only child's talk for public men to make a pretense of that kind. Why, there is not one man in a thousand in Great Britain who knows that their country has a preference in the Canadian market, and there is not one man in a thousand who cares whether she has a preference or not. The buyer in England will buy the most goods he can for the least money, irrespective of where those goods come from, and the buyer in Canada will do the same thing. We have won our way in the English market on the same conditions as we have won our way in the markets of other countries. Our goods must depend upon their superiority in the market over the goods of other countries, and if we have made England and Germany buy our goods, it is because we are able to produce better and cheaper goods than the people of any other country in the world. These gentlemen opposite now tell us that we have touched the sentimental aspect of this question by giving this preference, but as to that we have the evidence of a gentleman who was very profuse in the session of 1897 with regard to how far sentiment went in Great Britain. That hon. gentleman was then quite as cautious and

quite as prudent as his friends are now never to go beyond a statement of glittering generalities with regard to this question. Speaking with regard to the tariff of 1879, which was in force in 1883, the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) made this statement, and I want this language placed alongside the language that he and his colleagues are using to-day :

> Now let me say, if it would be of any comfort to hon. gentlemen, that in this matter I speak entirely for myself, and I do not attach or never did attach as much importance to the question of imports from Great Britain and the United States respectively as some hon. gentlemen have attached to them.
>
> True, I recognize the fact that in England we borrow our money. That her flag floats over us. That her army and navy are pledged to defend us, and therefore it was not exactly the thing that might be called very loyal to Great Britain to put on a tariff that would legislate especially against her. I have gone that far in sentiment, but we all know that in matters of trade there is very little sentiment.

Was that the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite then ? I would venture to say that every one of them took precisely the same view, and I am bound to say that it was a rational and sensible view—a view which all men would take to-day, if they were not enslaved to circumstances of political advantage.

But we are told that by reason of the preference the people of Canada get cheaper goods. We have been told in the past, and I should not be surprised if we are told again, that by reason of the preference goods coming from other countries than Great Britain are, of necessity, correspondingly reduced in price. That is a broad statement, and demands some examination. Let us take the country to the south of us. Hon. gentlemen who have given any attention to the matter know that there are two distinct fields of operation for the trade of the United States and the trade of Great Britain. True, there is a common ground on which they met, but it is a small ground. There is a large ground in which the imports from the United States and other countries do not come into competition with the imports from Great Britain. But suppose they did, will any hon. gentleman go so far as to assert that if a gentleman from New York went to purchase a certain kind of goods in London or Manchester, he would have to pay any more for them than a gentleman from Montreal ? If hon. gentlemen are not prepared to take that ground, then it seems to me they are without any sensible foundation for claiming any advantage for Canada in that respect. Take the case of the United States and Canada. We know that the United States to-day are manufacturing very largely in almost every line of goods that England has to sell. Of course, sometimes a single line of goods not made to any extent in the United States, or a higher grade of goods, are sometimes purchased in Great Britain, while of other grades of the same goods we buy very large quantities in the United States. For instance, would any hon. gentleman say that where a man buys broadcloth and another buys tweeds, the broadcloth comes into competition with the tweeds ? It is absolute folly, it seems to me, for any hon. gentleman to take a position of that kind.

The Minister of Finance stated this afternoon that we cannot hope to get a preference by huckstering or by demanding a preference, or without England being convinced that it is in her interest to give us a preference. What is the position of the two parties on this matter ? One party has given a one-sided preference without any compensation whatever. The other party has demanded, and if it had continued in power and had the control of this country, it would have entered upon a preference, if a preference at all was entered upon, that would have had two sides, and would have commended itself to both countries entering into the contract. Are we to get a preference by hon. gentlemen declaring that it would be madness on the part of England to give us a preference ? Are we to get a preference when we have hon. gentlemen supporting the government declaring that it would be a piece of impudence on the part of Canada to ask a preference ? Read what a gentleman who stands high in the councils of that party has said on the question. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)—I am sorry he is not in his place to-night—speaking on this question last session, and referring to the limited trade Canada had with Great Britain, said :

> This is a very small trade relatively, less than 2½ per cent of her exports to the world, only one mill in excess of 3½ per cent of her exports to foreign countries, 6 8-10 per cent of her exports to British possessions, and yet, we stand up with this comparatively insignificant portion of British trade, and with sublime impudence, ask England to tax herself for the benefit of this little Oliver Twist that is continually calling for more.

Now, I would like to ask how we are to get a preferential trade with Great Britain ? Are we going to get it when we have hon. gentlemen on that side of the House prompted to get up in their places and make statements of that kind ? But the hon. gentleman went further. He said :

> If it can be shown, as it can undoubtedly be shown clearly, that the adoption of the policy the hon. gentleman asks for, would impair the prosperity and strength of Great Britain, why, we would be asking, even if we could obtain it, something actually not in our own interest.

The hon. member for North Norfolk not only declared that it was madness to talk of a preference, but that it was not in the interest of Canada to have such a preference. Well, I believe we are entering upon a period when the statesmen of England must

educate the people of Great Britain in regard to the completely changed circumstances of to-day. The people of that country may be slow to take notice of the rapid changes which are occurring; but the British manufacturers are becoming justly alarmed at the prospect of the American people driving them out of their own market. We have to-day an instance of that in the fact that Great Britain, which formerly did nearly all the iron trade of this country, has to-day less than 6 per cent of it. It is an alarming state of things. There never was a period when there was a better opportunity for the people of Canada and the statesmen of Great Britain to prepare for the changed circumstances, and to realize that nothing short of a trade preference between Great Britain and her colonies can protect the mother country against the evils arising to-day from foreign competition.

But we had another evidence from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He declared in this House, I think upon the same occasion, that we dared not have a preference in England because if Canada obtained preference in Great Britain, we should invite the hostility of her neighbours to the south. Here is what the hon. gentleman had to say:

> Her relations with other commercial powers are of such a character that the introduction of such a policy would be fatal to her interests. It would invite retaliation. It would not only invite it, but it would secure retaliation. England would invite disaster that would surely fall upon her if this unreasonable demand were granted to a country which takes but 5 per cent of her exports and sends but 3½ per cent of her imports.

In other words Canada sends so small a quantity of exports to Great Britain and purchases so small a quantity of goods from Great Britain, that we dared not enter upon trade preference with each other lest we invite the hostility of the American people. The hon. gentleman, in order to make his case stronger, depicted what he conceived to be the state of feeling in the United States:

> We have seen something of the result in the United States. The members of the joint high commission met at every turn that feeling of animosity which exists in the United States in consequence of the adoption of preferential duties of 12½ per cent, to be increased to 25 per cent.

Thus the hon. gentleman argues that we dare not enter into closer trade relations with the mother country because, in the first place, that would prevent all possibility of reciprocity with the United States, and in the second place invite commercial hostility that would be dangerous to Great Britain.

We, however, do not propose to be deterred from the policy we deemed essential to the interests of both Canada and the mother country by these timid imaginings of the hon. gentleman. We propose to call the attention of the people of Great Britain to the advantages that will flow from closer connections in trade matters, and particularly to the fact that a duty imposed by the mother country upon the products of foreign countries would not necessarily advance the price to the English consumer. If Canada were admitted to the markets of Great Britain on specially favoured terms, and if foreign products desired to compete against ours, they would have to be sold at the same prices, and consequently the English consumer would not have to pay a farthing more than he otherwise would.

We have been told that the trade with Great Britain has immensely increased under the policy of the present government. Well, I think it will be admitted that the trade with foreign countries from 1896 to 1900 will be a fair index of the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's statement. The increase of exports in 1900 over 1896, to the following countries, were as follows:—

	Per cent.
Belgium	1,121
Italy	359
Australia	214
Portugal	176
France	136
Germany	126
Other countries not classified	71
Great Britain	61
United States	54
South America	43
Holland	34
Newfoundland	20

This shows conclusively that the sentiment in our favour, of which all these hon. gentlemen are boasting, has had such little effect that Great Britain, as a consumer of Canadian products, stands only eighth upon the list. Take the aggregate trade with foreign countries, and the following are the increases in 1900 over 1896:

	Per cent.
Belgium	334
Portugal	112
Holland	74
United States	73
Other countries	71
France	69
Switzerland	59
Great Britain	53
Germany	51
Spain	45
Italy	41
Newfoundland	20

This shows again that Great Britain, as a consumer, stands eighth in the list, and I think is conclusive evidence that the position taken by the hon. gentleman is entirely without foundation.

It would be well, in view of the statement made by the hon. Finance Minister this afternoon, showing the increase by years in trade with Great Britain, that he should give us the corresponding years with

the United States. When asked for that information, he replied that he did not have a statement of the trade with the United States during that period.

Let us now compare our trade with the two great trading countries, Great Britain and the United States, in the two periods. First take the exports. The exports to Great Britain increased by a larger percentage than those to the United States. The increase in our exports to Great Britain in 1900, as compared with 1896, was 61·54 per cent, while the increase of our exports to the United States in the same period was 54·34 per cent. On the other hand, our imports from Great Britain increased, in the period I have named, 35·80 per cent, while our imports from the United States increased no less than 87·53 per cent. Now, let me compare the aggregate trade with these two countries. Our aggregate trade with Great Britain increased 53·3 per cent, while our aggregate trade with the United States—no inducement offered, no preference given—increased 73·22 per cent. The Finance Minister or hon. genlemen on his side can hardly answer that by merely saying we bought the goods we needed. That was perfectly true, but it only shows that trade will seek the channels of least resistance, and that to the extent that trade goes on each country produces goods that are required by the other. This is further exemplified by the fact that notwithstanding hostile tariffs, our trade with Belgium and Germany has increased by a greater percentage than has our trade with Great Britain.

Now, I shall not detain the House long, but I wish to make some reference to what I consider a very important statement made by the Minister of Finance. I notice that the hon. gentleman had one way of making his calculations up to the present year and another way of making them this year. In making a comparison as to the rate of taxation, he, very fairly, excluded Indian corn, which was imported into Canada and re-exported, for although, appearing in the returns as entered for consumption in Canada, it was well known that this corn was not for Canadian consumption and should not be included. He also excluded coin and bullion, which is usually done in making these calculations. But, perhaps some hon. gentleman on that side can explain why the hon. gentleman excluded coin and bullion in former years and included coin and bullion to-day. In making his comparison this year he includes coin and bullion for all the years covered by his comparison. And why does he do so ? Because to do so tells in favour of his own position, for the quantity of coin and bullion imported into Canada in 1900 was larger than in any previous year, and the effect of including them is to show a reduced percentage of taxation. I do not find fault with the hon. gentleman's previous basis of calculation, and in making up the figures I have followed up the course which he previously thought the correct one, and have excluded coin and bullion as well as Indian corn, which ought to be excluded, as it merely passed through the country and was not consumed there. I ask your attention to a comparison of the rates of taxation on this basis for the two periods from 1893 to 1896, under Conservative rule, and from 1897 to 1900, under Liberal rule. Take the first period first. In this case, I exclude coin and bullion, but include Indian corn, because under the former tariff corn for consumption was so entered. Here are the percentages of duty actually collected on goods entered for consumption for the years mentioned :

	Per cent.
1893	18·37
1894	17·76
1895	17·76
1896	19·19
Average	18·28

Now, to take the next period. In this I exclude not only coin and bullion, but also Indian corn, as it was admited free, and that which merely passed through the country was entered as for Canadian consumption :

	Per cent.
1897	18·66
1898	18·28
1899	17·92
1900	17·21
Average	17·93

Thus we see that there has been a reduction in the duties of just 35-100 of 1 per cent in the period of Liberal rule as compared with those under Conservative rule. This is the immense reduction of which the hon. gentleman boasts. And what would this reduction mean in money ? In round numbers it means $1,800,000. And this is the net result of this preference modification of the national policy as adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite. We never contended that there were no faults in the national policy. Like every tariff, it had its objections, but in the case of the national policy as adopted and carried into effect by the Conservatives, those objections were merely minor ones. While in the main it was a wise policy—the fact that it built up Canada being proof of it. And when hon. gentlemen came into office they pretended to modify it. When he announced his first tariff the Minister of Finance stated in most explicit terms that it would not lower taxation, but he had a special tariff that would lower taxation—the preferential tariff. And this is the effect of that lowering of the tariff—35-100 of 1 per cent. It is not to be wondered at that the effect of the preferential tariff was so small when we consider that less than 26 per cent of the dutiable goods imported into Canada come in under the preference. I can scarcely find terms adequate to describe a policy of that kind, that

we have to-day the national policy as it was understood in the past, modified according to what hon. gentlemen have stated, by a preference, and under which we have achieved such meagre results.

But hon. gentlemen have not been slow in increasing the taxation. I say that apart from that reduction, they have largely increased the tax upon the people. They have increased the customs rate from 1896 to 1900. In 1896 the customs was $3.94 per head and the excise 63 cents, or a combined taxation of $4.57 per head. In 1900 the customs rate had increased to $5.37 and the excise to 83 cents, a total of $6.21, or an increase of $1.64 since 1896 upon every man, woman and child in Canada. Hon. gentlemen may say, perhaps, that is not strictly accurate, that it is open to the objection the Minister of Trade and Commerce has urged upon more than one occasion, namely, the mode of calculating the increase of population. But the hon. gentleman is not in a position to do more than state that the mode of calculation is not accurate. However, whether accurate or not, it applies to both cases, and one side has absolutely no advantage over the other.

Now, let us see what has been the result of this taxation. Take the increase of taxes made since 1896 on tobacco and cigars. The extra taxation has been $1,313,337. We have also an increase on sugar, notwithstanding the position taken by the Minister of Finance when he stated that he was going to give a free breakfast table, that he was going to reduce the duty on refined sugar from $1.14 per hundred pounds to $1, that he was going to allow the duty to remain as it was before at one-half cent a pound on raw sugar. We have an increase in duties on sugar by reason of the law governing the test under which it is imported, of no less a sum than $737,534 more than it was in 1896 under the existing duties. Then we collect an increased duty on rice, another article which the hon. gentleman was going to make cheaper; we collect an additional $26,205. Now, I want to call attention to two facts. One is that by reason of the operation of the preferential tariff, according to the Trade Returns, there has been a reduction of $1,180,325. What have we in the way of increased taxation on other articles? Take tobacco, that is a luxury perhaps to some extent, but to a great multitude of poor men in this country it is their greatest luxury; we have an increased taxation upon that, as I have already stated, to the extent of $1,313,000 a year; in sugar, $737,000 in round numbers; in rice, $26,000; in other words, as against a reduction of $1,180,000, we have an increase of $2,077,466. Surely that is not a very comfortable outlook.

Now, I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to say that we are not paying, under the proposed reduction of hon. gentlemen made on sugar in 1897, nearly three-quarters of a million dollars more in duties than we paid in 1896. Then the Minister of Finance stated that we imported goods from the United States because they are raw material. Is sugar not raw material? If you import iron goods for the purpose of aiding manufactures in this country, and of lowering the price of iron manufactures to the consumers, which was the reason alleged, what is the difference between lowering the duties on raw material that is composed of iron and on raw material that is composed of rice, or sugar, which are necessaries of life? There is, to my mind, a most contradictory position taken by the Minister of Finance. In one class of raw material the duty is not to be lowered, and in another class it is to be lowered, yet in both cases he says they will be equally cheap to the people. Now, by reason of the arrangement of the test under which sugars will be entered for duty, he has laid down a rule by which he takes from the people nearly three-quarters of a million dollars more than was taken in 1896. But what was his declaration in 1897? He declared that he was lowering the duties on sugar to the extent of $400,000 annually. Has he done that? I do not think the hon. gentleman will contend that he has done it. I do not think the hon. gentleman will contend that he has not advanced the duties to the extent of nearly three-quarters of a million dollars over 1896. Then I would like to know where are the grounds for congratulation which the hon. gentleman and his friends claim to possess.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance claimed some credit for reducing the public debt and for having a great surplus. The hon. gentleman went so far as to say that it was really a very gratifying thing that there should be a reduction of the public debt under the circumstances. Now, I desire to call his attention to the circumstances under which he reduced the public debt. Sir, the circumstance is that he has taken $52,000,000 out of the pockets of the people, the largest sum that was ever collected from the people of Canada. Yet he congratulates himself that while he takes $14,000,000 more from the people than was taken in 1896, he glorifies himself for having made a slight reduction in the public debt. He says they have a great surplus of $8,000,000. Let us see now whether the hon. gentleman has a surplus or not. In arriving at his surplus of $8,000,000, the hon. gentleman did not include all the expenditures. Now, it is a mere trick, I will not say it has been confined to one side of the House, but it is a trick upon the public to found the statement of a surplus upon the expenditure under consolidated revenue. Our receipts in 1899 were $51,029,994, our expenditures for the same year were $52,717,466, or a deficit between the two sides of the ledger of $1,687,472.

I am quite aware, Mr. Speaker, when I make that statement, that this is not the first occasion upon which a surplus has been counted in that way. But, I wish to call

the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that we collected $51,000,000 in 1900, and that we expended $52,000,000. What is the answer of hon. gentlemen opposite ? They say that a part of this should be charged to capital account. That is not a fair answer. A fair statement is that we spent more money than we collected ; that we made the largest collection that was ever made in Canada, that we made the largest expenditure on the other hand, and, instead of having upon the whole transaction, namely, the sums of money that were spent on capital as well as the sums that were chargeable to consolidated revenue, a surplus, we have, in round numbers $1,687,000 of a deficit. I think that is a fair way of putting it, and if hon. gentlemen boast of that kind of thing, I do not think there is very much credit due them. If hon. gentlemen were able to say: We have only charged to capital account such items as properly belong to it, we have not unloaded on capital account for the purpose of having a surplus they would be able to make a creditable showing. But, hon. gentlemen, as they have done in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, require to charge endless expenditures to capital account in order to show a surplus. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) could have a surplus to such an extent as suits his sweet will by adopting that course. He could charge services to capital account which did not properly belong to capital account as was shown in a debate in this House during last session. It was then shown that he had charged to capital account expenditures in connection with services that had never been so charged before. I do not say that the hon. Minister of Finance is doing that, but, if the expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway which were charged to capital account, form part of that surplus of $8,000,000 it shows how much there is to support the claim of such a surplus. The fact is that hon. gentlemen have paid out over $1,500,000 more than they collected, although the sum collected was very large. As to the attitude of hon. gentlemen upon this question in the past I shall not dwell. We have had the spectacle of hon. gentlemen going to the people with one set of professions and coming back and acting on an entirely different set. They have proclaimed that they have a revenue tariff and that they are able to collect $51.-000,000 with a surplus of $8,000,000 under that tariff. The very thing that hon. gentlemen declared against in the past. Hon. gentlemen went to the country and declared against the national policy, but, what was the attitude of hon. gentlemen in the past. I suppose I may acquit the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. He was fortunately silent but the right hon. First Minister was not silent in his early history in regard to being a protectionist. He was a protectionist in the movement which took place in the province of Quebec in 1876, when the national party was formed. The right hon. gentleman was a member of the legislature of Quebec at that time, and he joined in the movement for protection to the industries of Canada. That was the attitude of the right hon. gentleman upon that occasion. Then, I will take the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I am sorry he is not here to-night, because he was very pronounced upon the question of protection. This is what the hon. gentleman had to say before the national policy was adopted in 1878 :

> I believe that the interests of the nation at large would be promoted by judicial protection. I believe that the agricultural industries of the Dominion would be promoted by protection and that the manufacturers, being brought to the door of the farmer, would afford a market for a great many articles that would not be saleable if the market were 3,000 miles away. With a home market of this kind established by protection to manufacturers the agriculturists can benefit by producing a rotation of crops.

The right hon. First Minister, although not a member of this House at that time——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) is mistaken. The Prime Minister was a member of this House in 1876, and he entered the government of Mr. Mackenzie in 1876 or 1877—I forget which.

The PRIME MINISTER. In 1877.

Mr. CLANCY. Quite so, but before he came into this House, he had in his province in which he was a distinguished member of the legislature, in which he was a prominent and leading mind in what was known as the national party, said that he favoured protection to Canadian industries. It is a matter of little consequence whether he was a member of this House in 1876, or whether he made the statement upon that occasion or prior to that. The point I am endeavouring to make is that the right hon. gentleman at one time in his life did look favourably upon protection to Canadian industries. Now, we will take the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) who also entertained a view of that kind. He said :

> I must admit that I am in favour of a defensive policy. I cannot view with complacency what we see in this country. We live beside a country with a population ten times greater than our own whose industries have been fostered by protection until they are enabled even in some articles in which Great Britain excels, to challenge supremacy with her. While that nation has erected against us and other countries a hostile tariff, we have our hands bound and give them free and unrestricted rights of trade in our market.

There can be no doubt about the tone of

that speech. That speech was made before the tariff was introduced in 1879. Now, I am going to acquit the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce of having committed himself, so far as he can be traced, to statements of that kind, but the hon. gentleman had it in his desk. The hon. gentleman believed in protection. There is no doubt about that and I challenge the hon. gentleman to say that he did not believe in protection.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. When ?

Mr. CLANCY. I will show the hon. gentleman when he believed in protection. We have the right hon. Prime Minister who is very candid sometimes, and I am going to call one of the most respectable witnesses in Canada to prove that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce was favourable to protection. He is a distinguished member to the party to which he belongs, an hon. gentleman who has done great service to his party, and I am bound to admit that the hon. gentleman with his ability could not fail to perform some service to his country whether we quite agree with the attitude he has maintained during his long years of service or not. But, at a public dinner, given to the hon. gentleman on the 10th of May, 1900, in this city, what was said ? We have an hon. gentleman who rose, not late in the evening, I presume, not at that period when men are influenced or moved by the spirit, but at that sober period when men feel quite candid and the right hon. gentleman was extremely candid. He was referring to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce when he said :

There never was a day of the many days since we had to discuss questions together in council but I could count and rely on the support of Sir Richard Cartwright; and though, as sometimes happens in the councils of the party, we did not agree when in council, when the policy of the party was agreed upon, Sir Richard Cartwright never wavered in his support of it. I will give you an instance which has come to me from reliable sources, and is a thing which goes far to show the character of the guest of the evening.

Mark the words, Mr. Speaker : the 'character' of the guest of the evening. I want the Minister of Trade and Commerce. (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) to note what follows :

In the days of Mr. Mackenzie, when the country was very much depressed, there were many who believed that if the tariff was increased, that policy would be justified by the necessities of the revenue, and that it would be a valuable policy for the country at large. I can give you the story without betraying secrets, because these things happened before my day, but if the advice of Sir Richard Cartwright had prevailed at that time this policy would have been adopted.

That is the time when the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) had it in his heart. There is more :

Mr. CLANCY.

If it was not accepted, it was on account of other influences which prevailed with the government of the day, and for sixteen or twenty years Sir Richard Cartwright bore the brunt of the obloquy of not having responded to public sentiment, whereas the truth was that he was ready to respond to public sentiment. For eighteen years he bore the brunt of all the obloquy and never whispered a word. It is not every day you can find such abnegation and such loyalty to the party, and I have reasons to believe and to repeat it to you, I not only repeat it to you my colleagues, but wish my words to be heard all over Canada, that Canada little knows the debt of gratitude it owes to Sir Richard Cartwright.

Now, Mr. Speaker, by a very easy translation, what does this mean ? It means that in 1878, when the Liberal party went to the country, when the hon. gentleman cried out against protection himself, that he had it in his heart and was a believer in protection.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). By no manner of means. I have no objection to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) what happened, if he will permit me. For revenue purposes, and for revenue purposes alone, I advised in 1876—the thing is public property—I advised, as is perfectly well known on both sides of the House, an increase of the taxation to about 20 per cent, but it had nothing in the world to do with the question of protection. It was done because there was a deficit or impending deficit. It was done for revenue purposes.

Mr. CLANCY. If that be so, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) has done his leader manifest injustice. Did the First Minister state the truth or was he doing the Minister of Trade and Commerce an injustice ? Why, Sir, the very position that was taken afterwards by the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) shows it. When his colleagues knew that he wanted and believed in protective tariffs—to use plain English as it is understood in Canada——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not protective tariff ; revenue tariff.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman and his leader will have to settle the question of 'revenue' and 'protection' between themselves. The First Minister has put himself on record on that question, and the country will believe the First Minister. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) who was known to his colleagues to have favoured at least a considerable amount of protection, put himself on record in 1890. I want to show the position of that hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) at the two periods in order to see how he stands before the world. He said in 1890 :

I say our protective system was a huge mistake, in so far as it was honest at all, and

in so far as it was not honest, it was a huge scheme of robbery. A small ring clique of combines and protected manufacturers have, as I have told you, been permitted for years to make a prize and plunder of the people of Canada. I stand by the declaration I have made that protection is nothing more or less than deliberate legalized and organized robbery, and more than that, if you do not stamp it out, it is the very high road to political slavery first, and industrial slavery afterwards. Our policy from first to last has been to destroy the villainous system of protection by free trade. Revenue tariff or continental free trade.

That is the position the hon. gentleman occupied during these whole years, when he did what ? When, to use the words of the right hon. the Prime Minister, he bore the brunt of obloquy for not responding to public opinion, and when he bore it in silence and did not dare to act upon the dictates of his own conscience. And what happened ? Notwithstanding that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) went to his own constituency before the elections of 1896 and declared that if his party were returned to power he would be Finance Minister ; notwithstanding that, he is sentenced to sit at the feet of the present Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding). And why was that done ? It was done for the reason that was disclosed in the First Minister's speech, who in the most extraordinary manner at a public dinner felt constrained to disclose the sad picture of Sir Richard Cartwright for eighteen or twenty years bearing in silence the brunt of obloquy because he did not respond to public opinion, I shall not dwell on that further ; I shall leave it for the public to pronounce judgment upon it. We have here to-day a set of gentlemen in office who have gone back on every profession they have made. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) laid down the political moral code of hon. gentlemen opposite before the elections of 1896. Speaking at Bracebridge for the Liberal leaders, and hoping at that time to be a minister himself, he used the language which I shall quote. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) too, has been set aside, and I am not sure that he is not having his revenge in some quarters, I am not sure that he is not giving evidence to the people of Canada that he is not quite pleased with the treatment he received. Mr. Charlton said at Bracebridge :

> In concluding his speech he told the audience what the Liberal party will do when they get into office. We will stop going into debt.

Well, the government have not done that. Why, Sir, we have had a declaration even this afternoon from the Finance Minister that, notwithstanding they claim a surplus of $8,000,000 ; we had the declaration from the Finance Minister this afternoon that the government claimed a surplus of $8,000,000 odd ; the revenue collected from the people in the form of taxation is said to be $52,000,000 in the present year ; and we have the announcement from the Finance Minister that, notwithstanding that fact, he proposes to run into debt during the present year to the amount of nearly $2,000,000. This is what the hon. member for North Norfolk said on that occasion :

> We will stop going into debt. We will adopt principles of honesty and economy.

Leaving aside the very difficult and irritating question as to honesty, where is the economy ?

> We will cut down the annual expenditures by four or five millions of dollars. We will bring about prosperity to the farmers by promoting reciprocal trade relations with their natural market.

Namely, that of the United States. Has that been done ? And lastly :

> We will have the same code for public as for private morals.

It is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that that was too refined altogether for the hon. gentlemen. No wonder my hon. friend said that a gentleman committing a party to a position of that kind, should be consigned to the place he holds to-day.

I say we can well afford to leave this matter to the judgment of public opinion. We have hon. gentlemen here to-day occupying a position just the opposite of that which they occupied before. We have hon. gentlemen declaring that we have no protection, when we have a protective tariff. With regard to our position on the question of the one-sided preference and the challenge the Finance Minister made this afternoon on the subject of the preference, I am speaking for myself entirely when I say that it is not the business of the Conservative party to repeal a one-sided, silly and senseless preference which hon. gentlemen opposite adopt ; but it is the business of the Conservative party to undo by all rational means the mistakes and misdeeds of hon. gentlemen opposite. The policy of the Conservative party is to educate our own people and the people of Great Britain too ; because I think the speeches made in this House are not without effect on public sentiment in Great Britain. We have gentlemen in this House capable of pointing out the immense advantages that would inure to the British Empire from trade relations carried on within the empire, as against every other country in the world. Is that not a reasonable and rational proposition which will commend itself to public sentiment in Great Britain ? We must help to educate the people of Great Britain to see the advantage of a condition of things that would be of mutual benefit to the people of Great Britain and to the people of Canada. But I despair, as the people of this country have reason to despair, of the consummation of

that great achievement for Canada and the empire—and it will be a great achievement when it is brought about, as I hope it will be in the near future—so long as we have hon. gentlemen on that side of the House declaring that the people of Great Britain would be madmen and fools if they assented to anything of the sort.

This is, in short, the difference between the two parties on this question. We believe that this country has a great future as a part of the British Empire; but we believe it has a future and destiny of its own that warrants it in having a fiscal policy of its own. We believe we are not called upon to go to another country and say, We will give you this for the pleasure of taxing people who are already impoverished by taxation. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to lay their finger on a single feature that can be urged on behalf of the present preference. What were the declarations made by the Liberal party in 1896 and laid down in the platform adopted in their convention in 1893 ? To reduce taxation on the necessaries of life. As the only modifying feature of what is to-day a decidedly protective tariff—and I am not finding fault with it on that ground—we have the preference which covers less than 26 per cent of all the dutiable goods imported into Canada. In that 26 per cent do the necessaries of life come in on more favourable terms than the luxuries ? No, Sir ; there is that fatal cut which admits all the luxuries of life on the same ground as the most pressing necessaries. Then, I ask hon. gentlemen where are the modifying features of this tariff to show that they carried out their pledge of 1896 to lighten the burden of taxation on the necessaries of life ? I will not say that there are not some cases, but they are so trivial and unimportant that they amount to nothing in the way of reducing the taxation. Now, I repeat that while our attachment to Great Britain needs not the proof of this one-sided policy, the people of this country have shown, when the occasion has arisen, that they need give no such proof of their loyalty to the mother country. There are no dollars and cents in it. If we had to prove our loyalty to the mother country by concessions on the basis of dollars and cents, that would be the lowest ground on which we could put it. I repeat, that while we have an interest and a destiny which is inseparable from Great Britain and which we do not desire to have separated, we have a future of our own ; and I believe that the best way we can serve the interests of the empire is by making our own country great and prosperous.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to inflict a fourth financial speech on the House to-night. Three are, I think, as much as the average digestion of ordinary members of parliament can very well endure ; and, therefore, with the assent of hon. gentlemen, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask when it is proposed to resume the debate—to-morrow or Monday ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. To-morrow.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will it proceed from day to day ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We shall be glad to consult the convenience of hon. gentlemen on that point.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 9.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 15, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 68) respecting the McClary Manufacturing Company.—Mr. Hyman.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the St. Lawrence Power Company.—Mr. Logan.

Bill (No. 70) respecting the E. B. Eddy Company.—Mr. Champagne—by Mr. Monet.

Bill (No. 71) respecting the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver —by Mr. Douglas.

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher—by Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Vancouver, Westminster, Northern and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher—by Mr. Davis.

REPRESENTATION IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. WILLIAM J. ROCHE (Marquette) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 74) respecting representation in the North-west Territories. He said : Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to change the title of this Bill from one to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900, to a Bill to amend the Act respecting representation in the North-west Territories.

The PRIME MINISTER. Explain.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). This Bill refers solely to the North-west Territories, and it

is meant to correct certain abuses which crept in during the last election. For instance, the lists in the North-west Territories are supposed to be completed and posted up eight days prior to election day, and to be finally revised two days prior to election day. The enumerators who prepare the lists also revise them and it has occurred that political opponents, desiring to obtain certificates for voters to poll their votes outside of their own polling subdivisions, have been unable to do so until within two days of an election day, whereas political friends have been enabled to obtain certificates any time within eight days. The Bill contains a clause to correct this abuse and to allow the issue of certificates any time during the eight days and also to provide a penalty for issuing blank certificates. Blank certificates have been issued to friends, whereas they have been refused to opponents, and a clause has been introduced to correct that. Then, again, the enumerator who would not give any certificates to his political opponents until within two days of the election would conveniently make himself scarce during these two days, and our friends were not able to obtain certificates at all. A clause has been introduced into the Bill settling the place, or office, where this enumerator may be found in order to secure certificates and to have placed on the list names that are entitled to be there. It also provides penalties for the wilful infraction of any of these provisions. These, in short, are the amendments proposed, which will be explained more in detail upon the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche, Marquette) if that can be made applicable to, say, the province of Manitoba, particularly in regard to requiring that the returning officer should have an office in which he may be found before the election ? I was utterly unable to get any certificates because he absented himself for four days.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). That can be provided for, but it is not included in this Bill, which applies only to the North-west Territories.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That, during the remainder of the session, Government Orders shall have precedence on Mondays, after ' Questions to be put by members.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not intend to oppose the motion, but, I suppose the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has taken into consideration the amount of time which will be required for the private Bill legislation before the House. It is a matter that I have not given very much consideration to.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think that we have made sufficient progress now to justify the government in taking this day. I have not been forgetting private legislation, but I see no reason why we should not go on with the government business and have the private legislation disposed of also.

Motion agreed to.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. EDWARD HACKETT (West Prince, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are entered into, I desire to bring to the notice of the government a very urgent matter affecting the people of Canada. It especially affects the people of Prince Edward Island, and when I say the people of Prince Edward Island I mean the people of Canada. I regret that I am unable to give notice of this question, but I want to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) : How are the trains down in Prince Edward Island moving ? What means has he taken to see that the people there are supplied with train accommodation that they should be supplied with ?

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) wants to enter into a discussion he will have to move the adjournment of the House. If it is only to ask a question upon an urgent matter——

Mr. HACKETT. I do not wish to go into a discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would ask the hon. gentleman simply to put his question without engaging in a debate.

Mr. HACKETT. I move that the House do now adjourn in order to put myself in order. The people of Prince Edward Island paid for that railway. It cost them $3,250,000. At the time of confederation that railway became the property of Canada and it was to be operated by the government of Canada. I have never known since confederation that the government of Canada has failed in its duty in operating that railway. But, I hold in my hand a telegram, received by me to-day from a friend in Prince Edward Island. I will read that telegram to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and I am pleased to see that he is present and that the time is most opportune now to reply to this question.

Mr. Edward Hackett, M.P., Ottawa :

Tignish, P.E.I., March 15, 1901.

No train this week. Superintendent won't employ sufficient men clear track.

(Sgd.) P. C. MURPHY, M.D.

Here is a telegram from a reputable and responsible man in the village of Tignish, informing me that, for the last week, there has been no train at Tignish. When we consider that the people of Prince Edward Island built this railway that they should be afforded every accommodation, and that the government of Canada acquired this railway it is only right that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals should see that his superintendent down there employs sufficient men to keep that railway open. An hon. gentleman opposite said something about snowing. I remember, that, two years ago, the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) was down in Prince Edward Island at a by-election. He received an address and he closed a beautiful speech by quoting Kipling's poem, 'Our Lady of the Snows,' which was received with great applause. We happen to live amongst snow, but it is not beyond the power of the government of Canada to have the railway track cleared and to give the people sufficient accommodation. Now, in corroboration of the telegram received by me to-day, the 15th of March, I hold in my hand a newspaper published in Charlottetown, the Charlottetown Examiner, of date the 12th of March. It says :

The failure of the western train to go beyond Summerside yesterday afternoon, will add to the discontent that prevails there on account of the irregular train service. It is remembered that just before the election there were numbers of men engaged to pick and pull the weeds along the track. But now, when the snowdrifts are deep, though men are rather more plentiful than they were in the fall, and have more leisure, very few indeed are called upon to use the shovel along the line. It is remarked that if a by-election were being held in West Prince instead of East Queen's there would not be now such wonderful anxiety to save a few dollars of the public money. The money would be spent and the trains would go through. L'Impartial had a strong article upon the subject last week, and the Summerside Journal is agitating this grievance of the west. We feel sure that if Mr. Sharp were relieved—as he ought to be—of the pressure of political influence, he would see to it that the west should have a regular train service as well as the east. At present the people at the west have strong ground for complaint, and they will do well if they agitate for railway reform.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.) Read it all.

Mr. HACKETT. That is all. The Minister of Railways will not employ the men to shovel the track although plenty of men are to be found to do the work. In the interest of the people whom I represent, I ask the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) to see that they shall have at least one train a day. We find the people of western Canada agitating for railway accommodation in Manitoba and the North-west and elsewhere where we are building railways, and the people of Prince Edward Island are satisfied that they shall have all necessary accommodation notwithstanding that in the little province we are deprived of anything like a decent mail service. The urgency of the matter will be seen when this gentleman to whom I referred, had to pay an extra amount for the sending of his telegram across the short cable of nine miles, from Cape Traverse to Cape Tormentine. I, as the representative of my constituents ask the Minister of Railways, I call on him and I demand from him that he shall see that sufficient men are employed to keep the track clear and give the people west of Summerside that railway accommodation they are entitled to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The information which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) has just now given me is the first I have had on this subject, and I think it would perhaps have sufficed if the hon. gentleman had sent me the telegram and put me in possession of the information which he has, so that I could have communicated with the general manager and have the matter inquired into. I am quite sure that there is no disposition on the part of any of the authorities to stay their hands when obstacles occur in connection with the running of our trains. The mere employment of additional labour would not, I am sure, prompt them to refuse doing anything that might be required under such circumstances. They have no instructions which would warrant them in not giving a proper service to any part of the Island, or indeed any other portion of the government railways. If the hon. gentleman will send me that telegram I will at once communicate with Moncton and ascertain what the facts are. I am not at all surprised that trains should be blocked there, because that is not an uncommon thing when storms are heavy and the same thing is occurring all over Canada. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) that perhaps those who are writing or inspiring such newspaper articles as he has read are more anxious to find a grievance and make a complaint than they are to bring the facts to the knowledge of the proper officers. I would suspect that the paper that the hon. gentleman has read from, is not one which is ordinarily friendly to the government, and I would imagine that it was not anxious to put the case in an impartial way. There is certainly no design on the part of the Minister of Railways or of the government, or the department to refuse the people all proper railway facilities or accommodation. I promise the hon. gentleman that I will inquire into the matter at once. I am advised that the very paper which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) has read from, contains the additional statement that the condition which is represented to have occurred on the western portion of the line has occurred all over the line. The hon. gentle-

man (Mr. Hackett) will know whether that is correct or not. If it is correct, it will show that this block in the west is not due to any discrimination on the part of the authorities.

Motion to adjourn the House negatived.

HALIFAX-MANCHESTER LINE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, will the right hon. the Prime Minister permit me to mention that I have just received a telegram from the president of the Board of Trade of Halifax protesting against a contract being made with the Manchester line which omits Halifax as a port of call on the homeward voyage. The board protests that the subsidy should not be granted unless Halifax is included both ways, and stipulation made that Halifax shippers shall have the privilege of shipping at least 2,000 tons per homeward voyage. I presume that the matter has been brought to the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), but in case it has not, I take the opportunity of mentioning it now. It is a matter which demands the attention of the minister.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Fielding :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Mr. Speaker, it is always matter of honest and legitimate curiosity on the advent of a new parliament, to ascertain whether either of the great parties representing the two great divisions of public opinion in this country have anything in the way of a new policy to propose ; and when, as in the case of one of these we have the happiness of knowing that they have almost a complete brand-new outfit of new leaders the curiosity is deepened. On the present occasion, however, if I am to judge from the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler), who, I suppose was constituted the mouthpiece of the opposition, and also of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) who followed him ; there does not appear to be any great chance of our legitimate curiosity being gratified. The hon. member from Toronto (Mr. Osler) in the course of his remarks yesterday observed that there was not much to be said about the budget—and the hon. member did not say much. The government largely agreeing with the hon. member (Mr. Osler), thought that they might give the opposition the great advantage always dear to theologians, to politicians, and to ladies of all sorts and conditions, of having the last word. We were willing to rest our case on the statements of my hon. friend beside me (Hon. Mr. Fielding), thinking our friends of the opposition were likewise willing to rest their case on the champion they had provided. But as it appears that the hon. gentlemen desire a further continuation of the debate, we have no objection whatever that the matter should be discussed from every point of view.

As I have said, Sir, the hon. member for Toronto did not speak at any great length. The hon. gentleman did not give us much indication of the new policy, if a new policy there is to be, which the opposition are prepared to propound. I am bound to say that in that respect, however, although he did not speak quite as long, he gave us some more hints than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) who succeeded him. The hon. member for Toronto is of opinion that from this time forth—I do not know whether in this he spoke for himself, or as the mouthpiece of the opposition—there should be no more bonuses to railways, unless I presume such bonuses are approved by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or some other competent authority. The hon. gentleman was likewise of opinion that the time had come when we should issue no more scrip to the half-breeds. The hon. gentleman, in the third place, thought it was impolitic to go on expending money on the St. Lawrence navigation, if I followed him correctly, until it was pretty well established in the fulness of time whether Montreal or Quebec should be the great port of Canada. Now, Sir, if on that occasion the hon. member spoke as the mouthpiece of the opposition, and if they will formulate their views and put them in the shape of a motion embodying these three great planks, nothing will give us more pleasure than to discuss them in any way, shape or form they please to choose.

As for my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), I did not observe that he made any suggestion at all, except to the effect that he was not going to be stampeded by any one—I do not know to whom he had reference—to vote against the present preference to Great Britain unless he liked to.

In the way of criticism, the hon. member for Toronto complained at some length of the increase of the public debt. The hon. gentleman did not find it convenient to mention, what I think he might have mentioned, that in four years the total increase of the debt of Canada under the present government has been a little less than $7,000,000; while, if my memory is not at fault, in the three years preceding, the total increase of the debt of Canada had been $17,000,000. It is perfectly true that the debt of Canada increased by about $7,000,000 in the last four years; and of what items were those seven millions mainly composed ? They were composed of a grant of about

$3,500,000 to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, a grant of $1,500,000, a free gift of the people of Canada to the troops in South Africa, and a discount of about $1,000,000 caused by the placing of a 2½ per cent loan in the English market.

Mr. Speaker, I am as averse as any hon. member can be to seeing any undue increase, or any increase that can be avoided, to the public debt of this country. It is, for our means and resources, a large debt, and I do not like to see it increased; but I will say this, that in the course of my experience I never knew a case in which better value was given to the country for an addition of six or seven millions of dollars to the debt than has been given to Canada in these three items to which I have referred. By the addition of $3,500,000, in the shape of a subsidy to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, the government very largely developed a very important region in British Columbia, and at the same time provided a large and growing market for a large section of the North-west, a matter of great importance and value to the settlement of that country; and it can easily be established, if hon. gentlemen choose to take the trouble to examine our records, that even at the present moment, in all human probability, the result of that expenditure and the increased population and increased trade and traffic thence accruing, has been to add to our revenue in the shape of increased returns from customs and excise, which we would not have had but for the construction of that road, a sum of money which has already almost entirely recouped the treasury of Canada for that $3,500,000. I say nothing of the importance—though they are a part of the consideration for that $3,500,000—of the great advantages which were obtained not merely for the people of the North-west, but the people of older Canada, who are enabled to trade with British Columbia on very much better terms than they could have done if that subsidy had not been granted. For the $1,500,000 which was granted for the service of Her Majesty in South Africa, I say also that this country has obtained good and adequate value. Putting all other considerations aside, and looking at the matter from the most sordid pounds-shillings-and-pence point of view you please, as a mere mercantile venture, as an advertisement, Canada never used $1,500,000 to better purpose than when she sent 3,000 of her choicest troops to Africa, and when they established for themselves, as I am glad to be able to say they did, a record unsurpassed by any other portion of Her Majesty's forces, for gallantry, discipline, endurance, skill and conduct in the field. The $1,000,000 which we added to our public debt under the guise of discount on a 2½ per cent loan, made by my hon. friend shortly after his entrance into office, was also money right well spent, and for this simple reason. It is a matter of very great importance to us, who will have to renew our indebtedness for many millions, I think not far short of fifty or sixty millions, within the course of a few years, to establish as low a rate of interest for our loans as can possibly be obtained; and therefore that nominal addition to our debt was money very well spent and invested in the interest of the people of Canada. If my hon. friend had simply desired to keep down the apparent debt, it would have been a very easy thing for him to have floated a 3 per cent loan. Had he done so, instead of an apparent addition to our debt of $1,000,000, he would have been able to reduce it by half a million from the proceeds of the premium which he would at that period have been able to secure on such a loan. In our $266,000,000 of net debt now existing, it would be hard for any hon. gentleman to point out any case in which the people of Canada have got better value for their money than they have in these six millions which have been added to our debt under the present government. I say further: if we were able to invest sixty millions on equally good terms, my hon. friend the Finance Minister would be well advised to do it, and do it at once.

The hon. member for Toronto also wanted to know what we had done with the large surpluses which we had received during the last few years. Sir, I am pleased to be able to inform the hon. gentleman and his friends that what we did with the surpluses to which he alludes was to pay off the large undischarged liabilities which our predecessors had left behind them. When we came into office we found that our predecessors had gone out of office not merely with a considerable deficit, but likewise with a large amount of undischarged liabilities.

There were several millions due on railway subsidies unpaid. There was a very large amount, not less, I think, than $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 at least, to be paid for the completion of the canal contracts which were under way and which the late government had left unfinished. If you add these sums together, you will find that there is ample scope for the employment of the entire surplus which we accumulated during our term. I say nothing of the fact, which may more fitly be discussed another time, that we had besides to turn a dead railway into a live one and provide a considerable sum for equipping and putting the Intercolonial Railway into shape to be an efficient competitor with its great rival.

But my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler), not content with the past, projected his eagle vision into the future. He desired to know what provision we were going to make for the next 25 years. I was pleased to hear that remark. The hon. gentleman is a citizen of Toronto. He has witnessed, no doubt with interest, how, for the space of thirty years, the Reform party have kept power in Ontario, and I think it suggested

itself to his mind that as things were going there was every probability that the present party in power would be called on to provide for the future of this country for the next 25 years. Sir, I am pleased to be able to relieve the mind of my hon. friend with respect to these 25 years. During the next 25 years, in fact, during a shorter period, we may probably have to refund the whole or very nearly the whole of our debts. At this moment, the charges for our debt and sinking fund are a little over $13,000,000 a year, but if my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) succeeds in establishing a 2½ per cent or even 2¾ per cent rate and in dispensing with the sinking fund—as I know he will—the probabilities are that before the 25 years will have expired, we will have reduced that $13,000,000, which is a fixed charge that we cannot control, to something like $6,000,000 or $7,000,000. And if the population—as I think, under the energetic operations of my hon. friend in front of me and other valuable members of the party, it will be—is sufficiently increased, if it resumes its normal rate of increase, and at the end of the 25 years we have 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 of people—as we have every reason to hope we may—the interest will be absolutely reduced to one-half, and, relatively to the population it will be reduced to one-quarter of the amount we now pay.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is it to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture the hon. gentleman is referring ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My hon. colleague the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) will answer for himself. I do not know what surprises may be in store for us, but I say candidly that I was rather sorry to see my hon. friends, who have spoken so far, were rather disposed to fall back into the old ruts. These hon. gentlemen refused—and refused, I fear, deliberately—to face the facts. They refused to admit that within the last four or five years conditions have changed to an extraordinary degree in Canada. They refused to admit that new obligations have been assumed, for which we have had to provide, and they refused entirely to make any reasonable allowance for the expenditure rendered requisite by these changed conditions. They preferred to repeat exploded charges. I had hoped better from them, I thought that those things might well enough be relegated to the limbo which always follows a general election, and that we would turn over a new leaf and deal with things to a greater extent as we find them to-day. But no doubt these hon. gentlemen are a good deal handicapped by the traditions which they have inherited from their predecessors. No doubt also they have found it rather difficult to get anything new to propose, and they must not complain—though I notice some of them are disposed to complain—too much if the people are disposed to judge them by the standards they themselves set up. I have seen a good deal of political life in Canada, and can very well recollect that, when times were hard, and we were in power, our friends opposite were the very foremost to impress on the people that these things depended entirely on the government. If times were bad the government were to blame. Sir, the people took them at their own words. The people judged them by their own standard and did, I dare say, to some extent, give my right hon. friend beside me and his colleagues credit for the fact that there were good times and that they knew how to make the most of them.

But when I come to deal with such criticisms as I have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite, I notice one thing. Not only are these criticisms to a great extent contradictory, but they appear to be self-destructive. These hon. gentlemen complain that we have stolen their policy, and almost in the same breath they complain that we introduced—especially in the matter of the preferential tariff—a totally new departure. They are never tired of complaining that we are giving England a preference, without favour or consideration granted to us, and at the same time they make it a charge against this government that one of the results of our policy has been a largely increased trade with the United States. Some of them were willing to show—and I think my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) rather intimated the same thing—that all the advantage which England gets in the preferential trade is of an extremely flimsy description. I think some have put it as low as one-quarter of 1 per cent. I think the hon. gentleman admitted that it was one-third of 1 per cent. What particular figure they may finally settle upon is a matter for their own consideration, but I would point out to them, that if that consideration be a mere flimsy and trivial matter, if the preference is of very little importance, is it not rather an audacious request on their part and would it not be one on ours, to ask that the English people should abandon their old and well-settled policy for so very trifling a consideration. I am not of the opinion myself that it is of such a trifling advantage. I think it is a matter, on more than sentimental grounds, of very considerable importance to the English manufacturer and exporter that whereas German and American competitors have to pay $3, he is only called on to pay $2, and I entirely differ from the hon. gentleman in thinking that the great consuming population of Canada fail to reap a large advantage from that reduction. Also—though I think they did not dwell much on that point—I have noticed that many of them complain that this reduction so trivial in consequence and insignificant in its character, has worked a great deal of injury to our own manufactures. There also I do not agree with

them, although I dare say some may be more or less inconvenienced by the fact that they have to compete on less favourable terms with England in our market.

Then these hon. gentlemen are constantly complaining of the extravagance of this government and constantly pointing to the fact that we are spending a great deal more money than they did—with which point I shall deal later on—yet almost in the same breath you will find these hon. gentlemen, or some of the leading men among them, constantly urging the government forward to new and heavy expenditure, in some cases expenditures, which, if carried out at all, would probably mean an addition of some hundreds of millions of dollars to our national debt. Sir, I would advise these hon. gentlemen to agree with each other—though perhaps that would be too hard, considering their traditions—and if they can agree with each other, I would advise them to formulate, and to formulate without much delay, some definite policy ; and, when they have so done, to challenge the policy of the government.

Mr. BENNETT. And you would adopt the policy ?

Mr. COCHRANE. As you did the national policy.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, I think my hon. friend is speaking in considerable ignorance of the real effect of the introduction of the preferential tariff, and other changes made in the tariff of 1897. If he means to say that our tariff is a very high revenue tariff, I will agree with him ; if he says it is a protective tariff, I differ. And I will tell him that the best test of a protective tariff the world over is this—and he will see it exemplified on the other side of the border—that under a protective tariff imports go down. Under our tariff imports have expanded marvellously.

Now, it is inevitable, under the circumstances, that I must go over some of the old ground. If our friends on the other side will persist in making these unfair comparisons, if they will ignore the changed conditions of the country and the new services we have to provide for, if they will ignore entirely the proposals which they themselves made in 1896 from this side of the House, it becomes our duty, whenever they take that line, to remind them, and to remind the country, of what the real, actual position of affairs was. Now, in 1896, the then Finance Minister, Mr. Foster, brought down main estimates—and it was perfectly well known that he had very large supplemental estimates in reserve, though I will not go over that ground now—these main estimates alone showing that he required $38,358,000 for the services of 1897. We will start with his main estimates ; for the sake of the argument, I put on one side the well known fact that he must have introduced, had his government remained in power, very heavy supplemental estimates in addition. These hon. gentlemen declare that we are enormously and atrociously extravagant, because my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), in the year last past, has expended $43,000,000, or nearly so. Now, I will admit that an additional expenditure of $4,600,000, in round numbers, is a very large addition to the annual expenditure ; it is a thing to be inquired into, a thing to be explained. But, before these hon. gentlemen declare that the mere fact that $4,600,000 more was spent in 1900 than was asked for in the main estimates alone for 1897 proves extravagance on our part, they will do well, and the House will do well, to consider under what circumstances this additional expenditure was required. I speak now, of course, of the sum chargeable to consolidated fund alone. I find that of the $4,600,000 additional expenditure, at least $1,500,000 was required for the services of the Intercolonial Railway, every penny of which was recouped to the treasury from the added receipts of the Intercolonial Railway. And a sum nearly as large was required for the service of the Yukon territory, for which the late government did not need to provide one farthing ; and this sum likewise was recouped the people of Canada out of the receipts of the Yukon territory. This service has not cost the people of the older provinces one single stiver. In fact, I am rather inclined to believe that the balance is the other way, and that we have a fair amount to our credit as a result of our expenditure on the Yukon. Then, about $500,000 was spent in the reduction of our debt in the added sum spent for sinking fund. If you want to make a fair comparison of expenditure, from this $4,600,000 you must take the $3,500,000 which appeared on both sides of the account. That is only common fair-play. And, when that is done you find that the alleged increase of $4,600,000 diminishes to a total increase at the end of the fourth year of $1,100,000—giving, as I said, the hon. gentlemen the benefit of the fact that I have simply taken their main estimates and have entirely left out of sight the enormous supplemental estimates that they would have had to bring down. Now, the total receipts from the railways and canals was, in 1896, $3,490,000, and, in 1900, $5,232,000, being an increase of receipts at the end of the fourth year of $1,638,000. Our expenditures for the same purpose, in 1896, were $3,826,000, and, in 1900, $5,244,000. So, our expenditures increased $1,418,000, while our receipts increased $1,638,000. I do not lose sight of the fact that there was considerable expenditure on capital account during that interval, but I point out that the interest on that account, up to June 30, 1900, was met, and, I believe, fully met, by the additional sum we received from the Intercolonial

Railway. Sir, I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite how much the poorer we were owing to the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways now spends five millions or five and a quarter millions on the Intercolonial Railway, and gets back five and a quarter millions ; how much poorer we are because we spend a million and a quarter or a million and a half in the Yukon and receive a million and a quarter or a million and a half from the Yukon ; how much poorer we are because we are debited on the one side with half a million of sinking fund and reduce the other side by purchasing half a million out of the sinking fund ?

There is another way of looking at this question that hon. gentlemen opposite would do well to consider. As I have said, the conditions are mightily changed. In 1896, when these proposals that I alluded to were brought down, we had a very considerable deficit. We were threatened with a deficit in 1897. In 1895 our total available income, after providing for the fixed charges—for interest and sinking fund, subsidies to provinces, and expenses known as 'collection of revenues'—was $7,000,000. In 1897, things were somewhat better ; our total available income was about $10,000,000. In 1900, making these self-same deductions, our available income was about $21,000,000. That is to say, our available income is treble what it had been in 1895, and it is double our available income—which is the point which hon. gentlemen should chiefly consider in regard to these matters—of 1897. And, while our available income had increased over 100 per cent, our expenditure on the same basis—putting on one side the fixed charges and expenses known as 'collection or revenue,' which, as I said, are recouped—was about 10 per cent more than it had been in 1896 and 1897—the expenses of the two years not varying materially. Under the circumstances, it does not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite to say that this government has been very reckless or extravagant in the additions it has made in public expenditure. And, if the House wants to know how the remaining $1,100,000, for which we are fairly accountable, is made up, I can give him in gross—I shall not inflict on hon. members the minute details—the three main items that have caused that increase. One of these was a considerable expenditure on the militia, to which I never heard a whisper of opposition from hon. gentlemen opposite. Another was a heavier expenditure on the part of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) ; and, if I remember well, very few indeed of his items were challenged in detail.

The third large item was caused by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture in the expenditures he made, with the unanimous approval of this House, for the purpose of developing and expanding our trade in agricultural products of various kinds ; the fourth was for the purpose of increasing and extending the immigration into this country on the part of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. Now, Sir, if I am correctly advised, the result of my hon. friend's operations, in brief, has been this, that probably within the last three or four years—and here again he can correct me if I am in error—something like 30,000 or 40,000 farms have been taken up in Manitoba and the North-west, are now being brought into cultivation, and are adding largely to the resources, and wealth, and exporting power of this country. These were the objects for which we incurred an additional expenditure. Up to the present moment they have not been challenged by hon. gentlemen, and I doubt very much whether here or elsewhere hon. gentlemen will venture to challenge the expenditures incurred for these particular purposes ; and if they do not venture to challenge them, if they are content to allow them to pass with their entire approval, then I say we are perfectly justified in saying that the additional expenditure we have incurred is either, as I have already said, wholly and entirely in the nature of cross entries where, for every penny we spend we get a penny back, or that it is for purposes which command the unanimous approval of this House and of the people of this country.

But, Sir, perhaps it is when we turn to the developments of trade and commerce that we are able to see better than in almost any other way how great and how vast are the strides which this country has been making within the last four or five years. I spoke just now of the increased trade with the United States, and here it is worth while observing that this increase is to a certain extent a nominal increase. The nominal increase, I believe, was close upon $40,000,000 during the past year. But it is to be observed that we imported and exported, thus virtually neutralizing part of the item a much larger quantity of coin and bullion than in previous years, and it is also beyond doubt that a large part of our increased exports to the United States consisted of precious metals, which would find a market with perfect facility in any other part of the world, and as to which we cannot say that we are under much obliation to American customers for relieving us of them. Nevertheless, after making all allowances, there is no doubt that our trade with the United States has largely increased, and so far from holding that as any ground for reproach, or any ground for misgiving, I for one am very glad indeed to know that our trade, and particularly our export trade with the United States, has incerased largely. A year or two ago our total export trade with the United States was about $45,000,000, our total export trade last year was $68,000,000, being

an increase of about $23,000,000, although $4,000,000 of that is nominal, as I said, being composed of coin and bullion, which was exported and re-exported. Still there remains a very large increase in our export trade with the United States. Practically we sold them about $60,000,000 worth of the imports of our country, excluding coin and bullion. We sold to Great Britain at the same time, $96,000,000 worth. And here it is perhaps worth while to notice, because it bears to a certain extent on this question of preferential trade, that man for man and family for family, our trade with the 40,000,000 of people in Great Britain is very much more profitable for us than our trade with the 76,000,000 of the United States. Sir, it need not be so, it is due to the folly of both countries in my opinion, that it is so. We ought to trade a great deal more than we do with the United States. Having a frontier of 4,000 miles contiguous to them, it is neither to our credit nor to theirs that our trade is comparatively limited as it is. But I am speaking of facts, and the facts are that at this moment our trade with Great Britain per head is enormously in excess of our trade with the United States. We sell to the 40,000,000 of people in Great Britain about $96,000,000 worth, and we sell to the 76,000,000 in the United States something like $60,000,000 worth of goods per annum; in other words, every man, woman and child in Great Britain takes from us about $2.50 per head, whereas in the United States they take from us scarcely 80 cents per head, and perhaps if the matter were looked into it would hardly equal that sum.

Sir, here I may say a word or two about two separate fallacies which hon. gentlemen sometimes indulge in. They appear to consider that under a revenue tariff it follows of necessity that if you tax one country you must tax another to the same extent. Now under the very peculiar conditions of trade which exist in the United States, it by no means follows that a higher tariff will necessarily exclude their products, as a matter of fact we know it does not. We know that owing to conditions of trade, that I need not now enlarge upon, you can safely impose on American products, without any detriment to a reasonable interchange, a very much higher duty than you can on British goods. But when hon. gentlemen tell me, in the second place, that we receive no substantial benefit from the preference we have granted to Great Britain, I take leave to differ from them altogether. The information which reaches me from every quarter, and I think men of business in this House will confirm the statement that I make, all goes to show that looking at it as I said, in the most pounds, shillings and pence point of view you please, a magnificent stroke of business was done for Canada by the introduction of the preferential tariff.

There never was so good an advertisement given to any country, or to the productions of any country, as that given to the productions of Canada when we introduced preferential tariff. When hon. gentlemen say, as I think I heard one hon. gentleman say the other night, that not one man in a thousand in England knows anything or cares anything about the preferential tariff, I can tell him that there is probably not one man in a thousand in mercantile life in England who does not know and appreciate, and was not exceedingly impressed by the fact, that Canada alone of all the world had given a distinct preference to British goods in her markets. Sir, this is not a sentimental question. Great Britain stands in the position of a very rich and wealthy consumer who has the power of choosing between four or five rival competitors for her trade in goods nearly equal in quality, nearly equal in appearance. If you have the good-will of that customer you may rely upon it, and the people of Canada may rely upon it, that you will get a preference in the trade of that customer. In dealings with such a customer it is of great importance to have his good-will, and our people are finding it so more and more day after day. If our people will continue to send forward good articles, if they will avoid the danger which always besets trade when there is a rapid increase in the demand, of sending forward an inferior article, and relying on the previous excellence of their products to retain the market, I say if they will avoid that besetting sin, there is hardly any limit to the extent to which we may push our most profitable trade with England, more particularly as the articles which we have to sell are products of high quality, articles in which quality is looked to more than price by a very large portion of the English consumers with whom we deal.

Now, Sir, I do not see the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) in the House, but I would like to put a question or two to his confreres. If these hon. gentlemen complain that we have too great a surplus, if they allege, as I think I heard that hon. gentleman allege, that when you have a surplus it is your duty either to reduce the taxes or to reduce the debt, I would like very much to know from the opposition what particular taxes they propose to reduce. Sir, that is part of the express business of an opposition. If the opposition think that any taxes are oppressive on the people they have the fullest constitutional power to bring the question up here, and I for one, would be disposed to give most respectful consideration to any proposition that they may be pleased to advance for the reduction of taxes, whether it be on American goods, whether it be in the shape of a further extension of the British preference, or in any shape they please. There is a fair and full opportunity and I invite

them most cordially to do so, if they want to move to reduce taxation. They may also move to strike out items of expenditure. It is fair, it is just and it is the duty of the opposition and I would be pleased, particularly in the matter of railway bonuses and other things of that kind, to see the opposition bestirring themselves actively in the shape of reducing the various items which are brought down by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and some other of my hon. friends. But, Mr. Speaker, I would say to hon. gentlemen opposite, that if they are not prepared to come forward and move for the reduction of taxation, if they are not prepared to strike out any special outlay, if they are not ready to abrogate the preference which we now grant to Great Britain, there is not very much object to be attained by prolonging the discussion of the budget brought down by the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding). It can serve very little good purpose for them or for us, to go over the old allegations which have been threshed out on every hustings in the Dominion of Canada during the last general election. There is one point, however, upon which I am disposed, and upon which my hon. friend beside me (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is disposed, to partially agree with these hon. gentlemen. There is no doubt whatever that we have had a most extraordinary and remarkable expansion of trade and commerce within the last few years, and I would be very sorry that this House, or this government should proceed to regulate their expenditure on the assumption that this will go on and continue until they had absolutely clear proof that the expansion was based on a permanent increase in production, which was perfectly sure to be maintained. However, on that head, I shall have a little to say before I sit down. I quite admit, as the history of Canada, of the United States, of Great Britain and of every other commercial country shows, that periods of great commercial expansion are apt to be followed by periods, either of depression, or of stagnation, and that a reasonable margin should be allowed to provide for such a case. Particularly, when the rate of increase has been as great and vast as it has been in our case, it would be folly for us to expect that it could be maintained ad infinitum. I believe I am speaking, for, not only myself, but, for my colleagues, also, when I say that we have fully realized that fact, that we have had it clearly before our eyes and that we design to regulate our future conduct in accordance therewith. But, Sir, in all these matters, after all said and done, there are two things which may be regarded as about the very best test of trade development in a country like this. One, I think, is the test of the great and rapid increase of trade and commerce; another is our success in filling up our waste lands and in adding largely to the active producers of this country. As regards the development of trade it is absolutely unparalleled; the record is almost too good. The figures which my hon. friend beside me (Hon. Mr. Fielding) gave were sufficiently convincing, and if he erred at all, I think he erred on the side of moderation and hardly dwelt enough on the enormous rapidity with which our general trade, and more notably, our exports, have increased within the last few years. It is a very interesting fact that I now state to the House, that, within the last six months, the exports of our own produce, the produce of Canada amounted to $108,002,883. Before we came into office the exports for 1896—and it was a record year, it was the highest year that had been attained—amounted to $109,707,805. Six months of the present fiscal year equalled the highest record that up to that time had ever been attained in the fiscal history of Canada in the matter of the exports of our own produce. As to the total volume of our trade, I would like to call the attention of the House to this very notable fact, that, in 1868, the total volume of our trade was $131,027,532. In 1897, and it was a record year, it was the highest year we had ever attained, the total volume of our trade was $257,168,862. In these thirty years the total volume of our trade had increased by $126,-141,330, and these were during the years in which we had added the whole of the Northwest Territories, the province of Manitoba, the province of British Columbia and the province of Prince Edward Island to our territory. Sir, in 1897, the total volume of our trade was, as I have already said, $257,168,-862. In 1900, the total volume of our trade was $381,517,236, the difference being $124,-348,374 in three years, as against $126,141,-330 in thirty years. Sir, as to the question, and a very important question it is, whether the great growth in our exports is reasonably likely to be maintained, I have been at some pains to analyse the chief items of increase, and I am inclined to think, that, from the character and nature of the increases, there is a reasonable probability that the greater part, at any rate, of the expansion in our exports will be maintained, a point which all business men will regard as a very important matter. I find that our exports of bacon and hams in 1896 amounted to $4,381,968, while, in 1900, our exports of bacon and hams had grown to $12,758,025. In 1896, our exports of butter amounted to $1,052,089, while, in 1900, our exports of butter totalled $5,122,563. In the matter of cheese our exports in 1896, were $13,956,571, while, in 1900, they were $19,856,324. In the case of the mines our exports in 1896, were $8,059,650, and in 1900, $24,580,266. Our exports in manufactures likewise increased very largely in these years. I would point out that these several items compose the major portion of the total

increases in our exports, and I think that there is reasonable ground to believe that these exports will not only be maintained, but probably will be increased with reasonable care and diligence on the part of our producers during the ensuing year or two. I need not say, Sir, that particularly in the case of the mines, these industries may be regarded as being almost in their infancy, that there is every ground in these and somewhat similar cases, as for instance, in the making of pulp, pulp wood, and paper therefrom, to look for a large and expanding trade. And now, Mr. Speaker, in concluding, let me ask if these facts be so, and I do not see how they can be successfully contradicted, is not my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and are not the government fully justified in asking: Why disturb so prosperous a condition of things; your trade is increasing, your debt is stationary, your population is increasing, your revenue is increasing, new resources are developing everywhere—why should we be asked to disturb so wholesome and goodly a condition of affairs?

I doubt very much, Sir, whether these hon. gentlemen really believe that the existing condition of affairs could be bettered in any shape or form. I look around and I find it very difficult to ascertain where, if anywhere, there is any real discontent with the government. So far as I have been able to see, I am inclined to believe that the discontent which the hon. gentlemen opposite say exists may be confined to three classes. I am aware that there is a numerous class of gentlemen who are discontented with us because we have not made them senators. I am aware that there are certain manufacturers who are discontented with us because we have not chosen to allow the tariff to be used as an instrument for their private benefit; and I am aware also that the members of His Majesty's loyal opposition think, and, perhaps, with some reason, that we have had altogether too good times. I am inclined to think that that is beginning to dawn dimly upon their minds. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler), though he knew it not, had, to a certain extent, the spirit of prophecy on him when he almost predicted that we were here to stay, and to stay for five and twenty years. If that be so, I trust that my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his colleagues will be able, in these five and twenty years to administer the affairs of this country in such a way that when that time expires, they can point to equally as good a record as that we have the honour to submit to the consideration of the House and the country to-day.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I am sure we have all listened with a great deal of pleasure to the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), but I dare say that some of us who were members of former parliaments had our pleasure diminished by the fact that we had heard that same speech in various forms on several occasions of late years. I may remark that it differs very widely from the orations which the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) was in the habit of delivering previous to 1896. I shall have occasion to make extracts from some of these former speeches of his, which will enable the House and the country to see what a wonderful distance the hon. gentleman has travelled, and how remarkable are his powers of locomotion. It would appear from what the minister (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) said at the end of his speech, that no reasonable man could suggest the idea that a change is wanted in this country, but still he sits representing a province which has overwhelmingly condemned the administration of which he is a member. More than that, I am told that in the constituencies he visited as an active agent of the Liberal party, his presence produced most disastrous results.

Mr. BENNETT. Lincoln.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The county of Lincoln, with an assured Liberal majority of 600, was visited by the minister (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), and his visit was immediately fatal to the candidate of the Liberal party there. Wherever the hon. gentleman passed through Ontario, his trail was marked in all directions by dying and perishing victims belonging to the Liberal party. He visited Toronto, and that city is to-day, perhaps, the banner Conservative stronghold of all Canada. Now, the Minister of Trade and Commerce is apparently very anxious that the Conservative opposition should furnish the government with some variation of its present policy. I am not surprised at that, because any one who takes the budget speech and adds to it what has been said by the minister (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), will be inclined to remark that so far as power of initiating anything new is concerned, the government has shown an absolute want of efficiency. It has to-day a policy, and that remark may form a companion remark to the statement of the minister (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), that the opposition has no policy. Well, a man whose purse has been taken from him by a footpad has no purse, while the footpad has come into possession of one, and may vaunt it if he choose. The government to-day has a policy, but it is a policy which they appropriated from the opposition, and the government apparently glorying, the theft, twits the opposition with having no policy. I do not think, however, that it is the intention of the opposition to allow itself to be thus defrauded of its policy. Sir, the Conservative party of Canada stands to-day as it has stood for the last twenty-three years, prepared to maintain that policy of protection; the

policy of adequate protection. In that respect, I do not see that we could propound any policy that could be of advantage to our opponents, because notwithstanding the denial of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, they have shown themselves to be adepts, not in initiating a protective policy, but in the maintenance of a protectionist policy when it comes ready-made into their hands. I was more struck by what the Minister of Trade and Commerce did not say than by what he did say, and particularly so, as he avoided, with the utmost care, any reference to that part of the speech of the member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), which most required attention at his hands. There can be no doubt that the belief exists in the lower provinces, whence I come, as well as elsewhere in Canada, that immediately previous to 1879, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) and his colleagues in the Mackenzie government, had, under pressure of public opinon, made up their minds to fall in with the views expressed in parliament by Sir John Macdonald and his lieutenants, in favour of protection to the manufacturing, the agricultural, the mining and the other interests. I have heard it told in detail that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) had prepared a protective tariff, when his purpose was interrupted by an incursion of free traders from the lower provinces, who threatened the Mackenzie government with the loss of their support unless the project was abandoned. It is told that then the hon. gentleman locked up in his desk his protective tariff, and he probably has it in the archives of his family to the present day. If that be not the case, then it is difficult to attach any kind of meaning or relevancy to the remarks made by the premier at the banquet given to the Minister of Trade and Commerce in April last, and in which the Prime Minister represented that hon. gentleman as showing great magnanimity and great loyalty to his party, in that he silently lay for eighteen years under the odium of having obstructed himself to the will of the people, and thus brought disaster upon his party, whereas, had he chosen to speak out, he could have shown that the fault did not lie with him. I regret that the minister (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) did not deal with that question, because the one thing which is altogether unsatisfactory about the budget speech is, that it leaves the government to-day standing in the equivocal position they have occupied since they came to power, of endeavouring to pose before the country as being in favour of protecting the manufacturers, and at the same time in favour of giving the consumers all they want. They are endeavouring to avoid the point at which it would be necessary to declare themselves, and to show whether they are protectionists or whether they are in favour of a revenue tariff—free traders, so called. The minister (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) told us last night, when he interrupted the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), that he was in favour of a revenue tariff which would impose a 20 per cent duty upon imports, and that the condemnation to which he had been subjected was not because he refused to adopt a protective tariff, but because he refused to go beyond a 20 per cent tariff. The hon. gentleman declares that to-day he is in favour of a revenue tariff.

He maintains that he is to-day opposed to a protective tariff; and still he sits as a member of a government which has at this moment not a maximum revenue tariff of 20 per cent imposed on all the importations of the country, but a tariff with duties as high as 5 cents a gallon on coal oil, 35 per cent on various lines of manufacture, and specific duties on every page. My hon. friend will not for one moment, I am sure, contend that the tariff which includes specific duties as high as 5 cents a gallon on coal oil, and which grants bounties to the extent of $3 a ton on pig iron, which the manufacturers tell us can be produced for something less than $6 a ton, is in any sense a revenue tariff. Does the hon. gentleman ask the people of Canada to believe that he is sincere when he says that he is a strong upholder of a revenue tariff, while he sits in a government and draws the salary attaching to that government, which maintains a tariff such as I have described? It is too much for human credulity. It is almost impossible to understand how the hon. gentleman can make such statements in this House. However, that point has to a large extent been avoided. The hon. Minister of Finance has made no change whatever in the tariff, and so this matter goes for the moment over, and we are compelled—because in this House we must believe what is said by a member—to accept the statement that the tariff of the government is a revenue tariff, although it imposes specific duties in all directions and grants bounties to the extent of 50 per cent of the cost of the materials produced, and imposes taxes on some commodities as high as 35 per cent, or even 50 per cent or 60 per cent, while it admits other commodities free of duty altogether, in order that it may benefit and favour certain industries in the country. We have to believe, I say, in a technical sense, whatever is said in this House; but I must say that the mental effort required to believe all these things is such a tax upon us that nothing but regard for an old statesman of Canada, a man who has grown gray in the service of the country, would induce us even to make the attempt to reconcile these hopeless discrepancies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was very much pleased yesterday to hear a budget speech of so very pleasing a character, both to the country and to the opposition—one of the most pleasing that has ever been delivered in Canada; because it is filled with good things—the

tidings of large revenues and abounding trade. I was pleased, during that discussion, to view the great delight which it afforded members sitting on the government side to feel that they were living in such a happy decade. Apparently, these gentlemen supposed that nothing of the kind had ever occurred before, and the Finance Minister, I believe, encouraged that belief in their minds. Now, it is always an unpleasant thing to dispel pleasing delusions. Still, we on this side of the House are always truthful ; and I am compelled, out of regard for the truth, to give these gentlemen the knowledge which they might not seek for themselves, in the happy condition in which they live—that there have been kings before Agamemnon, that there have been surpluses in this country before the days of the present Liberal administration. In 1881, 1882, and 1883, when Sir Leonard Tilley was Finance Minister of Canada, there were surpluses just as good, and I am compelled by truth to say even better than that with which the hon. Minister of Finance has met the House on this occasion. The surpluses of the Finance Minister which afforded such pleasure to his friends on the other side of the House, for the last three years amount to $14,615,000. For 1900, which is his banner year, he has a surplus of $8,054,000, a most amazing sum of money. Still, Sir Leonard Tilley, in 1883, had a surplus of $6,316,000, to which he added—and at that time my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was sitting in the House, and did not contradict him, so that I presume a different system of book-keeping at that time prevailed—to which he added from the sale of Dominion lands $1,744,000, making a total surplus of $8,060,000, surpassing the boasted surplus of the present year by some $6,000. At present, I need scarcely say, receipts from the sale of Dominion lands are to be found under the head of miscellaneous, and are included in the consolidated revenue of Canada. In 1884 Sir Leonard Tilley had again the pleasant duty devolving upon him of meeting parliament with a surplus of $7,064,492, and adding the receipts from the sale of Dominion lands amounting to $1,009,000, he was able to present to the House a total surplus of $8,073,492. And we must remember that that was 17 years in the past, when Canada was a comparatively small, poor, and unimportant country, compared with the Canada of to-day. At the same time Sir Leonard Tilley was in a postion to announce to parliament that the whole capital expenditure of the country, amounting to $14,171,413, had been met in full without borrowing a cent of money outside of the revenues and the resources which came into the hands of the government. That achievement, I need scarcely say to my hon. friends who will take the trouble to recall the facts, eclipses the brilliant record which the Finance Minister was able to lay before parliament yesterday.

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

Another point that becomes interesting is to contrast the mode in which these different Finance Ministers dealt with this happy condition of affairs. We find that Sir Leonard Tilley showed a great desire to benefit the people of the country, and so managed the finances of that day that he reduced the net debt of Canada from $36.17 to $35.75 per head, and reduced the net interest on the debt of Canada from $1.64 to $1.50 per head, diminishing the annual impost on every individual in the country by 14 cents, or a relief of taxation on every family in the country of some 70 cents. Contrast that with the condition of things to-day. Does my hon. friend the Minister of Finance use his surplus, the golden harvest which has been gathered, for this purpose and in this way ? No. We find that under the present Finance Minister, who no doubt his friends on the other side of the House would like to suppose is a greater Finance Minister than has been, the debt has increased from $63.33 per head to $64.75, an increase of $1.42, and the net interest has increased from $1.74 per head to $1.78, an increase of 4 cents per head, showing a difference between the two of 18 cents as the result upon every individual in the country.

What was the condition of affairs in those years ? The capital expenditure of the government then was very high. It was the period just on the eve of the rebellion in the North-west, and when there was great activity in canal and railway building and tremendous demands on the treasury were being made. In those three years the capital expenditure of Canada was $29,729,000, or an average of $9,909,771 per year, whereas in the four years of the present administration, the capital expenditure has been only $23,358,000, or $5,839,000 per year. Contrast the two expenditures on capital account, that of this government, amounting to $5,839,000 per year, and that of the Conservative government, in the period I have referred to, amounting to $9,900,000 per year, and you will see how much less expenditure this administration has had to meet, and yet the ministers of the period I have referred to, when a Conservative administration held office, were able, despite the fact that our population and resources were smaller, to exhibit surpluses greater than even those of which this government boasts.

What is the contrast in another respect. It will be found that the Finance Minister has not distinguished his term of office since 1897 by any great reduction in the taxes of the people, if we except the 12½ per cent, 25 per cent, and 33⅓ per cent taken, under the preferential tariff, off the duties on British goods. With the exception of this preference, the hon. gentleman has not made any reduction in the taxation. Compare his record in this respect with that of the late Sir Leonard Tilley. Sir Leonard Tilley in 1882 reduced taxation by one and a quarter million dollars, and in 1883 by a like amount.

He took this amount off the taxes with the full intention of diminishing the surplus and thereby lightening the burdens of the people, and yet, after making these reductions, he was still able to come before parliament with a surplus greater than that which the hon. the Finance Minister announced yesterday. It has been always held a proper policy for a finance minister to reduce taxation when he finds a buoyant revenue and a large surplus. I could recall capital speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite—particularly by the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce, pointing out the great danger attending a surplus and declaring that a finance minister, whose administration showed a large surplus, was not a good financial manager. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) has not succeeded in impressing this view, to which he so frequently gave such vigorous expression when in opposition, on his colleague, the Minister of Finance. The finance minister who succeeded Sir Leonard Tilley, the Hon. Geo. E. Foster, pursued the same course as did his predecessor. In 1891, when the country was very prosperous, when business was flourishing and the prospect of a surplus most certain, Mr. Foster took $2,000,000 off the taxes of the people, and he deliberately did so with the object of leaving that money in the pockets of the people instead of putting it into the treasury. He reduced the taxation of sugar by $3,500,000, and on the other hand imposed taxation of one million and a half dollars on malt, spirits and tobacco, making a net reduction of $2,000,000. But our present Finance Minister is wedded evidently to the opposite policy. His desire is to be able to boast of surpluses, but I do not know whether the people will enjoy his surpluses to the same extent as do the hon. gentleman and his supporters in this House. To my mind, the people would have far more reason to congratulate themselves if the Finance Minister would so manage the affairs of this country as to impose only such taxes as are necessary to avoid a deficit. But the hon. gentleman persists in keeping up the taxation so that he may be able to boast of a surplus.

In 1878 the net debt of Canada was $124,551,000; in 1896 it was $258,497,000, and in 1900 it was $265,000,000. There is nothing that seems to afford our hon. friends opposite so much pleasure as to make very unfair and misleading and improper statements in connection with the public accounts. During the few years they have been in office, they have had comparatively small capital expenditure to meet, compared with what the previous government had to meet in 1884 and 1885. The capital expenditure then rose to the point of $23,000,000 in one year. We then had to meet the cost of building the Canadian Pacific Railway and the expenses of the North-west rebellion, and were consequently adding to the capital debt of the country at the rate of $9,000,000 per year, as compared with a smaller capital expenditure of only $5,839,000 by this administration. So that it is not difficult to show that as regards the progress of Canada and the amount of money collected during the term of the present administration, and its addition to capital expenditure, that record is eclipsed by that of a previous Conservative administration.

I have indulged in these remarks principally because to a great extent the claim is made on the part of the government everywhere—not only on the hustings, but even here in the House of Commons, where men are supposed to know something of the facts—that we are living in an era of such prosperity as we never knew before, and that all this wonderful prosperity is entirely due to the financial guiding power and ability of our hon. friends opposite. This is a most absurd contention. I have pointed out facts to show that twenty years ago, when Canada was a poor country compared with to-day, a Conservative administration eclipsed the boasted record of the present government.

So far as the citizen of the country is concerned, he is not so much concerned in great surpluses as he is in economy. What is good for the citizen, 'the man in the street,' as he is called in the old country, is to have a government in power that will give him efficient service, security of life and property and light taxation. What is the record of this government in this respect? They have not reduced taxation, but have wonderfully increased it. It is true, they have, at various times in the past, condemned expenditures as extravagant and condemned them because they meant increased taxation. I might as well here recall to the memory of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce who, I regret to see, has left his place, an utterance of his own when he was in opposition and criticising the administration, to show the position he occupied toward this matter of expenditure at that time. In criticising the budget speech of Hon. Mr. Foster in 1896—the last occasion when the task devolved on the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright)—he expressed himself in this way. And I may say to those who listened to his speech to-day and noted not only what he said, but made correct and careful note of what he did not say, that the remarks that I am about to cite offer a remarkable contrast with his utterance of to-day:

> For my own part I do not hesitate to tell him that I consider a yearly expenditure of $40,000,000 of $38,300,000 altogether too large for the present resources of Canada. I say it is a disgrace and a shame to the government that have been entrusted with our affairs that they come down to us and ask for an expenditure of $38,300,000 a year for Federal purposes. Sir, the thing is wholly unjustifiable. . . . . The fact of the matter is that hon. gentlemen opposite have been discounting the future at a most

tremendous rate, and now the bills have come back and there are no assets wherewith to meet them. Sir, there is very little use on the part of hon. gentlemen whining over this matter. They ought to try and meet it, and the way to meet it is to reduce our present establishment, the way to meet it is to reduce your present extravagant mode of government and to reduce your extravagant ideas.

In 1897, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) went into power in company with his colleagues. In the year that had elapsed from the making of his speech in 1896 to his accepting office in 1897, affairs in Canada had changed only in that the recovery which was manifest in 1896 had continued to make its way. There was nothing in the circumstances of 1896 to justify the hon. gentleman in the statements he made, for instance, that we had been discounting the future at the most tremendous rate. We had been recuperating, we had been passing through a period of hard times, a period of rest, a period when the country was economizing and had gained a position from which it could go forward to greater expenditure, could begin to live upon a higher and more extravagant scale—as is the habit of governments as well of private individuals. If these remarks had been made by the hon. gentleman today in criticising the budget speech of his hon. friend the Minister of Finance, they would have been proper. We have been discounting the future; we have been taking every dollar we could from these fat years and spending it; we have not been putting one dollar of it away to meet the lean years that are to come. These remarks of the hon. gentleman would have been pregnant, pertinent, wise, if they had been made in criticising the budget speech of to-day; they were neither wise nor applicable in criticising the budget speech of Mr. Foster in 1896. What is the reason the hon. gentleman, who was so critical then, who was so rabid that his judgment persuaded him to say what he knows he could not defend anywhere, to make statements that are contrary to the facts and not to be defended—what is the reason that the hon. gentleman, who was so prone to criticism then that he was led to be unfair and unjust, who criticised so severly an expenditure of $38,000,000, sees nothing wrong in an expenditure that will touch if it does not exceed $46,000,000 ? The sole change apparent to me and to the country is that the hon. gentleman himself has got into office. The course which he recommended to the Conservative administration of reducing our present establishment, reducing the number of ministers and the cost of government has not been carried out. The ministers have been increased in number, and among the gentlemen so added to what he called an unnecessarily large establishment is the hon. minister himself. The hon. gentleman, so long as he is in this House, will not get up and argue that he should not be here—I presume that he is too logical for that. Before he makes up his mind to criticise the administration, his resignation will reach the premier, and he will be able to make that criticism a candid one. Is it possible that he will hesitate to make that small sacrifice in order that he may become once more the keen, unspairing critic of extravagant administration in Canada ?

An hon. MEMBER. He could not do justice to it.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). An hon. gentleman on this side has anticipated me. I am sorry that he who made so much of small opportunities during the years of Conservative administration is not on this side today. There is only one thing that would put him at a disadvantage—a lack of adjectives, I think he has quite exhausted the vocabulary in criticizing the Conservative administration. With such a task as would be presented to him if he were on this side, he would be in the position of the gentleman, who on one occasion was expected to indulge in a great burst of profanity, but said not a word except, 'I won't swear ; can't do justice to the subject.' Now, while we would like very much if we could have had the opportunity in indulging in an analysis of the fiscal management of this government, we would like also to lock horns with them on the subject of free trade or protection. We would like to have driven them out of the lines of Torres Vedras in which they are now so comfortably ensconsced, get them in the open and make them declare whether they are or are not in favour of protection. There is one subject on which our hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has given us a large invitation. He has asked us to name those expenditures we would like to have stopped, to specify the taxes we would like to have reduced. I think it is not very difficult to meet his views in that respect. I think it would not be difficult, in the matter of public works, to make large economies without impairing the efficiency of the service. For instance, the expenditure on the Sorel bridge, to which attention has been called by the Auditor General, might have been much less without injury to any public interest. I think that numerous cases in which contracts are let without tender might have been managed by hon. gentlemen on this side so as to economize considerably. I think we could have built telegraph lines in British Columbia without such expense as has been indulged in by these hon. gentlemen. I think we could have economized to the extent of a couple of millions in the subsidies to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway.

I think, on the other hand, if we had been on that side of the House during the last four years we could have been able to specify some matters in respect of which we would have removed the taxation. I

do not see why the Minister of Finance did not make some suggestions of that nature, while maintaining that protection of the industries of this country in which we support him, and for which we give him credit, according us that sincerest form of flattery which he has administered to our vanity in imitating our policy. If we had been on that side of the House we could have suggested changes in the tariff which would have impaired the rotundity of his remarkable surplus, and which would not have impaired the rotundity of the purse of the public. We could have suggested the removal of the taxation on sugar, of the taxation on tobacco; we could have suggested that in many other respects which are properly the subjects of a revenue tariff, the tariff could have been reduced on the necessaries of life to the lowest possible point. But the hon. gentleman will probably not take our advice in this matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think the hon. gentleman would give it.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I am giving it in all sincerity. A government which is going to maintain a protective system can derive money enough from the duties on protected articles, and still relieve many other articles by making them subject to a revenue tariff.

Now, there is another point in reference to which the Minister of Finance seemed to be in a somewhat combative mood, he was very anxious to have his course challenged in respect to the preferential tariff, he wishes that the opposition should challenge his course in that matter. The hon. gentleman reminds me of the miserable plight in which Sinbad the sailor found himself after he had foolishly allowed the old man of the seas to get upon his shoulder. He found himself choked and incommoded by the manner in which the old man of the sea gripped him about the neck, and when he suggested that the old man get off his shoulders, he, feeling very comfortable where he was, resigned to his situation, declined to quit. I believe the Minister of Finance with his preference to England on his back is in a similar situation, he put it there and let him keep it there. He is anxious apparently that the opposition should help him out of his dilemma. He blundered into it, he may blunder out of it; if not, let him blunder along until he falls under the weight of it, as he undoubtedly will. There can be no question whatever that if nothing else drives this government into a corner where they will be compelled to make an honest and public declaration of their policy, and to say whether they are genuine protectionists or hybrid free traders, it will be the operations of this precious preference to England. It is a thing that no man on this side of the House approves. But, as I have said, our hon. friends have got themselves into this plight, and by all means let them stay there until they find some way of relieving themselves. Now, the objections to such a policy are numerous. In the first place, while there may be some value in the sentimental considerations which are asserted continually, they are very intangible. When the Minister of Trade and Commerce, with his great experience, spoke, I hoped to hear something important from him. When he told us today that he was prepared to defend the preference and challenged the opposition to say anything against it, I hoped to hear him say something to justify it. Now, what was the extent of his justification? It was a bare assertion that the sentiment aroused, the effect produced upon the English mind by the knowledge of the fact that Canada alone of all the world had given that country a tariff preference, increased our exports to that country. The hon. gentleman made that assertion, I presume it was necessary for him to make some assertion, but did he furnish one vestige of proof of that assertion? Did he suggest one consideration that made that assertion a probability, that made it a likelihood? Not one. There is only the bald assertion that the kindly sentiments aroused in the minds of the English people by the preference we had given them, the fact that we had shown them a disposition to help them in the work of developing their trade, has earned for us a kindly place in their minds, to such an extent that they will buy our goods. Now, I do not believe that. I am prepared to believe it on reasonable proof, I have never heard any proof whatever, and I decline to accept even the assertion of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the one thing follows the other. The facts are against it. The relative developments of trade as proved by the figures cited last night by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) discredit the statement. The showing is that while our trade with Great Britain has increased, it has increased much more largely with other countries to which we have shown no favour whatever. The evidence goes to show that while our trade has increased with Great Britain, it has increased far more with the United States. So that the whole argument falls to the ground, and in calling it an argument, I am showing sincere kindness towards the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I am conceding to him a great deal out of a sense of politeness. To my mind it is an argument that does not carry conviction. On the other hand, this mode of assisting the British manufacturer is, to my mind, exceedingly objectionable. What is the fact of the case? Supposing that we wanted to benefit England, supposing we wanted to bestow a large advantage upon

her, the greatest advantage we can possibly bestow on her is by maintaining a good understanding with that country, by drawing closer and closer the ties of kinship and the feeling of kindness, while at the same time endeavouring to build up this country to a point, to a stature, at which it will be a more and more powerful ally and a strong arm to Great Britain, if she should ever need our help.

Now, how can we do that? That question was settled in 1879. One of the objections made at that time to the establishment of a protective tariff in Canada was that it was an unfriendly act towards Great Britain, a country which depended upon its manufactures, which prized its foreign trade. It was argued then that possibly the British government might even disallow our protective tariff on the ground that it was striking at British trade. But the men of that day who passed the national policy, who put the national policy into operation, had considered all these things, they met the objection that it was an unfriendly act to Great Britain, they faced that bugbear, for bugbear it was, they were not frightened by it, and they faced that consideration in 1879, and settled it then. Their protective tariff was not hampered, or impaired, or emasculated, by sentimental consideration for the manufacturers of Great Britain. Nothing of the kind was allowed to affect the efficiency of the national policy at that time, and nothing of the kind should be allowed to affect the efficiency of the national policy to-day. Therefore, I say if this administration is ever brought to their knees, when pressure of hard times will come to the manufacturing industries of this country, and bring them to that point where they will approach the government for relief, if this government is then going to maintain the position of a protectionist administration, it will have to look carefully into the effect of this preferential tariff. I believe that the very preference into which this administration fell by accident will force them at a very early date to declare themselves either straight protectionists, as I would like to see them, or to go back to their old love which was inculcated in them by Brown, Mackenzie and all the other worthies who were leaders of their party before 1879, and to declare themselves a free trade or a revenue tariff party, not only so, but to live such a life in the eyes of men as will prove them to be a free trade and a revenue tariff party.

Now, what is the objection to this preference? It is sometimes called a concession made to the British public. If it is a concession it amounts to very little. It is one that is conferred not upon the whole British population, but only upon a section of it. Now, the whole effect of the preference so far has been to increase the imports of Canada from Great Britain in the last year by $7,729,000.

Now, as this is rather an important point, perhaps I had better deal with it as a whole. The total imports of Canada in 1896 were $110,000,000, and in 1900, $189,000,000. Our total trade in imports increased in four years $79,000,000. The increase in the last year, this extraordinary year, this year in which we have had a most startling development of trade, has been $35,000,000, or nearly $36,000,000. Great Britain's part of this business, for the year 1896, amounted to $33,000,000, and for the year 1900, to $45,000,000. In exact figures, our trade with Great Britain increased in four years by $11,809,988, and in the last year, in which the most satisfactory increase has been made, satisfactory from the point of view of those who like that kind of thing, because it has been very well said that for people who like that kind of thing, that is the kind of thing they like, the increase was $7,729,607. We, on this side of the House, do not like it at all, because, as far as we can see, this increase has been at the expense, not of the whole people of Canada, but at the expense of a very limited class of the people of Canada, a matter to which I will refer later on. Taking now the United States imports, they amounted to $58,000,000 in 1896, while, in 1900, they amounted to $110,000,000, showing an increase in four years of $51,000,000, and in the last year, an increase of $17,000,000. Relatively, the increase in trade from Great Britain is larger. It is not surprising that it should be so, but the whole increase in our trade from the United States, amounting to $17,000,000, is more than double the increase in trade from Great Britain. Our imports from other countries also increased. We bought, in 1896, $19,000,000 worth, and in 1900, $35,000,000 worth. In four years our trade with other countries increased by nearly $16,000,000, and in the last year it increased by $9,000,000, so that, as compared with the rate of increase in our trade from Great Britain, it does not show to advantage at all. Our trade from a number of other countries increased from $19,000,000 to $35,000,000, and in the last year it increased by $9,000,000, whereas the trade from Great Britain showed an increase of $7,729,607 last year. However, this is not as conclusive, perhaps, as the figures given by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), because, he showed that, whereas the government party are, in this matter, driven to argue and to try and persuade the public that we are getting our advantage indirectly, that while we are increasing our imports from Great Britain, to a great extent, we are largely increasing the exports from this country, his evidence goes to show that Great Britain stood eighth in the list of countries in the order or proportion of their trade. So that, the fact of the

matter is, that despite this preference given to Great Britain, our trade with that country has not increased as rapidly as it has with other countries to which we make no concession whatever.

Now, there is another very marked objection to this preference. It is given only to a special class in Great Britain. It is given only to a very limited portion of that class, because there are very many lines of manufacture in Great Britain which cannot compete with similar industries in the United States or in Canada. The advantage therefrom is derived by the manufacturers of woollens and some lines of metal. In wood, tobacco, and other manufactures they cannot compete. We can hold our own in manufactures of paper, and some other lines, and the consequence is that the scapegoat, the man who is called upon to make all these sacrifices in order that Canada shall acquire certain advantages of a sentimental character, is the manufacturer of a comparatively limited number of lines of goods in Canada. Take the manufacturers of woollens, for instance ; they tell us that they cannot face the competition to which they are subjected under a tariff that has been reduced by 33⅓ per cent. Why should a certain industry be singled out for destruction in order to secure a sentimental consideration of this kind ? If Canada wishes to confer an advantage on the empire, it should put a tax on all the citizens of Canada to defray the cost of that advantage, and not throw this burden upon one particular class. Apart from that, no man who is thoroughly in favour of adopting protection as the national fiscal system of Canada can justify that process, if it be one that throws a burden upon any particular industry in the country. The whole purpose of protection is to protect ; and to introduce into the system a provision which makes it inefficient is a course that can be followed by no government that honestly believes in protection. For a protective government to have tacked to this system such a form of modifying the tariff as this preference, is to show that these hon. gentlemen do not understand what they are doing, when they are, on the one hand, protecting by their system some industries, and on the other excluding some industries from its advantages. If, at the same time, their system is allowed to go to its legitimate end, it must end in disaster to the whole system, to the industries of the country, and they will be forced to deal with the subject at an early day.

There were a great many things in the budget speech which were very pleasing, because they conveyed to us the knowledge that the country is prosperous. However, there were a good many things not dealt with that one would naturally expect to be contained in a message indicating the condition of prosperity in which the country is. There are, I think, many portions of the world to which we might turn our eyes with the view of extending our trade. In the last budget speech, one of the most notable points was the information as to a proposed arrangement with a portion of the West Indies, by which we expected to develop a certain amount of trade in that direction. Unfortunately, that matter fell through, and it is a somewhat singular thing that, in the budget speech made this year, there is no reference whatever to any negotiations, or any attempt to regulate, or improve our relations with outside countries, and notably, no intimation made whatever to show that any effort has been made to develop our trade with the West Indies. This is a matter in respect to which I think the government should be alive ; they should be awake and hard at work. I believe it is only necessary for Canada to take in the West Indies to round out her confederation, to make it a perfect government, to give it all those diversities of climate, soil and product that will make it a self-supporting and practically independent part of the world. With the addition of the West Indian islands, so far as this country is concerned, I would not exchange places with the United States, powerful as they are. I think in that case we will be a microcosm, a little world, and we will have added to our territories a contiguous territory which would enable us to develop some very valuable resources. Then, there is another point, and that arises in connection with the preference tariff, to which I have paid some little attention. That is, the discrimination of Germany against the products of Canada. The government makes no reference to that. Apparently the government has never thought of it. Is the government prepared to take any action now to protect Canadian interests or is it inert ? Is it aware of this fact, or is it in the position of the Minister of Railways, who discovered only from a private telegram read by a private member, that an important portion of his railway system was blocked up by snow ? Is it possible that the administration is not aware that discrimination is being used against the exports of this country in Germany ? Is it possible the government has no remedy to offer ? Is it not a singular thing that in the one opportunity during the year which the Finance Minister has of telling the people of Canada how he is looking after their affairs and what proposals he has to make for the future, that the Finance Minister neglects to give any consideration to a most important matter affecting the country ? Or is it possible that the government shrink from their duty ? If so, I would remind them that here again there is a contrast between their attitude and that of the Conservative administration, because so far back as 1883 Sir Leonard Tilley said :

If we fail to make satisfactory arrangements with the governments that do not place the

natural products and the manufactures of Canada on equal terms with those of any other country, we will ask parliament, at the next session, to impose a duty of 10 per cent additional on their products until they grant us such terms.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is what we are doing now.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Where ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is exactly what we are doing now ; imposing a material difference—not exactly 10 per cent—between the duties on German goods and British goods.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). That is a most unworthy statement.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It happens to be a fact, and I suppose therefore the hon. gentleman thinks it unworthy.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). It just shows the size of the calibre that suits the Finance Minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The House can judge of calibre between us.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). It is just about his size. What he does is actually to put Germany on an inequality with one other country in the world and leaving her exactly equal with every other country in the world. That is a most unworthy statement of the Finance Minister, and I would be tempted to use even the stronger word 'evasion' in reference to the unfortunate remark made by the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not happen to think so ; we will have to differ.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I do not doubt at all the difference would be in my favour. Then we are to assume that the duty apparently has been discharged by the government. We now have it on the high authority of the Finance Minister that they have dealt with this question, and, therefore, I presume I need not waste my time in arguing further on the question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). We know from the Finance Minister that they have done all that is necessary under the circumstances. They are apparently satisfied. Germany can go on and discriminate against Canada and I presume the government will still impose that 10 per cent—as the Minister of Finance says—discrimination against her in the same vigorous and effective manner in which they are imposing it now. Hurrah for this government. It is a great day for Canada that its interests are so well guarded.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend had better explain what he would do about it.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I have already explained what a predecessor of this Finance Minister would do about it, and although I am not in a position to promise too much, I venture to assure the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) that so far as he does at any time stand up and strike a blow in the interest of Canada as against any foreign country, he will have the support of the Conservative opposition of this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have gone, somewhat inadequately perhaps, over the various features of the budget speech that attracted my attention. I regret very much to find that the charge which has been made at times against this administration, not only by members of the opposition but by the independent people of the country, is borne out by the facts as we see them to-day. The great merit of this administration since 1897 was in their capacity to follow. Their great good fortune was that they succeeded an administration which lived a long time and which gave that feature of stability and firmness to the tariff which the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) spoke of as a good thing that attracted his commendation and approval. But, Sir, that quality of stability and permanency in the fiscal system of Canada has not altogether grown up during the years which the hon. gentleman has been Finance Minister. It has been a characteristic of that system since 1879, and that these last four years have not been an unfortunate exception to that stability is due to the fact that he and his friends very properly determined to follow in the footsteps of their predecessors and in consequence to abandon every profession and every pledge they made while in opposition. In every department of government these gentlemen in office have acted most wisely in continuing the course of their predecessors. They have disturbed nothing. In connection with this, perhaps I may read an extract from the speech of the Minister of Finance in 1897, when he found it necessary to turn that sharp corner which they had to take. He said :

> Every man who invested a dollar in the national policy——

That is, I suppose, in the industries fostered by the national policy, because I do not think this was a policy game, although it had a policy name.

> Every man who invested a dollar in the national policy did so with his eyes wide open to certain important facts. He was well aware that from the beginning down to the end the national policy was condemned by one of the great political parties in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wonder what party that was.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). You will find out by-and-by.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). It will be in the sweet by-and-by when we pass from this sublunary sphere. I think it has gone to that limbo in which ghosts and disembodied spirits play their part.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I will be able to tell you one hon. member who condemned it.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). How does he vote now ?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). He is on the opposite side of the House.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). He probably is and votes for this revenue tariff-protective administration.

Mr. BENNETT. And bounties on iron.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). And bounties on iron, no doubt. I go on with the reading of the extract :

He was well aware that every effort had to be put forth by governmental influence and such influences as the manufacturers themselves are well aware of——

I wonder if the manufacturers are well aware of these influences now. I have reason to think that during the last campaign in the country the manufacturers were well aware of these influences and were looked to by the government to exert themselves.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. More so than ever.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Even to a greater degree perhaps. I quote again :

—in order to obtain from the public an apparent endorsement of that policy.

Apparently that endorsement was satisfactory because it has passed current with the gentlemen who came into power ; it was discounted in full.

Now, the manufacturers knew of this and they must have known that when they put their money into these factories they were taking their risks. There was a speculative element in the whole national policy business, and the men who played the game and gathered in the winnings ought to be prepared when the turn of the tide comes, to pay the losses and try to look pleasant.

I am surprised to find that my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding) speaks so familiarly in the language of a certain element of sports in which I did not know he was so well versed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He probably visited New Glasgow occasionally.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I quote again from the Finance Minister :

I wish to emphasize the fact that it never has been the policy of the Liberal party, as declared by any member of the Liberal party occupying a responsible position, if they came into power to destroy at one movement all the manufacturing industries or so change that policy as to place them in peril.

What a lovely thing it was that all the time these gentlemen were going about Canada denouncing protection and the bloated monopolists, and the thieves, and robbers, and praying no doubt night and morning for the salvation of that unhappy victim who had been bled white—is it not a lovely thing to know that during all that time these hon. gentlemen were carrying in their breasts this lovely reservation ; this saving grace, this clause that saved them ; that it was never their idea when they came into power to destroy by one fell movement the policy of protection. And here I take it there is another saving clause apparently. They are not to destroy it by one movement, but they are to destroy it by a very great number of small movements, and by a graduation so imperceptible that we will not get to the end of it when that period of 25 years has expired which we have been talking about. The Finance Minister goes on to say :

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people. And we declare our conviction that any tariff changes, based on that principle, must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country suffers.

That issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

What issue was that ? It was the issue of a gentleman who believed in free trade, who denounced protection, but who, with his healthy and wholesome reservation, thought that his creeds, his convictions, did not pledge him at all to destroy the manufacturing industries of the country or place them in peril, or change the policy that existed. That is the issue—a lovely issue, a double-barrelled issue; an issue which placed him not between the two horns of a dilemma, but between two comfortable seats on either of which he might reach office. The Finance Minister calls that an issue. Yes, it is a very satisfactory one for him and his party; they are in power, the industries of the country have not been interfered with, and the policy has not been disturbed. I do not know that he will find any party in this country ready to grapple with him on that issue, unless possibly some third party arises that would be willing to do so. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) might be prepared to take up that issue; but as long as we are limited in this country to the two great issues of a revenue tariff on the one hand and protection on the other, it will be difficult to find a party ready to join issue with a party which believes in both of these things at once.

Now, a great feature of my hon. friend the Finance Minister's policy when he was in the government of Nova Scotia was to do nothing—to draw his salary and stay in office; and possibly his coming to this government marks the adoption of such a policy here. We will see whether this system, which worked so well in a small field, will be equally successful in the larger one, and whether this government will succeed simply by staying in office and drawing their salaries. While I am prepared to look as favourably on this government as any man in Canada who is an opponent of theirs, I

do begin to fear that there is a little truth in the criticism which has been directed against them, that they lack initiative. What have they done or originated since they came into power in 1896 ? What have they changed ? Well, they changed one thing: I believe they turned down the fast Atlantic service, and they have not yet revived it. I have no doubt, however, that true to their system of sooner or later carrying out those features of their opponents' policy which they come to believe are popular with the public, they will ultimately revive that project. But what have they themselves initiated ? What new departure have they made ? I ask for an answer, and there is no answer. Nothing; they have made no change; they have shown no originality, no inventiveness, no ingenuity. I believe their whole idea is to do just as my hon. friend the Finance Minister did when he was in the government of Nova Scotia—avoid running up against anybody's prejudices or doing anything that would provoke opposition, but hang on to the sweets of office as long as possible.

There is one great party in Canada which has never been known to be satisfied with simply doing nothing. The Conservative party had its faults, no doubt, because no man or party is faultless; but it was a party which had thrown upon it the burden of developing a great country, and they developed it. They had to take upon themselves that task at a time when this country was comparatively poor, a task which might have daunted the legislators of a much older and richer country, and they performed that task, I need scarcely say, in the face of a great deal of opposition from hon. gentlemen opposite. They wrought out everything of value which we have in Canada to-day—our system of government, our canal system, our railway system, our judicial system. Everything of value which we have in Canada to-day was set in motion by the Conservatives. There is not a single thing in Canada to-day, except that preference into which these gentlemen fell or blundered, to show that they are in power, except the fact that they are drawing their salaries and occupying their offices and that their names appear attached to certain public documents. Now, there is work for them to do. There is a tremendous task lying immediately in front of the government of Canada, and that is to go on and develop and perfect that system of international preference which we who are Imperialists long to see and under which this country will grow up as one of a great band of sister nations associated with the mother country. We want to see the trade between the mother country and all the colonies developed. The Finance Minister says it cannot be done—you cannot get this preferential trade. Why not ? He says you cannot get it because Lord Salisbury is not in favour of it, because Mr. Chamberlain is not in favour of it; and he rests his opinion of Mr. Chamberlain's views on a newspaper article which referred to what occurred in an informal interview which a gentleman of Ottawa had with Mr. Chamberlain. But are we to cease exerting ourselves to secure this great and desirable result simply because certain statesmen of the mother country express themselves unfavourably to it ? No. That was not the course pursued by the Conservative government. Hon. gentlemen know what obstacles the Belgian and German treaties were in the way of preferential trade, and how the government of Canada for twenty years asked that those obstacles should be removed, and were met with a constant refusal. They know how, when the colonial convention met in Ottawa, a formal request was made for their removal, and how that was refused also. Then, hon. gentlemen opposite had the good luck to come to the day of reaping after all that sowing, and in their time these treaties, which we were told could not be abrogated, were denounced by the British government. These gentlemen, by their preferential tariff, blundered into such a position that it forced the hand of the mother country——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELL (Pictou)—and the mother country, in kindness, to help them out of their difficulty—because at that time the preference, instead of being a preference to Great Britain, was extended, through the blundering of these gentlemen, to no less than twenty-three countries. Laugh now, if you please. I think there are quite a number of new members in this House, Mr. Speaker, who laugh a little out of place. The preference was extended to twenty-three countries, not one of which had extended corresponding benefits to this country which were supposed to be necessary in order to get the preference. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that it was not a blunder that compelled him and his government to admit the goods of all these countries into this country under the preference, while they maintained hostile tariffs against us ? One happy result was the abrogation of the German and Belgian treaties by the British government, and the result of that abrogation shows that the Conservative contention that Great Britain would not suffer was the correct one. Both Germany and Belgium were willing to renew the treaties without the objectionable feature.

Let these hon. gentlemen make another move and see whether they cannot blunder into another such situation. They may not do it by design, but may by accident, but if they do not move at all, whatever chance we might have of taking advantage of the present opportune moment may be lost. Theirs is a great work to be accomplished, and that work will not be done if these hon. gentlemen will restrict themselves to considering simply what Lord Salisbury or

Mr. Chamberlain wants or even what the people of England want. We are rapidly attaining the position in this world in which our sister colonies and ourselves stand on a position of equality, so far as wealth, industry and energy are concerned, with the people of the mother country, and I should not be at all surprised if it would be the happy function of my right hon. friend and those associated with him to show the way to the statesmen of Great Britain of accomplishing a policy which will make all parts of this great empire one in self-interest as well as in sentiment. We have solved problems in Canada that might well have daunted the statesmen of any country. We have, in the course of a few years, with a handful of people, created a great empire without any help from Downing Street. We have shown what a comparatively small people can accomplish. Then let these hon. gentlemen on the government benches not be discouraged by a simple refusal to be heard in Downing Street, let them leave Downing Street severely alone, and approach the people of Australia and the other British colonies in different parts of the world, and let all these branches of the one great family make common cause and approach unitedly the British government. I have given my right hon. friend credit for more ability than he thinks he possesses, for I believe that with the assistance of the premiers of the other colonies he would be able to formulate a scheme by which the mother country and all her colonies could enter into the full enjoyment of a common preferential tariff. The task lies at the hands of this government, and I hope that when we next meet, the government will be in a position to show the people of Canada that they are in sympathy with the great mass of our people, because our people do believe in the advantage of preferential trade and a fiscal system that would knit into one whole all the English-speaking colonies. I hope that the government will show themselves alive to the necessities of the hour, and will come here next session, if not with a complete scheme, at least with the facts collected which will enable the people to arrive at some conclusion as to the best method of accomplishing what the great majority desire.

I am sorry that it has been my painful duty to tear away that vision of golden enjoyment in which the Prime Minister and his supporters are now revelling. It is too bad that I should have been able to show that when this country was not half as rich as it now is, it could boast of as large surpluses and show a much better use made of the money, and at the same time show a considerable reduction in taxes.

I congratulate my hon. friends on the fact that they are living in such good times. I also congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Finance on the fact that he has not lost the shrewdness for which he was noted in our province. Like an experienced sailor, he is evidently quite aware that a gale is brewing. He sees the skies darkening, the waters foaming, and is taking in a reef and preparing the crew for rough weather before long, so that they may not be too much disturbed when the winds break on the vessel and the salt seas flow over it. But the hon. gentleman's views have changed considerably. When he was in opposition, and a reaction set in, and the tide of prosperity changed, he and his friends said that was a proof of misgovernment, that the country was being robbed and everything going to the dogs.

On this side of the House, however, we do not take that position. We are prepared to admit that it is perfectly natural the tide should turn, and are pleased that the Finance Minister should see the change coming, but we would be better pleased if we saw some preparation for the change in the estimates. No doubt, however, this administration finds it hard to make the expenditure any smaller than that in which they have been indulging during the last four or five years.

The hon. gentleman speaks of this approaching period of depression, not as the result of misgovernment—as he would have done were he in opposition—but as a necessary period of rest and recuperation, and upon the existence of which he is actually in a position to congratulate the country. Why, it is almost worth the money it has cost Canada to see how these gentlemen have changed their views. Depression is no longer an evidence that the country is being mismanaged and misgoverned, but is merely an evidence that the country is resuming a more healthy condition and getting ready for greater exertions in the future. How is it that that view of the question never struck that wonderfully wise man the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) during eighteen years? It may have struck him, he may have been fully impressed with it, but if so he kept his opinion profoundly secret. When on this side, he was always prepared to denounce and never to praise, but things have wonderfully changed since the hon. gentleman obtained office, and to-day we have him admitting what he would have never acknowledged previous to 1896, namely, that Canada is getting rich.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance pointed to the deposits in the post office savings bank, and to the note circulation as evidences of prosperity. Well, I have been pretty observant in political affairs, and I never met during the years the late government was in power any Liberal speaker who was prepared to admit that there was anything in such matters. They would all tell us that undoubtedly the country was being bled white for the benefit

of the bloated manufacturers and that the deposits in the savings banks and the note circulation did not mean anything. It is really gratifying to find these hon. gentlemen converted to more rational views.

But, I fear that my hon. friend the Finance Minister may not have anticipated the full force of the approaching gales. He is still figuring on a very large surplus. I hope he may get it, but there are certain indications that the stringency coming may be more severe than the hon. gentleman anticipates. There are certain things which indicate the coming change. The hon. gentleman spoke of the wonderful development of our exports. Well, I have not the advantage of access to the latest documents as has the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but I have access to the customs returns to the end of November, and I find that while the exports of bullion from the Yukon amounted to $14,000,000 or $15,000,000 over the same five months of the preceding year, and while there is a small excess in manufactures, every other department of our exports has fallen off quite largely—the forests, animals and their products, agricultural products, the fisheries, every one is diminished. There is another thing even more important, a point of which Sir Leonard Tilley took good note when he anticipated the decline coming in 1883, and that is the probable great decrease in prices. We have had good times in Canada, marvellously good times. This is due to a variety of circumstances. The first is the one great general cause, the swing of the pendulum upwards, which is world-wide. The second cause has been the war between Spain and the United States. Then there are the war in the Transvaal, the good crops and the Yukon, with its enormous development. And lastly, there is the enormous increase in prices. Prices, since these hon. gentlemen came into power, have advanced 20 per cent according to Bradstreet's table—from 68 to 88. That state of affairs is not going to last long. At an early day we are going to see a change. The apparent shrinkage of the exports of this country and the shrinking prices that will accompany it will, I fear, bring a state of affairs worse than my hon. friend the Minister of Finance expects. I hope it may not be so. In that, I am sure, I voice the opinion of hon. gentlemen on this side. While hon. gentlemen opposite, when on this side, did take pleasure to a certain extent in pointing out all the losses, all the bad balances that took place in the history of Canada, I do not think there is a man on this side who will not rejoice to see the country prosperous even beyond the expectation of the hon. Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, there are very many other points to which I would like to address myself, but I observe that it is six o'clock, and I will conclude my remarks.

At Six o'clock, House took recess.

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 20) respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—Hon. Mr. Prior.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the United Empire Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Birkett.

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Pontiac Colonization Railway Company.—Mr. Murray.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. CHARLES S. HYMAN (London). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that members on this side of the House, and I am equally sure that members on the other side, are pleased at the courteous manner in which the debate, so far, has been carried on. I can only trust that to the end of the debate, we may have the same courtesy, the same kindly feeling, between the two parties in this House; that we shall continue to recognize as we ought, though we may differ as regards certain principles, that, as representatives of the people of this country, we should all endeavour to work out the destiny of the country to the best of our powers. The courtesy of debate has been very largely contributed to, I feel sure, by the happy statement that the Finance Minister has been able to make with regard to the finances of Canada. It must have given the hon. minister great pleasure, not merely as representing the people of Canada in the important office of Finance Minister, but as speaking on behalf of his party, to be able to make to the House the statements he did in his speech. It must have been a matter of congratulation to him to be able to announce that the revenue of the country for the year ending 30th June, 1900, had been $51,029,000, and the expenditure only $42,975,000, thus giving the very gratifying surplus for the year of no less than $8,054,000.

And still greater, Mr. Speaker, must have been the hon. gentleman's pleasure to be able to tell the House, that, notwithstanding the normal current expenditure, and notwithstanding the large expenditure on capital account, he was enabled to reduce the debt of this country by no less a sum than $779,000. Now, we have had a somewhat lengthy speech this afternoon from the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) and he was pleased, during his remarks, to make some reference to the fact that the great province of Ontario had condemned the present government. I do not know whether this hon. gentleman is aware of the facts of the case, but if he has carefully studied the subject, if he will, for a mo-

ment, remember, that, in 1881, this great province was gerrymandered from one end to the other, if he will remember that not only was it gerrymandered in 1881, but, that the process was repeated in 1891, he may possibly find same reason for the vote which was cast in the last general election in that province. I may give this crumb of comfort to the hon. gentleman, that if he were to take the vote that was polled for the different Liberal candidates in the province of Ontario in 1891, and if he were to apply that vote to the different constituencies as divided for the local legislature, he would find the Liberal party would have a distinct majority from that province in this House. But, fortunately, as the poet might say, there are others. The province of Ontario is not the only province in this Dominion, and if that province did condemn the government, probably for the reasons I have given, what shall we say of the province from which the hon. gentleman himself comes ? What shall we say of the province of Nova Scotia ? Surely the policy of the government is not condemned in the province of Nova Scotia, but, on the other hand, the government came from the province of Nova Scotia in a very much stronger position than before the election. What shall we say of the province of New Brunswick ? The province of New Brunswick did not condemn the government. What shall we say of the great province of Quebec ? The province of Quebec certainly did not condemn the government. What shall we say of the North-west Territories, from which not one member opposed to the government sits in this Chamber ? And what shall we say of the province of British Columbia in which the government have a decided majority ? I think that this country has grown to be too large, that it has passed the time when provinces and provinces only can be considered, and I think that the policy of the government, as pronounced upon, not by any one particular province, but, by the people of this country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, is shown to be acceptable by the majority of members we have on this side of the House. I am not going to follow at any great length the hon. member for Pictou, but, as far as I could follow his speech his main charge was directed to what he was pleased to call the inconsistencies of the government. Now, there may be hon. gentlemen in this House who might with some degree of fairness make that charge against the government, but I do think that when we come to look somewhat casually into the speeches that the hon. gentleman, who now so glibly says the government is inconsistent, has made, it will be seen that the charge will stick more closely to him than he succeeded in making it against the government. I have before me a copy of the lecture delivered by the hon. gentleman in the year 1891 in which he says :

> I consider the argument of the free trader unanswerable. I believe at this moment that if Canada took a liberal step in the direction of free trade it would go a longer way to place her upon the road to the greatest prosperity. The reasons why I consider Canada should turn about and adopt a free trade policy are : (a) that we might free ourselves from the dominating influences of the United States; (b) on account of the failure of the national policy; (c) because of the startling revelations of the census.

Surely, it does not become the hon. member, who gave, no later than 1891, vent to such sentences as I have read, to spend probably three-quarters of the time of his speech trying to find inconsistencies on the part of the government. But the hon. gentleman was not content with that. Again, in 1896, he made another speech from which I quote :

> The great issue for this election is the trade and tariff question. I avow myself an admirer of the national policy, and am prepared to support it in preference to any so-called free trade policy which could be put forth.

Now, he deliberately, thereafter, and in his speech to-day, charged the Liberal party with having appropriated their policy—I presume, meaning the so-called national policy. While it may be true in part, the very most we can be charged with, if such is the fact, is petty larceny in any case. The hon. gentleman, after having accused the government of appropriating their policy, says, that, so far as the Conservative party are concerned, they stand by the old policy. If we have appropriated their policy and if the hon. gentleman as a member of the Conservative party, stands by that policy, I would like to know why he should take up the time of the House so long in condemning that which he stands by. But, I take issue with the hon. gentleman even upon that question ; I say that the policy is not the same policy and if he will carefully go into the different items of the tariff he will find considerable differences. He will find that in more than 140 items in the tariff there have been reductions, and large reductions, and he will find, that, if he were to apply the old policy to the imports of last year, the government would have taken from the pockets of the people something more than $3,000,000, but herein, I say, lies the greatest difference. Notwithstanding the fact that the Conservative party were in power for so many years, notwithstanding the enormous majorities, that, during most of the time, they had at their back, did they ever succeed in making any preferential arrangement, or giving any preference to Great Britain ? Therein lies very largely the difference between the old policy of protection of the Conservative party and the new policy of the Liberal party. The only two tariff items to which the hon. gentleman referred were the tariff on oil and the bounties. So far as the tariff on oil is concerned, under the old government, the tariff was 7 cents a gallon and under the

present government the tariff is 5 cents a gallon, a reduction of very nearly 30 per cent. As regards the bounties to be paid on iron and steel, I fancy the great difference between the policies of the two parties lies in this, that, while the bounty was inaugurated by the Conservative government, there never was any finality. The Liberal party took the matter in hand, and very properly said that while they would still continue the bounty for a certain number of years there would undoubtedly come a period when these industries could exist and flourish without that bounty. And so they have changed the policy in that particular, and have taken, I think, a very wise course indeed.

Now we had, as the chief financial critic of the opposition, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) who I am sorry is not present, and one of his chief complaints against the present government was that of increased expenditure and extravagance. But I did not hear during the whole course of his remarks that he took exception to one single item of expenditure that the present government have made. Now, I do not think that the hon. gentleman chosen as the chief financial critic of the opposition, is entitled to a great deal of credit when he makes general charges of extravagance, but will not take the responsibility of laying his finger upon one single item to which he takes exception. Of course we know perfectly well why he did not do so. We know that if he objected to any particular item it would probably have a political effect against his party in some particular locality. Therefore, unless he is willing to share some of the responsibility for objecting to some particular items, his opinion is not entitled to much respect.

The hon. gentleman stated that so far as the Canadian farmer and exporter were concerned, they were at a great disadvantage in Germany on account of the abrogation of the treaty, and of Canada having been removed from the favoured-nation clause. I was somewhat surprised, after listening to his speech, to turn up the figures of our trade with Germany, and to find that the exports from Canada to Germany in 1896 amounted to $757,000 in round numbers; while in 1900, after the abrogation of that treaty and the exclusion of Canada from the favoured-nation clause they had grown to $1,715,000, or 130 per cent. So I do not think that his criticism in that respect amounts to very much. With regard to our imports from Germany, I find that in 1896, we bought $5,931,000 worth, while in 1900, we bought $8,383,000 worth. So that while our purchases from Germany increased 41 per cent, our exports to that country increased 130 per cent.

The hon. member for Toronto laid down some very strange propositions, and one proposition that he laid down with a great deal of fervour, was that the time had come when the bonusing of railroads, especially in the older provinces, should cease. One particular railway that he happened to mention runs from the town of Amherstburg in western Ontario to Ridgetown. He did not object bonusing that part of it, but he did object to that road having been bonused by the present government from Ridgetown to St. Thomas. Now, what are the facts of the case ? That road was projected a number of years ago, that road was bonused from Walkerville to Ridgetown, not by the present government, but by the late government; and if the Minister of Railways and Canals were here he would bear me out in the statement that when a deputation asked for the continuation of that road from Ridgetown to St. Thomas, one of the strongest and the most effectual arguments they used before this government was that the late government had practically pledged to them a bonus for the distance between Ridgetown and St. Thomas. Now, I have no desire in the absence of the hon. gentleman to impute any motives to him; but one cannot forget the fact that so long as that railway stooped at Ridgetown, so long was it a feeder of the Canadian Pacific Railway, of which he is a director; but the very moment that that road was continued to St. Thomas, instead of being a feeder for the Canadian Pacific Railway it became a competitor of that road. I say that under these circumstances one cannot avoid joining the financial critic of the opposition with the director of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the course of this debate we have had several references to the preferential tariff, and I think that the Minister of Finance has succeeded in defining very clearly the differences between the two parties on this important measure. Now, if I understand the policy of the Conservative party, it is this: They are not prepared to give the mother country a preference in Canada unless we receive an equivalent from the mother country. They want an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. The Liberal party on the other hand simply go to the mother country and say : We know that you are under a large expense on behalf of Canada, we know that your army is kept up, not only for the protection of Great Britain, but for the protection of greater Britain; we know that we have the protection of your navy, we know that in every English consulate on the globe a Canadian citizen has the same protection as a British citizen, and that protection means a great deal. We say to the mother country that while we would like a protection in her market we will not wait, until she is willing to give that preference before giving her a preference in our market, but we will give her the preference in our market at once. Now, Mr. Speaker, which of the two policies is more likely to attain the object of securing a preference in the

markets of the mother country? I believe myself that the time will come, in view of the growing Imperialism which we see on every hand, when we will obtain a preference in the British market; but I do say unhesitatingly as a member of this House, that I think the means adopted by the Liberal party will achieve that end very much sooner than the means adopted by the opposition. It must have given the Minister of Finance, particular pleasure to have noted the tremendous expanse of trade during the last few years. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) referred to most of the items bearing on this increase of our prosperity, but with the permission of the House I will mention briefly some of the comparisons which he omitted.

Turning, in the first place, to the imports into Canada, I find that in the year 1878 they amounted to $93,081,000; in 1895 they amounted to $110,781,000, and in 1900 they had grown to the great volume of $189,622,000. During the seventeen years of the so-called national policy, with all the development which that policy was said to have brought about, the import trade of this country grew by $17,700,000, but in the five years that this Liberal government has been in power the imports of this country grew by no less a sum than $78,841,000. In other words, during the seventeen years of Conservative rule they succeeded in increasing the imports at the rate of $1,000,000 per annum, while during the five years the Liberal party have been in power the imports have increased by no less a sum than $15,768,000 per annum.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HYMAN. If we turn to our exports, we find a no less favourable condition. In 1878 the exports of this country amounted to $79,323,000; in 1895 they had grown to $113,638,000. So that during the seventeen years of the Conservative regime the exports of Canada had grown by $34,315,000. Then came the advent of the Liberal government to power, and from that period until the 30th June, 1900, the exports had grown to $191,894,000, or a total growth of $78,256,000. Let us analyse this a little further. In the seventeen years of Conservative rule, the seventeen years of national policy with all that the members of the opposition would have us believe it implied, they succeeded in increasing the exports of Canada at the rate of $2,000,000 per annum, but, Sir, the present government—whether they stumbled upon it, as the member for Pictou would lead us to believe, or whether they did it by design—have succeeded in increasing the exports of this country during these five years by no less a sum than $78,000,000, or at the rate of $15,651,000 per year.

Let us now look at the total trade of Canada and make a comparison between the years the Conservative party were in power and the five years of the Liberal government, and no less a satisfactory state of things will be found to exist. In 1878 the total trade of Canada was $172,405,000; in 1895 that had grown to $224,420,000; but in 1900 it had grown to the enormous sum of $381,517,000. During the seventeen years of the Conservative rule there was an increase of $52,015,000, or about $3,000,000 per annum, while during the five years of Liberal rule it increased by no less a sum than $157,097,000, or somewhat in excess of $31,000,000 per annum—$3,000,000 a year in the seventeen years' Conservative rule; $31,000,000 a year in the five years of Liberal rule. But says the hon. gentleman from West Toronto (Mr. Osler): You have been spending a great deal too much money. Well, Sir, I submit it is a good business proposition, and one that even the hon. member (Mr. Osler) would likely concur in: that the larger one's trade grows the larger sum is required for the carrying on of that trade. And although I am not prepared to admit, nor is there any necessity to admit, that the expenditure of this government has increased to any very large extent, still, it would be a wonderful thing if it had not increased, and increased almost in comparison to the increased volume of trade. Let us assume the position of a large merchant, or an aggregation of merchants, and if their trade were to grow from $224,000,000 to $381,000,000 in the course of five years, surely that merchant, or that aggregation of merchants, could not be charged with extravagance in carrying on that business if it were shown that there was some slight increase in the way of expenditure during the period of this immense growth in their business. If there was one thing in which the late government did pride themselves on, it was the tariff as applied to manufacturers. It was stated by them that the national policy or the protective tariff was largely, in fact directly, in favour of the manufacturer. There is one test by which the manufacturer can show his strength and it is not so much by his success in the protected market, as it is his success in carrying on his business where he is brought into competition with the world. Therefore, we would naturally suppose that if we on this side of the House are open to the charge, that by the destruction of the national policy we have materially lessened the power of the manufacturer of this country to go abroad and sell his goods in competition with the whole world, there might be some facts to prove the statement. But so far from that being the case, we are prepared with figures to prove that the Canadian manufacturer is in a far stronger position in this respect under the present government than he was under the government that held sway for eighteen years with their so-much-boasted national policy. In 1878 the manufacturers of Canada exported $4,127,000 worth of goods, and in 1895 they had

increased their exports to $7,768,000, or an increase in the seventeen years of the national policy, of $3,641,000. Then the Liberal government took office, and we find an enormous increase in the ability of the Canadian manufacturer to compete with the manufacturer of the whole world in the markets where competition is keenest. We find, Sir, that in 1900 the manufacturers of Canada exported no less than $14,224,000 worth of products. During the seventeen years of Conservative rule the increase was $3,641,000, but during the five years of Liberal rule the increase was no less than $6,435,000. During the seventeen years of Conservative rule, the manufacturers of Canada, notwithstanding the fact that to a very large extent they were the supposed pets of the government; notwithstanding the fact that to a very large extent the whole policy of the government was supposed to help the manufacturers; they were only able to increase their exports, and thereby show their ability to compete in the markets of the world, to the extent of $214,000 per annum, but in the five years since that date they have shown their ability to compete, and compete to the extent of an increase per annum of $1,291,000.

It must also have given the hon. Finance Minister the greatest pleasure to state to this House the high standing of Canadian credit in the financial markets of the world. He was able to make a statement which I am sure aroused the pride of every Canadian, namely, that the 2½ per cents which he himself had placed on the English market had risen in value, while the consols, the strongest of all securities, had materially declined. I think there was no statement made by the hon. Finance Minister in his excellent presentation of the budget which could give Canadians more pleasure and more joy than the one relating to Canada's financial standing in the English market. I may be pardoned, if under the circumstances, I repeat the details: that the 2½ per cents, which sold at 91½, were now quoted at 92, while consols, which at the time the 2½ per cents were sold at 91½ were worth 115, have dropped at the present time to 97¾—a drop of nearly 17 points for consols, and a rise of Canadian securities during the same period of nearly ½ per cent.

I am sure it gave the members of this House particular pleasure to hear the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance in regard to the Yukon. If there is one hon. member on this side of the House against whom the attacks of the opposition have been strong, it is the hon. gentleman who has charge of the administration of that district; and I am sure it speaks volumes for his care, his prudence and his judgment, that after the three or four years since that country commenced to develop, we find that it has not cost the people of this country a single copper for all the development that has taken place there. I say there was no statement made by the Finance Minister which gave more pleasure to members on this side of the House, because we know the bitter attacks which have been made on that hon. member, and we respect him so highly that we are glad the Finance Minister was enabled to make that report to the country.

There is another department as to which the Minister of Finance was able to make an announcement which also gave particular pleasure; that is, the Post Office Department. We know that the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock), when he succeeded in inducing his colleagues to reduce the postage, made a bold stroke. I myself, and I have no doubt a number of other members, thought it would mean a large shrinkage in the receipts, and therefore a larger deficit in the department. But I was delighted, as I am sure we all were, to learn from the hon. Finance Minister yesterday that in the month of January the receipts of the Post Office Department had exceeded the expenditure. I trust and hope that the prognostications which were made by the hon. Postmaster General last year or the year before will be fulfilled. I believe that he is so careful in his statements that before very long we may safely look for the receipts of the post office to be sufficient to carry on the business of that large department.

There was a statement made by the Finance Minister which may not have given so much pleasure to hon. gentlemen, not merely those on this side of the House, but to those on the other side: that was, that in the wisdom and judgment of the government, there should be no tariff changes during the present session. As a business man, and one knowing something of the principle and the workings of the tariff, I must say that I concur most heartily in the judgment of the hon. Finance Minister and his colleagues in not making any changes in the tariff during the present session, for I think we should have a longer period in which to give it a fair trial. I have no doubt that the time will come when some change must be made in the tariff, and I am perfectly sure that the hon. Finance Minister and his colleagues will then most carefully consider what is in the interests, not of any particular class, but of the country as a whole. I know that some sacrifices will have to be made. No tariff could be applied to a country so diverse in its interests and its character as Canada, that would satisfy everybody; but we on this side of the House, and I think the country generally, are prepared to make those sacrifices, and I am prepared to leave in the hands of the government the choice of both the time and the manner of such alterations in the tariff as may have to be made.

Now, it seems—and I am very glad that it is so—that this is to be a session of short speeches. I will not detain the House any longer, except to refer to what the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) said in his closing remarks, that this government had a work to do. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this government have a great work to do, and they are perfectly able and competent to carry on that work. They have grasped Canada's position better than any government that has been in power heretofore; and I am sure they are prepared to do that great work, perhaps not to the entire satisfaction of the hon. member for Pictou, but to the satisfaction of the majority of the people of this great country. Speaking for myself, Mr. Speaker, I am a Canadian; I am proud of being a Canadian. I love Canada, and I do trust and hope that the future development of this great country will be thoroughly in accordance with its greatness. I may be hoping for too much, but I hope that we will soon have a fast Atlantic service and see steamers plying between this country and the mother land, that have been built from Canadian steel. I hope to see steamers built that will be a credit to Canada, in which every plate, bolt and rivet will be the product of Canada and Canadian workmen, and I hope to see the present government bring about that result.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I rise with a great deal of diffidence to speak on questions so important as those now under discussion. The policy of the government and the finances of the country are, I presume the most important questions that can engage the attention of parliament, and I trust that in the few remarks I propose to make I may meet with the indulgence of the House.

The statement made by the right hon. the Finance Minister in his speech yesterday showed a state of affairs that, it seems to me, calls for the earnest attention and discussion of every citizen of this country. The hon. gentleman said that the expenditures for the year ending 30th June next, out of consolidated fund, would be $46,400,000. This is a tremendous sum, and it certainly behooves us to consider what justification there is for such a large expenditure. Before discussing that feature of the budget speech, however, I wish to point out that even if it could be shown that so heavy an expenditure is necessary in the interests of the country, it is one which no one could possibly have anticipated from the present government, if we are to accept the professions which these hon. gentlemen made when in opposition as having been made in good faith. What were those professions? I would crave the indulgence of the House while I read a few extracts from the speeches of the great leaders of the Liberal party, when in opposition, so that the country may see what these gentlemen really did pledge themselves to, and how miserably they have failed in carrying out the promises of economy they then made.

The right hon. the First Minister, in 1890, speaking upon the expenditure of the country, said:

> Moreover, they tell us that if we were in power we could not retrench and economize, but I do not believe it would be a very difficult task to economize to the extent of one, two or three millions, and, as Mr. Mills told his constituents a few days ago, possibly to the extent of four millions a year.

There is a definite statement. It is very easy for hon. gentlemen to make general statements that the government are conducting the affairs of the country extravagantly and that the expenditure ought to be less, but here is a definite statement that the expenditure at that date was greatly in excess of the requirements of the country. That was in 1890. Our expenditure then was $35,994,000, and our expenditure the year now closing is $46,400,000, or an increase of considerably over $10,000,000. And yet the right hon. gentleman said in 1890 that the amount we were then spending, which is $10,000,000 less than what we are spending to-day, was an extravagant sum by some millions.

The population of this country has of course increased during these ten years, and it is natural to expect that we should have an increased expenditure. Our population has probably increased, roughly speaking, 10 per cent. Well, add 10 per cent to the expenditure of 1890, and we will have a sum of about $39,000,000; and according to the right hon. the First Minister $39,000,000 would be an extravagant sum to expend to-day—some millions more than the requirements of the country demands. But what are the facts? Instead of $39,000,000 or some millions less than $39,000,000, we have to-day an expenditure on consolidated fund alone of $46,400,000.

The hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), a gentleman well versed in finance, who used to pose as the financial critic of the opposition during the eighteen years he was out of office—let us see what he said:

> In the House I have said before, and I repeat it now, that $38,000,000, let alone $40,000,000, is, in my judgment, a monstrous sum for the people to be called on to provide. It is a matter of history that when the United States mustered 20,000,000 strong, its total expenditure for federal purposes was barely $22,000,000.

He did not say whether he was speaking of the expenditure out of consolidated fund or the total expenditure. If he meant the expenditure from the consolidated fund, that amounted to $36,946,000 during the last year of the Conservative administration, and that the Minister of Trade and Commerce considered a monstrous sum. Yet this same hon. gentleman has sat silently in his seat and sanctioned by his voice in

the councils of his party an expenditure, from the consolidated fund alone, during the past year of $46,400,000. And for what purpose ? Not to build great public works or great public improvements, but simply to carry on the ordinary affairs of the country, simply to do those same things which were done in 1896 with nearly $10,000,000 less money, and which amount the hon. gentleman then said was a monstrous sum to provide.

If the expenditures being made by these hon. gentlemen in power can possibly be justified, it does not lie in the mouths of the leaders of the party to justify them, because they professed, when in opposition, that a sum $10,000,000 less was a monstrous and extravagant amount to provide.

I might read one or two more extracts. The great Liberal party met in 1893 in this city, and formulated a policy. One of the planks was :

> We cannot but view with alarm the large increase in the public debt and in the controllable annual expenditure.

Well, what was the controllable annual expenditure in 1893 ? It amounted to $36,814,053. According to the collected wisdom of the Liberal party, not the utterance of one individual party in it, but as laid down by that party in convention assembled, $36,814,053 was a sum altogether beyond the requirements of this country to expend. And yet that party to-day is expending just about $10,000,000 more than that. The present hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) said :

> The Liberal party says that several millions may be lopped off the present expenditure without injury to the public service.

The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said :

> The Liberal party, if in power, could at once reduce the public expenditure and effect other savings to the extent of five millions per annum without impairing the efficiency of the service.

The hon. member for North Norfolk, I am bound to admit, in the address he scattered amongst the electors of his riding, apparently still has this idea to a certain extent. He differs from the government slightly, but at least sufficiently to appear to be independent, so that the opposition in his county withdrew and allowed him to make a safe entry into this parliament. He criticised the government in that manifesto for not carrying out their promises, and, in that respect he is consistent.

Now, let us compare for a moment these expenditures. For the five years commencing with 1892 and ending with 1896, that is, the last five years of Conservative administration, the expenditures on consolidated fund amounted to $186,246,120. What have they risen to ? In five years that are just closing, they amounted to a total of $208,461,066, an increase of a little over $22,000,000. This is for carrying on ordinary affairs of the country, not for building great public works or effecting any important and permanent improvement. This is the amount required by these economical gentlemen who were going to do it for millions less. The fact is they required twenty-two millions more in the five years just closed than was required by the extravagant Tories in the five years previous. Now let us turn to the total expenditure. It is easy to keep down the expenses on consolidated fund if large items that were formerly charged to that account are chargeable to capital, therefore, in order that we may prove our case fully we must take the total expenditure. And it would be scarcely fair to compare one single year with another. Let us take five years of Liberal-Conservative rule as compared with five years of Liberal rule—that should make a fair comparison. In the last five years of Liberal-Conservative administration, the total expenditure was $210,202,852, whilst in the five years now closing the total expenditure was $247,539,129, or an increase of $37,336,277. Now what has become of this $37,336,277 ? What have we got to show for it ? If we had great public works more than we had before, if there had been an enormous development of the country and huge expenses necessary, there might be some excuse of this tremendous expenditure even from these gentlemen who professed to believe that the sum spent previously was monstrously too much. Why, this additional expenditure is more than half of what the Canadian Pacific Railway cost. What would have been thought of any hon. gentleman had he risen in his place in this House five years ago and asked that the total expenditure for the public service or public works, or anything else, should be increased $33,000,000 over what had been under the previous administration? He would have been said to be almost insane. But the hon. gentlemen who have been ruling the destinies of this country for the last five years have made that enormously increased expenditure. Now let us compare this with the methods adopted by the Liberal-Conservative party. They were in power for eighteen years. The hon. Minister of Finance in his speech goes back eighteen years. That scarcely affords a fair basis of comparison. Let us go back for five years and compare the five years of Liberal-Conservative administration previous to their getting out of office to the five years previous to that and see how it stands —let us see if they carried out their promises. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that when the great public works, the great arteries of commerce, such as the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Intercolonial Railway and the great Welland canal, were being built, the Conservative administration were charged by their opponents with incurring an expenditure that would be far beyond the means of this country, that bankruptcy and ruin would follow such enormous ex-

penditures. Sir John A. Macdonald and the other great leaders of the Liberal-Conservative party thought differently; they thought that the country could stand the strain and that the expenditures would be justifiable. They incurred those expenditures, and the country received the benefit. In replying to their critics, they said that when the great arteries of commerce, so necessary to this country were completed, we will call a halt; we will then try to live within our income and to keep the total expenditures of this country from increasing. Did they do it? In 1887, the total expenditure was $41,504,152. In 1891, the total expenditures were $40,538,534. The total of the five years from 1887 to 1891 was $210,674,843. This, it will be observed, was after the great arteries of commerce I have referred to were built. In the next five years, the last five years of Conservative administration, the total expenditures were $210,202,852, a decrease of $471,991, as compared with the previous five years—and this notwithstanding that the population increased and the requirements of the country increased. Carrying out their promise, the leaders of the Liberal-Conservative party kept the expenditure down, not entirely within the income, but sufficiently to prevent an increase. And it must be remembered that during the last five years we had our hard time. The hon. Minister of Finance went back eighteen years in speaking of our debt, and tried to make a comparison between the debt annually incurred under a Liberal-Conservative administration and that annually incurred under his administration of finances. Now, I think the Minister of Finance was scarcely fair in going back eighteen years. It seems to me that, had he been just in his statements he would have been satisfied with going back seven or eight years. In going back eighteen years, he took in the total expenditure incurred in building the Canadian Pacific Railway, in which period $52,512,613 was spent. At that time also $10,000,000 were allowed to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the release of a certain portion of the land grant. In that period the debts of the provinces, an altogether unusual expenditure, amounting to $10,291,052, were taken over, making a total extraordinary expenditure over and above anything of the same nature incurred by the present administration, of $73,000,000. I think it was hardly fair for the Minister of Finance to include those things in his statement.

Now, I propose to extend the period and go back eight years under the Conservative administration, and let us see how the matter stands. In the eight years from 1888 to 1896 the Conservative administration had annually increased the debt at the rate of $2,997,000; under this administration it has increased $1,749,093, or a decrease of about $1,200,000 annually in the debt. That is to say, the debt has increased annually $1,200,000 less than it did during the eight years of Conservative administration. But what are the circumstances? During these last five years we have had a plethoric revenue. The world has experienced the best times it has seen in this generation; Canada has shared with that prosperity, and no one is more delighted to know it than we are on this side of the House. During that period of good times the revenue has been redundant, $31,115,384 more have been taken from the people during the last five years than was taken during the five years previously; and the debt has increased within $1,200,000 a year as fast as it did under the Conservative administration, when hard times prevailed in this country and all over the world. We all know that during that period hard times prevailed in the United States even to a greater extent than in Canada. During that period over 400 banks toppled over in the United States, and in this country only one. In England, although possessing the greatest amount of skill and capital of any country in the world, although her ships were carrying her commerce over all the seas, even she felt these hard times severely. There were proportionately more men out of employment in England, more distress prevailing in all industrial ranks, than there was in Canada. We could not help but feel those hard times, however prices fell, and consequently the revenues fell. The quantities of goods we imported fell off and the duties collected fell off proportionately. So I say that a comparison between the annual increase to the public debt during the two periods is infinitely in favour of the Conservative administration. Now, what have these gentlemen on the ministerial benches done to increase the revenue? According to the Minister of Trade and Commerce they have not increased the duties, in his opinion the duties are a little lower now than they were before, but I will deal with that point a little later. What I want now to impress strongly upon the House, is the fact that in spite of the enormous taxes taken from the people of $31,000,000 more than by their predecessors, and in spite of the $7,000,000 that have been borrowed during the past five years, we have nothing of importance, no great public works, no new and valuable assets to show for it. It seems to have been actually wasted, or at least the major part of it.

Now a word with regard to the trade and commerce of the country. The hon. Minister of Finance is very canny, he did not attribute, as has been so often done, to this government the greatly increased trade of this country in exports and imports. He probably has learned wisdom by experience. But the hon. member for London fell into the trap that the hon. Minister of Finance avoided. It is true that the trade of this country has increased, it is true that our exports and imports have increased enor-

mously, but what has that got to do with the administration ? Even though our exports and imports were double what they have been, what would that have had to do with the administration ? Have the hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches caused those exports and imports to grow ? If they can show that it has been through their effort that our farms and our mines have produced more, then we will be glad to give them the credit for it. Let us examine some of these exports in detail. In 1899 we exported $3,562,794 worth of coal, and during the past year $4,599,602. Now, I would like to know what the government has done to increase the export of coal ? Have they found a market for our coal in any other country in the world which we did not possess before ?

Mr. KENDALL. The Nova Scotia government did.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). We are now discussing the policy of the Dominion government. In 1899, of gold-bearing quartz, we exported $3,272,702, and last year $14,-148,543. What have the government done to increase our exports of gold-bearing quartz ? I thought it was due to the energy of the miners, I thought something was due to the men who dug, and delved, and brought up from beneath the surface of the earth these minerals and exported them. But the hon. member for London wants to claim the credit of this increased export for the present government. In sundry ores our exports increased from $48,000 to $144,-000 ; of building stone, from $55,000 to $115,-000 ; the total produce of the farm increased $29,663,000 ; our exports of animals to Great Britain increased from $8,194,928 to $9,093,-317. I would like to know what the government in power has done to cause an increase in the exports of any one of these articles.

Then the hon. member for London stated that our exports of manufactures had increased. I would like to know what this government has done to increase the exports of our manufactures. Have they made it more profitable for the manufacturers in this country to produce the articles of their industry ? Have they made it easier for them to export their products ? Have they found in any part of the world a better market for the manufactures of this country ? Will they point out any new market or any better market that they have obtained for us, any market in which we have better terms than we had before ? Is it the United States ? These gentlemen, when they were in opposition, promised that if they were returned to power they would find us a better market in the United States. Have they done it ? Have they found a market for us in Germany ? No, in Germany and in many other countries, we are now finding it much more difficult to introduce our products than before, and that is one thing for which the government in power can claim credit. The hon. gentleman for London finds consolation in the fact that our exports to Germany have increased in spite of the large increase in duties imposed upon our products as compared with what they were before the preferential tariff came into force.

To say, as the hon. gentleman for London has said, that, notwithstanding the large increase in duties, there has been an increased importation into Germany of goods from Canada, is logically equivalent to saying that we would be better off if every country in the world raised their duties. I do not thinik that even such sophistical gentlemen as those occupying the benches on the other side of the House will agree with the hon. gentleman when he makes that statement. Neither he, nor any other hon. gentleman who has spoken on the other side of the House, has been able to point to a single market that has been procured for the people of Canada by the adoption of this policy. Every one knows that it is now more difficult to find markets for our goods than before. Now, if the government are in any way responsible for the increase in our exports, surely they are also responsible for the decrease. In 1898 we exported $17,313,916 worth of wheat, while in the next year our export of wheat was only $7,784,484. We exported flour, in 1898, to the value of $5,425,760, and last year to the value of $2,791,885. Of barley, in 1897, we exported $566,505 worth, while last year the export fell off to $110,040. Of oats we exported, in 1899, $3,266,388, while in 1900 we exported $2,-143,179 worth. Our total exports of agricultural products in 1898 were $75,834,858, and in 1899 they fell to $68,140,758. The total exports of Canada fell in 1899 to $138,462,037 from $145,594,885 in the year previous. According to the hon. member for London, the government are in some way responsible for the increase in our exports. If they are responsible for the increase in our exports, surely they are responsible for the decrease in our exports. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), or some one of the three hon. gentlemen who spoke on the other side of the House, challenged hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who have spoken, and those who are to follow, to state on what ground we criticise them, to state what our policy is and what we propose to advocate. We do not propose to emulate them in the extraordinary expenditures they have incurred during the past few years. That is one of the things in regard to which we must give hon. gentlemen opposite credit for having branched out and done something new and original. They have increased the public expenditure. Their adoption of the present preferential tariff is also a change, and these are the principal changes that these hon. gentlemen have made in the manner of conducting the affairs of the country. But, there

are other questions besides these which have been mentioned, and one of the most important, it seems to me, is the transportation problem. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was content, in his speech, to rest upon his oars. It seemed to me as if hon. gentlemen were satisfied to go on for the next five years in the same course that they have been pursuing during the past five years. They challenged us to propose something new, but they did not propose any changes, any new policy, or any retrenchment in the matter of public expenditure. There is a question, as I said before, which appears to me to be more important than almost any question that could engage the attention of this House, and it is the transportation problem. The hon. Minister of Finance would not touch upon it, but it seems to me that this is a question which deserves the attention of the House. It is one thing to grow products and to manufacture articles; it is another thing to find a market for them. These are two very important things, but what is the use of products and what is the use of markets unless you can carry these products to the markets safely and cheaply. This is a great question, and we expected to have a declaration from the government as to what their policy is on this question. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) brought in a resolution to this House, and it seemed to me that it was a very pertinent resolution, one asking that the government should now take up this great question of the transportation of the products of the country, and lay down a policy upon it. We have been waiting long enough for a policy on this question. The government are spending large sums of money to build up different ports in different parts of this great country, but they have not so concentrated their energies as to mark out some great line of action which should be pursued. It is proposed to expend $5,000,000 in deepening the harbour at Port Colborne, it is proposed to expend enormous sums of money in improving the harbour at Montreal, it is proposed to spend large sums in deepening the St. Lawrence river and making it a first-class outlet for ocean-going vessels, and we have had intimations of money being spent and proposed to be spent in various other directions, but no definite or straightforward line of action seems to have been laid down by the government. It is the duty of the government to state their policy. It is not the duty of the opposition, but rather the duty of the government, if they are earnestly endeavouring to administer the affairs of the country in the best way possible and in the best interests of the country to lay down some definite line of action and follow it out. Whether the expenditure of this sum of money at Port Colborne is desirable or not is a question. According to statements made by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) the other night, it would seem that grain from the great North-west Territories and the North-western states, can be carried as cheaply by the Booth line to Montreal, or almost as cheaply, as he has any hope of having it carried by the all-water route. If this is the case, if it is true that wheat can be carried as cheaply by the rail line from Parry Harbour, or any other harbour on the Georgian Bay to Montreal, then, these expenditures—and hon. gentlemen require some criticism of their expenditures—of $5,000,000 is unnecessary and unwise, and not in the best interests of the people. It devolves upon the government, not upon us, to find out which of these two great lines is likely, in the near future, to be the cheaper and better line to carry the provisions of the great North-west, that, in time are destined to assume enormous proportions, to the seaboard. It has also been proposed, and it seems to me very feasible, that a line of railway, running in an air line almost from Parry Harbour to Quebec, might be the cheapest way to send the products of the west to the seaboard. If that is the case, then, we ought to devote our energies to immediately developing that line. It devolves upon the government to ascertain promptly whether this line, or whether the line from Parry Harbour to Montreal, or whether the route from Port Colborne to Montreal is the cheapest line and the best line, and when they have made up their minds which of these is the best, it is their duty to go to work vigorously and put that line in a condition in which it will carry these products at once. They have been dallying with this question for a great many years. It is a good many years since they proposed to incur this expenditure in the harbour of Montreal. I think the harbour of Montreal ought to be improved; certainly it has been a disgrace and a shame to this country that the harbour of Montreal should have been in the condition in which it has been during the past. It cannot in any way compare with the harbours in the United States in facilities for loading or unloading vessels. If the citizens of Montreal are not energetic enough to spend a sufficient sum to make a good harbour in their city, it is the duty of the Dominion government to do so, and I quite approve of such an expenditure. Whether or not Montreal will be the export point for the products of the North-west, it will certainly serve a large portion of the province of Ontario and we should have proper docks there. But there are other things to be looked to besides providing cheap transport facilities. We will have to provide safe transport facilities which will enable us to carry perishable products in good condition to distant markets. It is one thing to have the products, another thing to have the markets, but neither is of any use unless we

can place those products in proper condition on the markets. The province of Ontario and portions of Nova Scotia are better adapted for the production of apples than any other place in the world. I believe that in Ontario and in the Annapolis valley we can grow apples with greater perfection than in any other part of the world, and that is making a very broad statement. In Ontario we have 10,000,000 apple trees, the product of which will soon be worth at least $10,000,000 a year. If in days gone by these apples could have been carried to the seaboard and thence to Britain, as they could and should have been carried, we would have, not 10,000,000 apple trees in Ontario, but 15,000,000 or 20,000,000 trees, and the farmers of Ontario as well as Nova Scotia would have a crop at the present time infinitely more profitable than the ordinary grain crop. Where apples can be grown successfully, then, if they are marketed at a reasonable price as they can be in England, they are infinitely more profitable to the farmer than either grain or dairy products. If the steamship people will not provide proper facilities for carrying apples, and if the railway companies are also neglectful, then the duty devolves upon the government. During the last ten or fifteen years the apple men of Canada have done all in their power to induce the railway and steamship companies to provide suitable arrangements for carrying this perishable product in good condition. It was impossible to move the steamship companies, because the apples are harvested at a time of the year when an enormous quantity of other products are going forward, when the steamers are all loaded to gunwales and the steamship owners cared little whether they carried apples or not, and so they snapped their fingers at the apple men. Finally the Fruit Growers' Association, as well as individuals, asked the government to do something, and I shall give the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) credit for making an effort. It is a small thing that has been done and it was done at the last moment, but I am not one to refuse credit where credit is due, although the little that has been done is but a small part of what ought to be done and what could be done. I would remind the House that the quantity of apples exported from Canada is no small item. During the past ten years we have shipped to Great Britain $18,000,000 worth of apples. Now, as the export price of these apples regulates the price in the home market, if we had secured the price in England that we would have secured had they been landed in sound condition, it would have increased the price of all the apples sold in this country. We lost no less than $5,000,000 on the apples exported, and as the amount exported was not more than one-third of the quantity grown, then we must have lost $15,000,000 on the total apple crop of this country, which hon. gentlemen will see means a large sum to the farmers of Canada. It is not only the immediate loss but the prospective loss that has to be considered. The farmers became discouraged because of the low price they received for their apples in consequence of the bad condition in which they arrived in England. Some years the apples rotted on the ground; some years they sold for 40 and 50 cents a barrel in the orchard, when, if they could be properly exported to Great Britain, they would have brought from 75 cents to one dollar a barrel. The year which was particularly unfortunate in this respect was one of the most unprofitable that our farmers ever experienced for their grain and dairy products, and if they had obtained 25 or 50 cents more per barrel for their apples, it would have been a God-send to them. However, they obtained such a low price for the apples that they became discouraged, and neglected their orchards and to-day there are thousands of acres of orchards in Ontario that are going to waste, the initial reason being that in the years when we have a large crop, the apples cannot be exported to England in good condition. In order to show the great loss to Canada from the defective facilities for carrying our apples across the ocean, I shall read from the report presented to a committee of this House two years ago by Professor Robertson. I may say that Professor Robertson was induced to make this report on account of a bundle of actual reports of sales of large quantities of apples which I had the honour to send him. I was trying to induce the Minister of Agriculture to take action in this matter, and I sent these account sales to Professor Robertson, who states in this report :

> With that letter came a bundle of account sales of last fall which accorded so thoroughly with this, that Mr. Smith inclosed them to me. I made a careful summary of them, which I will give to show the condition in which our apples arrived in England, not a few barrels, but in large lots. Dealing first with that lot of Nova Scotia apples, all that is on the one set of account sales sent by forty-three shippers and sold in London. There were 950 barrels sold as tights, five barrels of slacks and nine barrels of wets.

The House will see that nearly all these apples shipped from Halifax on a certain steamer arrived in a sound condition. I wrote to the manager of that steamship line to find out how it was that the apples he carried landed in good condition, while the apples carried on other steamers were half rotten, and the statement he made to me was, that his vessels were specially constructed for the shipment of apples and the captains were instructed to look after the ventilation of the holds, and to see that the appliances for ventilation were properly used on the voyage. Professor Robertson further says :

> Taking the shipments of Canadian apples last fall, which are Ontario mainly, a few perhaps from Quebec, sold in Liverpool by two different

sets of salesmen; taking a quantity of 14,416 barrels going by seventeen different steamships and sent forward, as near as I can make out from the brands, in about 185 different lots—the brand is sometimes so much like another brand that it may have been the same—but that is a very wide range, you see, of data from which to make a calculation. There were nearly 15,000 barrels on seventeen steamships sent forward in 185 different lots.

The account sales show this, that out of the total quantity there were only 5,928 barrels sold as tights. There were 2,793 slacks, 2,446 slightly wet, 1,997 wet, and 1,252 wet and slack. That is to say, rather more than one-half of the apples shipped in these lots were sold as slack, slightly wet and wet. The difference in price realized by these apples is very great. The only way to get any fair information on this is to take a lot of apples sent by one ship and pick out the apples of the same class sold as tight, and the others of that variety sold as slacks or wet. Going over the list and taking out the apples of the same variety under these conditions, the slack on the average sold for 2 shillings and 7 pence less than the tights. The slightly wets for 3 shillings and 8 pence less than the tights, the wets for 7 shillings and 3 pence less than the tights, and the wets and slacks for 9 shillings and 11 pence less, or nearly 10 shillings, and of these wets and slacks there were 1,252 barrels.

This is a statement that ought surely to be convincing. Here was a large quantity of apples going forward in which it is shown that the loss incurred was more than 75 cents a barrel. Therefore, I think I am within the mark when I say that the loss in the last ten years on all the apples grown in Ontario which have been shipped to the old country has been 50 cents a barrel.

Mr. WADE. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to state what the crop of apples was in Ontario in 1896, and whether the orchards are larger now than they were then ?

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I presume there are more acres planted at the present time than there were then, although I believe the orchards are to-day in a very much worse condition. Now, what has the government done with regard to this matter ? As I stated before, the Minister of Agriculture, in pursuance of this statement by Prof. Robertson, sent a circular to a number of these steamship companies, and endeavoured in this way to have the holds of the vessels ventilated. But the steamship companies have not ventilated the holds of their vessels. Some of them may have done so; but from all the evidence I have been able to gather, there is no proof that these exhaust fans, if placed on the steamers, have been operated. It is one thing to put an exhaust fan in the hold of a vessel, but it is another thing to operate it while the vessel is crossing the ocean. I am led to the conclusion that the steamships, even those few which put in the fans, did not carry their apples in good condition; and I am bound to conclude that the fans have not been in operation. I expected to have a statement of the sales from those ships in which exhaust fans had been placed; but I have not yet received it. However, I have a statement of a large quantity of apples that went forward during the past year, and I am bound to say that the condition of these apples was as bad as before. Let me give a few examples to prove what I say :

Boat.	Date Sold.	Tight.	Slack.	Slightly Wet.	Wet.	Slack and Wet.
Roman	Jan. 2 & 11..	485	112	19	64	48
"	Dec. 1 & 5..	434	121	63	73	33
Irishman	Nov. 5 & 7..	103	49	160	19	2
Saxonia	" 5 & 7..	1,217	311	484	201	74
Lake Megantic	" 5 & 7..	64	17	38	3	6
New England	" 5 & 7..	72	44	109	41	0
Devonian	" 5 & 7..	29	29	79	46	32
Lake Outario	" 21 & 26..	353	59	117	12	8
Tunisian	" 21 & 26..	61	58	19	0	0
"	Oct. 20 & 26..	668	202	150	61	0
Turcoman	" 20 & 26..	98	31	23	13	0
Montfort	Nov. 30..	568	345	37	20	0
Manchester	" 29..	277	188	58	109	0
Cestrian	" 30 / Dec. 5	815	186	28	50	18
Lake Champlain	" 12 & 14..	34	233	56	54	17
Dominion	Oct. 12..	569	296	393	78	7
"	Nov. 14 & 16..	238	39	39	7	4
"	Dec. 21 & 28..	276	190	83	44	14
Manchester City	Oct. 30..	224	134	117	27	13
Bohemian	Nov. 14 & 16..	160	76	29	15	7
Sylvia	" 14 & 16..	36	17	70	23	23
Lake Superior	" 14 & 19..	513	104	185	38	13

And so on. I could give a very large number of instances of the same kind. Now, I will give a few instances in which the holds of the vessels were ventilated, to show the difference in the condition of the apples :

Boat.	Date Sold.	Tight.	Slack.	Slightly Wet.	Wet.	Slack and Wet.
Ottoman	Jan. 24	123	14	0	0	1
Corinthian	" 24	166	8	0	0	1
Numidian	" 18	281	21	0	0	5
Cameronian	" 2 & 11	354	105	16	10	4
Vancouver	" 2 & 11	4,206	301	4	12	30
Lake Champlain	" 2 & 5	1,397	280	99	5	0
Michigan	Oct. 20 & 26	118	12	16	1	0
Numidian	Dec. 12	580	114	19	8	3
Manchester Trader	" 6	1,058	173	46	36	26
" Corporation	" 11	515	63	4	5	8
" Commerce	Nov. 9	830	38	10	0	0
Corinthian	Oct. 5 & 8	834	100	44	0	3
Parisian	" 10	502	32	31	4	0

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. May I ask the hon. gentleman what season he is speaking of ?

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). This season. It is possible that a few barrels may be slack owing to the carelessness of packers. I know it has often been charged in committees where this matter has been discussed and even outside, that the fault is altogether with the packer. I am bound to deny that statement in toto. I know that there are some packers who are green at the business and who do not pack properly; but they form a very small percentage, I believe not over 5 per cent of the whole. There may be a larger percentage of packers who foolishly think that by putting small apples in the middle of the barrels, or putting in apples of an inferior grade, they may make some money; but that does not affect the conditions in which the apples arrive. A barrel of apples, with big ones at the end and little ones in the middle, will go across the ocean as well, so far as being wet or slack is concerned, as a barrel of the best apples grown. So that the charge made against the packers of apples is not in accordance with the facts; but the statements which I have given prove that the fault lies with the steamship companies, and partly with the railway companies. I know that Prof. Robertson has shown that apples have landed in Montreal in such a condition that the temperature inside the barrel showed eighty-five degrees. These apples put in the hold of a vessel where the temperature may be ninety or one hundred before they get across the ocean, are certain to arrive in bad order. They would arrive in worse order from the fact of their being landed in Montreal in that heated condition. It devolves upon the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) to do something to compel the railway companies to carry these apples and other perishable products of the farm, in ventilated cars. We load our apples and other perishable products, that do not require to go into cold storage cars, into box cars which have no ventilation whatever, and in which the heat is ten to twenty degrees greater than the temperature outside. If the railway shippers and the growers of apples have asked the railway companies time and again, as they have done, to provide better cars and the companies refuse, it is the duty of the government, particularly of the Minister of Agriculture, to see that these railway companies provide suitable cars. It may be asked how would we provide ventilation. Well, there is a number of appliances that could be utilized which would enable the railway companies to have the temperature inside the cars at least as cool as outside. These appliances cost very little, and it only requires a little pressure from the government on the railway companies to make them do this. This matter might perhaps come within the jurisdiction of the railway commission proposed to be established, but in any case it comes within the province of the government, and the hon. the Finance Minister might very well have considered this question of transportation, which is of infinite importance to our people, in his budget delivery.

Let me say a word with regard to some of the questions brought up by the hon. gentleman who preceded me on the opposite side. If there is one department, which the government claim credit for having carried on economically, it is the post office. I do not know that during the last election there was any one department that they did really dare to claim having carried on economically except the post office, and concerning the management of that department, there has been a great deal of boasting. I am bound to say that it has not been carried

on so badly as some of the other departments. What are the facts ? The hon. the Postmaster General takes great credit for having reduced the postage from three to two cents and for having, in spite of that reduction, a deficit less than that which existed under the Conservative administration. The hon. gentleman prides himself on that as an admirable condition of affairs, but I must take exception to his claim. In the year 1896, when the rate was three cents, the receipts were $2,964,014. In the year 1898, when the rate was still three cents, the receipts amountd to $3,527,809, or an increase in two years of $563,795. Then the two-cent letter rate came into operation, and the receipts decreased ; but it is fair to assume that if the three-cent rate had remained in force, the rate of progress would have been maintained. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that the progress of the country has been greater than it was in the previous two years, that the imports and exports and the trade of the country generally have been greater in these two years than in the two previous ones, and it is fair to assume that a greater amount of money would have gone into the post office had the letter rate not been reduced. Under the three-cent rate, the receipts increased $563,795 in two years, and had that rate continued we would have had receipts amounting to $4,091,604, but instead they were but $3,183,784 or a falling off of $907,620, caused by the reduction in rate. In other words, had the three-cent rate remained in force, instead of having a deficit of $461,000, we would have a surplus of $446,000. These hon. gentlemen, however, say that this is not a bad condition of affairs. They say that we have relieved the people of this amount of taxation. They say that we have taken from the people $900,000 of taxes and that it is very satisfactory to know that we did not require that amount of money ; but a few minutes later the hon. gentleman said that he expected during the coming year he would have to borrow at least $1,000,000 in addition to the enormous revenues which he is wringing from the pockets of the people. Well, if he had allowed the three-cent letter rate to continue, he would have had about $1,000,000 extra, and would not be under any necessity to borrow. However, if this decrease in the letter rate were really a relief to the people generally, it would perhaps be a good thing, and even as it is, I am not going to severely criticise the step taken. But I want to point out that we have lost $907,000 by that reduction, and further, that the saving made has been made by business men. Personally, it has saved me some hundreds of dollars annually, but 999 other men, who only send a few letters every year, have saved but a few cents, and that amount must come sooner or later out of the pockets of the people. It is idle to say that because our revenues are sufficient to meet our expenditures this year, we do not need that $900,000. Surely, when we have a debt of something over $260,000,000, it does not lie in the mouth of the Finance Minister to say that we do not require any money ?

Let me say a word, Mr. Speaker, about that great question which has agitated the people for the past twenty years—the question of protection. It is somewhat amusing at times to see the frantic efforts made by hon. gentlemen opposite to prove that they are still free traders. I must say that I was rather amused by that great financier, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). He has been accused of having renounced his principles, and he made a huge effort to-day to show that he had not renounced any of his principles. He admitted that in 1878 he had proposed an increase of duty from 17½ per cent to 20 per cent, but he pleaded that 20 per cent was not a protective tariff and that he had not in any sense renounced his principles when he proposed an increase of 2½ per cent.

Now, the hon. Minister of Finance, in his budget speech, said that during the four years' administration of the gentlemen now in power, the duties had been reduced by 2·30 per cent and he maintained that that reduction changed this from a protective to a revenue tariff. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce maintained, only yesterday, that even with an increase of 2½ per cent, his position was not altered but he was still a revenue tariff man. This point has been discussed a good many times, but, if the House would bear with me for a few moments I would like to say a few words upon it. I want to prove that hon. gentlemen opposite, in spite of their actions, at one time declared themselves free traders, and that they still say that they are free traders or believers in a revenue tariff only. In 1893, at the convention that I have already mentioned, one of the planks in the platform was as follows :

> We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours. This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await the fullest confidence the verdict of the electorate of Canada.

The present Prime Minister said at that same convention :

> We will tax for revenue, but not one cent for protection.

Would he say that he is not imposing to-day one cent of taxes for protection ? The Minister of Trade and Commerce said that none of our taxes now were imposed for the purpose of protection ; but I do not think there is any other hon. gentleman on the other side who feels the necessity of maintaining his free trade principles who would go so far as to say that our tariff

was a tariff for revenue and not one cent for protection.

> Taxation is an evil that nothing but the requirements of government can justify. When we are in power—and I don't want to sell the skin of the bear until the bear is shot ; yet I think the Tory bear is about to be skinned—we will free the people from protection, which is a fraud and a delusion and a robbery.

Has he done it ?

> For it is robbery to take money from one man to give it to another.

On another occasion he said :

> I will not be satisfied until the last vestige of protection has been removed from the soil of Canada. Our great reform is to put away from the soil of Canada the last vestige of protection.

Once more, he said :

> If the Liberals are successful, they will cut off the head of protection at once, and trample on its body.

The present hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) said :

> We have been attacking this policy year by year. This is an accursed system, a system accursed of God and man.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce on one occasion said :

> I say our protective system was a huge mistake, in so far as it was honest at all, and in so far as it was not honest, it was a huge scheme of robbery.

Again, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said :

> I stand by the declaration I have made, that protection is nothing less than a deliberate, legalized and organized robbery; and, more than that, if they do not stamp it out, it is a very high road to political slavery first and industrial slavery afterwards.

Again, he said :

> Our policy from first to last has been to destroy the villainous system of protection by free trade, a revenue tariff or continental free trade.

Surely these utterances are sufficient, combined with those that we have heard in this House, to convince the most sceptical that these hon. gentlemen were, at any rate, at that time, staunch believers in free trade or a tariff for revenue only. They have been in power for more than four years. Have they carried out their principles ? Are they establishing a revenue tariff, or a free trade, or continental free trade ? No, the tariff to-day, in its main and essential elements, is a protective tariff as much as any tariff as ever existed in this country. The duties may not be quite so high, but that fact does not destroy the protective elements in the tariff. It is not necessary that a duty should be a certain amount to make it protective. I maintain, and I think that every hon. gentleman who has made a study of political economy will agree with me, that the system we have is a protective system pure and simple. It is true that hon. gentlemen opposite have tinkered with the tariff. They have cut off a frill here and a flounce there, to make the people believe that they are carrying out to some small extent the principles that they have advocated. But in its principles the tariff is a protective tariff. And that tariff is being carried into effect by gentlemen who do not believe in it. Are they the men to carry out the principles of protection ? Is it not right that the people who believe in protection should carry it out and not the party who have professed, all their lives, as the Minister of Commerce professes to-day, that they do not believe in it, but believe in a policy of free trade ? The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce told us one of the main distinguishing features of a protective tariff. He said that a protective tariff was one that reduced the revenue while a revenue tariff was one that increased the revenue. Let us consider this. Surely the hon. gentleman will not deny that the United States is a protective country ; surely he will say that the duties levied there are based upon the principles of protection. Yet, what do we find ? In 1894, the United States imported $257,645,702 worth of dutiable goods; and in 1900 they imported $463,759,330 worth, or nearly double the amount imported in 1894. Yet, the Minister of Commerce would tell us that the United States have a revenue tariff because it increased the customs revenue of the country.

Now, let us go over some of the items of our tariff and see if they are protective. The hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) said that he could point out 140 items the duty on which had been reduced. I challenge the hon. member for London to take the tariff for 1897 and the tariff before that and go over them with me, and I will undertake to show an item on which the duty was raised for every item that he can show on which it was lowered. True, they made a reduction on some items coming from England after that date. Take a few items and see whether they are protective or not. We bring into this country $21,700 worth of fresh salmon, the duty on which is 25 per cent. Is that for protection or for revenue ? We bring in $292,974 worth of furniture, the duty on which is 30 per cent—and this is an item which is not affected by the preference, because furniture comes almost entirely from the United States. Is that duty a revenue or a protective duty ? We import lamp chimneys to the amount of $117,915 from the United States, and none practically, from Britain. The duty on these is 30 per cent. Is this a revenue duty ? In rubber boots and shoes, our imports are $57,591, on which a duty of 25 per cent is charged. Pronged forks—of these we import $10,986, the duty is now 25 per cent. It was 35 per cent. And this reduction, they console themselves, makes it a revenue duty instead of protection. Surely no hon. gentleman who is really in

earnest will maintain that the reduction by 10 per cent of a 35 per cent duty makes it a revenue instead of a protective duty.

Let us take the item of biscuits, $19,781. The duty was raised by 2½ per cent. I do not know whether it was done in the interest of the Minister of Customs who has a large biscuit manufactory in Brantford, but certainly in that respect we do not get any benefit from the preferential tariff. Then, tallow candles, $31,275; carriages and buggies, $43,014. These receive no advantage from the preferential tariff, and they pay a duty of 35 per cent. Thirty-five per cent upon cutters, 25 per cent upon the old farm wagons, $78,033; 25 per cent upon farm wagons and drays, $26,203; 25 per cent on sleighs, $5,684—all these goods are bought from the United States and get no benefit from the preferential tariff. 'Bicycles and tricycles, 30 per cent, $496,129; childrens' carriages, 35 per cent, $19,914; carpet sweepers, 30 per cent, $28,826; clothes wringers, 35 per cent, $13,255, all from the United States, none from England. Bituminous coal, duty 53 cents a ton, $3,609,389. They did make a little reduction of 7 per cent a ton, and therefore they think they have converted themselves from protectionists into free traders.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the duty on English coal ?

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). On hard coal it is the same as it was under the late administration. Duty on electric motors, 25 per cent, $120,299; railroad engines and locomotives, 25 per cent, $398,118; steam engines and boilers, 25 per cent, $103,187; fanning mills, 25 per cent, grain crushers, 25 per cent, windmills, 25 per cent, $15,537; portable engines, 25 per cent, $74,703; portable saw-mills, &c., 25 per cent, $15,779; threshers and separators, 25 per cent, $78,264; sewing machines, 30 per cent, $154,753; axes, 25 per cent, $41,547; typewriting machines, 25 per cent, $91,898; saws, 30 per cent, $73,297; jewellery, 30 per cent, $393,382; boots and shoes, 25 per cent, $427,906. Here they bring in hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of goods, and not one cent of preferential tariff in their favour because they are all brought in from the United States, no similar goods are brought in from Great Britain. Lubricating oils, under 25 cents a gallon, 5 cents a gallon, $81,422; wall paper, 35 per cent, $70,137. I might go on and enumerate a long list of other articles that we bring in from the United States on which the duty is highly protective. There is the matter of coal oil. The hon. member for London took great credit to the government for reducing the duty on coal oil from 7 to 5 cents. I want to draw his attention to a little slip he made, the duty on coal oil was not 7 cents under the late administration but 6 cents, and these gentlemen changed a protective duty of 6 cents to a free trade tariff of 5 cents a gallon on coal oil. Will the Minister of Trade and Commerce dare to stand up in this House and maintain that a 5 cent duty on coal oil is not a protective duty ? Will he dare maintain that it is a revenue tariff or approaches it in any sense ? I do not think that with all his courage, and everybody knows he has a great deal, and it requires a great deal of courage for an hon. gentleman in his position to swallow the principles that he has advocated for twenty years, but even he will not dare to maintain that a 5 cent duty on coal oil is a free trade or a revenue tariff duty. I do not object to these duties that are protective, I maintain that in many cases they are not high enough. The difference between hon. gentlemen opposite and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House is simply that we believe in the principle of protection, and if we were in power we would carry it out to the full extent, while our friends opposite do not believe it but still they are carrying out the principle in such a manner as to make it odious to the people, if they can. Now, I think enough has been said and will be said to convince the people that the hon gentlemen occupying the treasury benches are carrying out the principle of protection simply and solely for the sake of maintaining themselves in power. Sir, I make the statement that it is no credit to the hon. gentlemen who are administering the affairs of this country that they are carrying out a protective principle which they do not believe in, simply in order that they may maintain power. It is no more creditable to those hon. gentlemen to carry out those principles in order to maintain office than it is to the wretch who, at election times, is willing to sell his principles for a five dollar bill. We know that during the last campaign there were many thousand electors, many hundred of thousands, I fear, who were willing to sell their principles, and that is one feature of the financial administration of this government which a portion of the people of this county appear to relish. But not many relish an increase of $16,000,000 in five short years to the total expenditure of this country. But there is a feature of the financial administration of this government which they exhibited a few days prior to the 7th of November, and which a small portion of the people relished to an immense extent, to such an extent that, combined with the abominable race cry that was raised in the province of Quebec, it enabled the hon. gentlemen to put themselves once more in the seats of power. I say that they have no right to claim that they have the endorsement of the people of this country for their extravagant policy during the last five years, and their proposed extravagance in the future. They have no ground to claim that the people have condoned their faithlessness in changing their free trade or revenue tariff policy to a pro-

tection policy. They obtained power at the last election by influences altogether foreign to those which I have mentioned, and it is not to their credit, nor to the credit of a small section of the people of this country, that such a condition of affairs should exist.

Now, a word with regard to the preferential tariff. It is maintained by hon. gentlemen opposite that because our imports from Great Britain during the last two or three years have increased, therefore Great Britain is returning the compliment which this government made her in giving her manufactures a preference in our market. The Minister of Finance pointed to largely increased receipts of goods coming from Great Britain as a proof of that. Now, here is a statement which varies a little from that made by the Minister of Finance. The total amount of dutiable goods coming from Great Britain into this country in 1898 was $22,556,479 ; in 1900 it was $31,561,756, an increase of $9,500,277, or 40 per cent. The total amount of dutiable goods coming from the United States for home consumption in 1898, was $38,063,966 ; in 1900, $53,897,561, an increase of $15,833,601, or 41⅓ per cent, or 1⅓ per cent more increase on dutiable goods for home consumption coming from the United States than coming from Great Britain. Therefore, I say that there is a positive proof that the preference given to England has not effected the great purpose they expected it would. I am not going to maintain that the preference given to England has not been the means of bringing some more goods to this country, but they have come here to the detriment of the manufactures of our own country, to a certain extent. But I want to point out that in spite of this preference the increase of the dutiable goods coming to Canada for home consumption has not been quite so great as it has been from the United States.

What is the inference to be drawn from that ? The inference is that the preference we have given to England of 33⅓ per cent, in the main, does not place England upon any better footing than the United States are upon to-day. On some items, no doubt, she is in a better position, but, in the main, in the total, there is proof that the preference has only placed England on a level with the United States, because the manufacturing in many lines of goods has been done more cheaply in the United States than in England. Each year the United States is wresting from England supremacy in the making of some lines of goods ; the United States can manufacture large lines of goods cheaper than they can be manufactured in England, and it is for that reason that the hon. gentleman's preference does not place England in a very much better position than the United States. Let us take Germany. The hon. member for London mentioned the imports into this country from Germany, and he did not realize that he was putting up an argument against the contention that the preference tariff has induced larger importations. In 1898 we imported from Germany $5,151,719 worth of dutiable goods for home consumption, while in 1900 we imported $7,465,447, an increase of $2,313,726, or 44 9-10 per cent, nearly 5 per cent more of an increase in these two years in the importation of goods from Germany than in the importation of goods from England with a preference of 33⅓ per cent in their favour. Now, what about the trend of the imports from Britain ? We have been comparing two years ; now let us see how it is working out. I want to show hon. gentlemen that the thing is growing worse instead of better. I shall now compare 1899 with 1900, and show that the thing is growing worse, and that we are increasing our importations from the United States more largely than from Great Britain. Comparing 1899 with 1900, from Great Britain, in 1899 we imported, of dutiable goods, $27,521,508 worth, while in 1900, we imported $31,561,756 worth, there being an increase, as between these two years, of $4,040,248, or 14⅔ per cent. Now, take the United States ; we imported of dutiable goods from that country in 1899, $44,471,824 worth, and in 1900, $53,897,561 worth, there being an increase of $9,425,737 worth, or 21⅙ per cent, as against an increase of 14⅔ per cent of importations coming from Great Britain. The tendency appears to be, that, year after year, in spite of the preference we are giving Great Britain, our imports from the United States of dutiable goods entered for home consumption go on increasing at a greater rate than do our imports from Great Britain. The hon. Minister of Finance took credit to himself when he was speaking for the preference tariff, but, when asked by an hon. gentleman on this side of the House to give the figures and to make a statement of comparison with the United States, he said that it was scarcely fair because a large portion of these goods came in free. I have taken the dutiable goods alone and compared them with the importation of dutiable goods from England, and the result shows that the importations have increased from the United States to a greater extent than the importations from Great Britain. I can gather no inference from that but that the preference we have given to Great Britain only places her on a par with the United States, or in a worse position than the United States, and why ? Because, before this preference was given, hon. gentlemen opposite raised the duties to a large extent on the class of goods that we import from Great Britain. Now let us have a comparison of the actual duties levied on dutiable goods coming from Great Britain and coming from the United States. Great Britain has 33⅓ per cent in her favour ; let us compare what the duties are on goods coming from that country with the duty

collected on goods coming from the United States. In 1890 we brought from the United States $53,897,561 worth of dutiable goods, on which we paid $13,491,872, or an average rate of 25¼ per cent. In the same year we brought from Great Britain $31,561,756 worth of goods and paid duty to the amount of $8,074,541, or an average rate of 25½ per cent, or ¼ per cent more on the goods coming from Great Britain than on the goods coming from the United States, in spite of the preference tariff.

Now, I have spoken perhaps very much longer than I should have spoken, being as I am, a new member of this House, but, I felt, Sir, that I could not sit in my place without saying at least a word in regard to the expenditures and in regard to the operations of the government during the last four or five years. I also felt it my duty to offer the suggestions which I have presented as to the line of policy which I think we should adopt in regard to our transportation facilities. I would be very glad to support and assist the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), or any other member of the government, who makes an honest effort to improve the facilities of this country and to bring about such a condition of affairs as will best promote the welfare of the people. Speaking for myself, and when I speak for myself, I am sure I speak for every hon. gentleman on this side of the House, I would say that I did not come here to criticise the government for the purpose of making political capital. I come here, as every other hon. gentleman on this side of the House does, with an endeavour to help the members of the government as far as possible to carry out such a line of policy as will inure to the best interests of the country. Whether they take our advice or not it is their own concern. If they take my advice in regard to improving our transportation facilities, I can assure hon. gentlemen, that, if they do it wisely and prudently, they will have my support. I will not detain you, Mr. Speaker, or the House any longer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate, and in doing so, I would like to give the House notice, that on Monday, I will move an amendment to the resolution that the Speaker do leave the Chair. The motion which I will make will be this :

That all the words after 'that' in the proposed motion be left out, and the following substituted therefor :

That, in the opinion of this House, the welfare of this country requires a pronounced policy of adequate protection and encouragement at all times to the labour, agricultural, manufacturing, mining and other industrial interests of Canada;

That, in the opinion of this House, the adoption of a policy of mutual trade preference within the empire would prove of great benefit to the mother country and to the colonies, and would greatly promote the prosperity, unity and progress of the empire as a whole, and that the present time, when the Commonwealth of Australia is laying the foundation of its fiscal system, is particularly opportune for taking prompt and energetic steps towards the furtherance of this object.

This House is further of opinion that equivalent or adequate duties should be imposed by Canada upon the products and manufactures of countries not within the empire in all cases where such countries fail to admit Canadian products and manufactures upon fair terms, and that the government should take for this purpose all such available measures as may be found necessary.

I hope the right hon. gentleman will have no objection to the debate being now adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 18, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 76) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892. He said : Mr. Speaker, prior to the last session of the Dominion parliament all convictions made by police magistrates in cities and incorporated towns had to be returned to the clerks of the peace of the different counties where the convictions were made. Last year, at the instance of some person, an amendment was made to the Criminal Code whereby it was allowed that police magistrates in cities and incorporated towns should not make these returns to the clerk of the peace. It was suggested that in the city of Toronto, for instance, the police magistrate tried obout 7,000 cases in a year, and that it would be hardship to him if he had to make a return of all these cases to the clerk of the peace in the city of Toronto. Though the police magistrate does try 7,000 police court cases in the year, the fact is that under section 55 of the Act, he would only have to make returns in something like 2,000 cases. The way the matter works out under the amend-

ment of last year is this. In each county there are from four to six or seven police magistrates in the different incorporated towns. All of these magistrates make more or less convictions, and try more or less cases each year. They try more now than formerly by reason of the fact that the jurisdiction of police magistrates is extended, so they are able to try almost any case that can be tried at quarter sessions by the consent of the person accused. The result is that a great many trials, under the Speedy Trials Act, with the consent of the person accused, take place before the police magistrates. If these returns are not made to the clerk of the peace, and if it becomes necessary, after the trial, at any time within six months, or a year, or two years, to get a record of the proceedings, it is impossible to know where to find the record. Unless you happen to know before what police magistrate the person accused was tried, you know nothing as to where to go to find the record of the case which you may happen to have under consideration. You inquire from the police magistrate and he tells you, perhaps, that he did not try the case. You, in the same way, apply to the others, and, of course, you will eventually be able to ascertain before whom the trial took place, but it is a great inconvenience to every person who has anything to do with the administration of the law throughout the country. When returns are made to the clerk of the peace you know that there is one central office where all these records can be obtained and that you may go there and find the papers. The clerk of the peace is a government officer. He is bound, under the law, to have a vault for the protection of these papers. Police magistrates are not so bound. They can keep the papers in a secure place if they choose, or they can keep them in an insecure place and allow them to be lost if they see fit, so that you have no regular system of any kind if the amendment to the code made last year is allowed to stand. I think it could not have been very carefully considered, because, otherwise, the amendment would not have been allowed. I think when the matter comes to be looked into it will be found that the ends of justice and the convenience of the public will be best served by having these returns made to the clerks of the peace in the different counties, as was necessary previous to the amendment of the law.

That is the object of the amendment which I propose. I think I am correct in saying that only one police magistrate in the province of Ontario, or in the entire Dominion for that matter, suggested that this change should be made, and I do not think that the opinion of one single police magistrate in all Canada should be sufficient reason for putting the general public, and particularly the members of the profession who have to do with the administration of the law, to a great deal of inconvenience. I believe that when the Bill is considered in all its phases it will be found to be a wise and judicious and proper thing to amend the Act by striking out that clause which was introduced last session of parliament.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DRAINAGE ACROSS RAILWAYS.

Mr. A. McLENNAN (Inverness). In the absence of Mr. Stephens, I move for leave to introduce Bill (No. 77) to amend the Railway Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. McLENNAN. The only explanation I can give in regard to the Bill is that it is in an improved form, the Bill introduced for several years in succession by the former member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) in reference to drainage along and across railways.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—RETURNED NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

Mr. S. HUGHES (North Victoria). Before the Orders of the Day, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to a matter which has been brought under my notice. Possibly the most concise way to lay the case before the minister is to read a letter which I have received and concerning which I have notified the hon. gentleman. The letter has reference to Corporal H. S. Moodie, and another non-commissioned officer, and I believe this case is similar to that of other non-commissioned officers who have returned from South Africa. A friend writes me as follows :

On leaving St. Johns depot in October, 1899, to join the 2nd (S.S.) Royal Canadian Regiment, Corporal H. S. Moodie was a lance-corporal and was promoted to corporal on board the ss. Sardinian, which rank he held until his return in October last, when he was taken on the strength of the depot with the rank he held in the 2nd Battalion.

On return all N.C. officers who had received promotion while in South Africa rejoined their depots retaining the rank they held in the 2nd Battalion.

Now, an order has been received by the commandant of the depot at St. Johns, Que., to say that N.C. officers who had received promotion while in South Africa would retain their rank as supernumeraries in their depots, without pay, they only to draw pay for the rank they held prior to leaving for South Africa, and any pay they had drawn in excess of the rank pay they were drawing before leaving for South Africa is to be refunded. Sergeant Allen's time expires on the 16th inst., so that he has to go away under this injustice, not having time to get satisfaction or have the wrong righted.

There are two here who are affected by this order, viz.: Sergeant Allen, who was promoted from corporal, and H. S. Moodie, promoted from lance-corporal.

Moodie's case is much more serious, as his term of service expires on the 21st of April, and he intends accepting his discharge.

You may see by this action that all Moodie's good conduct pay is absorbed by having to refund 20 cents a day since rejoining, which amounts to $33.

Moodie had an application in for rejoining the South African Constabulary, and was accepted.

He applied to purchase his discharge; this was refused at the last minute, after he had disposed of all his civilian clothes, and surplus kit at a great loss, and now as he has only a few weeks to serve, the government takes all his good conduct pay he has earned for the last few years, and will then turn him out on the world absolutely penniless.

There are a number in each depot similarly affected.

It is not necessary that I should read the balance of the letter.

Mr. SPEAKER. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman will conclude with a motion to adjourn ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If necessary I will do so.

Mr. SPEAKER. It would be more regular.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I shall conclude with a motion to adjourn the House. I would draw the attention of the minister to another aspect of this case. A large number of the soldiers who have been with the regiment in Halifax have recently taken their discharge and they are very dissatisfied because they had to leave in their civilian clothes. Some of them state that the order was that they should not only hand in their overcoats, fur caps and boots, but also their ordinary kharki uniform. It seems rather hard that the men should be sent home at this season of the year without their overcoats, or without being in position to get civilian clothes. Many of these men, I suppose, disposed of their civilian clothes when they enlisted or returned them to their homes. I saw some of the men on the train in their light kharki uniform; in fact it was a mixture, some having civilian and others military caps. I would suggest to the minister that each man should retain the overcoat and the other parts of the uniform that he had worn for a year. The orders to the contrary have caused a good deal of dissatisfaction. I do not wish to find fault; in fact I am not sufficiently posted on the details at the present time, but as other men will be returning, I trust that the minister will look into the question. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). I am quite unable to answer at this moment the question which my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) has put. It is true he sent a note to the Militia Department this morning, but I did not happen to be in my office at the time, and as I only knew of the substance of the note by telephone I have had no opportunity to make inquiry. If the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to send me such portions of the letter as he has read with the name of the writer, I will promise to give an answer at the earliest moment.

As to the Halifax men, I understand from the general that these men have been treated as all men under similar circumstances are treated, and in fact better, because they have been allowed to take their uniform away with them. It is presumed, I suppose, that when men enlist they have civilian clothes, and that these clothes would be available when they are discharged. We have not only allowed the men to return in their civilian clothing, but we are giving them the uniform they were wearing at the time their services terminated. I will get fuller information on that matter also.

Motion to adjourn the House negatived.

NORTH BRUCE ELECTION.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Before the Orders of the Day are taken up, I wish to bring to the attention of the House an item which appears in the Wiarton Canadian, and to ask a question in connection with it. It is headed :

' Shameful Tactics ; Contemptible Act of the Grit Combination ; Conservative Mail Clerks Transferred to Prevent them from Voting ; '

And reads as follows :—

The Grit machine has commenced its work in connection with the North Bruce by-election, and the act that has been perpetrated this week by the Tarte-Laurier combination is one of the most contemptible in the history of party politics, but it is one that will be a boomerang——

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to call the hon. member's attention to the fact that questions which may be brought up before the Orders of the Day are only questions of privilege. I do not see that the article which the hon. member is reading involves any question of privilege.

Mr. SPROULE. If you had been good enough to allow me to get through, Mr. Speaker, I was going to show where the urgency came in, and how it was absolutely necessary to bring the matter to the attention of the House at the present time.

Mr. SPEAKER. The article which the hon. member is reading appears to have reference to an election. It is not a question of privilege.

Mr. MACLEAN. These men want to vote.

Mr. SPEAKER. I heard enough of the article to see that it does not involve a question of privilege as that is understood by the rules of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. As I understand, I have a right to bring the matter up either as a question of urgency or a question of privilege. I bring it up as a question of urgency, because the election takes place the day

after to-morrow, and the question concerns the right of individuals to use the franchise.

Mr. SPEAKER. Perhaps there is some misunderstanding in regard to questions of urgency. I suggested the other day that when any hon. member wishes to bring up a question of urgency, it would perhaps be advisable for him to have an understanding with the government as to the bringing up of that question. The general rule is that no question can be brought up without two days' notice having been given. Besides I do not see that there is any great urgency in the question now brought, up, and I think it should not be allowed.

Mr. SPROULE. In the first place, I could not give notice because the matter only came into my hands a few moments ago. Surely I am in order in trying to show why this is a question of urgency.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question has been decided so far as I am concerned. I do not consider this a question of urgency. The question may have been brought to the attention of the hon. member only a few moments ago, but he might give notice of it, and then it could be brought up at a future day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I rise, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of obtaining a thorough understanding of your decision? As I understand, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is trying to bring to the attention of the House certain alleged conduct of the Post Office Department, which will result in depriving certain electors of North Bruce of the right to vote the day after to-morrow. The matter has been brought to his attention only a few moments ago. He regards it as a matter of urgency. If it is not brought to the attention of the government to-day, it will be too late to bring it to their attention at all, as the election takes place the day after to-morrow. If, under these circumstances, you decide as you apparently have decided, that the matter cannot be dealt with as a question of urgency in the House, we shall bow at once to your decision; but it may involve consequences which you may not have fully taken into consideration. I would respectfully suggest, with all deference to your ruling, that the hon. gentleman had no other course under the circumstances than to attempt to bring the matter to the attention of the House at the present time, because, as you yourself will see, it would be idle for him to do so at any later day.

Mr. SPEAKER. Perhaps there is some misunderstanding in regard to the rule. No question can be brought up before the Orders of the Day except by giving notice of motion. It has been allowed sometimes to bring up questions of urgency, without notice, but they are not regular. Even questions of urgency should not be brought up without notice, except with the unanimous consent of the House. I was simply drawing the attention of the hon. member to the fact that I did not think this was a question of privilege, and I did not see that it was of so much urgency that it might be brought up just now.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to make an observation, is not this a question of privilege? Would not the alleged fact that certain electors are going to be prevented from exercising their franchise be an infraction of one of the most important privileges of this House? I have not looked up the point; but it seems to me under the circumstances that it might well be considered a question of privilege—a privilege not of a member, but of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. A question of privilege might affect the seat of a member. This question does not appear to affect the seat of any member, and therefore I do not think it should be considered a question of privilege. Orders of the Day.

SUPPRESSION OF THEATRES AND GAMBLING HOUSES IN DAWSON.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). As I wish to lay on the Table of the House certain correspondence in answer to an inquiry by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, I beg to move:

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence and papers relating to the issue of an order for the suppression of theatres and gambling houses in Dawson City.

Motion agreed to.

SOUTH AFRICAN CONSTABULARY UNIFORMS.

Hon. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Mr. Speaker, I am not unmindful of the ruling which you have given to-day, nor of the one you gave a few days ago in regard to a matter brought up by myself; but I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia (Hon. Mr. Borden) in particular to a matter which I consider of the greatest urgency; that is, the uniforms which have been issued to the South African Constabulary, who are to leave here in a few days. At present they are clothed in suits of dungaree or blue jean with woven toques, which are altogether derogatory to men of their standing. I can assure the government that both the non-commissioned officers and men feel very deeply their being obliged to wear such clothing when being enlisted and whilst in town. It is all right on shipboard, but it is not the style of uniform that Canadians should be asked to wear in town. Especially is it noticeable now that we have the Strathconas here in their picturesque garb, going about our streets; and these men in the constabulary feel very badly about it. I do not blame

the government, as I am informed that the government are not paying these men, but that it is for the Imperial government to provide them with uniforms as the men are under their pay. But I do think that our government might have made some different arrangements so that the men of the constabulary might be clothed in a more suitable uniform. They certainly should be provided with khaki uniforms and puttees, and at least a small forage cap. I am informed on good authority that to clothe these men in a becoming uniform would not cost more than $5,000, and I feel perfectly certain that if Mr. Chamberlain or the Imperial government were cabled on this matter they would willingly provide the funds to furnish a suitable uniform. If they would not, then I think that Canada could afford to provide for these men, who, I am glad to say, are as fine a body of men as you could find in the world, $5,000 so that they could go out of the country in creditable shape; they will have to land in Cape Town wearing this miserable clothing, and there they will come face to face with the Imperial troops. They will be a laughing-stock, and I am sure that nobody in this House or this country wishes that. I would make an appeal to the government that they should look into this matter. I am informed that in twenty-four hours these men can be provided with khaki uniforms, and I trust that the Minister of Militia (Hon. Mr. Borden, King's), who, I regret to see is not in the House at this time, will give this subject careful and immediate consideration.

QUESTIONS.

ST. JOHN HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Wilson—asked:

Referring to page 7401 of 'Hansard' for the year 1899, in which the Minister of Railways said, 'With these two deposits amounting to thirty-four thousand dollars there would be a diminution by that amount in the cost of the work, assuming that the contract being awarded to Connolly, they were prepared to enter into it for this sum'—

1. In what year and where does this amount appear in the public accounts ?

2. If it does not appear in the public accounts, has it been returned to the contractors ? If so, in what manner and on what dates ?

3. If not reported in the public accounts or not returned to the contractors, what disposition has been made of the amount ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair):

1. This amount does not appear in the public accounts.

2. No. it has not been returned to the contractors.

3. The cheques for the amount have been sent to the Department of Finance. My attention has been recently called to the fact that they were still remaining with the accountant in my department.

LIGHTHOUSE—HAWK ISLAND, N.S.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

What are the particulars and dates respecting the calling for tenders and contract for lighthouse at Hawk Island, county of Richmond, Nova Scotia ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In the absence of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies), I would answer the hon. gentleman's question as follows :

Tenders for the construction of lighthouse on Hawk Island, Poulamond Bay, Richmond county, N.S., were invited by bills sent to the agent of the department at Halifax, and to the post offices at Poulamond and Arichat, to be put up in conspicuous places. Three tenders were received, viz.: Peter McLean, Cannes, $942; Alex. McCuish, St. Peter's, $1,373; Edward Doyle, Poulamond, $1,397.

The manner in which the case was dealt with is set forth in the following memorandum from the acting Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Hardie, dated Oct. 23, 1900 :

The minister approved of the acceptance of the tender of Mr. Alexander McLean, carpenter and builder, Cannes, for the construction of a wooden lighthouse, with outbuildings, on Hawk Island, Poulamond Bay, N.S., for the sum of $942.

Before informing Mr. McLean of the acceptance of his tender a letter was received from him, dated 29th Sept., requesting that the contract might not be awarded to him as he omitted to charge for masons amounting to $167.

As the amount omitted in Mr McLean's tender if added to it would still make the tender considerably lower than the next, which is one from Alexander McCuish, of St. Peter's, N.S., amounting to $1,373, inquiry was made of Mr. McLean as to whether he would accept the work if $167 was added to his original tender. He writes to say, under date 19th inst., that he will be glad to do the work, but it is now too late in the season to carry it on this fall, and that it would be the last of November before he could get lumber, so that he could not possibly finish the work before the 1st of January. He states that if it would suit to have the work completed on or before the 1st of June he would undertake the work at the price stated, viz, $1,109. The chief engineer recommends that the time be extended to the 1st of June and the work given to Mr. McLean at the amount stated, and I concur in his recommendation.

The matter is submitted for the minister's approval.

(Sgd.) J. H.

The minister approved of this recommendation and the contract was made accordingly.

I.C.R.—NUMBER OF HANDS EMPLOYED.

Mr. MORIN asked :

What was the number of hands, including the staff employed by the government, on the Inter-

colonial Railway, on the first day of July in each year during the years 1892-3-4-5-6-7-8-9 and 1900 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

The number of persons, including staff, employed by the government, on the Intercolonial Railway, on the first day of July in each year during the years 1892-3-4-5-6-7-8-9 and 1900, is as follows :

1892	3,537
1893	4,376
1894	4,146
1895	3,982
1896	4,193
1897	4,386
1898	4,740
1899	5,309
1900	5,949

BUILDINGS IN OTTAWA LEASED BY GOVERNMENT.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Hughes—asked :

1. How many buildings not public property, are leased, rented or occupied in the city of Ottawa by the Federal government ?
2. Where are they situated and what rental is paid for each ?
3. By whom are the buildings severally owned?
4. Does the government pay taxes on such properties ? If not, who does ?
5. If no taxes are paid, under what provision of the law is exemption obtained ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

With reference to questions 4 and 5, all property which is leased by the government in the city of Ottawa is not subject to taxation. The government pays no taxes. This is done under British North America Act, section 125.

As to questions 1, 2 and 3, the information had better be moved for in the ordinary way.

CANADA EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. WALLACE asked :

1. Has any promise, statement or assurance, written or oral, been given by the Minister of Railways and Canals, or by the Premier, or by any member of the government to Alexander Gibson, or to any person, with respect to the intention of the government as to the purchase of the Canada Eastern Railway ?
2. If so, what promise, statement or assurance has been so given, and when was it given and to whom ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

I am not aware that any member of the government, other than myself, has made any statement or had any communication on the subject of the acquiring of the Canada Eastern Railway as part of the Intercolonial; nor do I believe that any such communication has taken place.

During the past four years, boards of trade in different sections of the province of New Brunswick, municipal bodies and the city and town councils of Fredericton and Chatham have declared themselves strongly in favour of the policy of the government taking over the Canada Eastern Railway, and both political parties in the provincial legislature have joined in a unanimous memorial to the government, in favour of the acquisition of this road by the government.

The railway intercepts the Intercolonial at Chatham Junction with one terminus, and crosses at the other terminus the St. John river, at Fredericton, over the new steel bridge, to which the Dominion government has contributed $300,000, which sum, with interest, remains as a lien upon the structure.

From time to time, both publicly and privately, when this question has been brought up by these various bodies and by business men, I have not hesitated to acknowledge that, in my opinion, speaking for myself alone, it would be in the interest of the Intercolonial that the Canada Eastern road should become part of the government railway system, and I have stated that I would, personally, advocate action by the government in this direction ; but I have never made, nor profess to make, any offer to the Canada Eastern Railway Company, or any person in its behalf, for the purchase of the road, nor has the company, or any person on its behalf made to me any offer for the sale thereof.

CORNWALL CANAL SUPERINTENDENCY.

Mr. PRINGLE asked :

1. Is Mr. J. H. Ramsay overseer of the Cornwall Canal ?
2. Has any notice of dismissal been served upon him ? If so, when does it take effect ?
3. If notice was served, what was the reason for serving and what charges (if any) were made against him ?
4. Was any investigation held ?
5. If so, was Mr. Ramsay given an opportunity of defending himself ?
6. Has any successor been appointed ?
7. If so, whom ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. No.
2. Yes, 1st March, 1901.
3. No charges made. For improvement of service.
4. No.
5. No. 4 answers this.
6. Yes.
7. Mr. Frank Lally.

I.C.R. ELEVATOR AT ST. JOHN.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Wilson—asked :

What are the names of the persons employed in connection with the Intercolonial Railway elevator at St. John ? What is the nature of their duties, and what wages do they receive, respectively ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

The names of persons employed at the elevator at St. John, the nature of their duties and the wages they receive, are as follows :

J. A. Perley, foreman, $75 a month; W. H. Daniels, weighman, $60 a month; Jerry Daley, engineer, $75 a month; F. P. Sinclair, clerk, $38 a month; W. Terris, fireman, $1.35 a day; A. Sterling, night watchman, $1.20 a day.

I. C. R. ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Wilson—asked :

What are the names of the persons employed in connection with the Intercolonial Railway elevator at Halifax ? What is the nature of their duties, and what wages do they receive, respectively ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

The names of persons employed at the elevator at Halifax, the nature of their duties and the wages they receive, are as follows :

William Peddle, day watchman, $1.25 a day; Allen Macdonald, night watchman, $1.20 a day.

P.E.I.—COMMUNICATION WITH MAINLAND.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to put the pier of Cape Tormentine in thorough repair this season, in order that the steamer Stanley plying between Summerside, Prince Edward Island and the mainland may land mails, passengers and freight there ?

2. Has the government decided to commence forthwith the construction of a pier at Carleton Point, on the Prince Edward Island side ? If not, why ?

3. How many boats are employed by the government for the carrying of mails and passengers between Cape Traverse and Tormentine this winter ? How many men to each boat ? The names of the men and the wages paid each ?

4. Were the boats in readiness to perform the service when the first detention of the winter steamers took place, so that mails and passengers would not be delayed ?

5. How many days elapsed in the month of February of this year without having mails from Prince Edward Island, and who is responsible for the inconvenience and loss in this connection ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. Repairs are now being carried on.

2. No decision has been arrived at upon this subject.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). As the remainder of these questions relate to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, in the absence of the hon. minister (Hon. Sir Louis Davies), I answer them as follows :

3. Ten boats, five going each way when practicable. Six men to each boat, including the officer in charge. Captains are paid at the rate of $75 per month, coxswains at the rate of $55 per month, bowmen at the rate of $50 per month, and waistmen at the rate of $45 per month. The same men are not continuously employed.

4. Yes, the boats were ready, but on account of continued snow storms and gales of wind it was impossible for the boats to cross.

5. Eight, from the 5th to the 13th February. I am informed that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries during this period made several attempts to cross the capes and each time had to return to Charlottetown as the boats could not cross on account of the weather. He came over on the first boat that was able to come across with the mails.

DAWSON PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. What is the cost of construction for the different public buildings, respectively, in Dawson?

2. Which of them were built under contract and which by day's labour under government supervision?

3. If by contractors, who were the contractors?

4. From which building, if any, were tenders asked?

5. What were the amounts of the different tenders?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. Telegraph office, to date, $10,000 ; and post office, to date, $50,246.68.

2 and 3. Both by day labour.

4. Instructions were issued to call for tenders for the construction of the post office and court house, tenders to be opened by Messrs. Ogilvie and Charleson in Dawson.

5. A telegram was received from Mr. Charleson, as follows : McLean Bros., $295,000, unaccepted cheque for $2,000 ; Yukon Saw Mills Co., $165,000 ; Mathewson, $142,079 ; others higher. It was ultimately decided to construct those buildings by day labour under the supervision of the resident architect, Mr. Fuller—and, to date one building (the post office) has been constructed.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked :

Is it the intention of the Department of Railways and Canals to grant to the permanent employees of the Canadian government railway system a reduction of freight rates over said system for the transportation of fuel for personal use only and household goods when an employee is obliged to move from one point to another, as is practiced on all company railroads where the employees thereof have a heavy reduction of freight, so long as they stay within the limit of the rules laid down in said allowance?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). This concession was tried some years ago but on account of its abuse by many of those per-

sons to whom the concession was granted, it was discontinued. It is not now proposed to revive it.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S FOOT GUARDS.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. What amount has been expended during the past five fiscal years on accoutrements, clothing and arms for the Governor General's Foot Guards, showing each year separately?

2. What amount has been expended during the same time on the band of the said regiment for clothing, instruments and music, showing each item and year separately?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). This is the statement in detail :

Statement showing amount expended during the past five fiscal years on accoutrements, clothing and arms for the Governor General's Foot Guards.

Accoutrements Issued from Stores.

1896-7	No issues
1897-8	"
1898-9	"
1899-1900—Oliver equipment	$1,773 75
S. Sergt. sword and belts	82 50
Value	$1,856 25
1900-1	No issues

Clothing, including Fur Head-dress.

1896-7—Issues amounting to	$ 300 43
1897-8 " "	2,491 13
1898-9 " "	5,211 22
1899-1900 " "	770 60
1900-1 " "	6,378 97
	*$15,152 35
Less band	1,163 42
Exclusive of band	$13,988 93

*Clothing for band—$1,163.42—included herein.

Arms Issued from Stores.

1896-7—325 rifles complete	$7,475 00
1897-8	No issues
1898-9	"
1899-1900	"
1900-1—Forty-four rifles complete	1,012 00
Value	$8,487 00

Statement showing the amount expended during the past five fiscal years for clothing, band instruments and music for the band of the Governor General's Foot Guards.

Clothing.

1896-7	No issues	
1897-8—32 frocks	$124 18	
32 pairs trousers	85 12	
		$209 30
1898-9	No issues	
1899-1900—33 tunics	$344 03	
33 caps	124 31	
		468 34
1900-1—33 frocks	$152 92	
33 pairs trousers	93 06	
33 great coats	239 80	
		485 78
		$1,163 42
Included in clothing for regiment		$15,152 35

Mr. BLAIR.

Instruments.

1899-1900—Grant to assist in purchase....$1,000

No other expenditure in past five years.

Music.

1900-1—One set sheet music..... $2 50

No other expenditure in past five years.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

1. What is the maximum grade on the Intercolonial Railway between (a) Montreal and Halifax, and (b) Moncton and St. John?

2. Has the government made an estimate of the sums of money necessary :—(a) to reduce the grades on the Intercolonial Railway to one-half per cent? (b) to double track the line from (1) Moncton to Halifax; (2) Moncton to St. John; (3) Truro to the Straits of Canso or other good port in that locality?

3. If the cost of any or all of these projects is known, will the government state the amount in each case?

4. What is the horse-power or tonnage of the most powerful engine running on the Intercolonial?

5. How many tons of freight, under present conditions, could that engine haul from Montreal to Halifax?

6. How many tons of freight could a similar engine haul from Montreal to Halifax, provided the line had not more than one-half per cent gradients?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. (a) The maximum grade on the Intercolonial Railway between Montreal and Halifax is 65 feet.

(b) Between Moncton and St. John, 45 feet.

2. Attention has been given to the subject of reducing grades, &c., but no estimate of any entire division of the line have been made. The same may be said with respect to the double tracking of any portion of the line.

(a) No.
(1) No.
(2) No.
(3) No.

3. The cost is not known.

4. The Consolidation engine, which has four (4) pairs of driving wheels coupled. Total weight of engine and tender is 129 tons.

5. This engine will haul 1,000 tons weight over the present grades from Montreal to Halifax.

6. A similar engine could haul 1,450 tons from Montreal to Halifax, provided the line had not more than one-half per cent gradient.

MR. D. J. O'DONOGHUE.

Mr. INGRAM—by Mr. Clancy—asked :

1. What is the date of the appointment of Mr. D. J. O'Donoghue, and by whom was he recommended?

2. What amount of salary does he receive annually, and what are his duties?

3. Did the government pay his removal expenses from Toronto to Ottawa? If so, how much did the government pay?

4. By what authority did the government pay his removal expenses? If by order in council, will the government lay said order in council on the Table of the House?

5. If by order in council or otherwise, what precedent has heretofore existed for paying the removal expenses of any new appointment?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. On 30th March, 1900.

2. $1,500 a year as a special officer to decide on a scale of fair wages to be paid employees on government contracts. And claims and other matters referring to the fair wages conditions in contracts.

3. Government did not pay for Mr. O'Donoghue's removal expenses.

I. C. R. SECTIONS.

Mr. MARTINEAU asked :

1. What are the limits and extent of each of the several sections of the Intercolonial Railway between Lévis and St. Flavie?

2. How far does the St. Valier section extend in St. François, and how far in St. Valier?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The sections run from 4½ to 7½ miles in length.

2. St. Valier station is on the 120th section. This section extends from ¾ miles east of St. Michel to 1¼ miles west of St. François.

THE UNION MUTUAL, OF PORTLAND, LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. GAUVREAU—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

Whether the life insurance company, 'The Union Mutual, of Portland, Maine,' has deposited in the hands of the government the amount required by law for the security of its Canadian policy-holders?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Yes.

DEPUTY RETURNING OFFICERS.

Mr. GAUVREAU—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

Whether the government are aware that the deputy returning officers in the province of Quebec at the last election—or a large proportion of their number—have not as yet been paid their mileage allowance? What has been the cause of the delay in this matter? Is it the intention of the government to provide an immediate remedy?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The government are aware that there has been some delay in adjusting these accounts. The Auditor General states that out of 2,439 claims received from deputy returning officers in the province of Quebec, 2,133 have been finally dealt with, leaving 306 claims for mileage, about which the returning officers have been asked to furnish explanations. The explanations are being considered as promptly as possible after their receipt.

The delay in dealing with the election accounts was due to the necessity for employing the whole staff of the Audit Office on the preparation of the audit report. Since the report was completed the examination of the election accounts has proceeded without interruption.

INTERCOLONIAL AND CANADA ATLANTIC FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. KEMP asked :

1. What was the rate per 100 pounds from Parry Sound to St. John, on export grain carried by the Canada Atlantic and Intercolonial Railways last November and December?

2. What was the rate per 100 pounds accruing to the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to St. John as its proportion of the through rate from Parry Sound?

3. What was the quantity carried?

4. What is the estimate of the net gain or loss to the government railway in connection with handling this export grain?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Rate per hundred pounds from Parry Sound to St. John, on export grain carried by the Canada Atlantic and Intercolonial Railways last November and December :

Grain.	Average Rate.
On wheat	9⅜ cts. per 100 lbs.
On rye .....10·7	cts. per 100 lbs.
On corn .....10·9	cts. per 100 lbs.

2. The rate per 100 pounds accruing to the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to St. John as its proportion of the through rate from Parry Sound, is as follows :

Grain	Rate.
On wheat	5·6 cts. per 100 lbs.
On rye	6·3 cts. per 100 lbs.
On corn	6·4 cts. per 100 lbs.

3. The total quantity of grain carried was 395,720 bushels.

4. It has not been the usage on the Intercolonial, nor is it customary on any railway to furnish the public an estimate of loss or gain to the railway in any particular shipment or shipments, nor would it be possible to do so with an approach to accuracy. Many varying elements would need to be taken into consideration for the purposes of such an estimate : such as the capacity of the cars ; power of the locomotive ; the rate and quantity of return freights supplied to the cars carrying the grain ; terminal charges and delays in transport, which more frequently occur during the winter season, before even an approximate estimate could be attempted to be made.

GRAIN ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX.

Mr. KEMP asked :

1. How much did the grain elevator cost, built by the present government, at the city of Halifax ?

2. How many bushels of grain have been shipped therefrom ?

3. How many men are employed at said elevator ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The total cost of the grain elevator at Halifax is $159,728.75, outside of value of several lots of land, and including city of Halifax contribution.

2. 763,425 bushels of grain have been shipped from the elevator at Halifax since it was first built.

3. Two men are employed at the said elevator.

MAIL SERVICE, ALLISTON AND ROSEMONT.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Who has the contract for carrying the mails between Alliston and Rosemont, in South Simcoe ?

2. What is the date of the contract, or renewal, and the amount paid ?

3. Were advertisements for tenders issued at date of last renewal, and if so, when ?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND :

1. John Joseph Holland is the contractor for the mail service between Alliston and Rosemont.

2. The contract at present in operation began on the 1st April, 1897, and terminates on the 31st March, instant. This contract was renewed with Mr. Holland for four years from 1st April proximo on the same terms and conditions.

3. Tenders were invited in 1897, due to be opened on the 19th February of that year. Two were received, from J. J. Holland at $234.75 a year, and from J. H. Johnston at $238 a year. Mr. Holland's offer being the lower was accepted, and a contract made with him at that rate. This is the contract now in operation. The former rate was $238 a year.

LOBSTER LICENSE, ANTICOSTI.

Mr. KAULBACH asked :

Is Mr. M. G. Daggett, to whom license was granted for packing lobsters on the Island of Anticosti, an employee in the service of Henri Menier, the owner of the island ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Mr. Dogget, or Dagget, I am not sure of the name, the person referred to, is an agent of Mr. Menier.

WELLAND CANAL, LOCK 24.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. Who was the successful tenderer for strengthening the wall at the head of lock 24, on the new Welland canal, for which tenders were advertised on January 18 last, and what is the amount of the tender accepted ?

2. From whom were other tenders received, and what was the amount of each respectively ? When was the contract let, and to whom, and for what amount ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The contract has not yet been executed, and until it is, it would not be in the public interest to give the information asked for.

WELLAND CANAL—QUANTITY OF WATER.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. What quantity of water per minute in cubic feet is being passed through the Welland canal at Welland ?

(a) What portion of this is required for the feed of the new canal for purposes of navigation ?

2. What is the maximum quantity of water per minute in cubic feet which can be passed through the canal at Welland, without being detrimental to navigation, according to the latest reports by the engineers ?

3. What quantity of water per minute in cubic feet is now passing into the old Welland canal ?

4. What quantity of water per minute in cubic feet can be passed through or down the old Welland canal ?

5. What quantity of water per minute in cubic feet was granted the Cataract Power Company by lease, in 1896 or 1897, and what amount since, and when ?

6. What quantity of water per minute in cubic feet is now passing the guard lock at Thorold ?

7. What quantity of water per minute in cubic feet is taken from the old Welland canal at Merritton and passed into the hydraulic race ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Some 66,000 cubic feet per minute. (a) Eighteen thousand (18,000) cubic feet per minute are reserved for the feed of the new canal for purposes of navigation.

2. Some 135,000 cubic feet per minute can be passed through the aqueducts without detriment to navigation, if that quantity could be discharged into the canal from Lake Erie without drawing down the summit level.

3. Some 45,000 cubic feet.

4. The quantity cannot be definitely stated until the various structures, upon the canal, are arranged to control and regulate a greater quantity of water than at present flows through it, which quantity can be considerably increased.

5. The Cataract Power Company was granted the right to draw from the canal 6,000 cubic feet of water per minute. No additional quantity of water has been leased since.

6. Some 34,500 cubic feet per minute.

7. Some 9,000 cubic feet per minute.

EMPLOYMENT OF CHINESE OR JAPANESE.

Hon Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Has the government issued orders to their agents in British Columbia not to employ Chinese or Japanese on any public works or government steamers ?

2. Is the government aware whether Chinese are employed as cooks on any government vessels, in British Columbia ?

3. If they are so employed, is it the intention of the government to continue their services ?

4. Is the government aware that there are plenty of white cooks obtainable for such employment ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). No special instructions have been given, but it is understood that Canadian labour is to be employed on the government steamers where it can be obtained, and we are not aware of any departure from the rule.

CARRIAGE OF MAILS BY CENTRAL RAILWAY.

Mr. WILMOT—by Mr. Hughes (Victoria)—asked :

1. Is the Central Railway, New Brunswick, under contract with the Post Office Department for carriage of mails ?
2. If so, what are the conditions of such contract, including amount to be paid ?
3. Have these conditions been carried out, and has any money, beyond amount of contract price, been asked for or paid ?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND :

1. The Central Railway of New Brunswick carries mails under an agreement with the Post Office Department.
2. To carry mails daily, each way, between Norton and Chipman, distance 45 miles, payment at the rate of four cents per running mile.
3. The conditions have not been carried out by the railway company, owing to a bridge disaster at Sargson in August last, but the railway company have substituted a stage, and performed the service. No money beyond agreement price has been asked for or paid.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—AXES FOR BRITISH TROOPS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the Canadian government any knowledge of a contract made by the British War Office with an American merchant for the supply of 3,000 felling axes for the British troops in South Africa ?
2. If so, was the contract made through the government of Canada ?
3. Who was the American merchant, and what was the price paid ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). The government has no knowledge whatever of any such contract as is referred to.

NORTH BRUCE ELECTION.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Before the orders of the day are taken up, I desire to bring to the attention of the House an item which I think reflects no credit upon the government of the day. I will read from an article in the Wiarton Canadian of March 14, and starting out with these headlines :

Shameful Tactics.—Contemptible Act of the Grit Combination.—Conservative Mail Clerks Transferred to prevent them from Voting.

The Grit machine has commenced its work in connection with the North Bruce by-election, and the act that has been perpetrated this week by the Tarte-Laurier combination is one of the most contemptible in the history of party politics, but it is one that will be a boomerang of telling force on the mean and cowardly Grit party who dare not force a fair and honourable contest.

Two mail clerks, Messrs. C. Pearson and R. Nelson, whose homes are in Wiarton, and who have resided here for years, have been sent to London until after the election in order that they may not be able to vote. Both gentlemen are capable and competent officers of the mail service, and during their long term of service no complaint has ever been made against them, but they are Conservatives, and to prevent them from voting for the Conservative candidate on March 20, they are transferred to another division of the service until after election.

Was ever any act more cowardly ? These gentlemen whose homes, property and interests are in North Bruce, are forcibly disfranchised by a despotic government which dare not allow the people to exercise their free will.

And two other mail clerks whose families, whose homes and whose interests are in London, are brought down for the time being to do the work of these men. I do not know whether it is the Postmaster General, now on his way to Australia, who is responsible for this, or the acting Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Sutherland), but if it is the Postmaster General, it is in keeping with the same tactics we have seen on his part during the late election. If it is the present acting Postmaster General, I respectfully submit that it is no credit to him. To my mind, one of the sacred rights of a Canadian subject is the franchise, he is undoubtedly entitled to exercise the franchise according to his own judgment, no matter whether he is in the service or out of the service, unless he occupies certain positions in which the law specifies that he should not vote. But in this case these parties have a right to vote. Therefore, I respectfully submit that they should have been allowed to remain where they were, and to vote if they felt disposed. I do not know whether they intended to vote or not, but if they felt disposed to vote, they had a perfect right to go and vote without being interfered with or molested. I can only say that if it is the acting Postmaster General who has done this, I would have expected better things of him; but it is quite in keeping with the tactics that have been adopted of late to prevent a free expression of the will of the people in the elections. We have a number of men up in that riding to-day who, I believe, are connected with the old Grit machine ; if they are not originators and manipulators of the machine. They are doing their fine work to the best of their ability, and in addition they have gone further and disfranchised men who have done nothing in the world to incur the displeasure of the government, except that possibly, as they were known to be Conservatives, they might exercise their right to vote the day

after to-morrow against the government candidate.

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). Mr. Speaker, the matter was brought to my attention on Saturday last by a telegram from a gentleman in Wiarton—I think it was from Wiarton, from the constituency anyway. I at once made inquiries and gave instructions to the deputy head of the department, that these gentlemen, if they had votes should be allowed to return and vote. I may say that this practice of continually bringing up rubbish out of newspapers, written in the heat of a campaign, seems to be out of place in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that what the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) calls rubbish ?

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think, from the first line that the hon. gentleman read, it is plain to see the kind of campaign that his party are running in North Bruce. It indicates the line of policy that they are adopting in this election. I wish to say that politics have had nothing to do with this matter at all. I believe it is in accordance with the custom of the department. They have instituted a new system of examination by which mail clerks are allowed an opportunity of becoming more proficient, and, without respect to party, they are promoted in the department according to their proficiency, as shown in this examination. The department have also adopted the policy of allowing mail clerks who have been in the service for some time, working on a short branch, to have an opportunity of increasing their knowledge and proficiency by being transferred to more important lines. As far as I am concerned, the first I knew of the matter was upon receipt of a telegram on Saturday, not from a Conservative, but from a prominent Liberal, drawing attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman states, and suggesting that these persons should be allowed to vote. I gave instructions that, if possible, arrangements should be made to allow them to vote, so that, there is no party consideration in the matter at all. I do not believe that the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) knew anything about it. On the contrary, the matter occurred simply in the ordinary course of the department. I would be very sorry to think that this department would take advantage of their position to use their employees in that way. If it is possible, in connection with the service they are performing, they should be allowed to return and cast their votes for whichever party they may choose.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). What I am going to state is not newspaper rubbish that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) has referred to, in speaking of what the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has read, because, I was in the midst of this election only a few days ago and heard for myself from one of the men who was sent from the London division to Wiarton, what had taken place. I may tell the hon. acting Postmaster General that he has done his party very good service indeed by issuing the order which he says he has issued to allow these men who were sent from Wiarton to London to come back and exercise their franchise. The feeling there was most intense, not only with Conservatives, but, with Liberals as well, and I have not the slightest doubt that if these men were prevented from voting, and no one supposed that the change was made for any reason other than to prevent them from voting, the Liberal party would lose many votes by the action of the government. I was there and I had an opportunity of ascertaining what the feeling was. I feel assured that the Liberals there consider that a great wrong had been done to two very honourable men who, I was told, did not take any part in elections beyond exercising their reasonable right to vote. They were men who were in no way offensive partisans. They were good citizens and those sent from London knew no reason why they were transferred from London to Wiarton ; neither do I suppose those who were transferred from Wiarton to London, could give any good reason why they were transferred. The reasonable assumption was that it was done wholly and solely for political purposes, and the simple designation of this statement by the hon. acting Postmaster General as rubbish, I think, will not go very far in the town of Wiarton, when his words are reported there. One can readily see the intensity of the feeling in that place when even a Liberal had to wire. They found that the matter was operating so strongly against them that a Liberal had to take the matter up in order to break the force of the injury which the action of the government was going to cause to the party in this election. I am very glad, even though the Conservative candidate may not secure some of the Liberal votes that this matter would have brought to him, that this great wrong has been righted and these men are to be permitted to go back and exercise that which is the right of every British subject. I hope there will be no neglect on the part of the acting minister in giving orders that these men shall be allowed to go back and exercise their franchise.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to make a personal explanation. I did not say that the matter was rubbish ; I referred to the way in which it was written up in the newspaper. It is quite proper, I think, that such matters should be brought to the attention of the department.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. A nice distinction.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Fielding :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, when my right hon. friend who leads the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) gets into what we may refer to as a tight corner, he is very versatile and resorts to various expedients. Sometimes, as in the case of the custom-house officer last year, he even becomes pathetic. The Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) generally endeavours to get out of such a difficulty by asking a question. My hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright)) generally endeavours to evade any trouble of that kind by indulging in sneers at the opposition. I do not think the hon. gentlemen, at whose speeches the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce saw fit to sneer, need pay much attention to those sneers under the circumstances. The hon. gentleman adjourned the debate at half-past nine at night, came back next day, told us that there was nothing in the speeches of these hon. gentlemen to answer, and then occupied an hour in endeavouring to answer them. I do not think that there is any particular occasion for the hon. gentleman to adopt that tone with us on this side of the House, because I know of no hon. gentlemen in this House whose armour is more vulnerable at many points than is that of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and if I thought it was worth while to waste the time of the House with a discussion of that kind, I could very well devote five minutes to the hon. gentleman, but I believe that under the circumstances, the House will justify me in refraining from entering into any discussion of that kind, which is not very profitable, and which does not tend to advance public business in this House. Now, the hon. gentleman, in years gone by, has posed as something of a Diogenes in this country. He went about with a lamp looking for an honest man and a great many of us were inclined to place a great deal of confidence in his assertions in that role. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that, in the way in which the hon. gentleman has dealt with the budget which has been brought down by the hon. Minister of Finance, he has preserved very well the role of a Diogenes. Let us compare, for a moment, a few of the things he said the other day with what he said in days gone by. He told us that everything is very comfortable and very lovely in this country, and asked : Why should there be any change ? He admits that there is a probability of depression in the future, as the hon. Minister of Finance admits that probability, and he says :

We have had it clearly before our eyes, and we design to regulate our future conduct in accordance therewith.

Just, Mr. Speaker, as if some one skating on thin ice and being warned of the danger would say : I clearly realize the danger and as soon as I fall in I will govern myself accordingly. That is the position of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). Instead of preparing for the future in these years when our revenue is large, he advocates spending all the money we can get out of the pockets of the tax-payers ; he advocates spending some $8,000,000 more, and then he says : When the hard times come we will regulate our conduct accordingly. I might ask, in passing, why it is that this government which professes to take credit for the good times in Canada during the past four years, proposes to allow this anticipated depression in business to take place. Why does not this government, which has brought these prosperous times to us during the past four years, take good care that no depression should come to this country ? That is a fair question to the hon. gentleman when he takes, as he is inclined to take, credit to his government for these good times.

The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) contrasts the trade of Canada during the past four years with that of former years. There is one matter I might have expected the hon. gentleman to deal with which he neglected to deal with, and that is : That during the four years from 1893 to 1896 under a Conservative administration our imports from England amounted to $145,000,000 ; while during the past four years under a Liberal administration our imports from England amounted to $143,-000,000, or to be exact, there was a decrease in the last four years as compared with the former four years of $2,214,000. On the other hand the imports from the United States during the four years from 1893 to 1896 amounted to $224,000,000, and during the past four years they amounted to $343,-000,000, a total increase of $118,000,000. Now let us see what the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) said about matters of that kind no further back than 1897, when speaking on the Trade and Navigation Returns (Budget debate ' Hansard ' 1897, page 1244) :

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. These returns show that, in the very last year of their term of office, we exported to England, apparently, $66,000,000 worth of our products, we exported to the United States $44,000,000, we bought from England $32,000,000, and from the United States $58,000,000 worth. There, if you will, is a genuine practical discrimination to an enormous extent, against England and in favour of the United States, under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite.

What are the facts to-day ? In the year 1896, we exported to England, $108,000,000 worth ; we exported to the United States, $69,000,000 worth ; we bought from England $45,000,000 worth and we bought from the United States $110,000,000 worth. Therefore, while the balance of trade (if you may use that expression) in our favour as between ourselves and England was $34,000,000 in 1896 ; it is $63,000,000 now ; and while the balance of trade against us with the United States was $14,000,000 in 1896, it is $41,000,000 in 1900. Yet, while the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) stated in 1897 that the facts then constituted a genuine practical discrimination to an enormous extent against England ; he now stands up in this House and tells us that a very much worse 'genuine practical discrimination' against England is perfectly delightful and pleasing to him and does not call for a word of criticism or a word of explanation. The view of the hon. gentleman in 1897 is borne out by what was stated in a leaflet published by the Cobdenite Club of London, England, which says :

> In spite of the preferential tariff the percentage of American goods entering Canada has continued to increase, and the percentage of British goods to decline. The tariff has therefore failed absolutely to effect the purpose for which it was intended.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look for a moment at the financial statement on which the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding), congratulated himself and the country to such a very great extent. He has shown us that during the past four years we have had a net surplus of $14,095,194, and he shows us by his estimate for the coming year a surplus of $6,350,000, or a total surplus during these five years of $20,445,194 ; and in addition to that, taking into consideration his estimate for the current year we will have an addition to the debt of $8,796,373 ; so that he will have expended not only his entire surplus but he will have expended on capital account more than $8,000,000 besides.

Now, my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) referred to the surplus which Sir Leonard Tilley was able to present to this House in 1882, and also in 1883 ; but the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) did not show to this House as I propose to do, what the opinion of the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) was with respect to these surpluses in 1882 and 1883. The Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) congratulates himself upon the surplus now, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) congratulates the country. In 1882 it was not so. An editorial utterance of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) in 1882 in the columns of the 'Morning Chronicle' (Halifax) was as follows :

> If these surpluses were created by the government in some magic way there may be in them a cause for thankfulness to Sir John Macdonald and his followers, but when it is considered that every dollar of the surplus is money taken out of the pockets of the people without a shadow of an excuse, money not required even by the reckless expenditure of the government, there is not much cause for rejoicing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are we to believe the congratulations tendered to the country by the Finance Minister in 1901, or are we to believe the criticisms of Mr. Fielding as editor of the 'Morning Chronicle' in 1882 ? If the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has abandoned the views which he entertained in 1882, perhaps at some future time in this debate, he will explain to the House when he abandoned these views, and the reasons on account of which he did abandon them. But that is not all. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) went at the surplus again in 1883, and this is what he said about it in the columns of the Halifax 'Morning Chronicle' :

> That millions of dollars should be unnecessarily taken yearly from the consuming classes of the country, and this without being absolutely necessary, is a cardinal principle of the Finance Minister's, to which even his best friends do not unreservedly assent.

Perhaps the best friends of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) who is Finance Minister to-day, do not unreservedly assent to his present proposition. He continued :

> They see that a surplus of millions at the capital is just so much money withdrawn from the trade of the country. How long can the Dominion stand the drain ? Certainly not many years longer.

In view of the depression which the Finance Minister says is probably coming upon this country, how many years longer does he think the country is going to stand this drain ? But, Sir, the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is not alone with regard to that. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) has told us :

> Taxation is an evil that nothing but the requirements of government can justify.

Then he now stands up and tells us that he expects a surplus of $6,000,000 and upwards during the current year, and at the same time he says that there is not the slightest necessity for any change in this budget, that everythings is happy, delightful and comfortable, and he asks the opposition to suggest to the government some particular class of goods from which the duty should be removed, some burden of the people that should be lightened. Well, it was not always so with the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). In days gone by he took the position that the doctor was not required to prescribe until he was called in to attend his patient, but now the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Richard Cart-

wright) thinks that the doctor should be called upon to prescribe before he is invited to the bedside of the sick.

Well, I will give the hon. gentleman a suggestion with respect to the taxes. Let us look at what the taxes on the people are. In the first place, there is a tax on tobacco, which is very large, and which has been increased by hon. gentlemen opposite. I find that we take out of the people, in taxes on tobacco, in customs, $486,000, and in excise $3,281,000. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that possibly the duty on tobacco, which was increased by them, might be reduced at least to the former amount. I find that in taxes on sugar a very large amount is taken from the people. During the present year, on sugar below 16 Dutch standard, no less than $1,828,000 was taken from the people ; and I desire, in passing, to mention to the hon. Minister of Finance that his taxes on sugar were considerably increased in 1898. In that year he took from the people in taxes on sugar $1,324,329, and in 1900 he took in the same way $2,286,123, an increase of nearly $1,000,000. The hon. gentleman admitted at the time that the additional tax which he was placing on the people amounted to at least $250,000. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) suggested that it would be at least $600,000 ; and, if we are to judge from the figures which I have just placed before the House, my hon. friend was well within the mark in making that statement. Will the hon. gentleman explain why we have not some remission of the sugar duties ?

But, Mr. Speaker, we had some suggestions from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce in days gone by as to taxes which should be lightened. In 1882, referring to Sir Leonard Tilley's surplus, he used this language :

> I ask how it was got. $1,100,000 was derived from two of the most odious and oppressive taxes which were ever imposed in any civilized country before, under similar circumstances at least, the taxes on breadstuffs and fuel. If he really wants to relieve the people, let him remove the taxes on breadstuffs and coal.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance in the legislature of Nova Scotia, in 1885, took occasion to move this resolution :

> That while it is as a rule inexpedient to deal with Dominion questions in this House, in view of the obnoxious character of the duty on breadstuffs, the House must firmly protest against the imposition of such duties.

Now, I find that last year the government took out of the people in taxes on breadstuffs $371,000 and in taxes on coal $1,309,000. These duties were maintained by the Conservative party in the past, and fought for by that party all over this Dominion, on the principles of the national policy—that the people of Nova Scotia were bound to submit to duties of that kind for the good of the country as a whole, and that the people of Ontario were bound to submit to them for the same reason. But hon. gentlemen opposite are now in power ; here are their promises and pledges before them ; and here is a surplus of over $6,000,000 ; and will they be good enough to explain to the House why it is, if those were good principles in 1882 and 1885, they are not good principles now ; or why it is that, holding those principles, if they do continue to hold them, they have not seen fit to lighten the burdens of the people ?

Further than that, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce distinctly stated in his speech—although he differed in that respect from the hon. Minister of Finance—that this is not a protective tariff, but a revenue tariff. If this is a revenue tariff, on what principle does the hon. gentleman uphold the maintenance of this surplus ? On what principle does he contend that under a revenue tariff we should come down with a budget which produces a surplus of $6,000,000 ? Is a revenue tariff designed to produce a surplus of that kind ? I do not pretend to be so great an authority on economic questions as the hon. gentleman ; but I have always understood that a revenue tariff was designed to produce a revenue fitting for the requirements of the government ; but here is a tariff which is to produce a revenue in excess of the requirements of the government by no less than $6,000,000. The hon. gentleman says it is a revenue tariff, and yet he says there is not the slightest occasion for making any change in it.

I do not intend to occupy further time with respect to the remarks which have been made by the hon. Minister of Finance or the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce ; but I desire to come to the resolution of which I have given notice. There have been in the past two political parties in this country, with somewhat divergent views upon the tariff question. Since 1878, and indeed since before 1878, the Liberal-Conservative party has been maintaining the principle of protection to Canadian industries. Since 1878 the Liberal party has not had any one uniform principle of trade policy. Sometimes they have put forth the view that free trade should prevail in this country, sometimes that a revenue tariff should prevail, sometimes that we should have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, sometimes that we should have commercial union with the United States. Since they got into power in 1896, they have to some extent modified the tariff, but I have never yet heard any authoritative statement from the hon. gentlemen occupying the treasury benches as to whether or not they still adhere to their free trade principles, or the free trade principles of some of them, or whether they have become avowed protectionists. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has challenged us to put our policy before the House.

Well, Sir, we are putting our policy before the House, and we shall be very glad indeed to hear what the Minister of Trade and Commerce has to say about it. Now, although according to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, they have not altered the protective features of the tariff, nevertheless we have had some changes, and we have had some warnings from these gentlemen. I will not trouble the House with going over all those warnings, but I will mention just two of them. In 1897, the Minister of Trade and Commerce said this :

> And lastly, what my free trade friends will remember and lay to heart, we have turned the ship's head in the right direction and towards the open sea.

That is, towards the open sea of free trade. Well, we shall be very glad indeed to know from that hon. gentleman, who apparently has not always been permitted to lay before the country his real views on points of this kind, whether the ship's head is still in the direction of free trade. Then my hon. friend the Minister of Finance told us :

> So far as protecting the industries of this country is concerned, eternal vigilance must be the price of protection.

In other words, the industries of this country are not to know from day to day whether they have protection or not ; the working men are not to know from day to day whether those industries will continue. They are not to know whether or not they shall be driven into exile into other countries to seek work or whether their wives and children will have bread in this country. But something, which the hon. gentleman describes as 'eternal vigilance,' is to be the price of that protection which the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce says does not exist ; and indeed we cannot find the hon. the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce agreeing upon the quality of the present tariff in any two speeches they have ever made in this House. I may say in passing that only on Thursday and Friday last these two gentlemen were in exact contradiction to each other. The hon. the Minister of Finance said, speaking of the delegation who had approached Mr. Chamberlain on the subject of Imperial preferential trade :

> Mr. Chamberlain told the delegation courteously, but firmly and emphatically, that the thing could not be entertained for a moment unless they were prepared to give up their protective tariff against Great Britain. That was the basic principle of Mr. Chamberlain's statement, and these gentlemen were not prepared to give that up nor would I have been prepared to give it up had I been in their place.

That is the statement made by the Minister of Finance, and against that we have the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, which he has reiterated over and over again. If, he said, any one maintains that this is a protective tariff, I differ with him. Which are we to believe ? Is this a protective tariff, as the great financial authority of the government at present tells us, or is it only a high revenue tariff, and not a protective tariff, as the former great financial authority of the government tells us ? Is the government at present a government which submits in its budget a tariff for revenue only or a government which brings before this House a tariff which does protect the industries of this country ? I leave these two hon. gentlemen, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce to settle between them their differences on that point. I am not able to reconcile their statements, and can only leave it to the House to determine what they mean.

I will not weary the House with quoting what has been said by the right hon. gentleman who leads the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce on this question in days gone by. The right hon. gentleman told the country at Winnipeg :

> I come before you to-night to preach to you this new gospel of free trade.

I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman—and I will sit down and let him reply if he desires—whether or not he comes before the House to-day to preach the gospel of free trade. I pause for a reply. The hon. gentleman does not seem inclined to give me any information on that point. He said :

> I denounce to you the policy of protection as bondage.

Does he still denounce the policy of protection as bondage ? He went on to say :

> Yes, bondage, and I refer to it as bondage in the same way as American slavery was bondage. Sir, our policy is freedom of trade, such as exists in England, such as is practiced in Great Britain.

Will the hon. gentleman rise and say that his policy is freedom of trade such as exists and is practiced in Great Britain.

The hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce was not backward in those days. That hon. gentleman has been a very considerable figure in political life in Canada for a great many years, and I am glad to say that I believe he has spoken for the right in many cases, and I wish I could say that he had persevered. But he then told us that a protective system was a huge mistake, and in so far as it was not honest, it was a huge scheme of robbery. No doubt, in so far as it was not honest, it was a huge robbery, but the question is in what respect was it not honest? Does the hon. gentleman think that the protection which the Minister of Finance tells us exists in the tariff is a huge scheme of robbery? What are the hon. gentleman's views on that point? He said further :

> Our policy, first to last, has been to destroy the villainous system of protection by free trade, revenue tariff or continental free trade.

But the Minister of Finance tells us that protection exists in the tariff to-day. Will the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce then tell the House that it is his policy to destroy that villainous system of protection or is he content to believe that everything is happy and pleasant and comfortable, and that there is no need for a change ?

I shall not take more time in discussing the past utterances of these gentlemen, but I will say that the policy outlined in the resolution of which I have given notice, and which I propose to move, is the same policy, in its main essential features, as that which was laid down by Sir John Macdonald in 1876, 1877 and 1878. It is a policy designed to protect the industrial interests of Canada. It is a policy intended to give work to the workingmen of Canada, to prevent our factories being closed, to prevent our people being forced to seek work in the United States, and to assist in developing the industries of this country. It is a policy, at all events, whether it be wrong or right, by which the Liberal-Conservative party is prepared to stand, and I shall ask the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce to tell us where they stand. I shall ask them to frankly and clearly say whether or not the government has now abandoned its policy of free trade and revenue tariff and believes in protection, or whether, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce has told us, the ship's head is still pointing towards the open sea.

The next branch of my resolution deals with the preferential tariff. In 1897 our chances were temporarily thrown away by the right hon. gentleman who leads the House, for a certain phrase which he used. He spoke of granting an advantage to Great Britain on account of the splendid freedom which she had granted us. Well, we all realize that Great Britain has granted us a splendid freedom, but did not the right hon. gentleman, when he promised the people of this country that he would obtain for them preference in the British markets, did he not know then that Great Britain had granted us a splendid freedom ? Had that fact dawned upon him only when he arrived in London, and did he not remember the words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who said that we owed Great Britain nothing but forgiveness for the wrongs she had committed against us by her blundering. We had in 1897, a magnificent opportunity to obtain from England some advantage in her markets. We did not obtain that, and, of course, it is too late for us to discuss with advantage what might have been. The practical question now for us is, what can be. The hon. the Minister of Finance is very ready to fling across the floor of this House the question whether or not we are prepared to repeal the British preference. Well, it is very difficult sometimes, and might be regarded as very offensive, to ask or to take back that which has been given away.

The Liberal-Conservative party have never said that they proposed to repeal that preference; but they have said that they would never rest satisfied until, in addition to that and as compensation for that, we had obtained a preference in British markets. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance a question with regard to that also. Suppose, as some business men throughout the country think may be the case, that additional preference which he last year gave to British goods should result in destroying some of our industries, in closing up some of our factories, in paralyzing a portion of the business of this country, what would the hon. gentleman do about it ? He may not be prepared to answer that question now. It is just as legitimate a question as the one he put to us. It may be that there will be difficulties in this country, it may be that there will be very great difficulties in this country, on account of the step which the hon. gentlemen have taken. The only thing that we can say is that we shall have to deal with these difficulties as best we may, but deal with them in such a way as not to offend or to lessen the sentiment of unity of the empire which is so strongly impressed not only upon the people of this country, but throughout the entire British possessions. Now, I do not want any misunderstanding so far as the position of the party which I have the honour to lead in this House is concerned. I am prepared to stand for the unity of the empire, for the integrity of the empire, as strongly as any member of this House. I am prepared, for that purpose, to advocate and support the claims of any government that will spend its last dollar and send its last man in support of the integrity of the empire against any foe that may threaten disruption. But, Sir, I do not attach as much importance to some things that have been said in this House with respect to the effect of sentiment in the mother country on matters of that kind as has been expressed by some hon. gentlemen opposite. Why, they would have one believe that the British workman foregoes his pipe and his beer every evening in order that he may go out on the streets to find some goods of Canadian produce or manufacture that he can buy. But the extraordinary part of it is that when you turn to these hon. gentlemen and say: If sentiment has such a remarkable effect upon the mind of the British consumer as that, how is it that Britain will refrain from giving us a preference in her markets ?—then these hon. gentlemen turn to you and say: It is of no use to talk about that, the Briton, in matters of trade, is absolutely cold-blooded and devoid of sentiment. The Briton, apparently has sentiment when he goes out to buy his goods, but when we talk about a reciprocal advantage by means of an adjustment of his tariff which could be effected

without additional burden upon the British people——

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, oh.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)—there is not the slightest sentiment in the Briton at all. My right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) laughs at that.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, I may say to my right hon. friend there have been business men in this country and in England, who have, probably, as good a practical grasp of the situation as my right hon. friend, and who say that the thing can be accomplished ; and, unless he is prepared to set himself above the opinions of these leading business men, he cannot say that this thing is impossible.

Now, is there any possibility of obtaining this preference ? So far as its benefits are concerned, I need not say one word. The right hon. gentleman himself has admitted the great benefit it would be to Canada. Every hon. gentleman who has addressed this House, every gentleman of any importance in public life who has spoken in this country on the subject, has admitted the great practical benefit it would be to the people of Canada if we could obtain an advantage in the markets of Great Britain. I will not weary the House by adducing arguments on that subject, because I believe that the advantage of such a preference is incontrovertible. But I will say a few words with regard to the possibility of obtaining it. Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance made a statement on this subject which is quoted in the Morning Chronicle, a Liberal organ in the city of Halifax, in its issue of the 28th of August, 1900. And this is what he said on that occasion :

> There are three points which Sir Charles Tupper would like to make, but in not one of them is there any foundation for his efforts. He continues to talk about the Conservative party obtaining a tariff preference for Canadian products in England ; that is to say that Great Britain would impose duties on foreign foodstuffs while admitting those of Canada free. This is an old cry with Sir Charles Tupper, but no one knows better than he does that it is arrant humbug.

That was an interview which the hon. gentleman, I think, gave to some person in Montreal. Now, I wish to point out to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and to the House that if this is 'arrant humbug,' there are a great many business men in this country and in England, who have been guilty, with Sir Charles Tupper, of believing in this 'arrant humbug.' The maritime Board of Trade, a body which represent 1,200,000 people in the maritime provinces passed this resolution :

> Resolved that in the opinion of this board mutual preferential trade within the empire would greatly tend to cement the unity of the empire, vastly assist in developing resources of the several colonies and dependencies thereof, hold a restraining influence upon emigration, directing it from foreign countries to countries within the empire, and conduce to an equitable system of commercial intercourse between the empire and the nations of the world.

I suppose that these men, who are shrewd, level-headed business men of the maritime provinces were not dealing with what they supposed to be 'arrant humbug.' The Boards of Trade of Toronto and Montreal have passed similar resolutions. On the 17th of March, 1896, the right hon. Prime Minister said :

> My hope is—nay, my conviction is—that on the 23rd June, the Liberal party will be at the head of the polls, and that it will be the Liberal party with its policy of a revenue tariff that will send commissioners to London to arrange for a basis of preferential trade.

And any one who reads the speech of the right hon. gentleman on that occasion cannot doubt that what he was talking about was mutually preferential trade. So, as far back as 1896, the right hon. gentleman did not regard this proposition as 'arrant humbug.' Then, the premier of Ontario, (Hon. Mr. Ross) said—and he has dealt on more than one occasion with this subject, but I quote from his utterance of a few months ago :

> I see no reasons why Canadians should hesitate o look to Great Britain for some encouragement nd response on her part. True she admits our products free of duty, but then she confers a imilar favour upon foreign nations.
>
> Have we not a right to expect that her own subjects, though living abroad, will be treated more favourably than the Magyar or the Russian or the citizens of the United States.

So, it is quite clear that the premier of Ontario, even so late as 1900, did not regard this project as one that involved 'arrant humbug.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) allow me a word ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Certainly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not, in an interview in Montreal or elsewhere, characterize preferential trade as 'arrant humbug,' but I said that for Sir Charles Tupper to pretend that he could obtain it through the Conservative party and by his methods was 'arrant humbug.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, I will read again what the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) said :

> There are three points which Sir Charles Tupper would like to make, but in not one of them is there any foundation for his efforts. He continues to talk about the Conservative party obtaining a tariff prefereence for Canadian products in England ; that is to say that Great Britain would impose duties on foreign foodstuffs while admitting those of Canada free. This is an old cry with Sir Charles Tupper, but no one knows better than he does that it is arrant humbug.

I did not read it all, but I will read it all

now, so that there may be no mistake about the hon. gentleman's meaning.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is none.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, and this further language will make it perfectly plain :

Everybody who has had a correct view of English public opinion has been and is still aware that such tariff legislation in Great Britain for the present or the early future is impossible.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I thank the hon. gentleman for reading it all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What the hon. gentleman was talking about was an agitation in favour of preferential trade, and characterizing it as 'arrant humbug.' If it did not mean that, it meant nothing. Why could not the hon. gentleman in the same way characterize this resolution which I have read as an arrant humbug ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So it is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He could just as well characterize the statement of the right hon. gentleman who leads the House as arrant humbug. These hon. gentlemen seem to forget that their leader stated so far back as 1896, not only that this proposal to obtain a preference was not an arrant humbug, but that the Liberal party were going to send commissioners to London for the purpose of obtaining it. Will hon. gentlemen cheer the characterization of their leader's words as arrant humbug ? They do not seem so ready. The present premier of Ontario says again :

Have we not a right to expect that her own subjects, though living abroad, will be treated more favourably than the Magyar, or the Russian, or the citizens of the United States?

Is that arrant humbug ? Hon. gentlemen seem to differ in their views, according to the person or the body which expresses a sentiment on this question. Then, Sir, there is another statement which I shall bring before this House, the statement of a gentleman who holds a leading position in the commercial life of the city of Halifax, and who was a delegate from Halifax to the Congress of the Chambers of Commerce in London, in 1900. On the occasion of a very full and exhaustive report of the proceedings of the conference with respect to this matter, he had this to say :

If the support of the powerful Australian Commonwealth could be obtained, it would have great influence with the British public, who are slow to adopt untried innovations in matters of trade, but on the other hand, will always listen to reasonable arguments if supported by solid facts and figures. If at the next congress, to be held four years hence, the colonies were practically unanimous a very long step would be taken towards the solution of a very difficult question.

That gentleman happens to be a Conservative, but I do not think any one in this House who knows him will say that he is not a moderate and shrewd man, of great ability and excellent judgment with regard to all matters of trade. Now, there has been some expression of public opinion in England with regard to matters of this kind. The Liverpool Journal of Commerce, in the latter part of last year, had this to say with regard to this subject :

. . . There is, however, a peaceful alliance which it is the country's duty to her colonies and to herself to make, viz. : a commercial alliance, and it behooves everybody with a stake in the country and a desire to see Britain flourish and maintain its commercial and shipping supremacy and its integrity as a nation, to do all in their power to encourage by all legitimate means reciprocal trade with the colonies, preferring the products of the labour of their enterprising brethren who are striving to bring honour and glory to the common flag by extending its sphere and increasing the value of the territories over which it floats.

Now, that is a fairly strong expression of opinion on this point.

Mr. HEYD. What does it mean ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It means that it is desirable for Great Britain, as I understand it, to adopt in the early future a policy of reciprocal trade, granting to the colonies a preference and receiving from the colonies a preference in return. Now, Sir, the Saturday Review, in October last, had this to say on that subject :

If the modification of the public attitude towards Cobdenite views goes on during the next twenty years at the rate it has proceeded during the preceding twenty, there will be no difficulty in getting a party strong enough to effect commercial union within the empire by means of preferential rates.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. After twenty years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Saturday Review at that time had not had the pleasure of reading the hon. gentleman's speech delivered on Friday last. No doubt if it had had the benefit of his views, this particular paragraph might not have been written ; but being in entire ignorance of what the hon. gentleman was going to say some months afterwards, that periodical published what I have read. Now, Mr. Boyle, the United States consul at Liverpool, reported to his government as follows :

Beyond question, during recent years there has been a great development of sentiment in favour of an Imperial preferential tariff, and I do not hesitate to say that this sentiment has a far stronger hold, not only among the masses of the people of Great Britain, but even among the politicians, than the party newspapers and party leaders concede. It is a significant fact that for the last two years this question has been discussed more than any other at meetings of chambers of commerce and trade organizations of Great Britain and her colonies.

It is clear that this consul, in making that report to his government, did not have exactly the same view as that which has been

expressed by the hon. Minister of Finance, that to consider any such question at the present time is merely arrant humbug. The Imperial Trade, Defence and Anti-Free Imports League has issued a pamphlet, in which they say :

If the incoming government fails to pass measures of fiscal reconstruction, giving the wheat, lumber and fruit of Canada, the wool, wines and minerals of Australasia, the tea and rice of India, and the products of South Africa an advantage over competing goods from foreign sources, it will amount to a criminal abandonment of the best fruits of the intertrading power of the empire.

And only in the latter part of last year, the United Planters' Association of Southern India passed the following resolution :

That considering the critical condition of the tea and coffee industries, this association do communicate with the India Tea Association, the Ceylon Planters Association, the Indian chambers of commerce, and the leading firms of merchants and brokers interested in tea and coffee, &c., in this country and in England and her colonies, with a view to ascertaining whether a movement in favour of a commercial combination of Great Britain and her colonies and India against the world (which would by a system of differential duties, afford some protection to British-grown products and manufactures) would receive support

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to weary the House by giving these extracts, but I feel it is my duty to do so. What I am asking in this resolution is that the House should declare that this is an opportune time for bringing that matter forward and influencing public opinion throughout the empire with a view to obtaining it ; and I am showing the House as well as I can that there is some opinion, not only here, but in England and in the other colonies in favour of this movement ; and that it will not be merely a forlorn hope. We remember the attempt which was made in 1894 to induce the British government to denounce the German and Belgian treaties. We know that at that time we were told in so many words by the British government that those treaties would not be denounced, that it was not prudent to denounce them, and questions of trade were dealt with, and the volume of the trade of Great Britain with Germany and Belgium on the one hand, and with the colonies on the other hand, was pointed out. These same questions are agitated now, and are referred to as affording an answer to any suggestions that we should make the attempt. But we know that the attempt to have those treaties denounced was successful ; and we believe that if this government and the other colonies of the empire were to put their shoulders to the wheel and make a vigorous attempt in this direction at the present time, we have at least some prospect of success. And if there is some prospect of success, why should this government sit silent and make no allusion to it in the speech from the Throne and in the budget speech, and simply say that it is arrant humbug and is not worth attempting ?

Now, there was a recent article in the 'National Review' which dealt with the subject from another standpoint, from the standpoint of the necessities of the British government at the present time. What was said in that article is this :

Beer and tobacco are already so heavily mulcted that they cannot carry greater imposts. Whence, then, are we to get the millions which will be needed if our national position is to be rendered secure? I answer that the political fads of the '50's and '60's and '70's must be discarded by a new administration. The condition which rendered them useful and salutary have long since passed away; yet such is the force of routine, such that inertia of mind to which allusion has been so often made, that men are still enslaved by them. And we shall have to fight for our lives, we must neglect no weapon. A tariff offers us at once a means of raising funds for naval armaments, of obtaining allies and of weakening the enemies who are plotting our fall. With a tariff, too, we can consolidate the empire.

This article shows that at least there is some volume of public opinion in England in favour of this view. Mr. Ford, the correspondent of the New York 'Tribune,' in commenting on this article uses the following language :

A reaction against free trade in England is now more likely to happen than a revolt against protection in either America or Germany ; and the consolidation of the empire, the great cause of Imperial federation may be the justification for the renunciation of time-honoured policies.

Then, we hear that the great Australian Commonwealth is now laying the foundation of its fiscal system and if we are to believe what we see reported in the public press we are to understand that that commonwealth is likely to adopt a moderate protection platform. We are also to understand that it is likely to adopt a system of a preferential tariff in favour of the United Kingdom, not of merely giving the United Kingdom a preference without any corresponding advantage, but a system by which England will be asked to give to Australian products similar advantages in the English market. In view of this movement in the Australian Commonwealth, is it not the duty of Canada, having regard to our own interests, to join with Australia in doing that, so that all the colonies of the empire may present their views to the mother country at the same time and in that way to assist in bringing about what all of us think to be so desirable ?

There is another suggestion which I have to make to the House. We know the condition of affairs in the British West Indies. We know that the trade of these countries has fallen off very considerably during the past few years. We know that the trade of Canada with the British West Indies has fallen off very considerable. In looking over the figures I was very much surprised

to see to what a remarkable extent our trade with the West Indies has fallen off since 1895. I find that in 1895 our total trade with the West Indies was $8,681,622, while in 1900, it was $3,976,172, showing a decrease of $4,705,450. Our exports to the West Indies were, in 1895, $3,887,602, and in 1900, $2,870,343. Our imports from the West Indies were, in 1895, $4,794,020, and in 1900, $1,105,829. I believe the figures which the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) presents to the House in the Trade and Navigation Returns relate to the entire West Indies. As far as I understand they are not confined to the British West Indies, and the figures I have just quoted are taken from his comparative statement. Now, on the contrary, I find that the trade of the United States, so far as the British West Indies are concerned, is increasing. In 1895 the trade of the United States with the British West Indies was $18,708,500, while, in 1900, it was $22,236,974. Both exports and imports have increased, while on the other hand there does not seem to be a very healthy state of affairs in respect to the trade relations between Canada and the West Indies. The point I am coming at is that the best possible solution of the difficulties that the British West Indies are labouring under, is the adoption of a preferential tariff throughout the empire. During the year 1899, Mr. I. C. Stewart, of Halifax, a very enterprising journalist who was interested in the trade of Canada with the West Indies, made a tour of the West India Islands and investigated the cause of the decline of our commerce with the British West Indies. He came to the conclusion, after carefully studying the subject in the different islands and after discussing it with the leading business men in the different islands, that a remedy might be found for that unfortunate condition of affairs. He believes that preferential trade within the empire would settle this difficulty. He says:

> For a time I found it difficult to make up my mind as to what should be done, and I seemed to be inclined to despond of any possible solution of the trouble, but, as I thought more deeply on the matter, it occurred to me that we might help to develop this trade by assisting the West Indies to find a larger market. If we could not give them that larger market ourselves, and recalling the important place that Canada now holds in the councils of the empire, it began to impress itself upon my mind that Canada might be able to bring to bear some influence upon the mother country to induce her to take the necessary steps to provide a market among her consumers for the sugar which the West Indies can produce, and would be producing, were it not for the unfair competition of the bounty countries. Preferential trade within the empire would settle this difficulty at once.

Then, he goes on to point out his views in regard to the way in which that might be worked out. That is a subject on which hon. gentlemen in this House, who are better acquainted with the trade relations between ourselves and the West Indies and who are better acquainted than I am in regard to the conditions prevailing there, are better qualified to speak than I am. I give this as the opinion of a man who has studied the subject and who has arrived at that conclusion in regard to it. What I suggest in the resolution which I am moving, is that we should now make an effort to achieve this purpose and surely I have placed sufficient evidence before the House to show that it is not such a forlorn hope that the government should remain supine and hold its hands from attempting to accomplish this end.

The third point in the resolution which I have placed before the House refers to the condition of affairs which exists between this country and Germany at the present time, and I am bound to say that I was astonished to hear the hon. Minister of Finance practically justifying Germany in granting a discrimination in favour of other countries and against Canada. I could not interpret his language in any other way and I am also astonished that neither in the speech from the Throne nor in any remarks which have fallen from the financial exponent of the government has there been any reference whatever to so important a subject as that which concerns this country in its trade relations with Germany. The situation as I understand it is that after the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties a modus vivendi, or temporary convention, was arranged between England and Germany and that convention practically gave temporarily to each country the same advantages which had been enjoyed by each country under the former treaty, except that Canada was excluded from it. Thus it is, that, at the present time, as has been pointed out in an article on the subject in the 'National Review' of November last, Germany having two tariffs, one a general tariff, and one a conventional tariff, grants to the United States, our keenest competitor in that market, the advantages of the lower, or conventional tariff and insists that Canadian products shall be subject to the duties imposed by the higher or general tariff. The hon. Minister of Finance and the government seem to think that this is a matter as to which we have no right to complain, and as to which it does not behoove them to say a single word. Well, Sir, they have very excellent authority as to what this act of Germany means. Let me quote to the House what was said by the Marquis of Ripon in his despatch to the Governor General of Canada on June 28, 1895 :

> It must not be forgotten that, as I pointed out in my other despatches of this date, whilst the grant of preferential tariff treatment is a friendly act to the country receiving it, it is an unfriendly act to countries or places excluded from it.

The position of affairs to-day in the empire is this : Canada gave to Great Britain

a tariff preference; gave to Great Britain an advantage by which the goods of Great Britain came into Canada at a lower rate than the goods of countries outside the empire. Germany, disliking this action of Canada; disliking the denunciation of the treaty, consents to a temporary renewal of the convention or treaty between England and herself but insists that Canada shall be excluded from it. Now, I do not know whether or not this is a correct statement of the actual position of affairs to-day. I take this from an article which seems to have been written by a responsible man in the National Review of November last. I say, that if this is the condition of affairs the Canadian government were extremely remiss in not dealing with the matter either in the speech from the Throne or the budget speech, and announcing to this country whether or not the government of Canada propose to sit calmly down and submit to that sort of treatment from Germany; whether or not the government of Canada have made any protest; whether Germany is to be allowed—on account of a preference which we granted, not to any foreign country but to Great Britain and certain of her colonies—whether Germany on account of that is to be allowed to do a friendly act to Great Britain and the rest of the colonies of the empire, and to commit an unfriendly act against Canada. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) told us that he did not know what Great Britain might do in the goodness of her heart if we granted this tariff preference. Surely the minister would not think that this is a very ample return for anything which we may have done.

But look at the result, Mr. Speaker. In 1896 we imported from Germany $6.493,000 worth of goods; in 1900 we imported $8,883,000 worth. In 1896 we exported to Germany $757,531 worth of goods; in 1900 we exported to Germany $1.715.000 worth. Our trade with Germany is developing; it would develop still further if we were not thus handicapped, for look, Sir, at the facts with respect to the trade between the United States and Germany. The trade of the United States with Germany, so far as imports are concerned, has increased by $3,000,000 since 1896, and so far as exports from the United States to Germany are concerned the trade has increased by no less than $89,000,000 since 1896. Germany grants to the United States a tariff preference. Under the tariff preference the United States exports to Germany have increased $89,000,000 in the last four years. We, because we granted a tariff preference to Great Britain, are practically excluded from the benefits of that trade and the Canadian government has not one single word to say to the country when it brings down the budget, and the Minister of Finance has not one single word to say with regard to it in his financial statement. Indeed, when this matter was dealt with by my hon. friend for Pictou (Mr. Bell), the Minister of Finance practically justified the course which Germany has pursued. I do not think that this country ought tamely to submit to treatment of that kind. I do not know of any reason why this country should not discriminate against Germany if Germany discriminates against this country. I have endeavoured to look into the treaty conditions between England and Germany and I have not found anything still outstanding which would prevent Canada from dealing with this matter in that way. I have pointed out in the resolution a means by which we might deal with matters of that kind where we do not have fair treatment in foreign markets.

With respect to our trade relations with the United States I do not desire to say much. I entirely concur with what was said, and very wisely said, by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), that so far as our trade relations with the United States are concerned, we must use every possible effort to maintain friendly and cordial relations with that country. I know that it has been suggested by a gentleman on the other side of the House, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that our best course would be to raise our tariff to 50 per cent, which he says is the tariff rate of the United States. I am not prepared to say at the present time that I concur with that; on the other hand, I do say that our trade relations with the United States demand the attention of this government. I think we might well have had some statement from the financial exponent of the government and from so great an authority as the Minister of Trade and Commerce with respect to that. Our resolution which we have brought before the House is broad enough to cover a matter of that kind, if it is thought wise to deal with it; but, as I have said, I do most heartily concur with the view that so far as the great country to the south of us is concerned, we should do nothing which should be misunderstood by that republic and which might provoke a breach of the very cordial relations which at present exists between the two countries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry indeed to have detained the House at such great length, but I was obliged to do so because I had a great many extracts—more than I liked—to read to the House. Just one word in conclusion. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has taunted us with the suggestion that we are likely to remain in opposition, as he says, for the next 25 years. Well, I do not know that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) is in a much better position to form an opinion in regard to that than the rest of us. But I would like to say this: I am sorry that the minister (Sir Richard Cart-

wright) did not see fit to put any higher ideal before members of this House and before any political party in this country, than the obtaining or retaining of power. I understood the hon. gentleman to suggest that such is the greatest possible good to any political party at any possible cost. There are, Mr. Speaker, things of more importance to any political party in this country than to obtain power or even to retain power. I think, Sir, that an honourable adherence to honourable principles professed in opposition or in power is a thing more to be regarded than even the obtaining of power itself. I think the upholding of the standard of public opinion in this country, the upholding of the standard of public life in this country, is of more importance to any political party than the obtaining or retaining of power. I think that to stand for the unity of the people of this country and to suppress any cry of race or creed that may be raised, is a matter of greater importance to any political party in Canada than is the effort to obtain or retain power. For my part, speaking for the party I have the honour to lead in this House, I say that we shall endeavour to carry out the principles which we have professed in this resolution and the principles which we have at all times professed in the past; of endeavouring to uphold the industries of Canada, to develop the resources of this country, to maintain the integrity and unity of the empire. In doing this, Sir, I think we shall be discharging our duty, and if we discharge our duty, I am sure that we need not fear the issue. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the resolution of which I have already given notice, as follows .—

That all the words after 'that' in the proposed motion be left out, and the following substituted therefor :

That, in the opinion of this House, the welfare of this country requires a pronounced policy of adequate protection and encouragement at all times to the labour, agricultural, manufacturing, mining and other industrial interests of Canada ;

That, in the opinion of this House, the adoption a policy of mutual trade preference within the empire would prove of great benefit to the mother country and to the colonies, and would greatly promote the prosperity, unity and progress of the empire as a whole, and that the present time, when the Commonwealth of Australia is laying the foundation of its fiscal system, is particularly opportune for taking prompt and energic steps towards the furtherance of this object.

This House is further of opinion that equivalent or adequate duties should be imposed by Canada upon the products and manufactures of countries not within the empire in all cases where such countries fail to admit Canadian products and manufactures upon fair terms, and that the government should take for this purpose all such available measures as may be found necessary.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, from the first day of this session there have been rumours whispered from ear to ear through the corridors of this House and sometimes heard also in the streets of this city, that the new opposition of His Majesty, when once constituted and organized, would spring upon us a surprise in the shape of a new fiscal policy. As time went on statements were made in the press that this new policy would surprise the government and stagger the Liberal party as soon as it was announced. We have it now, fresh and brand new, from the lips of my hon. friend, and lo and behold, it is the same old national policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. The same old national policy, with a few adornments which, instead of taking from its native deformity, only add to it. It is the same old national policy which we have fought in past elections, and which, after an experience of some twenty years, has been twice rejected by the people at the polls. There was nothing new under the sun some three or four thousand years ago ; there is nothing new in the Conservative party to-day. I take the motion of my hon. friend, as you have just had it from his hands, and it reads as follows :—

That, in the opinion of this House, the welfare of this country requires a pronounced policy of adequate protection and encouragement at all times to the labour, agricultural, manufacturing, mining and other industrial interests of Canada.

I take up the famous resolution which was moved in this House twenty-two years ago, and it reads as follows :—

This House is of the opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a national policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home.

This is the policy repeated in the resolution of my hon. friend the new leader of the opposition ; and my hon. friend tells us, and apparently seriously, that the policy which he now reaffirms, has had a great success. But he forgets that though it was designed to keep our own people at home, yet one result of that policy was that his own province lost one representative in this House. The hon. gentleman also tells us that he wants to go back to the principles of the national policy and have them re-enacted. Let us cast a glance at what that policy has done. At the time the national policy was adopted in 1880, the trade of the country amounted to $203,000,000 ; in

1896, when it was put an end to, the trade of the country had increased to $239,000,000, an increase of $36,000,000 in sixteen years. In 1896-7, we adopted a new tariff—a revenue tariff, as I shall explain in a few minutes—and in the course of four years the trade of the country increased to $381,000,000, an increase of $142,000,000 in the four years. On this comparison of the results of the policy adopted by this government and the results of the policy proposed by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I leave the people and the House to judge of the merits of the two policies.

It is refreshing, however, to hear the statement made by my hon. friend, in view of the attitude which has been maintained by his party ever since this debate has commenced. We have had the statement made by these gentlemen day in and day out that the present tariff is still a protective tariff, that there is nothing changed, that we have the same policy that we had up to 1896. If the tariff which we have at the present moment is the same protective tariff which we had formerly, what is the use, I want to know, of taking up the time of the House to argue that we should have a protective tariff? Why should we have this new proposition solemnly made by my hon. friend, 'that in the opinion of this House the welfare of this country requires a pronounced policy of adequate protection,' when these hon. gentlemen tell us that we have adequate protection to-day?

But, Sir, I care not by what name the policy of the present government is characterized. I care not whether it pleases my hon. friends on the other side to call it protection or free trade or a revenue tariff. There is only one difference between us and gentlemen on the other side of the House. We agree with them that the revenue of the country ought to be levied by means of customs duties; but there is this difference between us, that while they would levy those duties only for the benefit of individuals, we levy them for the benefit of the revenue first and foremost.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have been dilating on the idea that the present tariff is a protective tariff. So far as protection is an incident of the tariff, there is no doubt that it is. There is a great deal of protection yet in the tariff, and there must be a great deal of protection in any tariff of customs duties. If we impose a duty of 25 per cent on an article of any kind whatever, it is manifest that the manufacturer of similar goods in this country must have the benefit of 25 per cent in favour of his goods. So far there is a great deal of protection in the tariff; if I were to express my own mind, perhaps I would say there is more in it than I would desire. But we have to reckon according to the condition of things that exists to-day. We have to maintain a tariff of customs duties; but, again I repeat, the difference that exists between us and gentlemen on the other side is this. Our first consideration, in imposing duties, is to produce revenue and if, as an incident, the manufacturers derive advantage, they are welcome to it. But gentlemen on the other side imposed duties not with the view of levying a revenue and putting money into the treasury, but of putting money in the pockets of private individuals. There is the difference between the two policies. Which of these policies is to prevail in this country? Is it the policy of protection pure and simple of hon. gentlemen opposite?

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend says hear, hear. I am quite content to abide by the result. Is it to be the policy of protection pure and simple or that adopted in 1897, not based on protection, but in which protection is an incident? The result of the policy adopted in 1897, is that the country has never been so prosperous.

Mr. MACLEAN. But that is not free trade as they have it in England.

The PRIME MINISTER. If these hon. gentlemen when they quote my words, would do me the simple justice of quoting them in their entirety, and not clip out a part of any utterance of mine, they would find that at no time have the Liberal party ever pretended that, if they came into power, they would adopt immediately free trade as it is in England. But what we have said again and again is that while we believe in free trade as a theory, we know that we are bound to raise a revenue by a customs tariff, and it will take many years before we could have free trade as it is in England. But apart from this, there is this consideration to be borne in mind. There has never been a period of time in the history of Canada when our manufacturing industries were so safe and secure as they are at present. If you had a tariff based, as in the years from 1879 to 1896, upon a protection basis, you would have the duties continually changed from one year to another, as was the case in those days. You would have, as we had under the late government, an incessant procession of tariff tinkerers from the different cities of Canada to the office of the Finance Minister. There never was a year from 1879 to 1896—or at least there never was a period of three years—when there was not some tinkering of the tariff. One man would find that some invention in the United States or Great Britain had lowered the prices of the products he was making, and instead of exercising his enterprise and ingenuity to overcome the difficulty, instead of putting more money into his business, he came to the Finance Minister and obtained some modification of the tariff. Then what happened? It was then found that the man

who was benefited by the change in the tariff was producing an article which was the raw material of some other industry. These other manufacturers came to the Minister of Finance again, and again there was more tinkering. But when the public at large understand that they have nothing to fear, when they know that the basis of the tariff is not to please this one or that one but to raise a revenue, they are aware that so long as the financial conditions remain as they are, there is to be no change in the tariff whatever, and instead of looking forward with dread to the deliverance of the budget speech, as used to be the case in former years, they know there will be no change and no reason to fear. They know that there will be no change in the tariff except when a general revision of it becomes necessary. This is the policy which we propose to maintain and upon which we take issue with hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now, I come to the other part of my hon. friend's resolution which is in these terms :

That, in the opinion of this House, the adoption of a policy of mutual trade preference within the empire would prove of great benefit to the mother country and to the colonies and would greatly promote the prosperity, unity and progress of the empire as a whole.

With regard to this policy, I am ready and willing, and even anxious to engage the issue with my hon. friends opposite. Let us understand, first of all, where we are. They want a mutual preference with England. Well, before we lay that policy before the Canadian people, let us understand well what is the object of the Conservative party. My hon. friend has said that they are protectionists, that they stand upon the old policy of protection. Protection against whom ? Against the United States ? Yes. Against Germany ? Yes. Against France ? Yes. Against England? Yes. Their policy is a policy of protection against England as well as every other country. This fact has been made plain to-day by my hon. friend. Before I go further I want it to be well understood on both sides that the main object which the Conservative party has in view to-day and which they will carry out, should they attain office again, is to maintain the policy of protection against Great Britain as well as every other nation in the world.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. This was laid down only a few days ago by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). My hon. friend delivered himself as follows on this point :

That question was settled in 1879.

He was speaking of the question of protection in favour of Canadian industries :

One of the objections made at that time to the establishment of a protective tariff in Canada was that it was an unfriendly act towards Great Britain, a country which depended upon its manufactures, which prized its foreign trade. It was argued then that possibly the British government might even disallow our protective tariff on the ground that it was striking at British trade. But the men of that day who passed the national policy, who put the national policy into operation, had considered all these things, they met the objection that it was an unfriendly act to Great Britain, they faced that bugbear, for bugbear it was, they were not frightened by it, and they faced that consideration in 1879, and settled it then. Their protective tariff was not hampered or impaired, or emasculated, by sentimental consideration for the manufacturers of Great Britain. Nothing of the kind was allowed to affect the efficiency of the national policy at that time, and nothing of the kind should be allowed to affect the efficiency of the national policy to-day. Therefore, I say if this administration is ever brought to their knees, when pressure of hard times will come to the manufacturing industries of this country, and bring them to that point where they will approach the government for relief, if this government is then going to maintain the position of a protectionist administration, it will have to look carefully into the effect of this preferential tariff.

If the hon. gentleman meant anything, he meant this, that so strong is the view of the party to which he belonged in favour of protection, that in its favour even the preferential tariff had to give way. There is no ambiguity in this policy. We know where we are. The policy of these hon. gentlemen is to maintain protection against Great Britain.

Before I go further let me say this, and I do not say it by way of rebuke or reproach, that if these hon. gentlemen believe that protection is the best policy for Canada, they are quite right in applying it against Great Britain. For my own part, although I am devotedly attached to Great Britain, if a conflict of interests were ever to take place between us, I would stand by my native land. Therefore if hon. gentlemen on the other side believe that protection should be maintained against Great Britain, I have no fault to find with them. But in the name of common sense I ask them if they believe in a policy of protection against Great Britain, what can they say if the people of Great Britain believe that a policy of free trade with all the world is the best protection they can have ?

Why, Sir, there must be the same rule on one side as on the other. If it is to be protection of Canada against Great Britain, it must be protection of Great Britain against Canada. Or, if the same rule should apply on either side, how are you going to speak of mutuality of preference where you have protection in Canada and free trade in Great Britain ? These gentlemen will go to Great Britain in order to proffer their policy of protection for Canada and a preference for Canada in the British markets. Why, they will be told by the people of Great Britain : You may believe in protection, but we believe in free trade, and

if you will not give us a preference we will not give you a preference ; and if you maintain a policy of protection against us, we shall maintain a policy of free trade, which is most in our own interest. I know that these hon. gentlemen hope, and even believe, that the people of Great Britain are turning their backs upon the policy of free trade. They see the day coming, as they think, when Great Britain will become protectionist, as it was at one time. But if that is their hope, in what position will the Canadian producer be if the views of the Canadian Conservatives are to prevail in England ? Canada will be a protectionist, and so will Great Britain—and what mutual preference could you have under such circumstances ? Let us consider this case as we should then find it. I suppose that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will obtain power some day. I will not discuss the exact time when that will come about. He found fault with my suggestion of a period of twenty-five years in opposition for him. Well, if he objects to that, let us say that he obtains power in fifty years. After that, he goes to Great Britain to present the view he has advocated here—for he cannot attain the object of his policy unless there is mutual and concurrent action by Great Britain and Canada. He goes to Sheffield, or Manchester, or Birmingham, or some other of the great business and manufacturing centres of Great Britain. He speaks before a meeting of working men, and says : We have a trade policy to propose to you ; the agriculture of Great Britain is inadequate ; it cannot feed you, and you have to import your food from all parts of the world. Canada cannot to-day, but by-and-by will be able to supply the whole of your food requirements : Give us a preference in your markets ; put a duty on corn, butter, cheese and everything that you eat that comes from abroad and that we can grow, but exempt from that duty all the products of Canada. The workingman would probably say : For the sake of the bond that exists between us I might put a tax on our food and exempt the products coming from your country ; but you know that I am a maker of manufactured products and I want a market for my goods ; I want a market in Canada ; and, since you want us to exempt your products from taxes, no doubt you will exempt our products from duty when we send them to your markets. But my hon. friend will say : No, I do not propose that ; I am a protectionist, and believe in protection for our Canadian manufactures ; therefore, I do not propose to exempt your products from a tax which affects products of all kinds ; but, while I do not propose to exempt your products from taxation, I want you to exempt our products from the tax which I wish you to put upon the products of other countries. Do you not think that the workingman will say : This is a rather cool proposal ; you want me to tax my food for your benefit, but you are not prepared to exempt my products from taxation for my benefit ; you want me to allow you to smite me on the right cheek and then have me turn the other cheek to be smitten also. Such a policy would not be received in Great Britain—it is not to be taken seriously.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is not a thing to be discussed seriously.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hon. gentlemen will insist upon that ; but, unless they are prepared to change their ground, they cannot hope to have a hearing before the British public. I have put forward the supposititious case of my hon. friend sending a delegation to Great Britain to make that proposition. But the thing has been done already. Time and again there have been delegations to make such propositions. In 1896 there were delegates to the Congress of Chambers of Commerce of the empire, who came before the British public with such a proposition. Mr. Osler, not then a member of this House, who was one of the delegates to that congress, moved this resolution :

Whereas, in view of recent events, and the attitude of other nations towards Great Britain, and of the fact that there exists within the British Empire resources in men and materials and arable land for its every requirement ;

Whereas, while the trade legislation of other nations is framed to subserve their local interests, all British trade and other legislation should aim to secure within the empire a union of interest of a federal character, and the policy of each British community should be designed to retain within the empire subjects whose labour would otherwise go to foreign lands ;

Whereas, Canada has already formed a basis for closer relations with the mother country and other colonies by building a highway across British America, by creating steamship connections between Vancouver, Hong Kong, New Zealand and Australia, by offering a large subsidy for fast Atlantic steamship service, as well as by her established precedent of confederation, making for British unity ;

And whereas, closer commercial relations between the mother country, her colonies and dependencies will be hastened by further subsidizing fast steamship services and completing postal, wire and cable communication with the different portions of the empire, thus making such routes for commerce, food supply and munitions of war the fastest and most secure from attack ;

Resolved, that in the opinion of this congress, the advantages to be obtained by a closer union between the various portions of the British Empire are so great as to justify an arrangement as nearly as possible of the nature of a zollverein, based upon principles of the freest exchange of commodities within the empire, consistent with the tariff requirements incident to the maintenance of the local government of each kingdom, dominion, province or colony now forming part of the British family of nations.

Now, mark this resolution. It is worded so as to convey one idea. It meant a zollverein—not as we usually understand a zollverein, because that implies free trade among the parties to it, but a zollverein modified by 'the tariff requirements incident to the maintenance of the local government, or each kingdom, dominion, province, or colony.' With this restriction, this motion could not be adopted. It had to be withdrawn. Then Sir Donald Smith—as he was then—moved this motion :

Whereas, the stability and progress of the British Empire can be best assured by drawing continually closer the bonds that unite the colonies with the mother country and by the continuous growth of a practical sympathy and co-operation and all that pertains to the common welfare ;

And whereas, this co-operation and unity can in no way be more effectually promoted than by the cultivation and extension of the mutual and profitable interchange of their products ;

Therefore, resolved, that this congress records its belief in the advisability and practicability of a customs arrangement between Great Britain and her colonies and India on the basis of preferential treatment, and recommends that steps should be taken by Her Majesty's government to bring about an interchange of opinions on the subject between the mother country and other governments of the empire.

Resolved, that in the opinion of this congress, the advantages to be obtained by a closer union between the various portions of the British Empire are so great as to justify an arrangement as nearly as possible of the nature of a zollverein based upon principles of the freest exchange of commodities within the empire consistent with the tariff requirements incident to the maintenance of the local government of each kingdom, dominion, province or colony now forming part of the British family of nations.

This resolution differed a good deal from the resolution moved by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), but it contained the last paragraph, which meant that there should be a zollverein, or some slight modification of it. Even this the Congress would not accept, and defeated it. The resolution which was finally adopted is this :

That this Congress of Chambers of Commerce of the empire is of opinion that the establishment of closer commercial relations between the United Kingdom and the colonies and dependencies is an object which deserves prompt and careful consideration. The congress, therefore, respectfully represents to Her Majesty's government that, if the suggestion should be made on behalf of the colonies or some of them, it would be right and expedient to promote such consideration, and the formulation of some practicable plan by summoning an Imperial conference, thoroughly representative of the interests involved, or by such other means as Her Majesty may be advised to adopt.

So the whole subject was left in an inchoate state, after the representatives of Canada had gone to England in order to impress upon the British people the necessity of having, not an absolute zollverein, but a union in which all the parts would be free to have such a tariff as they wanted. This whole proposition had to be abandoned, and the scheme could not proceed any further. Again the scheme was attempted last year, and the hon. member for Toronto East (Mr. Kemp) offered the following resolution :

Whereas it is generally recognized that an advantageous commercial bond is the strongest link in national unity, and that the maintenance and strengthening of trade is the keystone of a state's successful development ;

And whereas the existence of an empire is largely dependent upon the material prosperity of its people ;

Therefore be it resolved : That in the opinion of this congress the bonds of the British Empire would be materially strengthened, and the union of the various parts of Her Majesty's Dominion greatly consolidated by the adoption of a commercial policy based upon the principle of neutral benefit, whereby each component part of the empire would receive a substantial advantage in trade as the result of its national relationship.

Further resolved : That in order to make the foregoing operative, the Chair should appoint, before this congress dissolves, a representative and proportionate committee of home and colonial delegates to devise a scheme of this nature, and report to this or a similar commercial congress, and that a copy of this resolution be officially forwarded to the home and colonial governments concerned in the proposition.

Even this proposition, mild as it was, could not be carried, but it was defeated by an amendment which, however, was withdrawn almost immediately. Then we know what took place, the Minister of Finance referred to it some time ago. A committee was appointed to call upon the Prime Minister and lay their views before him, but the Prime Minister would not even receive them. Baffled at every point, they thought they would go to Mr. Chamberlain, not officially, but in an informal capacity, in order to put their views before Mr. Chamberlain, and he answered giving opinions which are altogether the adverse to those which have been advocated in this House. Mr. Speaker, if we are at any time to obtain mutual preferential trade between Great Britain and Canada—and more than once I have stated that for my part I think it would be a great advantage for Canada—but if we are to obtain it, upon what conditions can we have it ? We can have it perhaps on one condition, but we cannot discuss it unless we have that condition, we cannot even discuss it as long as we have a protective tariff, or a customs tariff in Canada. That is the position which has been taken again and again.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. But it is somewhat difficult to convince hon. gentlemen, it is difficult to convince men who do not want to be convinced ; it is difficult to be heard when men will not hear you. It is difficult to convince men when they do not

want to see. Hon. gentlemen opposite are like the pagan idols, they have eyes but they do not see, ears but they do not hear. Here is the language of Mr. Chamberlain upon this point, which has been quoted again and again, delivered before this very Congress of the Chambers of Commerce in the year 1896 :

But up to the present time we have not been agreed as to the methods by which this object may be reached. It appears to me that there are only three lines of progress which have been suggested to accomplish this great object. The first of them is a proposal that the colonies should abandon their own fiscal system and should adopt ours, that they should carry out fully the doctrines of free trade, that they should open their markets not only to us but to all the world, and that they should abandon entirely the protective duties upon which now they rest very largely for the revenues which they collect. That is a proposal which is supported by the Cobden Club, by the extreme, or perhaps I may say by orthodox free-traders, and there is no doubt a good deal to be said for it. I do not deny that possibly it might be to all concerned the best solution ; at the same time I am bound to point out that that would not bring about commercial union in the sense in which we have generally understood the word, because that would be in the direction of cosmopolitan union, but it would offer no particular advantage to the trade of the empire as such. But what is to my mind a much more fatal objection is the fact that, speaking generally, the colonies will not adopt this proposal.

I think he was speaking truly there.

We must consider it, therefore, as a council of protection, and if we are to wait until the colonies generally are converted to our views in regard to the advantages of free trade, let us recognize the fact that we must postpone the hope of commercial union to the Greek Kalends. General free trade in this country has been developed, no doubt, to the great advantage of this country for the period of half a century, but in spite of that it has made no converts. We do not find—again I am speaking generally because I know there are exceptions—that there is any considerable approach to our system on the part of the colonies, and there is no approach at all to it on the part of foreign countries. Well, I pass on to the second proposal which has been laid before a similar congress to this, which found expression at the great congress at Ottawa a year or two ago,—that is a proposal which has been favoured by some of our principal colonies and described with great force and elegance by leading colonists, and it is the very reverse, in spirit at any rate, of the proposal which I have just been considering ; for whereas the first proposal requires that the colonies should abandon their system in favour of ours, this proposal requires that we should abandon our system in favour of theirs.

That is bringing the proposition to its true basis.

It is, in effect, that while the colonies should be left absolutely free to impose what protective duties they please both upon foreign countries and upon British commerce, they should be required to make a small discrimination in favour of British trade, in return for which we are expected to change our whole system and to impose duties on food and on raw material. Well, I express again my own opinion when I say that there is not the slightest chance that in any reasonable time this country, or the parliament of this country, would adopt so one-sided an agreement. The foreign trade of this country is so large, and the foreign trade of the colonies is comparatively so small that a small preference given to us upon that foreign trade by the colonies would make so slight a difference, would be so slight a benefit to the total volume of our trade, that I do not believe the working classes of this country would consent to make a revolutionary change for what they would think to be an infinitesimal game. Well, you will see that so far we have only arrived at a deadlock. We have a proposal by British free-traders which is rejected by the colonies, we have a proposal by colonial protectionists which is rejected by Great Britain.

That is the true position.

We have, therefore, if we are to make any progress at all, to seek a third course in which there should be give and take on both sides—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hon. gentlemen had better wait a little before they cheer.

—in which neither side will pedantically adhere to preconceived conclusions, in which the good of the whole shall subordinate the separate interests of parts. And I admit that, if I understand it correctly, I find the germs of such a proposal in a resolution which is to be submitted to you on behalf of the Toronto Board of Trade. What is that resolution? I hope I correctly explain it. That resolution I understand to be one for the creation of a British Zollverein or customs union which would establish at once practically free trade throughout the British Empire, but would leave the contracting parties free to make their own arrangements with regard to duties upon foreign goods; except that this is an essential condition of the proposal that Great Britain shall consent to replace moderate duties upon certain articles which are of large production in the colonies. Now, if I have rightly understood it, these articles would comprise corn, meat, wool and sugar, and perhaps other articles of enormous consumption in this country which are at present largely produced in the colonies, and which might be, under such an arrangement, wholly produced in the colonies, and wholly produced by British labour. On the other hand, as I have said, the colonies, while maintaining their duties upon foreign imports, would agree to a free interchange of commodities with the rest of the empire, and would cease to place protective duties upon any product of British labour. That is the principal of the German Zollverein; that is the principle which underlies the federation of the United States of America; and I do not doubt for a moment that if it were adopted it would be the strongest bond of union between the British race throughout the world. (Cheers.) I say that such a proposal as that might commend itself even to an orthodox free trader. It would be the greatest advance that free trade has ever made since it was first advocated by Mr. Cobden, to extend its doctrines permanently to more than 300 millions of the human race, and to communities many of which are amongst the most thriving, the most prosperous and the most rapidly increasing in the world. On the other hand, it would open up to the colonies an almost

unlimited market for their agricultural and other productions.

Now, that is the condition upon which the man who has been relied upon to favour the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, says that you can negotiate free trade within the empire. If hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are ready to go to England and negotiate upon that basis, they may do so. They can agitate public opinion upon that basis, but so long as they go to England as protectionists it is the essence of absurdity—I can use no other word—for them to expect a hearing. That is not the only occasion upon which Mr. Chamberlain has spoken upon this subject. He spoke a few months ago at the last congress of the Chambers of Commerce which took place in June, 1900. In parliament, in 1900, on the floor of the House of Commons he spoke again on this subject. Speaking on the motion of the hon. member for Elland, he said :

The hon. member for Elland referred to a proposal which has been made by the London Chamber of Commerce for a fiscal arrangement with the colonies, which is, indeed, a proposal for an Imperial Zollverein. I have never done anything of the sort. It is one of those mistakes of which I am so largely the victim, and which perhaps it would hardly be worth while to contradict until the occasion becomes urgent. All I have done is to point out that, following the language used by Lord Ripon, my predecessor, if there is to be any kind of fiscal arrangement with the colonies, the only form which I myself think would be viewed with the slightest favour in this country would be an Imperial Zollverein, in which there should be free trade between the whole empire, and duties of some kind as against other countries. But I have not proposed that; I have only stated that that alone seems to be a proposal which might be seriously considered.

Allusion has been made very often to my trip to England and to the position I took there. The position I took there was this: I acted like a reasonable man, I saw at once that it could not be possible, so great is the free trade sentiment in England, to have a mutuality of preference so long as we continue to levy customs duties upon English goods. But, the moment we are ready—it may take a long time, but I hope that some day it shall come—to discard our tariff, the moment we come to the doctrine of free trade, then it is possible to have a commercial mutual preference based upon free trade in the empire. There is free trade to-day between seventy-five million people in the United States, there is free trade between forty million Germans, there is free trade between thirty-six million Frenchmen, and if it is possible to have free trade between 300,000,000 of British subjects you would have the greatest commercial policy the world has ever seen. But, how can hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House hope to have any hearing whatever so long as they go to England and say : We will protect ourselves against your goods and at the same time we want you to give us free trade for our goods ? The thing is absurd. That is the policy that hon. gentlemen are proposing.

I come to the third proposal of my hon. friend in his resolution. I may say that I am glad to hear the declaration made by the hon. gentleman on this subject, and I think it is a considerable back down from the terms he has proposed in his resolution. In his resolution the hon. gentleman says :

This House is further of opinion that equivalent or adequate duties should be imposed by Canada upon the products and manufactures of countries not within the empire in all cases where such countries fail to admit Canadian products and manufactures upon fair terms, and that the government should take for this purpose all such available measures as may be found necessary.

When I read this resolution before it was commented upon by the hon. gentleman, I assumed that it applied to the United States which maintains a high tariff against us, and I would not be prepared to adopt it upon this ground. I am glad that the hon. gentleman has taken a more sensible view and that he takes the position that however unfair we may think the United States tariff is against us, it is not practically enforced against us, because it is directed against and it applies to the whole world. However unfair we think it, my hon. friend thinks it would not be right for us to follow in the same direction and elevate our tariff as high as the United States tariff is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) allow me to interrupt him ? I said that I was not prepared at present to coincide altogether with the views of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), but that I thought that the trade relations between this country and the United States was a subject that might fairly claim the attention of the government.

The PRIME MINISTER. I might fairly claim the attention of the government. Well, I thought it claimed the attention of the opposition also, but I am wrong in believing that. My hon. friend says : I wash my hands of the whole thing, the government may consider it, but as to this I do not advise. I have no objection to advise as far as Germany is concerned, but as far as the United States are concerned I do not advise. Well, if the hon. gentleman will not advise, I will. I have no hesitation in facing the situation. And when hon. gentlemen opposite, because we must assume that my hon. friend is voicing the sentiments of his friends upon this subject, tell us that we should elevate our tariff to the height of the American tariff, I take issue with them altogether. The tariff of the people of Canada is to be determined by the people them-

selves not from any consideration of the tariffs of the United States or of other countries, but simply of the consideration of what best suits the Canadian people. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House cannot maintain their doctrine; they would be blocked at the first step that they would take if they were to try to elevate our tariff to the height of the American tariff. I will take one or two articles. The American duty on wool is 11 cents per pound. Our duty is practically nil; wool is practically free. Would hon. gentlemen opposite advise us to elevate our tariff to the height of the American tariff on wool? Would they propose to raise the duty on wool to 11 cents a pound because that happens to be the duty imposed under the American tariff? The thing is absurd. Hon. gentlemen know that it cannot be done and they simply placed before the people a proposition there which the hon. leader of the opposition recants but which may go abroad here and there because it may affect this or that interest. Let us face the situation bravely like men, let us resolve that whatever may be the American tariff we shall be guided only by the measure of what is in our own interest in this respect. In regard to the German tariff, I have a word to say to my hon. friend. I find no fault with the manner in which he has approached this question. This is a question of some importance and which deserves to be very seriously considered. Some years ago we found that the treaty of Great Britain with Germany was a great block in our path. It affected our commercial liberties. We could not give a preference to Great Britain because we would have to give it to Germany.

For years and years the Conservative party when they were in office tried to get these treaties abolished, but they could not succeed. When the Liberal party came into power they were at once successful in that direction. It is refreshing to hear the explanation given us the other day by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) as to the manner in which we accomplished that which his political friends failed in accomplishing for many years. He told us that by our preferential tariff we blundered into such a position that it forced the hand of the mother country. Well, I would not quarrel with the hon. gentleman as it is past six o'clock, but whether we blundered into it or not, yet if we did blunder into it, I call his attention to the fact that even when we do blunder we can accomplish things that he and his friends in power could not accomplish even by design?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. And so, if we blundered and if they designed, they failed in their design and we carried our point. Sir, if we forced the hand of England to denounce the German treaty it is not because we had any hostility against Germany; it is not because we did not want to trade with Germany, but simply because we wanted our freedom of action restored to us. In this we succeeded. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) told us truthfully that there were two tariffs in Germany; the general tariff and the conventional tariff; the general tariff being the higher and the conventional tariff the lower. Great Britain negotiated a new treaty and obtained the advantage of the conventional tariff. The United States to-day have the advantage of the conventional tariff, and I am not without hope that we also shall have some day the advantage of the conventional tariff. But before we bring this question to the angry discussion of parliament and of the country, my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will agree with me that we should exhaust every confidential mode of obtaining this object. And when we have adopted every confidential mode that we can adopt, then if we fail we shall have to come before the House and frankly say that we have failed, and we may have to adopt some other method. But until that time arrives my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will, I think, agree with me that it is better to leave this matter to be dealt with confidentially between the Imperial government and the Canadian authorities.

There is one thing as to which I am glad to agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax). In his peroration he uttered some very noble sentiments which I trust shall find echo in North Bruce the day after to-morrow. The hon. gentleman told us that he was adverse to having anything like racial questions introduced. I do not know if his attention has been drawn to the paragraph in the paper which is his organ, if he has an organ in North Bruce, and which referring to the contest now going on in that constituency spoke of the 'Tarte-Laurier combination.' This 'Tarte-Laurier combination' referred to in that style in a Conservative paper published in a riding where a contest is now pending has a meaning which we all understand very well. It has a meaning the very reverse of the language spoken a moment ago by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) when he stated that he did not want any racial cry raised in this country. I trust that his words therefore will go to North Bruce to be pitted against the language of the newspaper which supports his candidate in that election.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York.) Mr. Speaker, before you left the Chair this

afternoon, we had a very interesting address from the right hon. the First Minister ; and we had a very able presentation of the case of the Conservative party by our honoured leader, the member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). I wish to make some remarks upon the speech of the right hon. leader of the government; and if at the present moment I do not take up all the points he referred to, I shall endeavour to do so at some stage of my remarks before I sit down.

The First Minister was exceedingly surprised to find that the Conservative party of this country adhered to the national policy—that that policy which they had inaugurated, and which they had continued during the time they were in power, should be their policy to-day, with changes necessary to the changed conditions of the country. And he might very well be surprised, because, looking at the record of the Liberal party in this House, we find that they never were consistent, they never adhered to the policy which they proclaimed. They proclaimed a policy of free trade, and they abandoned it ; they proclaimed a policy of commercial union, and they abandoned it ; and it was a surprise to them, judging by their own standard of right and wrong, and of consistency, that the Conservative policy should have adhered to the professions which they had made. He dwelt very much upon the contrast, as he called it, between the two political parties. He said the distinction was this : We arranged our tariff to produce a revenue ; they arranged theirs to put money into the pockets of a few people. Well, I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman, or the Finance Minister, who is here, what about the bounty on pig iron and steel ? They have made a tariff to give away $3 of the people's money to the manufacturer of pig iron for every ton produced, and $3 per ton more when that pig iron is converted into steel or wrought iron—a total of $6 a ton. Why it will be simply a payment of a million or more dollars per annum—and we are told that that is a policy for revenue. The Minister of Finance has told us that enormous sums will be paid out during the present year on this account, and increased sums during the years that are to follow. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, is that a revenue policy ? There never was a more transparent fraud than the attempt to prove that their tariff is a tariff for revenue only. When you examine into it carefully, you find that it is a tariff for the purpose of helping their friends very largely. If we judge by the fact that during the campaign just over there were enormous amounts of money in every constituency where it was required, for the purpose of defeating the will of the people, we can say that the policy of subsidies was one which produced a very large revenue for the supporters and members of the government.

Mr. KENDALL. Some of us did not find it so.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sorry for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. KENDALL. So am I.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman was one of those left out in the cold because the money was not evenly distributed, there was lots to go round.

Mr. KENDALL. We had to fight the Canalian Pacific Railway Company, and we also had to fight the Dominion Iron and Steel Company.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman can tell that to the marines. I am not bound to believe it.

Mr. KENDALL. We will give the hon. gentleman a little more light later on.

Mr. WALLACE. The First Minister told us to-night that theirs was a revenue tariff, while ours was a protective tariff ; and then he discussed at great length the usefulness of going to England to get a reciprocal preference in the markets of Great Britain for Canada and the other possessions of the empire. He said you cannot go to England with a protective policy, and get them to give you any preference. But he goes there, he says, as a revenue policy government. But, Mr. Speaker, he had just told us that it was not a protective policy. We are not in power ; we cannot go. Hon. gentlemen opposite are in power ; it is they who would have to do it. According to his statement, they would go to Great Britain and say : We are not protectionists, but free traders ; we are coming to free trade as rapidly as we can ; and we come to you in Great Britain to ask you to give us a preference in your markets, as we are giving you a preference in our markets. The First Minister, in his whole speech, was dealing with a case which did not exist, if what he had said to the House a few moments before was true.

But he argues that you cannot have a protective policy and get a preference in British markets. Why not ? We go to Great Britain, and we say : We have taken off one-third of the duties as a preference to Great Britain ; we do not ask you to adopt a protective tariff, except in a moderate degree to give a preference to the other possessions of the empire. They have declared their willingness to do that.

An hon. MEMBER. When ?

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Chamberlain himself, in one of his speeches, said: You come to us with any proposition ; it is not for us to go to you to make an offer; but you come to us, and we will treat you in the most liberal spirit ; we will not make it a question of profit or loss for the British Empire, but we will deal with you as citizens of the

same empire, we will treat your requests with the greatest consideration. He invited not only Canada, but the other possessions, to go there and make the offer ; and Canada in that matter had struck out the course for the others, because she was the dominant power, the premier representing about six millions of people. He said : We do not want any preference ; we are becoming a free trade country, and we do not want any preference in your market at all. He made a mistake ; he did more than that, Mr. Speaker—he committed a crime against the people of Canada ; because the Hon. Joseph Chamberlain had invited them especially to go to him with their requests, and there never could have been a more opportune time than that for Canada and the other possessions to have given and received reciprocal concessions which would have benefited the empire and placed all the colonial dependencies in a state of prosperity such as they never had seen before. The First Minister, when he told us that, was merely touching a question which he was afraid to meet. But what more did he tell us ? Of course, he told us the old story that never was the country so prosperous, never was trade so great, as at the present moment. That is the answer we always get ; but it did not go down with the people of Ontario at the last election, when we heard that cry on every platform, because they knew that the prosperity of the country was not due to the efforts of the Liberal party, but was in spite of their efforts. But there was another significant statement made by the First Minister. He said to the House to-night : We are not going to disturb the tariff; what we want is permanence and stability. In fact, he said, we are not going to have a procession of tariff tinkers coming down here to disturb the tariff of this country. Mr. Speaker, tariff tinkers have come down here. They came down in 1877 and 1878, and they said to the government of that day : Our industries are languishing and being destroyed ; the competition of the United States and other countries is destroying the manufacturing industries of this country ; our farmers are having their markets invaded by the farmers of the United States, and every industry in this country is being destroyed, and we come to you and ask for redress. But they were dismissed with a wave of the hand, and told that the government knew all about it, and the people did not know anything. The tariff tinkers, as the right hon. gentleman calls them, who came down asking for redress on behalf of the people, were sent home. The right hon. gentleman was a member of the government at that time himself ; he was one of those responsible for the sending home of these men who had come to complain of the gross injustice of the tariff of that day. But the people rose in their might and dismissed those high and mighty men who are to-day adopting the very same programme. The right hon. gentleman has said: We are not going to hear those tariff tinkers. The men from all parts of Ontario, who came down the other day to make representations to the government on behalf of the beet sugar industry, instead of having proper attention paid to their demands, are to-day told by the First Minister : Oh, you tariff tinkers, get out ; we do not want to see you ; just as soon as we wish we will make a tariff to suit ourselves. What is that tariff to be ? The right hon. gentleman has told us. He has told us that there will be no change until his government is ready to make a great change looking towards free trade. The woollen industry may be destroyed, other industries may be destroyed, but this great powerful government, intoxicated with their own vanity, drunk with the idea of their greatness, sends all complaints back with disdain and scorn and says to them : We do not want to see you; we know better than you the conditions of the affairs of this country, and we will make no change in the tariff. We will adopt the old Tory doctrine: Let everything stand as it is, no progress, no improvement, no wrong to be righted. This great government folds its arms and will do nothing until the time comes when it can move in the direction of free trade.

This is a warning that the people of Canada will read to-morrow with amazement. The right hon. gentleman told us that we cannot have protection and a preference. I should like to know why. We can go to Australia and can say to that country: You are making a tariff, which will probably be very largely a protective tariff, we will make a bargain with you. We will give you a preference in the markets of Canada over foreign nations, and we ask you to give us a preference in yours. You cannot send a man too soon to interview the commonwealth of Australia and see if we cannot make trade relations with that colony, which will be mutually advantageous to both.

At the conclusion of his speech the right hon. gentleman expressed himself as very much aggrieved because he said the racial cry was being raised, and he gave as evidence the heading of an article read by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) : 'The Tarte-Laurier combine.' Well, 'The Tupper-Foster combine' was all right when the Conservative party was in power. Why then does the right hon. gentleman object to the Tarte-Laurier combine ? Is he getting ashamed of his colleague ? But what about the hon. gentleman himself ? Have we not read his speeches when he addressed his fellow-countrymen in the restricted sense, because we are all fellow-countrymen in Canada in the larger sense. But he never went to address a French gather-

ing in which he did not refer to them as his fellow-countrymen, because of their French origin. I have read reports of his speeches, and in these he was wont to say: I am a Frenchman and am proud of it. The same blood flows in my veins as runs in yours, and I want your votes on the ground that we are all French. That is what the First Minister said time and again.

The PRIME MINISTER. I never did.

Mr. WALLACE. I read reports of his speeches time and again when he made that statement.

The PRIME MINISTER. Never.

Mr. WALLACE. Did the right hon. gentleman never say he was a Frenchman ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Over and over again, but I never said I wanted their votes because I was French.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not say that the right hon. gentleman told them that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not say that he told them that, but I say that was the logical and straight conclusion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, why should he say it at all ? When I address an audience, have I ever told them that I am an Irishman because my father and mother came from Ireland ? Never in my life. Never have I gone to an audience and appealed to them in that way. I have appealed to them as a Canadian—not an Irish Canadian, or a French Canadian, or a German Canadian, but simply as a Canadian citizen —and because the programme I approved was the best for the citizens of Canada. But the First Minister has time and again said : I am a Frenchman, and I am proud of it, and the same blood runs in my veins as runs in yours. What was that said for ? Is it any difference that a Frenchman is First Minister of the Dominion ? What was the meaning of all that? Was there anybody attacking him because he was a Frenchman either there or anywhere in the Dominion of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, yes.

Mr. WALLACE. I for one have never heard of it.

Mr. KENDALL. Let me tell the hon. gentleman——

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman need not tell me because I have heard him once or twice state some things that were not so, and I do not want to hear that kind of thing again. I say that such language in my opinion is unworthy of a Canadian statesman. It is raising a racial cry. What was this said for ? 'I am a Frenchman, and am proud of it, and the same blood that runs in my veins runs in yours.' It means one thing and one thing only.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to some of the statements made by those who preceded the First Minister. We listened to the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) last Thursday with something of surprise at the change in his attitude. Hitherto he has always been jubilant, he has always been rampant, always spreading himself over the greatness of this Dominion and the prosperity that prevails throughout the country. The other day, it is true, he told of a surplus last year, and said that he had reduced the debt of the country by $770,000. He said that on two other occasions the debt of the country had been reduced. But he did not tell us, as in all fairness he might have done, that in one year, in 1882, the debt was reduced by three times as much.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not so much—the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) might as well be accurate, seeing he likes accuracy.

Mr. WALLACE. My figures are accurate.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I stated that the debt was reduced by a large sum.

Mr. WALLACE. But the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) did not state the sum, he took care not to mention that it was reduced by several millions.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was under a million.

Mr. WALLACE. No, it was over two millions. I said the hon. gentleman might have been more candid and have told the facts, instead of simply stating that there were large reductions. When the hon. minister announced his surplus and said there was to be a reduction of the public debt for the year, the cheers that went up from hon. gentlemen opposite no doubt did his heart good. But this was when he was speaking of the past. He was obliged to face the future. He said : Surpluses may be a very good thing, but we cannot have them always. As to the future, we are going to have a surplus of $6,400,000 next year, but we are going to have an expenditure on capital account of $10,300,000. This would mean an addition to our indebtedness of nearly $4,000,000. But the hon. minister, I do not know by what means figured it out at about two millions—he allowed less for the sinking fund, I suppose, or some little game of that kind. But that was quite a surprise to those behind him. They would hardly understand that the good state of affairs was not to continue. This sent rather a cold blast over the spirits of the new members. But there were some who were ready. The old campaigners were ready to cheer the minister whatever statement he might make. More particularly I noted that the

gentlemen who sit immediately around the ministers, those five or six who are supposed to be anxious that ermine should be cast over their shoulders, those gentlemen who, if report is to be credited, have been clamouring to be appointed to judgeships throughout the country, did not hesitate, but cheered and applauded. They could applaud anything, they could do anything, to help the government out of a difficulty. When the emergency food question was up, they could swallow any quantity of the emergency ration. When it was necessary to burke inquiry into the Huron and Brockville elections, these gentlemen were selected for the task, and nobly they performed their duty. Their friends, Cap Sullivan, Duncan Bole and the rest of the gang were to be protected at all hazards, and these gentlemen protected them in the committee and in the House. And they are ready to do it again. They are ready to do anything. What do they care ? With a judgeship coming up, why should not they earn it ? So, things are not looking so well for the Liberal party for the future. The Minister of Finance tells us that we have been going up year after year and that we are now on the crest of the wave. And he said we were going to stay there. But, Mr. Speaker, you cannot stay on the crest of the wave—it is a physical impossibility. If you have ever been a navigator, you know that you cannot stay on the crest of a wave, you know that you have to go somewhere—and you go downward. That is the way that the minister of the nautical metaphor—he is going to go downward. He was warning the people. And why ? Because all his predictions and those of his colleagues were falsified. The hon. gentleman announced that in four years after they came into power they spent $21,300,000 on capital account. And, after the manner of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), who said 'wait until you see us next year,' the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) took us into his confidence to the extent of announcing that he was going to spend about ten and a half millions on capital account this year if I took his figures correctly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it was ten millions.

Mr. WALLACE. That will make almost $32,000,000 spent on capital account. But these hon. gentlemen tell us: It is true we are spending large sums of money, but we are developing the resources of the country and are enabling the people to earn more. But, with this vast expenditure on capital account and this enormous increase in the expenditure on account of consolidated fund, the Minister of Finance feels bound to come and tell us: You must look out for squalls; you cannot expect that in the future we are going to have a continuance of this era of great prosperity; we are going to take a rest so that we may be strengthened and refreshed; and, at some time in the future resume our vigorous efforts. And so they see the signs that the prosperity which they did nothing to bring about and which they cannot keep from being overcome by an era of adversity—they know they are helpless—must inevitably decrease.

The Minister of Customs has furnished us with a report of the trade of the country during the past five months, from the 1st of July to the last of November. During those five months, as was mentioned by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), there have been decreases in every item of the exports of this country except gold and manufactures, which I presume came from the Yukon, and in which there was an increase of about fifteen million dollars. That large production of gold in the Yukon was due in no sense to the efforts of the government. They had made no roads, furnished no facilities to open up and develop the country, and give the miners an opportunity. They had imposed a royalty of 10 per cent, handicapping the miners, which they now declare to have been a mistake, because they propose to reduce it to 5 per cent. There were increases in manufactures to the amount of $1,600,000. Our exports of fish decreased in those five months, compared with the five months of the previous year, by $836,000, the exports of the forest decreased by $1,380,000, the exports of animals and their products decreased by $1,567,000 ; miscellaneous decreased by $131,000, and bullion by $586,000; making a decrease in the great staples of the country of between four and five million dollars. No wonder the ministers are becoming alarmed, no wonder they are now sounding a note of warning because the export of the country is leaping up, the expenditure on capital account and for running the government has reached such enormous figures that the people are becoming alarmed.

Now, there is another reason. They said, and the First Minister repeated to-night, that when we were in power we were going to stop all emigration from the country, we were going to give employment to the people at home. So we did, and we prevented these men from going out of the country, because we built up manufacturing establishments and Canadians were employed in them. We opened up Manitoba and the North-west Territories, we sent tens of thousands of young Canadians up there who otherwise would have gone to the North-western States. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said last year that they had stopped all that. They have not stopped it. Last year household effects, which is the only test they can give us as to the emigration from Canada, amounted to $1,165,000, notwithstanding the great era of prosperity we are enjoying, and that is about the amount under the period of depression when the Conservative party were in power, in 1893-4-5. So, Mr. Speaker, there was reason

why these gentlemen sounded a note of alarm.

They say : Look at the trade of this country, grown to greater proportions than ever before, the business of the country amounting to $381,000,000. The total trade of the country is measured by imports for home consumption and exports of Canadian produce. The hon. gentleman put the imports at $189,000,000. There were to be deducted from that, as the Minister of Finance himself admitted, $4,750,000 of American Indian corn, which they had put as a product of Canada and exported, and which they admitted was not the product of Canada, but simply grain going through in transit. Deduct that from the imports and the exports, deduct the wheat which went through in the same way to the amount of $4,370,000, and flax, $1,039,000, making a deduction altogether of $10,170,000. Now take the exports. There were $191,000,000, and they add to make up that sum, $5,500,000, which they say was short, that was not reported in the customs house. I do not believe they should have any such figure. I believe that the machinery we have in force to-day, with the enormous army of customs officials, and the fact that business is done better than it formerly was, prove that there is really no large amount to be added to exports. I deduct that, and you have $186,433,000. Deduct from that $21,000,000 for exports not produced in Canada, and you have a total showing of $165,000,000 of exports and $176,000,000 of imports. You have $10,500,000 of trade against the Dominion of Canada. The imports exceed the exports by $10,500,000.

Now, Sir, notwithstanding all that has been said about the balance of trade, the peeople of England to-day are inquiring what the balance of trade means. It means nothing more nor less, in the case of Canada, than this : If you import $176,000,000 and export $165,000,000, you are $11,000,000 short in your accounts.

Mr. KENDALL. Not at all.

Mr. WALLACE. You cannot demonstrate to me in any way you like that a country is becoming rich, especially a country like Canada, where the exports are millions of dollars every year less than the imports. Take an individual. He brings to his farm $2,000 worth of goods every year for consumption, and he sells $1,500 worth every year ; in a long course of years he will inevitably become poor, he will become a pauper, he will be driven off his farm. The same rule will apply to a nation. They ask us to look at Great Britain. Great Britain is becoming rich, although the imports are very much greater than the exports. That is true. But they are doing a great deal of business for other countries. They have the ships that carry the produce to and fro, they have the control of the banking business, they do the buying and the selling, and they have profits on all this business. But to-day they are asking themselves the question whether they are not living on the profits they have made in former years ; and they will come to the conclusion, when they examine into it, that they are living upon the profits that they have formerly made.

Now, there is another matter. When some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House called attention to the preference that we are giving to Great Britain and criticised it, the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) demanded from hon. members on this side of the House that we should get up and move for its repeal, which would be, in his opinion, disloyal and improper. The right hon. First Minister went over the same story to-night. It was something sacred, it was the symbol of the loyalty of the people of Canada to give a preference to Great Britain, and if the Conservative party dared to interfere with it they would be branded with disloyalty. I would like to know, and I would like somebody to tell me, when these hon. gentlemen were put in the position of claiming to be the loyal party in Canada. During every emergency the Conservative party have fairly stood up for the connection with Great Britain, when these men sneered at us, and when the right hon. First Minister told us that he preferred the American dollar to the English shilling, thus sneering at the connection between us and Great Britain. He was looking at the mighty dollar. Their whole course, from the time that they proposed commercial union, that would have allowed American goods to come in free of duty while British goods will have to pay a duty, has been disloyal. That was a disloyal position to take because it would end only in one thing if carried out, and that would be in severing our connection with the mother land. When we dared to say that we wanted a preference in the markets of Great Britain the right hon. gentleman told us that we could not have it, and declared that it was disloyal to even think of touching the preference that we were giving to Great Britain. Who are these gentlemen who are going to teach the Conservative party loyalty ? Is it the hon. Minister of Finance, who, in a speech which he made in Halifax—not in a speech but throughout a whole campaign—advocated the smashing of confederation, advocated the secession of the province of Nova Scotia from the Dominion, and not only advocated the secession of Nova Scotia, but asked the neighbouring provinces of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island to join with him in smashing confederation. Yet, that hon. gentleman comes to us and preaches loyalty. Here is his speech :

The interests of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia are alike in this matter. All these provinces have been sacrificed to the confederation. I trust this ques-

tion of separation from Canada will be brought up by independent members in both provinces, and fairly discussed. Bad as is the position of the two provinces in the union, it will become worse if Nova Scotia secedes. Maritime interests will be weaker than ever at Ottawa, and there will be little chance for the New Brunswickers and the Islanders to obtain justice. They will have everything to gain by joining Nova Scotia, and I am satisfied that if the movement be taken up with vigour in our sister provinces the demand for separation from Canada will be made, not by Nova Scotia alone, but by the three maritime provinces. But if New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island are content to occupy their present position, or the weaker one which they would occupy after the withdrawal of Nova Scotia, they must be permitted, of course, to take their own way. We shall take our way, and demand for Nova Scotia alone separation from the Dominion, though we would much prefer joint action, because we have always felt that the provinces down by the sea have a unity of interest, and that in co-operation we might bring about results which would go far to make the people of our country prosperous. I believe the people of Nova Scotia will at the approaching elections throw off the yoke of Toryism, and that in our province particularly we shall have a grand victory for Liberalism and repeal.

That is one of the hon. gentlemen who get up on the floor of this House and preach loyalty to us. I think he would have done much better if, looking at his past record, he had kept very quiet about that question. Then we have the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), and the two other hon. members who endorsed him the other night and took such a position that the right hon. gentleman had to repudiate it—as disloyal an attitude as an hon. gentleman ever took in the parliament of Canada.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. The First Minister laughs, and says 'hear, hear.' I am glad to have his approval in that matter. Of course, it may be that, as last year it was a little game played on the House and on the country. It may be that the hon. member for Labelle was put up to make that speech so that the Prime Minister could make his superloyal speech and spread himself in the House and in the country. It has been so stated, and the speech of the First Minister rather lent weight to that statement.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. We know what the right hon. gentleman said when the people were proposing to assist the mother land when war was declared in South Africa. We know the attitude he took then: We could not, we would not assist Great Britain. We had passed a resolution by a unanimous vote a few months before in the House of Commons. With what result? Why, the ink was hardly dry until circumstances compelled us to make a choice, and the right hon. gentleman made his choice that we would not, we could not go to the aid of Great Britain. The overwhelming voice of the loyal people of Canada made the First Minister turn about as he had often done before and therefore it came quite easy to him, and he consented to send a contingent to South Africa. Then, there is another hon. gentleman who professes loyalty to us—the hon. Minister of Public Works. He spoke in Guelph on Friday last. He made quite a speech, and gave us a lecture on loyalty, telling us how we should be good Canadian citizens, and he was going to invite himself to come to Ontario and have a constituency there. When I look at myself for a moment, I see that the electors of Ontario, and particularly of West York, are very generous. They do not look too particularly at their candidates, but, we must draw the line somewhere, and I think there is not a constituency in Ontario but would draw the line at the hon. Minister of Public Works. He has invited himself. I wait to see whether any constituency in Ontario will invite him. It would be particularly hard up for public works before that would be done. But, he says that he is going to come to Ontario, not only to tell them that he is going to be a candidate in Ontario, and that he has always deprecated the racial and religious cries that we now have to-day in North Bruce, but, he says that he is preparing to come even to the Orange order and ask the young men there why they are opposed to the Liberal administration. If he comes to any meeting of the Orange Association, or where the Orangemen are, I will guarantee that he will receive fair treatment. After he has done making his harangues in Ontario, which are very much different from those in Quebec, I have no doubt many of the audiences will ask him: Are you the Mr. Tarte who said, when a Canadian contingent was being sent out: Not a man, not a dollar will be sent? Are you the same individual? Are you the man who made a speech at Laval University a few months ago in which you said:

> One of the paramount duties of the French members of the House of Commons was to show that they were Frenchmen.

Are you the Mr. Tarte who said:

> I am a minister in a British government; I take the liberty to call myself French, but if it is desired that I should declare myself a British citizen and it is desired to prevent myself calling myself French, then I refuse to call myself a British subject.

They would no doubt ask him was he the Mr. Tarte who said these things. They would ask him: Are you the man who put up the tri-colour above the Union Jack on the ships under your command down in the St. Lawrence.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. Our friend over there says : 'Hear, hear.' There is another Tarte in the House. They would also say: Are you the gentleman who had an interview in Paris; a disloyal interview in which you said :

We have to make pretenses of our friendship and our loyalty to Great Britain because it would lead to difficulties if we did not.

They would also ask him: Are you the Mr. Tarte who denounced the Fox Bay settlers on Anticosti Island as murderers, without having a particle of evidence to prove it, and are you the gentleman who had to withdraw that statement, and withdraw it with very bad grace indeed. They would ask the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) all these questions and a great many more. They would also ask him: Are you the gentleman who in a court of justice a short time previous to the elections stated that you were not worth a dollar, and who afterwards said in the House of Commons that you had bought La Patrie with your own money for $30,000 cash, and had bought a royal residence almost, for which you had paid cash too. And then they would ask : Where did you get the money. They would load up the Minister of Public Works with so many inconvenient questions that I think he would be rather sorry that he came up there even if he got the good hearing that is proverbially characteristic of an Ontario audience. Therefore, I say, Mr. Speaker, that we do not require to have lessons in loyalty from the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), from the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding), from the First Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), nor from the Minister of Public Works. The record of the Conservative party is one of loyalty and consideration for the mother land.

Mr. BOURASSA. Except when Home Rule Bill is moved in England.

Mr. WALLACE. Except when Home Rule Bill is moved in England.

Mr. BOURASSA. Then comes the Kingston speech.

Mr. WALLACE. That Kingston speech that I made was an exact repetition of a speech of Lord Salisbury, which met with the approval of the British people. And my remarks met with the approval of the loyal people of Canada too and were approved by the parliament of Canada. I have said, Mr. Speaker, that these gentlemen opposite were not disturbing themselves very much in the interests of the people of Canada. The First Minister said : We should not be bothered with those tariff tinkers; they are a great nuisance, and the Minister of Finance told us how the bounties to be given on steel and iron were to be charged to capital account in the future and removed from being paid out of current account as has been usual in the past. The fact is that if we are going to give bounties the only proper way is to pay them out of current revenue, and not borrow the money to pay them. If you pay $1,000,000 in bounties on the production of $2,000,000 worth of steel or iron produced at the Sydney mine, almost the whole of that steel is sent out of Canada to Europe, and the moment it leaves this country Canadians receive no further benefit from it. We are told now that although this material is not going to be used in Canada it will be charged to capital account. If you construct public works out of capital account the people of Canada own these public works, and if you give subsidies to railways, these railways add to the wealth of the Dominion and are an advantage to the people, but this $2,000,000 worth of iron and steel that goes out of the country is never more seen here. All it is worth to the Canadian people is the labour it gives in producing it, and yet we are told that the bounties on it are to be paid out of capital account in the future. Well, why does the Minister of Finance do this ? It is because that next year the minister or this minister should have a surplus of a million dollars, he will say that his government is running the affairs of the country well so as to get that surplus, whereas if the two million dollars that he will pay in bounties were charged to revenue as it should be, he would have to face a deficit of one million dollars. But, the Minister of Finance wants to prepare himself for something that is coming, and so he wants to have the iron and steel bounties struck from being a charge on the revenue and placed in capital account. I protest against that kind of book-keeping.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we were told to-day, as we were told on Thursday last by the Minister of Finance, that the beet-root sugar men may look for no consideration from the government of Canada. We are told that the government would give them some benefit in letting them have their machinery free of duty. Well, that was done last year. As a matter of fact the question stands in exactly the same position as it was a year ago, because there is not a dollar's worth of beet-root sugar machinery made in Canada to-day. There is not a beet-root sugar factory in Canada, and therefore this pretended concession is no concession at all. It is a negative concession anyway, and it is not worth a cent unless the industry is established here. It costs the government nothing and it is worth just about that to the beet-root sugar industry. I was present at the deputation of the beet sugar men which waited on the government last week, and the members of that deputation made out an extremely strong case although they were told by the government that nothing could be done for them. We imported last year 366,000,000 pounds of sugar and syrups valued at $8,350,000, the freight on which from far-off lands would be certainly $1,000,000 ; making it cost to the

people of this country, $9,350,000 ; and there was $2,380,000 of duty paid on it ; making it altogether $12,000,000 when it arrived in the Dominion of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been proved by that deputation of gentlemen who were here, and who knew what they were talking about, and by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who has made a most exhaustive examination of this question, that beet-root sugar can be made in Canada. We can grow the beets, and we can make the sugar. Beet roots grown in Canada have as large a percentage of saccharine matter as beets grown in any other country. The gentlemen desiring to establish this industry come to the government of Canada and ask for a bounty to enable them to establish factories. We were told that it would cost at least $500,000 to establish each factory, and that it would take about 30 factories to supply the Dominion. It is difficult to get these men to put their money into the industry, because if the Conservatives came into power to-morrow, I have no doubt they would strike off that $2,380,000 of duty to commence with. But the government turn a cold shoulder to them ; they do not want any tariff tinkers to come here to bother them ; they want to enjoy their well-earned luxuries and rest; no trouble or worry for them. We are to have $6,400,000 of a surplus, the Finance Minister tells us, and to give a small percentage of that to build up an industry in the country which will save $12,000,000, and give that $12,000,000 to the farmers and manufacturers of Canada, will never do. It could not be done ; it would never be done ; and the First Minister sent them about their business. He said : They are tariff tinkers, and we will give them warning to keep away for all time.

Another industry of enormous importance to this country has evidently been treated in the same way. In the Kootenay country they are producing enormous quantities of silver, lead and copper ores. They ask to have smelters and refineries established there. A resolution which was passed by the Trail board of trade, says :

> Whereas, there are at the present time no lead refining works in the Dominion of Canada, and the initial cost of establishing such a plant is very great, it is the opinion of the association that the Dominion government should encourage the establishment of such a plant by the grant for a term of years of a bounty of $5 per ton on all lead of Canadian origin smelted and refined in Canada.

We are robbed by the United States tariff to-day on our lead and silver ores ; and these people come to the parliament of Canada, as they have a right to come, and they get the cold shoulder and a point blank refusal. The exports of these ores last year were :

	Quantity.	Value.
Lead	19,800,000 lbs.	$ 678,000
Copper ore and matte..	13,000,000 lbs.	1,387,000
Silver	2,283,000 oz.	1,354,000

A total value of $3,420,000, not speaking of the nickel, which amounts to more than $1,000,000. For the last four months the production amounted to $2,500,000, showing how rapidly the production is increasing. Last year hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of dollars could have been saved to the people of this country if we had the smelting and refining works in Canada. All that is required is a subsidy of $5 a ton on silver lead ore, which is worth $60 or $70 a ton ; so that $5 per ton is equivalent to 7 per cent—that is all they ask. The Finance Minister thinks it is a very nice thing to give a bonus of 55 per cent on pig iron ; but 7 per cent is asked on lead ores, and it is refused. I would like the Finance Minister to tell us by what rule of fair-play the government give 55 per cent bounty on pig iron, and refuse to give 7 per cent on silver lead ores ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will my hon. friend allow me to say that there is an application before the government on that subject ? I do not say what may be done with it, but it is not correct to state that the matter has been disposed of and the application refused.

Mr. WALLACE. The Finance Minister announced no tariff changes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is not a tariff question at all.

Mr. WALLACE. The First Minister told us to-night that there would be no tariff tinkering, and we are told now that this is not a tariff question at all. I have in my hand the prospectus of the company which the Finance Minister knows something about—the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, Limited, of Sydney, Cape Breton, Canada—a company which an hon. gentleman has told us was working so strenuously against him that they got him elected. This company say in their prospectus that they are going to produce next year 400,000 tons of pig iron, 75,000 tons of steel blooms, and 325,000 tons of steel rails. They say :

> If the production from the company's works be as estimated, 300,000 tons of pig metal and 60,000 tons of steel blooms in 1901, and thereafter 400,000 tons of iron and steel per annum, made from Newfoundland ore, the bounties to be received from the Canadian government will be as follows :—
>
> 1901..... $ 870,000
> 1902..... 2,075,000

And this is only one of the refining works of all those that are being established all over the Dominion. We are having them at Collingwood, at Midland, and in successful operation and prospering at Hamilton ;

and we shall have them at many other points in the Dominion. This company, according to the prospectus, will be getting in 1902 $2,075,000 of the money of the good people of Canada ; and in what proportions are they getting it :

After crediting the value of the by-products from the coke ovens, the cost of our pig iron should not exceed $5.50 per ton, after everything has been reduced to steady practice.

On an article worth $5.50 they are going to get a bounty of $3, 55 per cent of the cost is to be paid by the people of Canada. It is a pretty liberal concession.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman's former leader (Sir Charles Tupper) wanted to make it $3.

Mr. WALLACE. The ost of our pig iron should not exceed $5.50 per ton and the government gives a bonus of $3 on every ton made from a Canadian ore.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not Canadian, the ore is Newfoundland ore, and the former leader of the opposition wanted to pay the full $3.

Mr. WALLACE. The late leader of the opposition was very anxious to have Newfoundland brought into confederation and treated as one of the family. But I find that the present government have not turned their hands to assist in any way in getting Newfoundland into confederation. They have treated her as a foreigner and an alien. They have done nothing to accomplish what we considered most important for the future of this country, for our fishery interests, and our interests in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and the late leader of the opposition was most anixous that something should be done. But I am speaking of the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not correctly.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, let me read still further :

To encourage the manufacture in the Dominion of iron and steel, parliament has granted bounties as follows :—

On pig iron, per ton of 2,000 tons to the 21st April, 1902, from native ore $3 and from foreign ore $2; on steel, $3.

From April 21st, 1902, to 1st July, 1903, from native ore, $2.70 ; foreign ore, $1.80 ; steel, $2.70.

The next year, native ore, $2.25; foreign ore, $1.50 ; steel, $2.25. The following year, native ore, $1.65 ; foreign ore, $1.10 ; steel, $1.65.

And so on, reducing the bounty until it disappears entirely. This company estimates —and I assume it is stating the facts correctly—if not the Minister of Finance can denounce them for speaking false statements with intent to deceive the people of this Dominion—this company estimates that in 1901 it will have obtained from the Canadian government, $870,000 ; in 1902, $2,075,000 ; in 1903. $1.850,000 ; 1904, $1,450,000, and so on. No wonder that the Minister of Finance is going to take that little account out of the current revenue and borrow the money and charge it to capital. Then the bounty is not limited to the iron and steel industry in Cape Breton, but all the other refining works and smelters in Canada are to be treated on the same terms, and let the hon. the Finance Minister estimate any figure he chooses to add to this $2,075,000 and see how much he will have to pay out altogether.

Yet, when the beet-root sugar industry, that is going to start thousands of farmers in this country and make an expenditure of $12,000,000 among the people and save the money we send out of the country to-day, asks for a bonus, those asking it are dismissed and called a lot of tariff-tinkers by the high and mighty gentlemen who are ruling this country

The hon. leader of the opposition called attention of this House to the fact that the German tariff was distinctly hostile to Canada, and that Canada has to pay 50 marks, or 9·82 cents, a bushel more duty on grain than is charged American product On rye we pay 9⅛ cents more than the Americans. On oats we pay 4⅛ cents more, peas 3¼ cents, corn 2½ cents. This was brought about by the blundering of this government. They first gave Germany and Belgium a preference in the markets of Canada, and a year later they repealed that preference. Why did they repeal it ? Either they had not intended to give it to Germany or Belgium at all, in which case they were blundering, or else they changed their mind and took it away. By their conduct they angered the German people, and the result is that the United States have a preference of 10 cents a bushel on their wheat over Canada. We had opened in these two countries a great market, which was rapidly growing, for the wild goose wheat which they required for certain purposes, but when the Americans got the 10 cents advantage, the price of wild goose wheat, which had gone up higher than the fall wheat of Ontario, dropped again, because the markets were closed to it. So with many other agricultural products. The United States have a preference over us in those markets, and we have not heard that the Canadian government have taken any steps to have it removed. Have they gone to the German government or made any effort whatever to get the same fair treatment as the United States ? No, Sir. And yet we do not put up such a high tariff against the Germans as do the United States. We import eight and a half million dollars' worth of goods from Germany and only send one and three-quarter millions, so that we could make a very strong case, but I have never heard that this government have ever bothered their heads about it. Too much like tariff tinkering perhaps, and they do not want to bother with it, but just stay quiet and enjoy themselves.

What about the United States ? Our productions are largely the same as those of the United States. We permit American goods to come in at a moderate tariff. The leader of the opposition said to-night that it was his most anxious desire we should live on the most friendly and amicable terms with the people of the United States. I reciprocate that sentiment, but I think the best way to do so is to look very closely after our own interests. Let us make a tariff that will suit ourselves, and if the American people charge high duties on Canadian products, let us protect our farmers by charging high duties on their products. We charge a duty on eggs of three cents and they charge five cents a dozen. On butter, we charge 4 cents a pound, while they charge 6 cents a pound. On cheese, we charge 3 cents a pound, while they charge 6 cents a pound. On apples we charge, including the duty on the barrel, 40 cents a barrel, while they charge 25 cents a bushel, which would be nearly 75 cents a barrel. On beans, we charge 15 cents a bushel, while their duty is three times as much—45 cents a bushel. On peas, green, our duty is 10 cents a bushel, while theirs is 40 cents a bushel. On peas dry, the duty on our side is 10 cents, while theirs is 30 cents a bushel. On potatoes we charge 15 cents a bushel, while they charge 25 cents a bushel. On hay we charge $2 a ton, while the charge is $4 on the other side. On barley our duty is 30 per cent, which, at prevailing prices, would be about 12 cents to 14 cents, while they charge 30 cents per bushel. On corn meal our duty is 25 cents per barrel, while they charge 20 cents a bushel of 48 pounds, or at least two and a half times as much as the Canadian duty. Indian corn we admit free, while they charge a duty of 15 cents a bushel. On oats, our duty is 10 cents per bushel, and theirs is 15 cents a bushel. On oatmeal we charge 20 per cent or, say, 60 cents per barrel, while they charge 1 cent per pound, which would be about $2 a barrel. On wheat, we charge 12 cents a bushel, while they charge 25 cents a bushel. On wheat flour our duty is 60 cents per barrel, while theirs is 25 per cent, which would amount to 50 to 80 per cent more. In hops, we charge 6 cents, while they charge 12 cents. As to live stock, they charge duties, which, if not prohibitory, are enormously large. On horses, their lowest duty is $30 apiece. This is when the horses are worth under $150, but if they are over that the duty is 25 per cent, which would bring it to $347.50 or over. On cattle they charge 27½ per cent on those over a certain age. On live hogs, the duty is $1.50 per head. The effect of all these things is to shut the Canadian farmer out of the United States market, while the American farmer has easy access of the Canadian market, and takes advantage of it too.

This is shown by the fact that the exports of Canadian agricultural produce to the United States amount to about $6,750,000, the imports of agricultural products from the United States into Canada far exceed that amount. Then there is another point to which I would like to draw special attention—the grievance under which the market gardeners suffer. The early products of the season are those for which the highest prices are paid and on which the greatest profits are realized. Being to the south of us, of course, the American gardener has special advantages in this respect. The market gardeners here have built up a great industry ; they have hothouses and other property used in this business to an enormous amount, some of the establishments representing an investment of tens of thousands of dollars. This industry, in my opinion, should receive adequate protection. The government of this country are being asked to consider the market gardeners' grievances—and it is a grievance of the whole people of Canada. The American to-day gets the profit which the Canadian market gardener ought to get. We should look after our own interests. A few years ago, the duty on pork and beef was not high enough to protect us from the invasions of the farmers of the United States. Delegations came down here and represented the case to the government of Canada, and immediately the government put on a strong protective duty. The result is that to-day we have a pork and beef industry which not only controls the market of Canada but has built up such an export trade that Canadians are proud of it. We send to the markets of Great Britain millions of dollars' worth of the finest bacon in the world. This was accomplished by acceding to the request of the tariff tinkers, the farmers of Canada who came here and represented the case to the government. So, we want protection for the market gardeners. We want protection also for the agricultural implement makers. Last year we imported from the United States agricultural implements to the amount of $1,815,000, while we imported from Great Britain, excluding scythes and reaping hooks and shovel blanks, agricultural implements to the amount of $1,015.

This $1,815,000 worth of implements that we import from the United States should be made in Canada by Canadian artisans. But we shall ask in vain for any change, because the government do not want any tariff tinkering until they are ready to come down with the free trade tariff.

Closely allied with this is the question of looking for markets throughout the world. These hon. gentlemen told us that if they were brought into power they would secure markets everywhere. They told us that they would go to the United States, and before you could say 'Jack Robinson,'

they would have a reciprocity treaty with the United States that would bring great prosperity to Canada. But they were in power two years before they turned their hands over on this question. They should have taken it up at once, because it was immediately after the presidential election. They waited until September, 1898, before they sought a conference. They met the other delegates, sat for a short time and then adjourned, and met again. To-day, after nearly five years of these hon. gentlemen in office, we are no nearer reciprocity than we were when they came into power. I think we may fairly ask that they wind up negotiations and tell us what they were doing, either proceed to get a reciprocity treaty or say they cannot. They have not been a business government, they have in that respect falsified their pledges to the people of Canada, they have been derelict in their duties.

More than that, there are markets elsewhere. There is a great trade in South Africa. What have these gentlemen done, what has the Minister of Agriculture done, who boasts about his cold storage, fussing around and doing nothing ? We had an interesting statement from the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) the other night, who knows the business of the exportation of apples. We exported $2,500,000 worth of apples. That business is capable of enormous expansion. We grow the best apples in the world. We ought to have control of the markets of the world. The government is asked—and they are bound to do it if they do their duty—to supply cold storage and other facilities that are required in order to land these apples in the markets of Europe. Have they done so ? The Minister of Agriculture has been dancing around doing nothing in the interests of the apple-growers of Canada. I was saying that they should be looking for markets everywhere. In South Africa last year Great Britain sent $63,000,000 worth of products, the United States sent $10,000,000, and Canada only sent $66,547. The United States sent 150 times as much as we did, and Great Britain sent about a thousand times as much as we did. What steps have the government taken to build up a business there ? New Zealand, a country with an area of 104,000 square miles, against our 3,500,000, and with a population of about 800,000, compared with our 6,000,000, has decided to put on a monthly line of steamers to run directly to South Africa, in order to overcome the disabilities in sending merchandise by way of Melbourne and Sydney. Here is a country with one-seventh of the population of Canada, making these efforts to build up a trade with South Africa. Now, what are the materials sent to South Africa :

Agricultural implements and tools, $738,000 ; ale and beer, $503,958; apparel, $3,217,592 ; boots and shoes, $2,486,361 ; butter and cheese, $994,-829; carriages, $682,000; cotton and manufactures of, $4,738,000; hardware and cutlery, $3,978,000; leather, $595,000 ; machinery, agricultural and other, $5,204,000.

We are the great manufacturers of agricultural machinery in the world. We should be doing our share of that business, we are doing practically none of it, because the whole exports of Canada to that country were only $66,000.

Meats, salted and preserved, $1,168,000; provisions not elsewhere specified, $2,599,000; railway materials, $1,239,000; spirits and wines, $1,228,000.

They say Canadian whisky is the best in the world, and here is a million and a quarter of dollars worth sent over there, and Canadians hardly send a dollar's worth. Corby's IXL, Walker's Club, Gooderham & Wort's Unexcelled Brands, Adams & Burns' Diamond D, Seagram's White Wheat and all the rest of them—not a dollar's worth of all this going to South Africa. Why, we could supply the world with the best of whisky, and we are doing nothing. Of course, temperance men, like the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), would be delighted to see the liquor go out of the country, then it could not do any harm in Canada.

Stationery and printing paper, $1,294,000 ; wheat, $2,451,000 ; furniture, $1,351,000.

They say we have a great combination in the furniture business. They are going to extend their markets. What is the government of Canada doing to promote trade in any one of these industries ? There was over $93,000,000 sent to South Africa in 1899. I should not be surprised if there were more than double that amount sent in 1900 ; and yet the government of Canada is unable to say they have sent a single dollar's worth, they have not devoted one day to the consideration of getting a market for us in South Africa. Just as it is everywhere. We are honoured with having a government that is satisfied with drawing their salaries, that is satisfied to rest and be thankful, that is satisfied to be a fossilized unprogressive government, that says, as the First Minister told us to-night : We are just going to do nothing. As the Minister of Finance told us the other night: We are going to rest on our oars, on the crest of the wave. They cannot do it, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance cannot do it either. He will flop down so suddenly that he will wonder what was the matter with him.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria). He will rise again. When you go down into the trough of the sea you will rise again to the top.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I am afraid that the Minister of Finance will have lost his balance and flopped out of the boat, and there will have to be another crew. Then

they will rise again, they will steer the ship of state in the right direction, and the people will be satisfied and thankful.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the resolution moved by the leader of the opposition to-day. I think the people of Canada will be pleased and proud to know that there is a party in this country that has got a policy and a programme. During the past election those gentlemen opposite paddled through without a policy. They have no policy to-day. What have the Minister of Finance and the First Minister told us? Have they given us a line of a policy: No, only a declaration that they have none; they have told us in the most savage, unfeeling and brutal way that they are going to do nothing, that they are not going to be bothered with those tariff tinkering people. I always thought it was the privilege of the humblest subjects of His Majesty to go to the foot of the Throne with a grievance. But the greatest citizen and the greatest interests of Canada are warned off. Don't approach his majesty, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government—keep off the grass. The First Minister told us to-night that mutual preference would be destructive to the policy of Great Britain. Would it? I beg to differ with the right hon. gentleman, though I do so with great diffidence, since he has laid it down so positively.

The people of Great Britain can give a preference in the markets of Great Britain to the productions of the various portions of the empire, to agricultural products, and still retain the policy that is existent there to-day. There are other necessaries of life beside bread and butter. The government of Great Britain receive from tea alone $19,581,000. They receive from the duty on coffee $844,000 or, £173,590 sterling. From currants, raisins and dried fruits they receive $1,859,000, or more than $22,000,000 from these three articles alone. All tea, whether high priced or low priced, pays a duty of 8 cents per pound. There is a duty of from 10 to 15 per cent on the highest priced tea, and of 50 per cent on the lower grades of tea. Tea is a necessity for the people; the poor man of England and the poor man of Canada is entitled to a cup of tea. He regards it as a necessity and he would consider it a great hardship if he were deprived of it. Suppose that a duty of $4 per bullock and 5 cents per bushel on wheat were imposed, taking the whole amounts imported into Great Britain, that would make a tax of $3,860,000 on beef, and $8,860,000 on wheat which would in the aggregate amount to $12,726,000. On tea they charge $19,581,000. Take $12,750,000 off the duty on tea and apply that to wheat and beef; is the English citizen, the English artisan or labourer any poorer, or does it cost him a dollar more to live? I say that it would not and it would give to Canada and other colonial possessions an enormous advantage over foreign and hostile nations. It would assist in building up the British Empire in the four quarters of the globe. It would give Canada an immense advantage in her competition against the United States. The 500 immigration agents that we have to-day could be dismissed and our North-west country would be filled up with the best quality of the farming population that can be found in any country in the world, and that would come from all the countries in the world. This would be the effect of having reciprocity, and if you went there with that definite proposition the people of England would not object to it. What will be the effect of imposing 5 cents per bushel on wheat or 23 cents on a barrel of flour? A barrel of flour will make 132 two-pound loaves and on six of these two-pound loaves the duty would be one cent. One-sixth of one cent on every two-pound loaf would be added to the cost for duty to be paid by the consumer. We will say that it is the consumer who would pay the duty although I do not admit it at all. We will assume that such is the case; the duty would be one cent for the whole six of the two-pound loaves. One-sixth of a cent a pound does not make any addition to the cost of the loaf to the consumer in Great Britain. He saves the duty on the tea, and he would be better off under that condition of circumstances than he is to-day. He would have less duty to pay and there is a practical solution of the question to present to the people of England. The practical question has never been placed before the British people, and as my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) says the cost would be less than I have said, because a large portion of the wheat that comes from British possessions would pay no duty at all. That is true, but, assuming that all of it had to be imported, what would be the result? It would not be many years until all the food supply of Great Britain, flour, beef, pork and all the provisions that we and other British possessions can produce would come from the empire itself, and as to the defence of Great Britain, as to her future prosperity, as to her safety and security in time of war, the blessings and benefits would be incalculable. As a measure of protection to the nation it would be worth ten times what it would possibly cost. There is a proposition right in the line of the resolution moved by our leader to-day which I am sure will commend itself to every farmer in this country, and to every loyal citizen in this country, because the prosperity of the farmer means the prosperity of the whole population. It would mean a rapid increase in the population of the Dominion. These hon. gentlemen have an army of immigration agents scattered all over the world. We are told, that one of these, the redoubtable Preston, was 300 miles beyond the Black Sea, that he discovered a new race of people and thought he is going to have them crowded

into Canada. Well, Sir, we are getting a little particular; we have not been very particular in the past, but I think we will want to know the antecedents of those people that are to be brought here from the Lord knows where. The Doukhobors, Galicians and all those people have not proved to be the most attractive or desirable class of immigrants, because they never will assimilate and become Canadians. If these people do not come here to become citizens, to take a part in the duties of citizenship and to assimilate with the people, we do not want them here at all. I say, Mr. Speaker, that in the matter of looking out for markets the government have been derelict in their duty. In the matter of reciprocal trade with Great Britain they have been hostile to the best interests of the people of Canada. In the matter of reciprocity with the United States five years have passed and they tell us, that, in the future, at some time, they will go down to the city of Washington, or meet some place, and see if they cannot do something more. In the matter of the beet-root sugar industry they have disappointed the people of Canada. They have refused to give protection to an industry which would be the greatest that we have in sight in Canada to-day, and which would serve to promote the best interests of the people. They boast of having a great big surplus. What are they going to do with it ? Hand it out in subsidies to railways ? We were warned that there is to be added to capital account this year $10,500,000; there has been $21,500,000 added since these hon. gentlemen came into power, making $32,000,000 added to capital account.

What are we doing with this $32,000,000 if it is not to make the country more prosperous and to improve the condition of the people ? As was truly said by the member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), a large portion of it benefited only the men who get the subsidies. We have the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) ramping and tearing about the country and telling the people that this government is going to build great works at Port Colborne and at Montreal and elsewhere. Well, the Conservative government had let the contracts for enlarging the St. Lawrence canals ; the Welland canal was completed to fourteen feet, and this government, when it came to power, had simply to stand by and see the contracts carried out—in two cases they cancelled the contracts and relet them. What have these gentlemen been doing for the last five years? They tell us that at Port Colborne they must spend five million dollars to enable that port to compete in the grain trade with the rival route via Buffalo. They tell us all this, but they have done nothing. They talk about building up the St. Lawrence trade so as to astonish the world, but the fact is that last year the trade by that route decreased. In spite of all their loud talk they cannot point their finger to one thing they have done to promote the welfare of the people. They have been a disappointment to the people of Canada. They have climbed into power on the racial cry, and that is the reason they are sitting on the Treasury benches to-day. Yet, they have the effrontery and the hardihood, as the Minister of Public Works did in Guelph the other night, to lecture the people of Canada on the iniquity and sinfulness of raising racial and religious cries in this country. Why, these men are in power to-day because they successfully raised that cry. They have fifty-eight out of the sixty-five members from the province of Quebec, not because their public policy was acceptable to the people of that province, but because of the racial cries that were raised by the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier), by the First Minister himself, and by all the ministers and all the members on that side of the House. They have fifty-eight out of the sixty-five members from the province of Quebec, and what does it mean ? It means, Mr. Speaker, that these hon. gentlemen have been making unworthy appeals in order to get back to power. But the people of Canada are no fools. The people of Canada are looking on and they are thinking the matter out for themselves. They see that this is unjust and unfair, and if the government are going to combine on racial lines it will undoubtedly and inevitably provoke combination against them. There can be nothing surer, and if the people of Quebec are combining on these lines, they are issuing a challenge to the other people of the Dominion. I warn the government that they cannot adopt that course, it is too late, because we doubt their sincerity. The government of Canada has to-day no programme and no policy unless it be that announced by the Prime Minister to-day, when he said that in the near future —not the near future either, but whenever it suits their convenience—they are going to bring down a new tariff, tending towards free trade. Well, Sir, we will meet them fairly on that issue. We are protectionists. We adopted the policy of protection in 1878 ; we stood by it straight through, and we are protectionists to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. Now, the Minister of Finance stated that there was a decrease of taxation and in order to suit his purpose he quoted the year of greatest prosperity since the Liberals came into power, and compared it with the year of the least prosperity when the Conservatives were in power. He just picked out these two years, but the fair thing for them to do, would have been to take the last four years of Conservative rule, and compare it with the the four years of the present Liberal rule. And adopting that method what do we find ? We find that the incidents of taxation in the Customs Department in 1893, amounted to

$17.38 ; in 1894, to $17.13 ; in 1895, to $16.99 ; in 1896, to $18.28, or an average of $17.44½ duty on every one hundred dollars worth of imported goods, dutiable and free. Since the Liberals came into power, according to their own statement, there is an average duty of $16.87½, but to that the Minister of Finance told us we must add 43 cents for the corn which was in transit and which was marked as a product of the country. I shall add 57 cents for the same purpose last year, and in that way you get $17.12½ for the four years that these gentlemen have been in power, as the average rate of duty, and $17.44½ for the last four years of the Conservative government, or a difference of 32 cents on every one hundred dollars worth of goods imported, including dutiable and free, and the only fair test is to take both. There is therefore one-third of a dollar difference on every one hundred dollars worth of imported goods, showing conclusively that this Liberal government has imposed as high taxes upon the people of Canada, though with less protection, than we did. As was pointed out by the leader of the opposition, this Liberal government have put an enormous increase of the duty on sugar which last year amounted to $793,000 in increased duties. I have not estimated it for this year, but with the large increase in the importation of sugar, molasses and syrups, I have no doubt the increased duties will represent one million dollars this year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Between $900,000 and $1,000,000.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, about that. This government has increased the taxes on sugar notwithstanding that they have a surplus of $6,500,000. What did the Conservatives do when they had a surplus ? This duty on sugar is a direct tax upon the people of the country. It does not encourage any industry. Every dollar's worth of that sugar has to be imported, and therefore this is a direct tax. The burden of taxation the people have to bear is one-third of a dollar less on every one hundred dollars worth imported, as between the four years of the Liberal government, and the four years of the Conservative government. Does that make a difference in policy ? Why, Sir, in 1890 the percentage of taxation on the people was $21.21 ; in 1891 it was $20.06, a reduction by the Conservative party of $1.15 per hundred dollars. Yet we made no boast about it. We simply said we had taken the duty off certain things and reduced the burdens of the people on those things which were not made in the country. In 1892 the percentage was $17.56, a reduction of $2.50 on every $100 from 1891. We took the duty off sugar, which was a direct tax on the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite have made a reduction of 32 cents per $100, and are crowing about it all over the country, and on the strength of that the Finance Minister takes the whole importation, and estimates a saving of $3,000,000. There never was such a fallacious statement made to the House. Last year the Minister of Customs tried to figure out in the same way that millions of dollars had been saved. It is a fallacious argument. You cannot tell to-day what the income would be on certain articles that existed half a dozen years ago. The importations are changed in their character. New industries are rising up ; conditions are changing ; people import one year one class of goods, and another year another class of goods. You cannot make an accurate calculation ; it is simply guesswork. If the calculation was made on the basis that they were saving about 2 per cent, it is not true. There are the figures, and I challenge the Minister of Finance to dispute them. If you take the four years, in each case you have to deduct the corn ; that is all I have deducted. Last year they deducted coin and bullion, but they did not this year, because the figures would be against them. I say we will rejoice to have that free trade policy brought down, when the government are ready for it. We are going to stand by our own policy, which built up this country, and which will continue to build it up and make it prosperous in the future.

Mr. B. RUSSELL (Hants). Mr. Speaker, I began to have a vague dread that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat had lost the end of his speech, and that we should be kept here all night ; but as he has found it at last, I beg to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

GRAND FALLS POWER AND BOOM COMPANY.

Hon. JOHN COSTIGAN (Victoria, N.B.) I beg leave, with the consent of the House, to present a petition of the Grand Falls Water Power and Boom Company, asking for leave to introduce a petition.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Explain.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Under the rules of the House this company are precluded from introducing a petition asking for an extension of their charter, which expires in July next. The president of the company, Sir William Van Horne, has been absent in Cuba for a long time, and on returning, instructed the solicitor of the company to make the application. The solicitor only arrived here on Friday, the last day on which petitions could be received ; and the only way to get the petition before the Committee on Standing Orders is by petition asking the House to allow the petition to be received ; and this is a preliminary petition for that purpose.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, when the last report of the Standing Orders Committee was presented, I made the remark, in reply to the hon. leader of the opposition, that I would for my part object to any more petitions being received ; but the statement made by my hon. friend that the gentleman who was pressing the charter had been away in a foreign country, and had only returned a few days ago, makes this petition fairly entitled to be received, and under the circumstances I think it might be received.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Under the circumstances I do not object to the reception of the petition.

Petition received, and referred to the Committee on Standing Orders.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the House adjourns, I would like to inquire when we are to have a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I was under the impression that it was called for to-morrow. I sent out a moment ago to see if there was a notice up, and there was none. The chairman is not present, and in his absence I am unable to say when the committee will meet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Who is the chairman ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The chairman of that committee should be in a position to give sufficient time to have the committee meet at least twice a week. I brought the matter to the attention of the hon. gentleman last week, and I understood that we were to have regular meetings that often. If the hon. member for Guysborough is not able to give the necessary time to call regular meetings of the committee possibly some other mode may be found of dealing with the matter. Perhaps he could appoint some one to act as his deputy when he is compelled to be absent from the city, or is not able to find time to deal with the matter himself. But if we are to expedite the business of the House, we must have arrangements made for calling this committee, and we cannot accept as an excuse the statement that the hon. member for Guysborough is prevented from dealing with it. Although I am ready on all occasions to make all reasonable allowances, the hon. member for Guysborough, who is a personal friend of mine, we must have some one as chairman of the committee who is prepared to deal with it. I have heard this excuse given on his behalf, not only in this parliament, but in former parliaments. All I ask is that whoever is chairman of that committee will give sufficient time to it, so that we shall not have to stand up in this House and inquire day after day why meetings of the committee have not been called. I do not want to be put in the position to have to cast reflections on the hon. member for Guysborough or anybody else ; but I do desire that meetings of that committee shall be called, and called regularly, and I think the right hon. leader of the House and the hon. Minister of Finance will agree with me that in asking that I am not asking anything unreasonable. I would also like to ask whether we are to continue the debate from day to day for the present. I understand that we are.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 19, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Hon. JOHN COSTIGAN (Victoria, N.B.) moved :

That that portion of the 49th rule which limits the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills be suspended in reference to the petition of the Grand Falls Water Power and Boom Company, presented this day ; praying for an Act to extend the time for the completion of their works, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the seventh report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

ALASKAN AND NORTH-WEST RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa) moved :

That the petition of John Mather and others for an Act of incorporation under the name of the Alaskan and North-west Railway Company, be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders for further consideration.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). I wish to know for what reason this motion is made. When this Bill was before the Committee on Standing Orders we had no evidence that it was properly advertised, or that the promoters had in any way complied with the rules of the committee or of the House. Unless there is some good reason this Bill should not be sent back.

Mr. BELCOURT. The reason is a very good one. The gentleman who had charge

of the Bill before the committee had not in his possession the newspapers containing the advertisement, and my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) was the means of having the Bill rejected on that account. The publication was made in a Dawson paper and every one knows the difficulty of getting Dawson papers here at this time of the year. Since then the papers containing the advertisement have arrived, and we are ready to show that the publication has been made.

Mr. WILSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) should be able to show that the advertisement was published during the

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Union Railway Company.—Mr. Demers (St. John and Iberville).

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—Mr. Vrooman.

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the St. Mary's River Bridge Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Algoma Central Railway Company, and to change its name to the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Fielding :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. B. RUSSELL (Hants). Mr. Speaker, for the statement which I am about to make, I have probably the same kind of authority as my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace), who last addressed the House, had for a number of statements which he made in the course of his speech. My statement is that I have received confidential communications in regard to a conference that took place between the hon. leader of the opposition and the advisory board that assists him in conducting the affairs of this House——

Mr. HENDERSON. Oh, how clever.

Mr. RUSSELL—and that it was arranged among them that my hon. friend who addressed the House last night should visit North Bruce in the capacity of a peacemaker, for the purpose of setting at rest all racial, religious and discordant cries and all disturbing controversies which would otherwise have agitated that community. It was represented to him that the subject of the preferential tariff would come up for more or less discussion in the course of this debate ; and as he had given utterance to some equivocal expressions on that subject on the occasion of its first introduction into this House—expressions which might be represented as an approval of it, if divested as it is at present of those features connected with the Belgian and German treaties, it was not desirable that he should interpose in the present discussion of the subject ; moreover, that his presence as a peacemaker in the county in which an election is now being run would be of infinite value to this country ; and, in view of that circumstance, and in view of those negotiations and advices, my hon. friend had prepared a discourse marked by those characteristics of mildness, and breathing that spirit of sweet reasonableness with which he so frequently delights this House; containing those very amiable references to his antagonists, those complimentary allusions to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and those pleasant remarks as to the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, so free from anything in the nature of innuendo ; those kindly observations with reference to the Minister of Finance ; and all suffused in that tone of Christian charity of which he is so admirable an exponent in this House. These things were not intended for this Chamber at all, but were intended for North Bruce; but, in some way that has not been explained, but probably will be later on, the hon. gentleman's connections failed, and so he did not get to North Bruce, whether on account of the snowstorm or for other reasons which may be supposed, and he was thrust upon this House, and was obliged to turn on the tap. He had no speech on the budget or on the preferential resolutions ; he had not prepared himself to discuss any of the questions which might legitimately come before the House ; and, therefore, he was obliged to give us, very inappropriately, the speech which was intended for the electors of North Bruce. That is the only explanation I can suggest for at least one of the features of the address he has given us—for the fact that in the main he steered entirely clear of the subject under discussion ; and it also illustrates the exceptionable reasonableness and sweetness of the discourse he gave us. I rejoice, and this House must rejoice, that we have in the public life of this country a gentleman who brings that tone into our discussions. The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) desired that this should be a parliament of peacemakers. We have one of those peacemakers present ; we have had from him an illustration and an assurance of what is to come : and I trust the hon. member for Bonaventure will fold the hon. gentleman to his bosom. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I am very largely dependent upon the assurances which the hon. gentleman has himself given to us in the course of his speech, for taking that view of his remarks ; otherwise, I would have been inclined to recall a story which was told by the late Wendell Phillips, in

connection with the anti-slavery agitation. Mr. Phillips was under the impression that the southern slaveholders, when crying out against those who were continually disturbing the peace of the country, were themselves the principal disturbers of the country's peace ; and by way of illustrating and clarifying his views, he was fond of telling a story of an old court crier who, when engaged in his official capacity in one of the courts at Massachusetts, used to fall asleep. When the voices of the counsel who were addressing the court rose to a louder tone than usual, the crier was aroused from his slumbers, and cried out at once, 'Silence in the court,' and immediately resumed his slumbers. This had occurred a few times, when the judge got tired of this interruption of the proceedings, and burst out in a somewhat indignant way, 'Crier, you are the only one disturbing the court, and if you will only stay asleep, there will be no more disturbance.' In the same way, if by some providential means, the hon. member for West York could be put into one of these slumbers which a gentleman down on Sparks street produces, I do think there would not be quite so much discord or trouble, noise, clamour and controversy as there happens to be from time to time in this community.

I endeavoured to follow the hon. gentleman in the course of his remarks last night, and I shall endeavour more or less to-day to follow them, but I am bound to say that his route was altogether too circuitous, it covered too wide a field to allow the possibility of my doing so. The discussion of all, or even one-half, of the topics the hon. gentleman saw fit to introduce in the course of his oration last night would occupy all the time at my disposal, or at the disposal of this House, from now probably until the end of the session, because there has been no subject under discussion in this parliament ever since it opened on the 6th February last, that my hon. friend did not import into this debate. I shall therefore endeavour, not to follow him all the way round, but to confine myself as much as I possibly can to the subject immediately under discussion. My hon. friend threw absolutely no light on this subject, although he imported a great deal of heat. It was heat without light. It was certainly of no purpose for him to repeat over and over again, as he did, and as he also did last year, the platitude that it would be an excellent thing for us if we could secure free admission to Great Britain of our grain and the imposition of a hostile tariff against the grain of other countries. If we could secure admission for our grain products into the markets of the old country free of duty and have all others excluded or subjected to a discriminating, and if possible prohibitory tariff, that would be a capital thing for us. I am sure it never needed any discussion or elaboration whatever to make good this contention and when the hon. gentleman repeated that platitude for the twentieth time he did not throw any light whatever on the question which this House is called upon now to consider, under the amendment of the leader of the opposition.

The hon. gentleman was asked how we could get that concession from the mother country—and that was the real point, surely, of any discussion that could be made on the subject. He was asked : How are you going to secure that concession ? and he answered at once : We can secure it because Mr. Chamberlain said that he was willing we should have it. Then he read—I wonder if the House will believe it without my verifying it—he actually read, in support of his statement, a paragraph from the very speech from which the right hon. leader of the House quoted the other day for the purpose of proving—as he did prove beyond all shadow of doubt—that Mr. Chamberlain had not expressed any such willingness and was entirely convinced of the impossibility of any concession of the kind being given. These were the words which my hon. friend from West York read :

> Let the offer——

My hon. friend did not tell us what offer it was to which Mr. Chamberlain was referring.

> Let the offer, said Mr. Chamberlain, come voluntarily from them, and I believe it will be considered in this country, not in any huckstering spirit, but will be entertained as part of a greater policy intended to unite in the closest bonds of affection and interest all the communities under the British flag and all the subjects of Her Majesty throughout the empire.

Those were Mr. Chamberlain's expressions, but in that very speech my hon. friend will see, if he takes the pains to read it, and I hope he has read it—but, no, I hope he has not, because, if he has, it would be extremely disingenuous conduct on his part to read the passage he quoted without reading the passages in which Mr. Chamberlain pointed out the impossibility of our having any such concession made to us under the conditions existing to-day. I shall read Mr. Chamberlain's expressions, which I only repeat because it has become necessary to do so in consequence of the turn the discussion has taken and the contentions made by my hon. friend. Mr. Chamberlain was discussing three possible solutions of the question of preferential trade within the empire.

The first proposition he discussed was that the colonies should abandon their duties, which were all in the nature of protective duties more or less. He said this proposition is not a hopeful one because not one of the colonies is prepared—they are certainly not all prepared—to abandon the tariffs they now have and which involve more or less a protectionist element, more or less an element which can be used, incidentally in

some of them, purposely in others, for the protection of colonial industries. That was a proposition therefore which Mr. Chamberlain felt bound to dismiss from practical consideration. He went on to say :

> There is another proposition, and that is that the colonies should keep their tariffs as they are to-day, but that the Imperial government should so arrange its tariff that a duty should be placed on foreign wheat and corn coming into the British islands, while the colonial tariffs remain as they were.

Mr. Chamberlain said no, there is no possibility of that ever being adopted. That is a result to which the workingmen of the mother country could never be induced to submit. And therefore the second proposition was dismissed as impracticable and impossible.

He said, there is a third proposition. That is the proposition of a zollverein not exactly like the German zollverein because that was a zollverein between conterminous countries, but a zollverein, with such modifications as might be capable of application to the condition of things in our colonies. He said that is a hopeful proposition, but it involves the colonies abandoning all their tariff imposts which are of a protectionist character. In other words, the colonies would have to abandon all their tariff imposts which are unlike those of the mother country, that is to say which either, directly and purposely, as is the case in some of the colonies, or incidentally as is the case in ours, involve protection to colonial industries.

The right hon. gentleman who leads the House (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has shown us conclusively that it is absolutely impossible for the two parts of the resolution of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition to hang together at all, under the doctrine laid down by Mr. Chamberlain. My hon. friend insists that we must have a protective tariff applicable to the industries of this country, and in the same breath he undertakes to say that we may have that which, according to Mr. Chamberlain, is absolutely inconsistent and diametrically opposed to it, namely, a preference in the markets of the mother country. The right hon. the First Minister has pointed that out so conclusively and luminously that I am not going to further impose on the patience of the House by discussing a point so absolutely clear and which so entirely disposes of the resolution submitted to us by the leader of the opposition.

But the hon. member for West York retorts: that may be all right from our point of view, but how is it from your point of view ? You profess that you have not a protectionist tariff, but a free trade tariff, and therefore there is no inconsistency in your going to the mother country and asking that which, it is quite evident, we would be entirely estopped from asking from the Imperial government. Well, now I want to know who ever said we had a free trade policy in this country. I want to know who ever said we had a free trade tariff, if I may use that expression, in this country. I do not think that anybody ever said we had free trade in this country; I am prepared to say we do not have it.

My hon. friend has discussed this matter as if there were only two kinds of tariff, of fiscal policy, a policy of free trade, and a policy of protection. He certainly is altogether at sea when he makes a suggestion like that. We have not free trade in this country, we have not a free trade policy in this country, nor have we a protectionist policy in this country. We have in this country to-day substantially the policy with which we set out in the year 1867; that is to say, that instead of there being two kinds of fiscal policy as my hon. friend suggests, there are really three kinds, clearly and easily distinguishable. There is first of all—if I may take four or five minutes to explain a matter which is so entirely elementary—there is first of all a protectionist tariff, purposely and ostensibly framed with the object of excluding foreign goods coming from other countries, and which does exclude those products in so far as it successfully operates as a protective tariff. It is levied on goods which can be produced and which are produced in the country, and of a kind that are and can be produced in the country, levied upon them for the purpose of compelling the population to use those articles produced in the country, and for the purpose of excluding those which are produced in the foreign and competing country. That is a protectionist tariff. There is opposed to that what I may properly call a free trade tariff, such a tariff as they have in the old country, a tariff which carefully eliminates any elements of that sort, which is carefully designed for the purpose of ensuring that every penny of taxation that is paid, every penny of money taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers, is taken solely for the purpose of going into the treasury of the country. It is a tariff levied upon things, not which can be produced in the country, but which cannot by any possibility be produced in the country ; that I call a free trade tariff, the very opposite of the one I spoke of previously.

Then there is between these two a tariff such as we had in this country in 1867 down to the fiscal revolution of 1878, and which we are endeavouring to work our way back to, and have in a large measure worked our way back to, under the reformed tariff introduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, a revenue tariff which is designed to exclude as far as possible the element of protection; because, as Mr. Mackenzie pointed out many years ago, in our tariff there always was an element of incidental protection, and in our tariff to-day there is an element of incidental

protection. But, as the Minister of Customs has often pointed out, that is an incident to the main purpose of the tariff, which is the collection of a revenue, and is not the protection of native industries. Now, then, this is the kind of tariff that we have to-day, and this is the kind of tariff, a revenue tariff with incidental protection, under which Mr. Chamberlain said it would be impossible for us to go to the mother country and ask for anything like a zollverein, or anything like a preference, or anything like such a scheme as is outlined in the resolution of the hon. leader of the opposition. The present tariff does afford incidental protection, that is to say, it does give a certain degree of assistance to native industries, it presents a certain obstacle to the foreign competitor, it does give a certain measure of advantage to the home producer as against the foreign competitor in the same manner as freights, insurances and other charges prevent an obstacle to the foreign competition and an advantage to the native producer. But it has for its chief purpose the collection of a revenue.

As I have said before, Mr. Chamberlain proved it impossible for us to go to the mother country and ask for preferential trade so long as we continue to maintain a tariff like that. We are prepared to stand upon that tariff, we are prepared to adhere to it. Our hon. friends opposite say it is really their own tariff, it is really their own policy, and I suppose therefore that they are also prepared to maintain and adhere to it. We all agree that it is impossible to adopt any other fiscal system or to abandon altogether all duties that could be made operative for the encouragement of native industries, and for that reason, I say again, it is absolutely impossible for my hon. friend to ask that we should accept his resolution, or to ask Mr. Chamberlain or anybody else to give us the benefit of a preferential arrangement in the English market, as matters stand at present. What may happen in the future, what may happen later on under the development of advanced Imperial ideas, what may happen in the course of a number of years, after this matter has been under consideration of the people of England and after it has been under the consideration of the people of Canada, opens up too long a vista, is too far remote for us to consider ; it is too far in the dim and distant future to be a matter of practical politics or command the consideration of practical men in a practical age, and in a business-like parliament such as I understand this to be.

But my hon. friend thinks it is a very easy thing. He can make a budget for the English Chancellor of the Exchequer just as simple as rolling off a log. If you take part of the duty off tea, take a part of the duty which is now paid by the Englishman on his tea, and every penny of which goes into the treasury of the country, and put it on the competing grain coming in from the United States, you have the whole thing done in a jiffy, no difficulty about it at all. He says that when you do this the workingman of England will have to pay no more than at present, he will be simply paying the same tax as now, and you will have this brought about by one stroke of the pen, by one item in the tariff propositions in the budget speech of an English minister. Very well, just let us analyse that for a moment. Of course if the discrimination against the foreign wheat was great enough, if the tariff charge was high enough to keep it out of the English market altogether, and if we could produce enough colonial cereals to feed the population of the British isles, then it is obvious there would be no tax collected from wheat at all, no tax collected from corn ; no tax collected from grain, and the consequence would be that the English taxpayer, the English workingman would have to make up that deficit by submitting to the imposition of a direct tax. But if it did not do its perfect work, and it would not do it for it could not possibly keep out the foreign grain altogether, not for years at all events, or until we were able entirely to supply the requirements of the country, then until that tariff which my hon. friend is going to give to the British Chancellor, is imposed and does its perfect work, then there will be a certain amount of corn brought into the British islands, there will be a certain amount of corn from Canada. Well, what would be the effect of that ? The price would be raised to the English consumer. Of course that goes without saying ; and my hon. friend agrees that this duty will be paid by the English consumer. He was somewhat in doubt about that, but I think there can be no doubt about it—the duty will be paid by the English consumer. But my hon. friend says that makes no difference, because he will only be paying on his breadstuffs, the same tax that he is now paying upon tea ; that it is only as broad as it is long to him, it will make no difference to him whatever, so long as he is paying the tax, upon what article or product he is paying it. But my hon. friend forgets that apart from the duty, apart from the increment of the price that would have to be added to the foreign corn on account of the duty payable upon it, there would also be the increased price at which he would have to pay for the corn which was produced in this country. I am certain that if he makes that proposition to any intelligent workingman in the old country, he will get his answer straight from the shoulder, so clear that it will be absolutely impossible for him to misunderstand it.

Mr. Chamberlain every time that he has had occasion to discuss this question, and he has discussed it in numerous speeches—I was going to say in innumerable speeches

in the old country, he has discussed it in these foreign and colonial speeches that have been quoted in the debate—has presented this difficulty so straight and clear that I cannot understand how it is that my hon. friend, or any other hon. member on his side of the House who has a practical head upon his shoulders and practical sagacity and wisdom, can over and over again present this proposal which has had the bottom knocked out of it so many times. The hon. gentleman compares this case with the case of Australia. He says that the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) is about to go to Australia in a few days and that if he goes there he will find a country that is about to have a protective tariff imposed on it. I believe that it is likely enough that it will have. All the signs go to show that a moderate protective tariff will probably be the fiscal system of the Australian Commonwealth. He says, notwithstanding all that, are you not going to ask for a reciprocal arrangement between this country and the Commonwealth of Australia. I hope we are, and I hope, more or less confidently, that we will be able to obtain it and that by virtue of the arrangement that may be made by this government with the Australian Commonwealth a growing and profitable business may be built up between the Dominion of Canada and that new Commonwealth. My hon. friend says: If this is possible with Australasia, why not with England? Why not? Because there is no analogy whatever between the two cases. If Australasia were a country such as England is, a small country in its extent, or relatively so, with an enormous population, with a population of from forty to fifty millions of people, absolutely dependent upon their foreign trade, and upon the extent to which they can push their manufactured products in foreign countries and obtain payment for them; the foreign trade of which, as Mr. Chamberlain says, is the very breath of its life, and engaged in a life and death struggle with other and competing countries with enormous resources and enormous capital; the centre of a vast and delicate financial organism which it would be fatal to disturb—if the Australasian Commonwealth presented such conditions as these, then, he would have a similar proposal to deal with to that which he is presenting to the consideration of the House and which we are asked to commend to the consideration of the British minister. The situations are so entirely different, there is such a failure of analogy between the two things that I am amazed—if I may use a word which has gone out of fashion since the leadership of the opposition has been changed—I am surprised, not to say either amazed or astounded, that either the hon. leader of the opposition, or the hon. member for West York, who has held a position in the cabinet, who has held not only a position in the cabinet but one which brought him into close touch with questions of this character, should have presented an analogy of that sort that had no possible bearing on the question which is under deliberation by the House at the present moment.

Well, Sir, there is one other subject to which the hon. member for West York referred, and with which I will deal very briefly, the subject of bounties. He discussed the iron and steel bounties as if these bounties were being given, not for the benefit of this whole country at large, but from some partiality for the capitalists, for the individuals, and for the corporations that are engaged in the work of producing iron and steel. Was there ever a greater mistake made? Was there ever a greater sophistry presented to the House for its consideration than that? The hon. member the other night referred to the bounties as if there was something inconsistent between the maintenance of bounties and opposition to a protectionist system. I have always thought, and I have always said, that if there is any way at all in which it is proper for the government to grant encouragement to one industry at the expense of the general public, the peculiarly and pre-eminently proper way to do it is by means of bounties. Why? If you pick out any particular industry and say that it is desirable and in the interest of the country at large that that industry should be established and if you set yourself to the task of establishing it and do so by means of the imposition of a protective duty, what are you doing? You are admitting that it is a matter of consequence to the country as a whole, you are admitting that it is a matter of public interest, that it is a matter in which the whole public are concerned, or else, you have no business to be dealing with it at all, and, making that admission, you are, nevertheless, taxing the cost of establishing that industry only upon a narrowly limited circle of people who are to bear the burden of the tariff imposition which you have imposed. Is not that so? I say it is very obvious, and if we come to the conclusion, as this country came to the conclusion years ago, that it is to the advantage of the whole Dominion that the iron and steel industry should be established, not for the benefit of the dealers in iron and steel at all, but for the benefit of the people at large, then, I say, that the peculiarly and pre-eminently proper way to do that is not by the imposition of a tariff which will be borne by a particular class, or a narrowly limited circle of people, but which will be borne by the people of the country at large and in common. Therefore, I say that there is all the difference in the world between a bounty and a protective duty for the purpose of establishing an industry, and that much can be said in favour of the granting of a bounty which

would have absolutely no application at all if one were dealing with the question of the imposition of a customs duty. That disposes then of what the hon. member for West York says in regard to lead. It may come to be considered in this country that lead is in the same position as iron and steel, that it is equally in the interest of the country to establish the lead industry, and if the government come to the conclusion that it is there will be no impropriety in granting a bounty on lead smelting, as they have granted a bounty on iron and steel production, provided that the money can be spared, because we are not bound to do two things at once. It may be very true that the lead smelters may be able to make out as perfect a case in favour of a bounty as the iron and steel men have been able to make out, and yet the government of this country may be compelled to say, under the circumstances, that they have exhausted all the surplus at their disposal, that they have pledged the resources of this country to as great an extent as they are able to do for the purpose of encouraging industries of that sort and that the lead men must bide their time. I was glad to hear the hon. Minister of Finance say that the matter had not been finally disposed of ; that it is still under consideration. I am certain that whatever resolution may be come to on the subject will be in line with the suggestions I have made and in accord with the principle to which I have just referred.

Now, I think I will not undertake to follow the hon. member for West York any further in the somewhat, if I may be permitted to say so, rambling and very circuitous route that was mapped out for us in the course of his speech on the tariff. I am certainly not going to follow him in those unamiable, unpleasant and undesirable topics which he thought it necessary to import into this debate. I have not the talent for them, I have not the genius for them, I have no liking for them, I have the most positive disgust for them, and I absolutely decline to enter into any controversies of the kind. I listened to the mover of the amendment (Mr. Borden, Halifax) with a great deal of interest to learn what it was possible for him to say in answer, as I know he must have felt, as a lawyer, it was incumbent upon him to answer, the difficulties that have been suggested from time to time, difficulties that have been so clearly presented by Mr. Chamberlain, who is his greatest friend in this matter, the greatest friend of this country, and the warmest advocate, in any exalted sphere, that has been found of the policy of a preferential tariff in favour of the products of Canada and of the colonies of the empire throughout the world. I say, that I did listen with a great deal of interest and earnestness to my hon. friend to ascertain what new thing the hon. gentleman was going to be able to say that would throw any light whatever upon this question of the preferential tariff, which I suppose is the central feature of the resolutions which he has presented to the consideration of the House. He is a very industrious man—we all know that. And I was quite sure that if there was anything in the whole compass of literature, ancient or modern, that could be brought forward in support of his resolution, my hon. friend's industry would enable him to find it. And what did he find ? Not a single statement, I undertake to say—not a single one—of an encouraging character from any English statesman of the first rank or even of the second rank. He did not even get as much as our lamented former colleague, Mr. McNeill, who represented North Bruce in the last parliament, used to get. He gave us scraps from newspapers and other periodicals. He quoted an utterance from the Saturday Review. I think one of the most encouraging of all was from a financial organ, admitting that there was a possibility that at some time in the future—twenty years from this, if I caught the phrase correctly—there might be a possibility of some change in the fiscal arrangements as now established between the mother country and the colonies. The hon. gentleman has undertaken to play the role on this question that used to be assumed by Mr. McNeill. That role is entirely unsuited to him. He is too hard-headed and practical a man to fill that role successfully—he has too much common sense and altogether too little imagination. He cannot indulge in those moonlit and mystical dreams with which the former member for North Bruce used to entertain this House. In spite of all his scraps from newspapers and his disjointed clippings from Mr. Chamberlain's speeches, though they were all patched together in a bag, he could not make the bag stand upright as the former member from North Bruce seemed to do. As hon. gentlemen will remember, it was a saying of Poor Richard, that you could not make an empty bag stand upright. This inter-Imperial preferential trade bag is absolutely empty and there is not a possibility of making it stand upright. As a former Minister of Railways in this country used to remark, 'there aint nothing to it. Our friend, Mr. McNeill, used to build himself—and rightly—upon Mr. Chamberlain. And the leader of the opposition, if he has anything in this new thesis of his of Imperial preferential trade, must also build himself upon Mr. Chamberlain ; because Mr. Chamberlain is the most advanced statesman in the British Empire to-day who has given the slightest encouragement to a proposition of that kind. If you do not find anything in favour of inter-Imperial preferential trade in this volume (Foreign and Colonial speeches) you will look for it elsewhere in vain. Mr. Chamberlain has discussed this subject with a wideness of range, and an accuracy of detail unexcelled by any other

statesman, either Imperial or colonial. If with the genius, the ideas and the courage of William Pitt, it is impossible for Mr. Chamberlain to hold out any encouragement but such as he has given—the extent and force of which we now know, as presented by the right hon. premier yesterday—it is idle and purposeless, it is a sheer waste of time to seek for that encouragement in the utterances of any other Imperial statesman. I dismiss, therefore, that proposition, so far as it has been given us by the leader of the opposition and enforced by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) as one in which there is absolutely no substance, and upon which it is not worth our while to occupy ourselves further under the present circumstances of the country.

But there is another element in the hon. gentleman's resolution, another article in this new opposition creed. I believe they are revising their creed, as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said the other night that his church were revising theirs.

Mr. MACLEAN. Somebody else ought to do the same.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are always ready to revise our creed when good reasons can be shown for it. I refer now to the last branch of the resolution, the proposal, if I understand it aright, that we should retaliate on all countries that do not treat us fairly :

This House is further of opinion that equivalent or adequate duties should be imposed by Canada upon the products and manufactures of countries not within the empire in all cases where such countries fail to admit Canadian products and manufactures upon fair terms, and that the government should take for this purpose all such available measures as may be found necessary.

We are asked by this resolution to retaliate in all cases. Yet, if I understood the remarks of the leader of the opposition, he was going to except from it our great neighbour, the United States, which certainly does not treat us with that degree of fairness, or generosity, at any rate, in the matter of tariff regulations, which we might reasonably expect. He is going to except the United States and apply the resolution to Germany, and to Germany alone. Now, one word as to retaliation. Of course, the temptation to retaliate when injured is one of the first instincts of our brute nature. We instinctively resort to the lex talionis which demands an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. But while the first impulse, the brute instinct of the natural man is to retaliate, the civilized man pauses to reflect. He does not obey his immediate impulse. He first asks himself the question whether he is likely to accomplish by retaliation any useful purpose. Now, I think I can suggest why the hon. leader of the opposition excepted the United States, not in the terms of his resolution, but by his comments, from the intended operation of this principle of retaliation. We did retaliate on the United States some years ago. Our policy of 1878 was professedly founded, in part, upon the idea of retaliating upon the United States—of giving the United States, as it was pleasantly put, that sincerest form of flattery which consists in imitation—we would retaliate upon them for their conduct towards us almost continuously in recent years. But what did we get for our retaliation ? What was the consequence of our national policy ? Why, I do not need to refer to any higher authority than the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), who addressed us the other day, for any answer to that question. He described the consequences very eloquently, indeed, very forcibly. It led to a condition of things in this country which was anything but pleasant for us, a condition of things under which we were losing our population, a condition of things so entirely the reverse of prosperous, that he could see no remedy but reversion on the part of this country to the principle of free trade. So, I suppose, this is the reason why we are not asked to retaliate against the United States.

Coming for a time to the remarks which the hon. member for Pictou addressed to the House, I was struck, as other hon. gentlemen must have been, with the fact that two speeches—I trust I shall not be considered presumptuous if I say two excellent speeches—one by the hon. member for Pictou, and one by the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Smith), were entirely destructive of each other on some of the main contentions presented to the House. It occurred to me that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden (Halifax), with his keen perception for logical fallacies ; with his strong, clear and logical brain, must have reflected when he heard these gentlemen ; How happy could I be with either were the other fair charmer away. Each of these supporters of his made a good speech, but the speech of one, to a large extent, nullified the speech of the other. The thought occurred to me at first that these two gentlemen could not have consulted together before taking such divergent views on the preferential tariff, but on reflection it seemed more probable that they did compare notes. They had instructions from their leader of course to oppose the preferential tariff. This was common ground. But they must not both oppose it on the same grounds. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) was retained to oppose the preferential tariff on the ground that it was going to interfere with our manufacturing industries, and the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) was retained to oppose it on the ground that it was not really a preference at all, and that it did not do any good to the people of the mother country. And so the hon. gentleman from Pictou (Mr. Bell), I

presume, said to the hon. member for Wentworth : You know there are many Imperialists in Canada and there is a strong British feeling which heartily welcomed and cordially supports the preferential tariff, so you tell the people of the country, through the House of Commons, that this tariff makes no concessions whatever to the mother country, and that before the government brought in this tariff, which professes to give concessions to Great Britain, they took good care to raise the general tariff on the articles to which the preference would apply, and to raise it so high that the preference was only such in name, and no benefit was left to the mother land. And then said the hon. member (Mr. Bell) : I will play on the other string ; there are a lot of manufacturers in Canada who are nervous about their gains. They are afraid that they will not have such an easy time during the next few years as they have had in the past, and so I will say : This preferential tariff gives such concessions to the people of Great Britain that it is going to ruin the industries of Canada. And so these two hon. gentlemen played their two discordant tunes, the speech of the one completely nullifying the speech of the other. Which is right? My hon. friend from Pictou belauded the men who introduced the national policy in 1878. These, he said, were men of blood and iron like Bismarck, and they went on with their task without sentimental considerations. These were the men, quoth he, who said : If this tariff is not good for British connection, then so much the worse for British connection. These were the men who said : Driven out of the markets of the civilized world, the mother land is compelled to force her wares upon savages at the point of the bayonet. They did not allow any sentimental considerations to interfere with the maintenance of the industries of Canada, as this government has done by its preferential tariff. This was the drift of his reference to the subject. He argued that the time was coming when, in consequence of the concessions given to the manufacturers of Great Britain by this preferential tariff, many of the manufacturers of Canada would be driven out of existence. His remarks were quoted by the right hon. the Prime Minister the other day, and in consequence I need not make a more explicit reference. But look at what the member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith said, and you will find that he took an entirely different tack. He says :

> I can gather no inference from the figures I have quoted but that the preference we have given to Great Britain only places her on a par with or in a worse condition than the United States, because before this preference was given hon. gentlemen opposite raised the duties to a large extent on the class of goods we import from Great Britain.

We, therefore, see that these two followers of the leader of the opposition, speaking in this House on the same day and on the same subject, give such diametrically opposite views as to the operation of the preferential tariff, that it is absolutely impossible for a plain man like myself to know what to think about the matter at all. They presented the same differences of opinion in regard to details that they presented in regard to the main issue. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) said that relatively, under the operation of the preferential tariff, the trade of England had increased as compared with the trade of the United States and of other countries ; while the hon. gentleman from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) proved to his own satisfaction that England did not hold her own in the Canadian market with either the United States or Germany, in spite of the preferential tariff. What can a plain man who sits here at the feet of these oracles for the purpose of learning the truth, what can he believe in view of this divergence of opinion between them. All that is left for me to do is to go to the trade returns, and there I find, and I am bound to make the admission, that the trade of the old country, even under the preferential tariff, has not been able to hold its own relatively with the trade of the United States or of Germany ; certainly not relatively with the trade of the United States. But, supposing that to be true, what is the vital question which remains to be answered ? If in spite of the preferential tariff that we have given Great Britain ; if notwithstanding that the United States and Germany are handicapped by a tariff discrimination against them ; if in spite of that handicap in favour of the old country she has still a life and death struggle to preserve her own in our markets against the United States, is it not a vital question for Englishmen to ask themselves : Where would we have been were it not for that preferential tariff ? Surely the response to this question is a conclusive answer to the argument, that we have done England no good by the enactment of our preferential tariff. This much, at all events, we have succeeded in doing. If you look at the actual importation of dutiable goods, you will find that they reached the nadir point in 1897. You will find that the importation of dutiable goods from Great Britain to Canada reached absolutely its lowest figure in 1897, and since that it has been absolutely upon the ascending scale—I do not say relatively to other countries, but I do say that it has been on the ascending scale since 1897. If you look further to what is a more interesting set of figures than this ; if you look at the percentage of imports from England and the United States, and take the percentage of the dutiable to the total imports—the percentage of dutiable goods that we get from Great Britain compared to our total dutiable importations into the country, and the percentage we get from the United States of duti-

able goods compared to the total dutiable goods imported into this country, you will find this very striking fact to be demonstrated, that we began in 1867 with nearly 65 per cent of our whole dutiable imports from Great Britain and only about 23 per cent from the United States, and that ratio has been continually declining as against Great Britain and continually ascending as in favour of the United States ever since the year 1867 down to and until the year 1897, when the percentage of dutiable goods imported from Great Britain went down to 30½ per cent, and the percentage of dutiable goods imported from the United States ascended to 46 per cent and a fraction. So that down to 1897, our percentage of dutiable goods from the old country was continually declining and our percentage of dutiable goods from the United States was continually ascending. Then, if you examine the figures of 1898, 1899, and 1900, you will find—and you may attribute it to whatever you please—I attribute it to the preferential tariff—that the declining ratio in one column and the ascending ratio in the other column were arrested in the year 1897. I think that is a conclusive demonstration of the operation of the preferential tariff—not as conclusive a demonstration as we would like to see of its operation in favour of the old country, but proving conclusively that it has operated in favour of the old country and that but for its operation the declining ratio I spoke of would have been reduced to zero, and there would have been hardly any proportion of dutiable goods imported from Great Britain into this country at all. Well, Sir, what does all this prove ? If it be true, as my hon. friend from West York and other hon. gentlemen opposite have said, that in spite of the preferential tariff England is not holding her own in our markets with the United States or with Germany, what does it all prove ? It proves what Lord Rosebery discovered, and told the English people in solemn tones the other day, that they are at this moment engaged in a hand-to-hand and life-and-death struggle with the people of the United States and the people of Germany.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear; free trade against protection, and the protectionists will win out.

Mr. RUSSELL. What I say is, if, considering the position we hold towards the mother country, and considering all that the mother country has done for us, we are not prepared, when we can do so without detriment to ourselves, and even though it were as we contend that it is not with detriment to ourselves, to give the mother country a preference, I want to know what sort of Canadians we would be if we had not a strong impulse to assist the mother country in that hand-to-hand struggle to preserve her trade from the incursions of competition from the United States and Germany.

My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) complained that there was no originality or inventiveness in this government, and no originality or inventiveness displayed by the Finance Minister in his budget speech or in his tariff. Well, Sir, whatever complaints might be made of the hon. gentleman himself, I think no one will deny to him the merit of originality and inventiveness. He has invented a variety of fictions, which he presented to us the other day. The first he invented was as to the permanence and stability of the Tory tariff. Assuredly that was an invention, or at least a discovery—that the tariff which existed in this country from 1879 down to 1897 was a permanent tariff. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance very properly claims as a merit of the tariff that was enacted in 1897, that it has remained on the statute-book ever since practically without any change whatever—I believe absolutely without a single change ; so that merchants and manufacturers know what they have to depend on, and can make their arrangements accordingly. My friend Mr. McClure, who was in this House last session, showed me the changes which were made by the Conservative party in their tariff, and they ran up into the hundreds. I fail to remember accurately the very great number of changes that had been made in this permanent and inelastic tariff, which was introduced in 1879, and the permanence and stability of which has been the discovery of my hon. friend from Pictou.

Another discovery which my hon. friend has made is that of the grievance on the part of the wool men. Now, I have looked through our tariff to find out what grievance the man who deals in wool has. The hon. gentleman suggests that it is wrong to encourage the manufacturers of the old country by placing a burden upon some particular class of people in this country ; and the particular class of people in this country upon whom among others he says we have placed a burden by the preferential tariff are the men interested in the manufacture of wool. Now, I am not very much of a hand at tariffs——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct; I am like my hon. friend the leader of the opposition —this is not my trade. I have heard a story told, I think of Richard Brinsley Sheriden, that he was coming home from his club one night a little under the influence of a certain kind of excitement to the physical and nervous system, when he saw a friend of his lying in the gutter slightly inebriated. With the instinct of humanity, the returning club man tried to lift his friend out of the gutter, but found that it was absolutely impossible to do so: so he said, 'My good friend, I cannot lift you out, but I will do the next best thing—I will

lie down beside you.' My hon. friend the leader of the opposition is not an expert in tariffs any more than I am. I would be glad to help him out of his scrapes; but as I cannot do that, I will do the next best thing—I will get in alongside of him.

But I can read common ordinary print, and I looked at this customs tariff in the Canadian Parliamentary Guide and scanned it carefully with the purpose of finding out what is the peculiar and special grievance under which the dealers in wool and the manufacturers of woollen goods are labouring. And so far as I understand, every one of them is put on the highest ad valorem tariff which is to be found in the whole list. I cannot find one of them under 35 per cent ad valorem, from which, if you deduct the one-third preferential rate, you get down to 23 per cent. And, looking at the figures presented a year ago by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), I find that, averaging the importations of wool into this country, they were the highest in the whole list. So that these people stand in our tariff in the most favoured position, and if there is any protection in this tariff—and I have admitted that incidentally there is—they get the fullest benefit of it. If there is any discrimination at all, it is in their favour, because they are put on the highest scale, and besides, they have, as others have, the freights and the insurance in their favour, and all the other obstacles which foreign competitors have to encounter. And, if, in addition to all that, they want something which nobody else has in this country, it is absurd to talk of their being subject to any exceptional burden. The case is just the opposite. It is the case of a particular class of people asking that we should burden all the rest of the community in their favour. My hon. friend must perceive that. I am sure he sees it, and I shall not waste time by discussing the point any further.

The hon. gentleman made another discovery and one which is greatly to the credit of the present Finance Minister. He discovered that twenty years ago—quite a long period in the history of a ministry or the history of a man—twenty years ago there was a Finance Minister in this country who was as good as the one who now administers our financial affairs.

Mr. MACLEAN. A great deal better.

Mr. RUSSELL. My hon. friend has discovered that there was a better Finance Minister, but he has not discovered that ever since Sir Leonard Tilley's day down to the present administration, there was another Finance Minister in that whole period of twenty years worth mentioning at all. He has to go back all of twenty years to find any Finance Minister who can at all compare with my hon. friend who now controls that department. I say that that is a high compliment to pay to my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), but it is not a high compliment to pay to the hon. gentleman who filled that position in the late government (Mr. Foster). I know that the ex-Finance Minister is not a persona grata to the hon. gentlemen on the other side. We do not often hear his name; they never speak of him. But to return to Sir Leonard Tilley twenty years ago. Twenty years is a long time, half the time that the children of Israel were wandering in the wilderness. These hon. gentlemen are fond of going back to history. I remember that when Mr. Foster went down to the town of New Glasgow to deliver a speech in my hon. friend's (Mr. Bell) own riding in my hon. friend's interest—and I think that when Mr. Foster put himself out so much to accommodate my hon. friend, the hon. gentleman might have had some kind words to speak of him in this House—when Mr. Foster went to Pictou to deliver a discourse, which, I think, was entitled a discourse to the young men about to enter on their political studies—a discourse addressed to the callow fledglings of the Tory nest down in the town of New Glasgow—all his address was occupied with historical reminiscences. These hon. gentlemen all go back to history, no doubt for the reason that the best part of the Conservative party is underground. Its best part is historical, and the only life it has left is its historical life. Its epitaph has come to be written. There was a story told of two gentlemen who were discussing the rival merits of New York and Philadelphia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Dispense.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know whether the story is worth telling or not, but I tell it, not for the intrinsic merit it may have, but because of its applicability to the situation. After each one had cited the merits of his native city, the Philadelphian made his final boast that the Quaker City was better laid out than New York. Well, retorted the New Yorker, when New York is as dead as Philadelphia it will be just as well laid out. Well, Mr. Speaker, whenever the Liberal party is as dead in this country as the Conservative party, we expect it to make as comely a corpse and hope it may have a more creditable history.

My hon. friend, referring to this great Finance Minister who existed twenty years ago, said that Sir Leonard Tilley had so managed the finances of his day that he reduced the net debt of Canada from $36.17 per head to $35.75 per head, and the net interest from $1.64 to $1.50 per head, thus diminishing the annual impost on every individual by 14 cents. And contrasting that with the performance of the present Finance Minister, he said that the debt had increased from $63.33 per head, which it was when the late government left office, to $64.75 per head, and the net interest from $1.42 to $1.78. But the point on which I would desire enlightenment is how it came to pass that this debt, which Sir Leonard

Tilley had reduced to $35.75 per head twenty years ago had been increased to $63.33 per head by his successors among hon. gentlemen opposite ? Why is this thus ? Of course, it must be due to the bad management of those incompetent Finance Ministers which these hon. gentlemen had as successors to Sir Leonard Tilley. Surely if it was a great credit to Sir Leonard Tilley that he reduced the debt to $35.75 per head, it is a great shame to his successors that they should have increased it so prodigiously and rapidly to $63.33.

Mr. Foster used to understand this matter pretty thoroughly, and I spent considerable time last year over his speech on this very subject. He made a far better presentment to the House than any of these hon. gentlemen opposite have made this session, and when I contrast Mr. Foster's effort with theirs I can realize how they must have sighed :

> For the touch of a vanished hand,
> And the sound of a voice that is still.

I can appreciate their feelings when they came to discuss the finance question and had to come from the Hon. George Eulas Foster down to——

I pause. I have no desire to say anything that could by any possibility be considered as unpleasant. But Mr. Foster made this calculation—a calculation more favourable to the Conservative party, I am bound to say, than the hon. member for Pictou made in regard to the debt. It is common ground, however, that the debt during the eighteen years of Conservative rule had been increased $118,000,000. My hon. friend (Mr. Bell, Pictou) made it out to be increased very much more than that, but he was several millions mistaken—it was only increased $118,000,000. But Mr. Foster said : It was all right to increase our debt by that enormous figure, because we were building our house and had to incur large capital expenditure. He went into the expenditures for which this debt had been incurred, and showed to his own satisfaction that they amounted to $142,600,000. He said : There is what you have to show for your debt. It is true you have a mortgage of $118,000,000, but look at the splendid edifice we have put up for you. Then he went on to contrast the capital expenditures under Liberal rule, and showed that we had only made a capital expenditure amounting to $11,000,000. But Mr. Foster did not attempt to draw any conclusion from what he had said, nor did my hon. friend on the other side. When I was at school, I used to study the rule of three, and my hon. friend, no doubt, did the same. The method, as he will remember, was to multiply the second and third terms together and divide by the first. Calculating according to that rule you will find what debt would have been put upon the country had the same ratio as under Conservative rule been maintained. And, if you work it out you will find that, according to the highest financial authority that ever sat on the other side during the Liberal regime, in proportion to our capital expenditures we added less to the debt than did the Conservative government. If you put $142,000,000 as the first term, $118,000,000 as the second term, and $11,000,000 as the third term, and work it out, you will see that we had a right to impose a debt of $9,102,008 before we could be called to account by those who favoured this expenditure by the Conservatives. And we did not impose any such debt upon the people. My hon. friend himself states the amount at $7,000,000. As a matter of fact, I believe it was stated last year allowing for about $2,500,000 used to pay floating debts of the previous administration at only $5,250,000. I care not what figure you take—as I have already said, I have no skill in figures. But in any case whether you take the larger or the lower figure we are some millions of dollars within the debt we would have a right to pile up against the people of this country before our record could fairly be challenged by those who approved of the record of Conservative rule.

Now, there was one other discovery the hon. gentleman made, but it is so stale and so hackneyed and shop-worn that I am almost ashamed to allude to it. That was the statement that we had blundered into the preferential tariff, that we did not know anything about the German and Belgian treaties, that we constructed our preferential tariff in such a way as to run up against these treaties without knowing they were there. If there was an intelligent schoolboy of ten years of age who did not know all about these German and Belgian treaties, he ought to have been whipped. Surely, every one in this country knew about these treaties ; and nothing could be clearer than that the administration and the leader of the government knew what was to be encountered in connected with them. They not only knew, but calculated upon it. As has been explained ad nauseam, they said : We will take chances. We shall never get rid of these restrictions upon the commercial freedom of the empire until we challenge these treaties and have the matter fought out. They framed their preferential tariff with that idea implicitly contained in it if not explicitly stated, and they fought the matter out. I shall not waste the time of the House by going into a long discussion over that. Everybody knows that it was this expedient and this expedient alone that led to the abolition of these restrictions on the commercial freedom of the British Empire. The hon. gentleman tells us that the seeds were sown by Sir Charles Tupper in the various interviews he had with the Imperial government and the articles he pub-

lished in the Nineteenth Century and the London magazines. Well, as the right hon. premier said last year of some other seeds sown by the former leader of the Opposition, these seeds were absolutely sterile; They never produced any result. It was only when this government took issue with the Imperial government and compelled the consideration of the subject that the result was brought about. And when the measure was brought down, we were told that it was absolutely impossible to bring about that result. But it was brought about, and it was by no other agency than the introduction of the preferential tariff of this country. I will simply read one short historical review in the London Times of 1897—and with that I will take my seat—for the purpose of showing that this measure and this alone was the cause of the abolition of this restriction upon the commerce of the empire. This was written not during the controversy, but when that controversy was cold and dead, and when the writer could review it with the knowledge and impartiality of the historian :

The Dominion parliament met on March 28, and on St. George's day, April 23, a tariff Bill was introduced, of which the effect was speedily felt throughout the empire. The principal feature of the Bill was that it adopted one tariff as the general tariff of the Dominion and another preferential tariff for those countries which showed a desire to trade with Canada upon terms of reciprocal commercial advantage. Whatever the duties imposed by the general tariff, the duties of the preferential tariff should be reduced in proportion to them for one year by 12½ per cent and after one year, by 25 per cent. As Great Britain and the British colony of New South Wales were at the time of the introduction of the tariff the only communities trading on the required terms with Canada, the tariff Bill became in effect a Bill for the preferential treatment of British trade.

Surely this is an answer to the remarks made on the other side of the House on this subject.

The Bill, which was received with enthusiasm in this country, gave rise to a keen discussion as to the power of the colonial government under the existing treaties of Britain with Germany and Belgium to extend to the mother country any commercial advantages which was not given to these countries, and to all others having a claim to the most-favoured nation treatment. Legal authorities in this country were understood to hold the view that the treaties did, as a matter of fact, preclude all British colonies from giving to Great Britain preferential advantage over most-favoured foreign nations, and to that extent constituted an interference with the fiscal freedom of the empire. The theory of the matter was not put to the test of authoritative decision. In recognition of the strong public feeling which existed on the subject, the treaties were denounced in July, and an irksome barrier to the possible commercial union of the empire was thus, on the initiative of Canada, removed.

Sir, this is absolutely conclusive that if we are now in a position in which we can, with any possibility of success, approach the question of inter-Imperial preferential trade, the fact that we are in that position is exclusively due to the proceedings taken by this government on St. George's day, 1897.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). In rising to support the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition, I will take occasion to refer to certain matters which have been brought up in connection with the introduction of the budget. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Russell) does not appear to be so strong a free trader as the right hon. the leader of the government. Now, Sir, permit me to draw the attention of those hon. gentlemen who have strong free trade proclivities, to the fact that out of our imports, which amounted last year to $189,622,513, $76,678,617 are free ; therefore, to that extent we have free trade in this country. Those free imports amount to 70 per cent of the dutiable imports, consequently there may be some comfort to the extreme free trader in contemplating these figures. I was somewhat disappointed yesterday afternoon in listening to the defence which the right hon. leader of the government made in reply to the speech of the leader of the opposition. I had thought that the experience of the right hon. gentleman in his responsible position as leader of the government, his experience in matters which came before the Joint High Commission which met at Quebec and later at Washington, would have taught him that the geographical position of this country demands a stable protective tariff, that without it this country cannot prosper, and that the attitude of our friends to the south of us is such that at all times we must of necessity protect our industries against their aggressive tariff policy. The right hon. gentleman, referring to the amendment, said :

As time went on statements were made in the press that this new policy would surprise the government and stagger the Liberal party as soon as it was announced. We have it now, fresh and brand new, from the lips of my hon. friend, and lo and behold, it is the same old national policy.

Now, Sir, what could the right hon. gentleman expect we would have brought down as an amendment ? Did he think we could shift and change our policy with every new moon ? I am convinced that this country will never accept anything but a protective policy ; that our hon. friends opposite need never look for any essential change in our tariff policy ; that we must of necessity always have a protective policy in this country. The right hon. gentleman proceeded :

Our first consideration, in imposing duties, is to produce revenue, and if, as an incident, the manufacturers derive advantage, they are welcome to it. But gentlemen on the other side

impose duties, not with a view of levying a revenue and putting money into the treasury, but of putting money in the pockets of private individuals.

Now, Sir, that sounds a good deal like those old speeches we used to hear a good many years ago. I say I am disappointed, and I am sorry that such sentiments have been given utterance to on an occasion of this kind, and after such an experience as we have had. Then, the right hon. gentleman went on to say :

But what we have said again and again is that while we believe in free trade as a theory, we know that we are bound to raise a revenue by a customs tariff, and it will take many years before we can have free trade as it is in England.

Further :

You would have, as we had under the late government, an incessant procession of tariff tinkerers from the different cities of Canada to the office of the Minister of Finance. There never was a year from 1879 to 1896—or at least there never was a period of three years—when there was not some tinkering of the tariff. One man would find that some invention in the United States or Great Britain had lowered the price of the products he was making, and instead of exercising his enterprise and ingenuity to overcome the difficulty, instead of putting more money into his business, he came to the Finance Minister and obtained some modification of the tariff.

Now, Sir, I submit, on behalf of the manufacturers of Canada, that this is a most extreme view to take of this question. I believe that the right hon. gentleman does not do the manufacturers of this country justice in making such a statement as that upon the floor of this House. I would like to know if the manufacturers of this country, when at any time in the past they found it necessary to come to this government to point out the difficulties under which they were labouring in connection with competition from foreign countries, had not quite as good a right to come here as any other citizens of this country. When you consider how many men there are in this country whose highest ambition it is to feed at the public trough, and who are constantly making pilgrimages to the various governments, I would like to know why the manufacturers should be singled out for reflections such as the right hon. gentleman has cast upon them. Sir, not only those who feed at the public trough come here, but a great number of others are constantly making pilgrimages to this government from time to time, seeking for blocks of work, without tender, work which they can get from the government. We see them in the lobbies of this House, on the streets of this city ; and yet, knowing that such men come here in great numbers, and for such purposes, the right hon. gentleman has chosen to refer to the manufacturers in the way he did yesterday. Then, there are another class of people who come here, we see them about the corridors of this House and on the streets of this city, coming from various parts of the country, some of them millionaires and multi-millionaires, coming here for subsidies to assist them in various enterprises, for subsidies to railways and other purposes ; yet we have not heard any one rise in this House and refer to those gentlemen in any such terms as the leader of the government employed in referring to the manufacturers. I say, Sir, that the manufacturer coming from his little town or the manufacturer coming from the city, who employs labour to a lesser or greater extent, has quite as good a right to come here and lay his case before the government as these wealthy speculators and subsidy-hunters ; they are just as important in the community in which they live, and they have just as good a right to claim the consideration of the government as any others.

Now, Sir, I take the ground that it should not be necessary for the manufacturers to make constant pilgrimages to this government in order to make representations in respect of the tariff ; I take the position that the policy of protection in this country should be so well established that people would not require to ask for changes. I think it would be a good thing for the government to employ a competent official, who would take the Trade and Navigation Returns and go through them carefully to find out what articles are coming into this country from foreign countries in competition with similar articles produced in this country ; and to inquire if those goods can be produced here, giving employment to our own capital, our own labour and our own energy. I say this government should pursue a policy of that kind, that is the policy which we on this side of the House intend to pursue; and then there would be no necessity for manufacturers to make pilgrimages to this government to ask for tariff changes. I say that our proximity to the great industrial centres of the United States renders such a policy necessary on our part, and if that policy is not pursued here, you will depopulate this country, and drive our people into the United States.

There is no great gulf, no great sea between this country and the United States, and when you remember that we are just on the fringe of the United States as it were and consider how easy it is for our people to go there, you will see how much more necessary it is that we should have adequate protection. The hon. Minister of Finance, in 1898, made a statement in this House which I could not understand, and I would like to read it. In his budget speech of that year, he said :

What a world of good might have been accomplished for the true interests of manufacturers in the Dominion of Canada if all the time, energy, labour and money that have been expended in the last twenty years in tariff watchings and wire-pulling at Ottawa, had been ex-

pended in the factories, in the development of business, in the discovery of new inventions, in finding means for the use of labour-saving machinery, in learning what might be done with waste products, in dealing with all those forms of industrial progress which had to be dealt with by the manufacturer when he has keen competition. We would therefore say to the manufacturer that if he desires permanency in the tariff, he must never expect permanency until the tariff gets down to a moderate point. To-day there are duties in the tariff so high that I am sure the government are not prepared to treat them as part of a permanent tariff. I say this in no spirit but that of friendliness to the manufacturing interests. While the manufacturers are in a fairly good position to-day, it would be a mistake for them to fail to realize the fact that Canada has turned her face away from the high tariff policy, and, though we may proceed slowly, whatever progress we make from this time forward, must and should be in the direction of greater freedom of trade.

These observations correspond entirely with the observations that fell from the lips of the right hon. leader of the government. Now, I want to say that the inference to be drawn from that speech to which I have just referred and from the speech which we heard from the right hon. leader of the government yesterday, is that the government are travelling in the direction of free trade. I do not think that in this country you could find a banker of any standing, a financial magnate of any standing, a man engaged in any great financial enterprise, or any important merchant, who would endorse any such proposition, irrespective of his politics. I wish to congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance upon occupying the position which he does during a period of great prosperity, and I also want to congratulate the ministry upon ruling over the destinies of Canada during a period of great prosperity shared by every civilized nation in the world. I shall not attempt to go into statistics in regard to the debt, or to the revenue and expenditure of this country, but there is one thing I would like to refer to, and it is that while the revenues have been ample, while we have been going through a period of inflation of values, this, coupled with the present ad valorem duties, has brought to the government very largely increased revenues. These revenues have been many millions greater than they were per year in any previous case, and yet we find that the government found it necessary not only to spend every dollar of these increased revenues, but that the debt of this country has increased during this period of great prosperity to the extent of about $7,000,000. At the opening of this parliament, I was very much interested in hearing the right. hon. leader of the government ask this side of the House a question. The question that he asked was : What is your policy ? I thought then of a resolution which was brought into this House in the year 1878 by the Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, and which the right hon. leader of the government read yesterday in his speech. Therefore, I need not refer to that resolution, because every one is conversant with it. However, Sir, I would like to refer to a resolution which was brought into this House exactly ten years later, and to which the right hon. gentleman gave his support. It was introduced into this House by the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is as follows :

> That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in or natural products of either of the said countries, should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other. Articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted.
>
> That it is further expedient that the government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite: which of these policies do they adhere to ? Do they adhere to the one laid down by Sir John Macdonald, or do they adhere to the one which was introduced at that time by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce ? There must be either one or other of these policies that they adhere to. Now, reference was made in the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance, to the fact that we brought into this country from the United States a very large amount of raw material which was used by our manufacturers, and that we brought it in free of duty because it suited us to do so, and quite properly. At the same time, I would like to point out that we also brought in from the United States $60,819,752 worth of manufactured goods, and that we are bringing from Great Britain about half that amount. It seems to me that the time has come when we ought to consider in what way the people of this country can benefit themselves by producing these articles which we import from the United States. I would like to know what benefit it is for an American commercial traveller to go through this country from one end to the other trying to sell American products. The only benefit that this country has from that kind of thing is the man's hotel bill while he is in the country ; he in no other manner assists in maintaining this country. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen to consider in what way we can so increase our tariff and so alter it that these goods which come into our country can be made in this country to a greater extent than they are at the present time. I am quite prepared to admit that you cannot shut them all out, and I am not in favour of a prohibitive tariff. But, we are harassed by the over-production of the United States. I have often been asked the question : Cannot your manufacturers

in Canada compete with the United States ? I have invariably answered : Yes, we can on equal terms, but not in the ratio of seventy millions of people to six millions, not when we are handicapped. I would point, hon. gentlemen, to the fact that Canadians who have had to leave this country because of the great inducements held out in the United States of employment, because of the great opportunities there and the great scope, have been able to compete in the United States with the citizens of that country, that they are able to occupy responsible positions and that we are proud of them. Therefore, I say that the question is irrelevant, that it does not cover the case and that the question should not be considered from that standpoint. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has stated that the United States tariff is 50 per cent higher than ours.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, no—their's is 50 per cent and ours is 25 per cent.

Mr. KEMP. That would be 100 per cent —double ours. While a good many people talk about reciprocity in tariffs, I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman opposite who said we should regulate our tariff to suit our own conditions, irrespective of what other countries do.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I misunderstood him. It is 50 per cent on the basis of percentage on the relative duties, higher than ours; but I understood him to say 50 per cent on duties higher than ours; that is to say, if ours is 25 theirs is 75.

Mr. KEMP. I think the House understands the position and I will not refer to it any further. While a great deal of time is taken up both in the House and in the country discussing the extent of our foreign trade, little or nothing is said with regard to our interprovincial trade, and I think the Minister of Finance might very well have dealt with that feature of our commerce in his budget speech. I speak of our interprovincial trade which moves from east to west and vice versa, which our railways and transportation companies are designed to accommodate, and which is the chief reason for the existence of our manufacturing industries. That interprovincial trade has been built up enormously within the last twenty-five years, and in connection with it I would quote to the House an extract from a speech delivered by the Hon. George Brown in the Senate on the 22nd of February, 1875. The Hon. George Brown said :

> And nowhere can be found a more gratifying illustration of the grand results which flow from commercial freedom than we have in the progress of our Dominion since the accomplishment of confederation. Though the customs barriers against inter-traffic between the British North American provinces have only been removed since July, 1867, the united foreign commerce of the provinces has arisen from an annual average for thirteen years before confederation of $115,000,000 to the enormous amount in the seventh year after confederation of $240,000,000.

The Hon. George Brown in these words refers to the importance of our interprovincial traffic, and he also indicates that when we have prosperous interprovincial traffic we also have large exports and imports. This much we may be sure of, namely: that if we are prosperous within ourselves, we will also be prosperous in our trade to and from foreign countries. I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no class of people in this country who have applied themselves more diligently to their business and more faithfully to the task set before them of studying new process for creating new enterprises than have the manufacturers of Canada. I therefore repeat what I said in opening, that the language which has been used by some hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to our manufacturers is unworthy of being heard in this parliament. I believe, Sir, that we ought to encourage in every way possible the manufacturers of this country in their efforts to give employment to our people in all legitimate enterprises.

Now, Sir, as to this matter of preferential trade which has been spoken of time and again in this House, and in connection with which the right hon. the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister referred to what had taken place at a meeting of the Chambers of Commerce in London last summer. The Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) told us that the only important matter in reference to preferential trade that had occurred recently took place at the meeting of the 4th Congress of the Chamber of Commerce in London last year, and in view of what has been said upon that question, I think it well to correct the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite lest they should create a false impression abroad. It is a very easy task for a member to get up in this House and tell of the difficulties in the way of securing preferential trade within the empire, but it is a very difficult task to bring forward a scheme which will remove these difficulties, and which would be in the line of what I might call constructive politics. I may state that the Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain was honorary chairman of the Congress of the Chambers of Commerce which met in London in 1896, but owing to his numerous duties and to the fact that the Imperial parliament was in session he was unable to occupy that position last year. His place was taken by his under-secretary, Lord Selborne, who is now First Lord of the Admiralty. Extracts from the speech of Mr. Chamberlain in 1896 have been read, and I may be pardoned if I present to the House a few of the utterances of Lord Selborne. I quote from his speech :

There was a time when no one who took an interest in these fiscal questions, whether he was a member of the Cobden Club or an ardent protectionist, could discuss them without assuming an air of absolute infallibility. There has been more assertion of dogma in this question of free trade and protection than ever has been current among theologians. I believe free trade not to be a religion, but to be a policy.

Again, in speaking of the difficulties which had been overcome in bringing about the federation of the different Australian colonies, he said :

In Australia difficulties have been overcome, and therefore it does seem to me that, probably in a different way, they may be also overcome in the empire. Union in any political sense is one of the problems of the future.

The Rt. Hon. C. T. Ritchie, who was then president of the British Board of Trade, and who is now the Home Secretary, said on that occasion :

I hope Australia will follow the example of Canada and do what she can to promote British trade. We also hope that this is only the beginning of some closer commercial action in the future. I myself believe that the days of the strict Manchester free trade school are passing away.

Mr. HEYD. Give us the rest of his utterances at the same time; give his explanation.

Mr. KEMP. I have the official report of the Chamber of Commerce here and these extracts I have taken from the speeches of these gentlemen. I shall be very pleased to lend my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Heyd) this report and he can read it. Now, Sir, something was said in this House as to the deputation which waited upon Mr. Chamberlain, and as it is a question which in all likelihood will be discussed in the future as it has been in the past I wish to state the exact facts in regard to that matter.

The resolution which was brought into that congress was a resolution on commercial relations which had been prepared by the Toronto Board of Trade, and which was adopted by a committee of the congress after due consideration. There were several other resolutions, but the committee of the congress decided that for the purpose of discussion the resolution of the Toronto Board of Trade would meet the case better than any other. That resolution, as was pointed out by the leader of the government yesterday, was not accepted ; but an amendment was accepted asking the government to appoint a royal commission to investigate this question of preferential trade between the colonies and the mother country ; and a deputation was appointed to lay the resolution before the government. The reply which the Chamber of Commerce received from the Prime Minister was, as stated in this House, that the time for receiving this deputation was not opportune. It was not opportune because at that time the South African campaign was at its height ; the war in China was also at its height ; there was a very important session of the Imperial parliament in progress, which took up the time and attention of the Prime Minister and his colleagues ; and the country was on the eve of an election. I can quite easily understand, therefore, and I think hon. members will agree with me, that under these conditions it was inopportune for the Prime Minister to receive such a deputation, especially in view of the fact that the discussion on this question being one which enters largely into the politics of Great Britain, his reception of the deputation might be interpreted to mean that the Imperial government were about to adopt a protective policy, and this might cause their defeat in the elections which were about to take place. The deputation which was appointed by the congress was composed of thirty gentlemen from all parts of the world ; and I may say that each gentleman was supposed to bring with him some other gentleman, and also any members of the Imperial House of Commons, to meet Lord Salisbury. The letter was received, however, and the matter ended. The Finance Minister said in his budget speech that the deputation also waited on Mr. Chamberlain, and that he also turned them away. I wish to deny that statement. The deputation which went to Mr. Chamberlain was a deputation of three or four Canadian gentlemen who desired to pay their respects to him before leaving England ; and they went to him a good many days, perhaps weeks, afterwards. They were not sent by the congress. What transpired there was not given correctly by the extract read by the Finance Minister from the report of the representative who went from this city. I might say, however, that I am not in a position to state to the House what was said on that occasion, because it was thoroughly understood by Lord Strathcona and Mr. Chamberlain and the three or four of us who discussed this matter, that nothing should be said about it, because of the stand Lord Salisbury had taken. In order to confirm my opinion in that respect, I asked the other members of the deputation what their view of it was, and I have here letters from Dr. Parkin and Mr. Cockshutt, stating that their view of the interview was that it was of a confidential character.

I do not intend to take up much of the time of the House in discussing this question ; but I would like to read one or two extracts from papers which were supposed at the time to have given the best account of what transpired at the congress. The Saturday Review said :

The fourth Congress of Chambers of Commerce of the empire, whose labours were brought to a close yesterday, entrusted itself with a task whose importance it would be hard to overrate. Numerous subjects were handled, but there was one subject which transcended all

the others put together in vital importance : it rightly occupied the greater part of the congress' time, and aroused by far the greatest amount of interest; the subject was the project for an Imperial customs union. Unfortunately, but inevitably, the subject also aroused a vast amount of prejudice and produced from a few delegates a flood of Cobdenite rhetoric, based upon out-of-date facts and worn-out arguments, which should have been decently buried years ago. There was almost a note of pathos in the speeches of the gentlemen from Manchester; for it was appropriately from that ancient home of the faith that the opposition to the customs union resolutions proceeded. Happily, however, their polemics were indignantly repudiated, not only by every one of the colonial delegates who spoke upon the subject, but also by not a few of the representatives of English chambers. And this circumstance is as noteworthy as it is gratifying. But a few years ago the mention of fair trade or preferential trade was scouted in this country by all except a very few thinkers, and the bare utterance of the word 'protection' sufficed to reduce any audience which considered itself representative of British industry or politics to a condition bordering upon hysteria. The newspaper reports of this week's proceedings at Fishmonger's Hall give hardly the faintest notion of the atmosphere which pervaded the discussions. It was necessary to be present in the hall in order to gauge the change which has already come over the representatives of this country's industry. Rhetorical periods about the glories of free trade and the purchase of everything in the cheapest market, which would, ten, if not five years ago, have raised outbursts of ecstatic cheering, this week fell absolutely flat, and, save for a belated voice here and there, were received in chilling silence. On the other hand, any reference to the dangers threatening British industry, to the need for the various parts of the empire to cement themselves together and, as one delegate expressed it, to stand shoulder to shoulder in matters of trade as well as in matters of warfare, evoked loud and significant applause.

I will only take up the time of the House to read a few lines of another extract from the Financial News of London :

It is not an exaggeration to say that this question absorbed more interest than that aroused by all the other topics combined. And it is significant that, next to the customs union, the sugar bounty debate (upon which a good resolution was passed, almost unanimously), excited the chief interest. The two subjects are so closely allied that a comprehensive scheme of commercial federation would dispose of the sugar bounty question by including it, as the greater includes the less. Preferential trade within the empire is as old as the empire; it began as soon as our colonies began, and was only abandoned when the Cobdenite fiscal policy established itself in this country in the middle of the century.

There were other expressions of opinion, which were referred to by the hon. leader of the opposition yesterday, on this question of preferential trade, and extracts from publications in various parts of the British Empire, showing how thought is moving along these lines.

Now, we have heard a good deal in this House as to what the attitude of this party may be in regard to the preferential tariff. In a discussion which took place on a motion made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) at the beginning of the session, we were challenged as to what our position was. We were asked if we would do away with the preferential tariff, and if we would not move a resolution to that effect. I would like to draw the attention of the House, if I am not treading on ground which has already been gone over, to an interview which took place in Washington in 1897 between the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies), and a representative of the Associated Press. On that occasion they were reported in the Globe as having said to these gentleman in Washington. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright spoke as follows :—

On the other hand, nearly everything we need in the line of manufactures would, under reciprocity, come from this side of the line. Our manufacturers would naturally protest against this competition, but that is to be expected.

The hon. the Minister of Marine (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) is reported as having said :

We have in Canada to-day a large element whose influence is thrown in the direction of a more extended trade with the mother country as against the United States. We Canadians believe that our trade should flow through natural channels, and this natural channel inclines to this country. If you cannot trade with America, we shall be compelled to trade with Great Britain, and once these intimate relations are established with the mother country, it will be difficult to break them. On the other hand, the American manufacturer has nothing to fear: he has everything to gain by such an arrangement as we propose.

Thus, on the 8th February, 1897, these hon. gentlemen, who were thus appealing to the Washington authorities, were not very much imbued with the idea of preferential trade with Great Britain. And I think when we take into consideration the attitude of these gentlemen on that occasion, when we consider that on the 8th February, 1897, they were in favour of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, the preferential tariff with Great Britain, which they introduced that same year, was the most remarkable acrobatic performance, from a political standpoint, that this country or any other has ever witnessed.

The hon. the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) told us a few days ago what the preference was intended to do. He said :

When we give a preference, if it is to be at any one's expense, it is at the expense of the manufacturer and the workingman of Canada. We go a little further, and say that it is policy of the Liberal party of Canada to reduce the duties and to remove to some extent the burden of the excessive tariff which was imposed on imported goods by the late Conservative government.

If this utterance represents the ideas of hon. gentlemen opposite on the preferential tariff, I say it is wrong to place such a burden on the workingmen as is indicated in the speech of the Minister of the Interior. If the workingmen who are employed in the woollen industry of this country are suffering from the preferential tariff, the government should consider how they can alleviate their sufferings, and I understand that there are some woollen industries which are suffering and being closed down from the effects of the preferential tariff and the government has often been made aware of that fact.

But in discussing this question, we are asked : Would you withdraw from England this preference ? If you would, your loyalty is only lip loyalty. I suppose that what is in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, when they ask that question, is the debt of gratitude which we owe to Great Britain. I believe we do owe the mother land a debt of gratitude and should fairly consider what it is, and I believe that we are not considering that question as fully as we ought. When I consider the responsibility that Great Britain has taken in the past in our behalf, when I think of the wealth of this country and how little we contribute towards our own protection, and the protection of our commerce, I cannot but conclude that we should be prepared to consider in what way we are going to assist in the future in defending the trade of commerce of this country and our sea coasts. We are not very near the millenium, and there is no reason to expect that we shall enjoy immunity from those responsibilities which weigh on other nations. Why should we enjoy immunity from the responsibilities that our neighbours to the south have to bear ? We find these aggressive people, whose industry we admire, every year spending a tremendous amount of money on defence, both coast and internal, and I would like to draw the attention of the House to our position in this respect. It costs Great Britain to maintain her army $5.40 per head ; it costs the United States $5.50 per head of their population. I believe in British connection ; I do not believe in annexation to the United States or independence. But if we were an independent country, we would have to spend, in the proportion in which Great Britain spends, $29,700,000 per annum on our army. If we were part of the United States, we would have to spend $30,000,000 a year on our army. But instead of spending $5.50 per head of the population, last year we spent about 40 cents. There is no nation in the world which spends so little as we do. All civilized countries have to spend from $2 to $5 per head on their army and navy and defences ; and this government should consider in what way we are going to maintain our position and assume the responsibilities we owe to the mother country. Only then would I deal with the preferential tariff ; and as Great Britain is not at this moment prepared to grant us a preference, I would deal with the preferential tariff on its merits. If these hon. gentlemen think that the debt of gratitude which we owe the mother country is being paid by the small benefit which the mother country receives on account of the goods which she ships us, that she might not send us if we had not this preferential tariff, they have a very small idea of what we owe Great Britain. Of our total commerce, which amounts to $381,517,236 imports and exports, and of which our imports are $189,622,513, only $26,094,101 comes under the preferential tariff, and therefore we are not giving Great Britain any adequate return for the privileges we enjoy of the protection of her navy and the prestige we enjoy of being a part of the British Empire. I say that we should divide this question into two parts and deal with the preferential tariff in one way and our obligations to Great Britain in another.

The next question I propose to refer to briefly is our position with Germany. We had been working up a very profitable export business with that country, and the prospects were that we would work up a very much better business in the future. But when the preferential tariff was announced, the German government tried to coerce us. They tried to make the world believe that we were not really a part of the British Empire.

There is no question, so far as I can judge, which excites German feeling to such an extent as the question of favoured commercial relations among the various parts of the British Empire. They almost go into hysterics when that question is discussed in Great Britain, or in any part of the empire. As soon as they heard of what we had done they discriminated against us. As I have said, I have been told that our produce merchants were working up a good trade with Germany, and that sometimes prices are more favourable in Germany than they are in Great Britain. We are doing a very satisfactory business with Great Britain, but that is no reason why we should not endeavour to obtain other markets, and markets which we can reach as well as the United States can. The produce of Canada which we sent to Germany last year amounted to only $1,108,163, and I am told that since these figures were made up for the Trade and Navigation Returns, even this small business has almost dropped off altogether. Our imports from Germany amount to $8,706,641. Since the preferential tariff went into effect our imports from Germany have increased in a greater proportion than have those from any other country, viz., 15 per cent. Our imports from the United

States increased 13·90 per cent, and from Great Britain 13·75 per cent. Germany discriminates against the products sent to that country by our farmers. On wheat the discrimination amounts to 50 per cent, as compared with the duty charged on wheat from the United States. On oats the discrimination is 40 per cent, and on rye 50 per cent. Yet, the United States tariff against German products, I believe, is 50 per cent higher than that which we impose upon German proucts. At the opening of this session, I asked the government for the correspondence between themselves and the Imperial government with reference to this question. The government have been aware of this discrimination on the part of Germany. The boards of trade of Montreal and Toronto have drawn attention to it. When the right hon. leader of the government was in Toronto last fall he was approached on this subject, and he told those who waited upon him that the matter should have his careful attention, and that everything possible should be done. I think it is the duty of the government, before this session closes, to tell this House what they are doing, and to bring down the correspondence which has passed between them and the Imperial government on this matter. I do not think it is the temper of the Canadian people to be used by Germany in this way, and I think the government would be upheld in taking steps to straighten the matter out. We have the case in our own hands. I feel confident that if any nation in the world were to do against the United States what Germany is doing against this country, it would take the American people a very short time to arrange it and retaliate if necessary. They would put such a tariff in effect against German products as would bring Germany to an understanding of what her position was. I do not think that because we are part of the British Empire, and that the people of Great Britain are easy going in trade matters, we should submit to this injustice at the hands of Germany. We ought to have every market for our farmers that we can obtain. Look at the position of the United States on this question as compared with ours. The exports of Germany to the United States amount to $103,456,554, while the exports of the United States to Germany amount to $197,603,400—nearly double the exports from Germany. We have very much the same kinds of products to sell as the United States supplies to Germany, yet our exports to Germany, instead of being double our imports from that country, as is the case with the United States, amount to only one-eighth, and even that trade has dropped off to almost nothing at all. Germany enjoys the run of the British market, and of the market of every British colony, on the same terms as British producers; yet, because we give the mother country a preference, we are treated in this way. I urge upon the government to consider this matter, and to offset this injustice which Germany has seen fit to put into effect against this country.

We have been told by the Minister of Finance that we are on the crest of a wave of prosperity. I hope that his pessimistic view of the matter may not be realized. It looked as if the hon. gentleman was trying to prepare a soft place for himself to fall on. What has this administration done since 1896? Great professions have been made in reference to transportation facilities, and to the great good the country was to receive by the solution of this transportation question. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite if there are any improvements they have made in the transportation facilities that have given the producers of this country any cheaper freight rates than existed when they came into power? I would like to have them point out any advantage that we enjoy that we did not enjoy before they took office. And I would like to direct the attention of the House to this fact, that in this province of Ontario, which produces the great bulk of the exports that go from this country, the freight rates are higher than they have ever been in the past. Unless the people of Ontario get an outlet along the great lakes, unless they can participate in the traffic of the canals, we shall have no relief. It may be a matter of local importance, but it is one of very wide importance as well—we have repeatedly urged the improvement of the harbour of Toronto in such a way as to allow the vessels of 14 feet draught, that use the St. Lawrence canals, to be able to come into the harbour; we have shown that Toronto is a great distributing centre, that more freight tonnage comes into and goes out of Toronto than comes into and goes out of Montreal; and yet we cannot get the government to move in this matter. We find all kinds of policies in regard to transportation, we find expenditures in all parts of the country, and yet the centre of the part of the Dominion where the exports are produced, and where they are gathered for export, is left without necessary improvements. There is another feature of the transportation problem, and one that I referred to a few days ago. That is, what I might almost call the calamity to the St. Lawrence route, of the transference by the Grand Trunk Railway of its terminus from Montreal to Portland. I do not know what the opinion of other members of the House may be with regard to this question, nor do I care. When I referred to it the other day, I was accused by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) with introducing politics into the discussion of this question. I should be sorry to create such a precedent. But, I venture to say that the very liberal manner in which the government dealt with the Grand Trunk Railway when it took over the Drummond

County Railway, had the effect I said it had. Calculated at 3½ per cent, the payments by the government of $140,000 a year, and $500,000 given to assist them in improving Victoria bridge, was in effect, a payment to the Grand Trunk Railway of $4,500,000, and this money the Grand Trunk Railway used to side-track Montreal, and to make Portland in the United States their terminus. I say that the government, when the Grand Trunk Railway stated publicly that their policy was to make Portland their terminus in summer as well as winter, should have inserted in their bargain a condition that would not tolerate that sort of thing, and I believe they could have prevented it.

Now, what do we find in the discussion of this transportation question? We find the Grand Trunk Railway are taking steamship line after steamship line away from Montreal, and they will continue to do so. Let me remind the House that every steamer that loads and unloads in Montreal, employs in labour and in the purchase of supplies for that purpose a sum of between $4,000 and $5,000; and the men who do that work come from various places down the St. Lawrence to work on the docks in Montreal, and the money is distributed among them. I say therefore, that instead of these men earning that money, it will be earned by aliens if the Grand Trunk make their terminal in the United States, as they intend to do. The government could have prevented this misfortune, and in neglecting to do so they have not shown ordinary business foresight. We have lost the German market, and we are not getting other markets which I think we should have. Now, Sir, we are sending to France only $1,372,359, while we are taking from France $4,464,938. The position of the trade of the United States with France is very much the same as that of Germany in respect of this matter. The United States import from France $72,781,212, and they export to France $82,553,335. Their imports are 90 per cent of their exports. The same conditions apply to Belgium and to Holland. We have also heard this session something about our trade with Italy, which amounts to only $400,000, while that of the United States amounts to $64,000,000 a year. I think it is the duty of this government not to rely altogether on the markets of Great Britain, but to seek out new markets. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite what they have done in the last four years to open up new markets for the produce of this country as the United States have been doing. We have got direct steamship lines with Germany and Belgium and we should not remain in this position.

Then, there is the question of the effect upon our workingmen in the woollen and other industries by the operation of the preferential tariff. I think the government made a mistake in not propounding some policy to the people before the last general election. I remember when the right hon. gentleman came to Toronto to address our people on political questions, and when he was so well received. Sir, I am proud of the way the Prime Minister of this country is received when he comes to Toronto, and I hope he will always receive the same courteous and enthusiastic reception from the people of that city. He said there was then no burning question before the people of this country. I contend that there has been time in the history of this country when we should not have had a burning question up for discussion between the political parties. Still, that does not excuse the government for their inaction. Instead of simply marking time, I would like to have them look out for new markets, to see if they cannot increase our exports to Germany, to Belgium, to Italy, and to France. I would like to see hon. gentlemen opposite, instead of criticising our policy for mutual preference within the empire, urge upon the mother country and urge upon the colonies, upon Australia, which furnishes so great a field for our exports, the advantages of a policy of preferential treatment within the empire for the products of the empire. I hope that we will be able to secure with Australia a treaty affording each country a mutual preference. If this country and Australia were to join hands in such a manner, it would have a very beneficial influence upon the mother country, and help them to appreciate the advantages which they might derive from a policy of mutual preference within the empire.

I am in full accord with a remark that fell from the lips of the hon. leader of the opposition yesterday when he referred to the present position of the Conservative party in opposition. I do not consider that it should be the highest ambition of a political party to hold the reins of power, but rather to be on the right side of public questions. I would rather see the Conservative party of this country adhere to their principles, adhere to an aggressive policy for the development of the great natural resources of this country, the development of our industries in various lines, though they may happen to be temporarily excluded from power. I hope, Sir, that this government will make some movement in the direction which I have pointed out, instead of simply contenting themselves with marking time, and that in the future these questions which I have endeavoured to advocate will receive support from the opposite side of the House, and even a more effectual advocacy than I have been able to give them.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), who concluded the

delivery of his speech just as the House rose at six o'clock, is not now in his seat, but, that fact need not prevent me from stating that I listened with great interest to his remarks, and I trust that the hon. member will take it in good part if I tender to him my congratulations upon the manner in which he acquitted himself. It may seem, perhaps, something like the display of a patronizing spirit on my part to tender my congratulations to that hon. member, when, I myself, have had no greater experience in the debates in this House than he has had, but, I certainly felt quite as fully as he did the strangeness of the situation and passed through the trial which he must have passed through this afternoon, in attempting to address the House for the first time. While I do offer him my sincere congratulations, I cannot approve of many of the statements which he uttered, or many of the sentiments which he expressed, and I certainly disagree entirely with many of the conclusions which he reached. I had never the privilege of listening to a budget debate before the present debate was brought on, but I had always understood that the discussion upon the budget debate was properly confined, more or less, to matters appertaining to the finances of the country in particular. and to matters of trade and commerce, more particularly as such matters were affected by the fiscal policy of the country and as these matters themselves had an effect upon the finances of the country. But, Sir, I have been enlightened during the past few days as to the scope which is allowed in the discussion of these questions in this House. I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House through all the matters to which he made reference in his speech. I do not think that one is called upon to do so at this time. I believe there are other occasions when an hon. member can more properly discuss questions of transportation, questions as to the Montreal harbour, questions as to the improvement of the Toronto harbour. All matters of that kind he can discuss more properly at other times. However, upon matters appertaining to the trade of the country and upon matters appertaining to the finances, there is no doubt that the discussion was quite relevant to the debate which is now in hand. In my humble opinion, whatever may have been thought, or whatever may be thought, of the amendment which the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) saw fit to move, one thing, at least, may be said for it, and it is that it served for the time-being, at all events, to rescue the discussion from the position of insignificance, to which his own followers were fast consigning it. The hon. member for East Toronto opened his remarks by expressing his keen disappointment at the remarks of the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) during the course of this debate. If there has been disappointment on that side of the House, there have been other matters during the course of this debate which have given rise to disappointment on this side of the House. I think I express the sentiments fairly of this side of the House when I say, that, apart from the remarks of the hon. leader of the opposition himself, the discussion of this question by hon. members opposite has given rise to no slight feeling of disappointment, a disappointment which has arisen from the manner of discussion, from the criticism and the manner of criticism, because, hon. gentlemen seem to have failed in raising this discussion to anything like the level of a budget debate, to anything like the traditional dignity and importance of such a debate. The disjointed and apparently aimless criticism which has been indulged in by some hon. gentlemen opposite has upset all the preconceived ideas of some of us as to what a budget debate ought to be, to the ideas which were formed, not by actual participation in such a discussion, but more from the pages of parliamentary history in Great Britain, or from the pages of parliamentary history in our own country—from the pages of parliamentary history in Great Britain from the days when the Great Commoner assailed the budgets of the administration of a Walpole, or later on, when the younger Pitt, Canning, Burke, and Fox, did not think it beneath their dignity to give their best time and their best thought to the discussion of the principles of finance. It was on the occasion of the budget debate that these principles were discussed, and not mere petty details. Later still, when men of the stamp of Sir Robert Peel, and Lord Derby and Richard Cobden and John Bright, gave their time to the discussion of the financial policy of their country, they employed their best thought and effort in elevating the debate. Throughout the past century and a half at least of British history, the occasion of the budget debate has been an occasion for the discussion of broad financial principles, and not the discussion of mere petty details, and also, I think, it has been so in our own House. We may go back to the days of confederation, we may pass onward from that time until twenty-four years ago, when the late Rt. Hon. Sir John Macdonald moved his celebrated resolution in this House, known as the national policy resolution. While we may disagree as to the principle of that resolution which he then moved, we agree that his resolution was one which involved the discussion of a broad principle. It was a discussion worthy of the occasion, and so it has been down through succeeding years in budget debate. Hon. members who then occupied the opposition benches discussed the question from the standpoint of financial principles. So it has been through succeeding years, right down, one might also say, to the present year of grace when we were treated, not to a dis-

cussion of these broad principles, but to a rambling discussion of the details of government, covering almost the whole of this vast country. Having these matters before us, is it any wonder that we did suffer a little disappointment on this side of the House when we noticed hon. members opposite, in their discussion and in their criticism, degenerating into the merest kind of commonplace, what, all our preconceived notions led us to look forward to as a veritable battle of giants. I am free to admit that it may be to some extent my own lack of information in regard to the details of the finances of this country which has rendered me incapable of appreciating either the force or object of the criticism which has been levelled at the present financial statement. I have not been able to make up my mind whether the object of the critic was to detract from the credit which is due properly to the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) for his admirable financial statement, or whether the real object was one of self-indulgence, of a little self-glorification over some real or imaginary achievement which took place in the early days of the Conservative party. If the object of hon. gentlemen be the first of these at which I have hinted, namely, to detract from the credit which is due the government for their statement as to the finances of Canada, the weakness of the assault which they were able to make has only served to magnify the exceptionally strong position which the government is able to occupy upon that subject, but, if, on the other hand, their object be merely self-glorification over their own greatness of years ago, I am sure that every one in this House will admit that it is the prescriptive and undoubted right of an opposition to extract all the consolation it can from the memory of vanished greatness. But, there is a limit to all things, a line must be drawn, and the time comes when the House demands something more substantial than reminiscences of the last fifteen, or twenty, or twenty-five years.

I believe I have the right to inquire : Upon what principle this question is being discussed by hon. gentlemen opposite. If a principle at all is involved ; what is the principle ? Do they charge that the government in its past management of the finances of this country or in its proposals for the future, has violated some recognized economic principle ? If so, what is the principle that has been violated ? Do they charge that the government in its management of the finances has committed some fundamental error ? Then, what is the error ? Do they charge that the government has been reckless and extravagant or worse ? If that be the charge, then, as a matter of common justice, the government is entitled to have the charge laid in detail in order to be able to meet it. But, failing any charge of that kind, failing any criticism upon any principle, economic or otherwise, is it to be wondered at that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), as far back as Friday last, threw out a mild hint in this House that if hon. gentlemen opposite had nothing more substantial to offer in discussion than had been contributed up to that time, the debate might as well be brought to a close because further discussion was not only unnecessary but a positive waste of the time of the House. There is no doubt in my mind that the timely hint from the hon. minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) was an incentive to the hon. leader of the opposition to put forth some effort to rescue his followers from the humiliating position which they were likely to occupy, and as a result of that effort we have the amendment which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) saw fit to move. It would be charitable to say that that amendment is a creature of unfortunate circumstances. It is a sort of emergency ration which the leader of the opposition has laid before the House. No one can claim that it is an amendment born of any present financial condition in Canada, or justified by any trade condition now existent. When I read the first clause of that amendment I was struck with the idea that the draughtsman, by the language which he had employed, had gone beyond any meaning which he himself intended to convey. But when we remember that the draughtsman was none other than the leader of the opposition himself whose practice of the legal profession has long accustomed him to the use of language, and the use of it precisely and concisely ; we must conclude that the language of the amendment probably expresses his own ideas upon the subject. In order that we may understand each other the better, let us examine that first clause. Does it mean, as I believe it means, that there is not sufficient or adequate protection in Canada to-day ? Does the hon. gentleman mean by the words 'pronounced protection' that the tariff now in force does not afford sufficient protection ? If that is his meaning we can argue it upon that hypothesis. Is it the insinuation of the language he has used that there is not sufficient assurance or encouragement to industries in this country. If that be the meaning we can argue it upon that hypothesis. Certain it is that if such be the real meaning of the first clause of the amendment, it is nothing less than an absolute refutation of the statements made by him and by his followers in this House and in the country. Is it not a fact that for the past four years the Conservatives have charged that the tariff which is in force to-day is what they call the grand old national policy ? Has it not been charged by the gentlemen opposite in this very debate, that the tariff now in force is a thoroughly protective policy? Has it not been charged on the platform and in the press, that the Liberals were unable or unwilling to make a

tariff of their own and that they boldly adopted the tariff of the Conservative party? Do we not remember those stories about the stolen clothes? Was our memory not refreshed a few days ago by the reference of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) to the footpad and the stolen purse. Has it not been the whole claim of the Conservative party up to the time this amendment was moved, that the present tariff in Canada is the tariff inaugurated by the Conservative party and is a protective tariff. Well, if it be correct that it is a protective tariff and that the Conservatives are responsible for it, is it not reasonable to suppose that they thought it adequate and sufficient when they brought it into being and kept it in force so long?

But, Sir, there is a wide difference of opinion upon the question of the tariff in this country, though it may be that the difference perhaps is more over a name or over language than over any real matter of greater account. I believe that with very slight change in the language of clause one this amendment could be made such a one as would commend itself to the judgment of every hon. member in this House. Strike out, if you will, the words 'pronounced protection,' which are objectionable to members on this side of the House. Do not say that we have a revenue tariff as we claim on this side and do not say that it is a protective tariff, as is claimed on the other, but merely make your amendment to read: That by the continuance of the present tariff policy adequate protection is given to the industries of Canada; and then you will have a fair expression of the best opinion of hon. members on both sides regarding the tariff. I do not know that anything in the politics of the country has ever been so persistently and so inconsistently misrepresented as the position of the Liberal party upon the question of the tariff. Hon. members opposite surely must know better than they say in regard to this. Hon. members opposite surely by this time have learned what is the Liberal position upon the question of the tariff. I did not know that the Liberal tariff policy went back as far as confederation, but I have heard to-day that ever since the year of confederation the policy of the Liberal party upon the question of the tariff has been, that we should have a tariff but it should be a tariff of revenue. We on this side of the House realize that we require a certain amount of money each year to conduct the affairs of the country. For the coming year it is to be about $46,000,000, but every year a large amount of money must be provided and the simple question is: How is that money going to be raised?

There are various methods of raising money for national purposes. It might be raised by the imposition of a direct tax; it might be raised in other ways; but the policy of the Liberal party and the present government is that the money necessary to be raised each year to conduct the affairs of the government shall be raised by means of a tariff, and that tariff shall be so adjusted as to produce sufficient revenue. That was the policy of the Liberal party away back in 1872. It was the policy of the administration of the late Alexander Mackenzie, and in the closing years of that administration, at a time when there was not enough revenue to meet the requirements of the public expenditure, it was proposed to increase the tariff—why? Not certainly for the reason suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite, in order that a certain degree of protection might be given, but solely to provide the Finance Minister with sufficient revenue to carry on the affairs of the country. That was the policy of the Liberal party then, and when they went out of power in 1878 they did not change their policy. In succeeding years the policy of the Liberal party on the tariff was the same. They said, we will maintain a tariff, but it will be a tariff for revenue and not for protection. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) quoted some articles on unrestricted reciprocity. It is true, at one time the Liberal party did advocate the principle of unrestricted reciprocity; but that was quite consistent with their advocacy at the same time of a revenue tariff; and I believe it is the uniform opinion in Canada to-day—and in this I believe hon. members opposite agree with me—that a very large measure of reciprocity between Canada and the United States in matters of trade is a most desirable thing, in the interests of both countries. But throughout, the policy of a revenue tariff continued. Then, Sir, in order that there might be no question at all about what their policy was, the Liberals of Canada from one end of the country to the other met in Ottawa in the year 1893 and solemnly laid down their policy in black and white, and spread it broadcast throughout the country, making it so plain that all men could understand it; and in that declaration they said they would have a tariff for the purposes of revenue. Did they not carry out that pledge within a few months after they came into office?

All these facts are just as well known by hon. gentlemen opposite as by hon. members on this side of the House. If that be so, why is there this persistent misrepresentation of the Liberal position on the question of the tariff? I could point out without any very great difficulty some Conservative inconsistencies with regard to the same matter. I can certainly point out inconsistencies in the Conservative view of the Liberal tariff. Why, Sir, when the hon. Finance Minister introduced his tariff in the spring of 1897, hon. members opposite almost to a man stood up and denounced it. They said, you have produced a ruinous

tariff, the attack being led by the hon. gentleman who then led the opposition. He said : You will bring ruin to every industry of Canada if you maintain a tariff of that kind. That was their first position. But when they saw that the industries of the country were going to prosper under the new tariff, that there was going to be no stagnation, but advance and improvement, they changed their song, and said : You have stolen our clothes ; you are maintaining the old policy of protection.

Now, Sir, is it not a reasonable thing to ask that the present tariff and the policy of this government upon the question of the tariff should be judged by its fruits ? I submit that if you judge it merely as an academic problem, or by the results which it has produced in this country, you must come to the same conclusion, that the government are justified in maintaining it. I do not go so far as to say that the tariff is complete, that it is entirely without error. I know some details myself which in my judgment ought to be corrected. But, Sir, it would be a wrong thing at such a time, when trade has become established on certain lines, for any government to interfere with the details of a tariff which would cause unrest throughout the business community. One thing that the present tariff has given to the country, which it never enjoyed before, is stability in the duties levied upon the various articles.

The hon. leader of the opposition said, how can you argue that you have a revenue tariff when you have a surplus? and to back up his theory that a revenue tariff and a surplus are inconsistent, he quoted some utterances of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) away back in 1882, and read some newspaper articles of 1882 which he attributed to the hon. Minister of Finance.

To my mind there is absolutely no inconsistency at all in having a surplus with a revenue tariff. The hon. gentleman knows precisely how a surplus comes about. He knows that the revenue of the country is estimated before it is collected. He knows that the Finance Minister makes a careful estimate of his expenditure and his revenue, and there can be little doubt that if the Finance Minister wished, he could so adjust his tariff that there would not be much of a surplus. I do not think he could come exactly within the figures, but he could come relatively nearer to the exact amount required than he has come this year. But why not have a surplus? Why not be on the safe side in your finances ? If all the money that was required in this country were merely the common annual expenditure of the country, then it would be a wrong thing to have a surplus under a revenue tariff. But we require far more money than we get. Far more money is spent in Canada than is represented by the annual expenditure. Take this year for example : The hon. Finance Minister says he expects to spend about $46,400,000; that is the ordinary annual expenditure. In addition to that, he expects to spend about $10,500,000 on permanent public works and improvements. That brings the expenditure up to about $57,000,000 ; yet all he expects to receive during the year is $53,000,000 He could have pruned his duties to have brought his revenue down to the $46,400,000 if he had so desired. Then he would either have had to abandon the public improvements or he would have had to go and borrow the whole amount necessary to make them. Which course is he to pursue ? The course the government adopts is : We will permit the accumulation of a reasonable amount of revenue, and when it accumulates we will spend it on the public works of the country. We will carry on these public works, and if the surplus is not sufficient to pay the cost, then the small balance will be the amount by which our debt will be increased. I submit that that is good financing. I submit that it is right to provide a small surplus annually, in order that we may expend it in this way. Far better that we should do that than borrow the whole amount we may require and pay interest. That, at all events, is the plan which the Minister of Finance has adopted, and there is nothing whatever in that plan inconsistent with the maintenance of a revenue tariff.

I have also heard it charged that ours is not a revenue tariff, beceause we grant bounties, and bounties are the most extreme form of protection. Well, Mr. Speaker, the bounty system, I admit, is a protective system, and admit also that I am not opposed to the bounty system so long as it is kept within reasonable bounds That, I think, is the principle on which the present government is working. Here, for instance, is a particular industry which needs assistance, and is going to become a permanent improvement and of great value in the development of the country, and to this industry the government agree to pay a bounty. No doubt, that is a principle of protection, and I am so far a protectionist that I agree with that prinicple so long as it is kept within reasonable bounds. I was glad to hear the Minister of Finance declare, in reply to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), that the subject of lead bounties was under discussion. Personally, I see no objection to a reasonable amount being expended in the development of the lead industry, just as such an amount is being expended in the development of the iron industry.

But, what objection is there, on the other hand, to charging these bounties against capital account ? One of the charges made by the hon. member for West York was,

that we were charging these bounties against capital account and not against annual expenditure. Is not that the proper way? Are these bounties an annual expenditure? Are they not precisely in the same position as railway subsidies? Does not parliament vote railway subsidies solely on the principle that they are going to develop the country and will be permanent improvements? If parliament does not vote them on that principle, parliament should not vote them at all. They are voted on the ground that they are going to develop the country, and are in the nature of permanent improvements. Where is that money charged? It is charged to capital account. Where did the hon. member for West York charge such subsidies when in power? He charged them to capital account. Where did every government that was ever in power in this country charge railway subsidies they charged them to capital account. Then, why not charge bounties to the same account. They are not in the nature of expenditure going on from year to year, but will only go on for a few years and then cease. They go to improve the country in a permanent way and should be charged to capital account and not to annual expenditure.

These are matters which struck me during the course of this discussion, but there is one other to which I wish to refer before leaving the subject. I think it was the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) who said that the policy of the government was driving people out of the country, and that men were actually leaving Canada for want of employment. Is not that entirely contrary to the facts? Is it not within the knowledge of every hon. member here that men have come back in large numbers from the United States during the past four years? Is it not a fact that there has been such great mercantile and commercial and industrial development in this country that more labour was necessary than has been employed, and a great portion of the additional labour consists of Canadians, who were expatriated a few years ago but have now returned to Canada? In proof of that statement, take the wail of the New England millowners, that they cannot get operatives for their mills. And what reason do they give? They say that so many French Canadian operatives have gone back to Canada that the mills are short of hands. Take the farms of Michigan, which have been abandoned, and the lumber mills, which cannot get hands, and what reason is given for this lack of labour? It is that the men have gone back to Canada. Is it not within the knowledge of every hon. member, in the particular locality in which he may happen to reside, that many men have come back to reside in their own town who had gone from Canada to the United States in the last ten or fifteen years?

As between Canada and the United States, the movement of population has been entirely in favour of this country. It has caused serious talk on the other side of the line, not only on the question of population, but also on the question of the export of our food products to the old country.

I will not occupy your time further, but will merely advert to the remaining sections of the amendment, and shall do so very briefly indeed. If there is one thing for which I admire the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) it is his courage and persistence in carrying on the debate on that question of preferential trade within the empire, after the manner in which the fallacy of that clause of the amendment had been exposed during the past forty-eight hours in this House. We admire courage and persistence, but I noticed that it was all courage, and nothing to back it up in the shape of reason, because I failed to recognize a single new fact which the hon. member brought to the attention of the House while he endeavoured to convince us that we should give our support to the second clause of that amendment.

Are hon. members opposite sincere in their desire to have Imperial or preferential trade between Canada and Great Britain, as is proposed by the amendment? If they are sincere in that view, they should stop their denunciations of the one act of the Canadian parliament which has brought that greater question within the range of possibility. I refer to the preference which we now give to the goods of the mother land. I have heard it stated here, time and time again, during the course of this debate, that the preference we give Great Britain is no preference at all, that our imports from Great Britain have not increased, that our exports have increased, but not to a greater extent than those to the United States. That may be true, but there is reason for it. The recent increase in exports of the United States to Great Britain is not in connection with goods which Canada produces, but in connection with goods which the United States export and Canada does not. It is in connection with the production of iron and steel probably that the greatest increase is noticeable. But that is an infant industry in Canada, which is rapidly rising to be a great industry. But where we have disturbed our competitors and where the benefit of the preference is noticeable in Canada, is with regard to the agricultural or finished food products which we are exporting to Great Britain. In the matter of cheese, bacon, butter and the like, Canada has far outstripped the United States since the preference was inaugurated, and nobody recognizes that fact more plainly than our friends to the south.

I heard the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) express the most earnest solicitude on behalf of the Canadian farmer.

I was surprised to hear the hon. member for West Toronto do so. He seemed to think that the government of Canada had committed a grievous wrong on the Canadian farmer, because, one result of our preference to Great Britan was a discriminating tariff against Canada on the part of Germany. That may be one of the results. But did not the hon. member for West Toronto realize what a relatively small quantity of goods from this country seeks German markets and what a tremendously large quantity finds its way to British markets? Does he think the Canadian farmer is mourning over the condition of affairs now so vastly improved over what it was a few years ago? Why, if he had expressed his solicitude for these poor farmers, as he put it, five or six years ago, I have no doubt the farmers would have appreciated his sympathy. He has not a single farmer in his constituency, I am persuaded. But he did honour the constituency which I have the honour to represent by sending up some seed grain prior to the last election. That, at all events, is my information on the subject.

Now, is there anything more manifest than this—that the farmers of Canada are in a much better position than they have been in any time in the last fifteen years? Is there any better satisfied portion of this community than the agricultural population? I can tell the hon. member for West Toronto that if the appeal of the government in November last had been solely upon its financial policy and only to the farmers of the country, the result would have been that the ruin which has been wrought in the ranks of our opponents would be as nothing to the ruin which would have followed an appeal limited to the farmers of Canada. The farmers are prosperous, the farmers are satisfied. They do not want parliament or the government to interfere with that preferential arrangement in favour of the goods of the mother land for the sake of a few paltry hundreds or thousands of dollars that might have found their way into the German market on even terms with the rest of the world. I prefer to leave that question of German discrimination as the Prime Minister left it. I think that the mode suggested by the Prime Minister to the leader of the opposition was accepted by that hon. gentleman as the proper one for dealing with this question. It should not be brought up here for discussion; we should not get into heated debate over it, until the government has exhausted all its powers of bringing about a satisfactory arrangement with the German Empire. Until that time, I think, our discussion is out of place. But this reference to the German tariff is not more out of place in this discussion than other clauses of the amendment are out of place. Is there any reason why there should be a change in the fiscal policy of the country? It is true there are some manufacturers that would like better terms. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) felt very sore that any one should mention that the manufacturers had been coming to Ottawa to ask that changes should be made in the tariff. But it is a fact that they have been coming—numerous deputations have come. Manufacturers are only human beings and, like other men, they want to get all the assistance and all the preference they can. And if their coming to Ottawa has the result of securing for them special terms, they will continue to come, but they must not complain if some of their requests cannot be granted. Such sensible business men as the hon. member for East Toronto should not take offence at a mere reference to the class of which he is an honoured member. There is nothing in the affairs of this country, financial, commercial, or otherwise to justify any change in our fiscal policy; but, on the other hand, I submit that if you will judge this tariff, the revenue tariff of the present administration by the results that have been brought about, one and all will say that the government is perfectly justified in maintaining that tariff.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that on this side of the House no fault will be found with the remarks made by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). I certainly think both sides will thank him very cordially for the lecture he has read the House on the proper method of conducting debate. He started out by telling us that there should be a higher standard of debate in this House, and in a rather eloquent burst he portrayed the greatness of English parliaments in the past in which there had been Cobdens and Brights. I presume his modesty forbade him, in the presence of the ministers, instituting a comparison between those hon. gentlemen and the giants of the English Liberalism of the past. But he did make a striking reflection upon the ministers who were present and listening to him, when he held up Bright and Cobden as men who were always martyrs to principle. Certainly he could not lay it at the doors of these ministers that they had ever been true to any principle. Principles they may have known, but principles as things to be suffered for were put behind them long ago. Nature has been kind to them. They are like the famous American politician who said:

> A merciful Providence fashioned us holler,
> In order that we might our principles swaller.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) early in his speech spoke in this high and lofty strain, and I would have thought that, coming from the constituency he does come from—South Wellington, a very grand constituency—he would have represented these high principles of propriety and of elevated

public life there as he does here. But I notice that the other day a banquet was—very worthily no doubt—tendered to him, and he did not condescend to tell the people there of the high state of morality which should exist in politics and the high standard to be maintained; but he did tell the people that they were led up as sheep to the shambles. He explained that the reason why the constituency did not go Liberal in 1896, was because the Liberals had carried on a campaign of cash and wind——

Mr. GUTHRIE. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) will excuse me for interupting him, but I desire to say that I used no such expression.

Mr. BENNETT. I will read from the Toronto Globe——

Mr. GUTHRIE. I have read that report—it is wrong.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman spoke somewhat late in the evening and no doubt this banquet having been in the town of Guelph was not a cold water affair. He is reported as saying that in 1896 the Liberals of South Wellington had fought a campaign of wind and cash, but that his campaign had been one of hard work and hence success. If he was reported correctly, he paid a poor tribute indeed to the intelligence of his constituency in intimating that it was up for bargain and sale. In his speech of this evening the hon. gentleman went on to discuss the policy of the present administration—if policy it may be called. In one thing the hon. gentleman is to be congratulated. He has no unhappy past to look back upon. He is not like the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) or the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding)—he has nothing to apologize for, because he has not been committed to any principle. He has taken his stand, and, I think fairly well. He is a protectionist as long as the protectionist policy is favourable, but the moment it becomes otherwise he is willing, like the ministers, to set his sails to any varying wind. I propose to deal for a little time with some remarks he made with reference to some questions of the debate. He commenced by commenting on the amendment which has been moved by the leader of the opposition. He said he wished to know from this side of the House where this party stood. Well, if the hon. gentleman will take pains to read the resolution he will find where this party stands. He asks if this party is prepared to increase the protective duties on any particular articles; if they are, he says, here is the time and place to do it. Now, let us see what the resolution says :

> That, in the opinion of this House, the welfare of the country requires a pronounced policy of adequate protection and encouragement at all times to the labour, agricultural, manufacturing, mining and other industrial interests of Canada.

Surely there is no uncertain sound about that. It says the country requires a pronounced policy. From this side of the House no apology need go forth as to the past of this party. For over twenty-five years it has stood for a policy of pronounced protection. But here is this marked difference between us and hon. gentlemen opposite, that while we have to a great extent adopted and fallen in line with a protective policy, they have at all times intimated, and by insinuation threatened, that at the earliest possible moment this policy will be cut in twain, or shorn of much of its strength. But it is to be noticed that these hon. gentlemen always have an attachment in the shape of some friendly manufacturers of the same political faith, and the result is that these gentlemen remain protectionists in certain lines and relative to certain industries. Now, there can be no more marked line of conduct mapped out than there is in that resolution stating that the policy of protection must be a pronounced policy. And now we have the warning note that has been sounded by the Minister of Finance, when he told the people of this country, and more particularly the manufacturers, that the time has arrived when they must take in sail, that a commercial storm is coming on. That is a declaration not only to the manufacturers of this country, but to the labouring classes and the agricultural interests as well, and indeed to every interest, because every interest is dependent on the manufacturing interests of the country. I say in view of all these facts it is time for the country to see where the present government stands. If this government is honest in what it says, why have they not the courage to take the tariff as it stands to-day ? The First Minister said yesterday in the House that there was a certain amount of protection on many items, and to his mind that protection should be lessened and reduced. The Minister of the Interior speaking the other day made this remark :

> When we give a preference if it is to be at any one's expense, it is at the expense of the manufacturer and workingmen of Canada. We go a little further and say that it is the policy of the Liberal party of Canada to reduce the duties and to remove to some extent the burdens of the excessive tariff which was imposed upon imported goods by the late Conservative government.

He shows that there are dozens of cases where goods are coming in from the United States, and from that country alone, where the duties are to-day exactly what they were under Conservative rule. Then in the name of all that is honest when these gentlemen denounce that protection, why have they not the honesty to attack

it and reduce the duties ? But they do not rest there. The Minister of Finance, speaking in the House a couple of years ago—I think it was on the occasion of the announcement of the preference—said that the manufacturers of this country must take notice from this time forward that they were not promised immunity from cuts in the tariff, that this might take place on any occasion, and that they should take heed. As I already remarked, the First Minister yesterday made the statement that there was already tariff protection beyond what there should be. I say, then, in face of these statements of these hon. gentlemen, it is time for us and for the country to understand where both parties stand. The amendment moved by the hon. gentleman who leads the opposition states clearly and explicitly that we are going to adhere to a pronounced policy of adequate protection, and there is not going to be on this side of the House from one quarter and from one section a defence of protection, and from another quarter hon. gentlemen standing up in their places and denouncing that policy, as they are doing on the government side to-day, and from different ministers of the Crown we hear these statements and insinuations that they believe that that policy should be cut in two. But, Sir, it is in keeping with the profession of hon. gentlemen ; they think one thing and they do directly the opposite.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman then dealt with the question of a tariff for revenue only, and he went over the old song that this was only a tariff for revenue. Why, Sir, fancy a city council or a town council yearly striking their rate, and at the end of the year having a surplus of $8,000 or $10,000. Would it be said that they had simply struck a rate for revenue and for revenue alone ? The fact of the matter is that these gentlemen are so held up by certain political friends of their own that they are bound in obedience to the wishes of those friends to maintain a high protective tariff on many goods coming into this country from the United States, and that is the reason for the high revenue that has been produced. There are other reasons no doubt for that revenue, one has been the increased values ; and no doubt falling values in this country is one reason why the Minister of Finance saw fit to sound the warning that he did the other day. Another point the hon. gentleman dealt with at considerable length was this: That the time had arrived in this country, in view of affairs as they stand, that we should endeavour to negotiate with the United States a reciprocity treaty. Well, I can only say that the hon. gentleman cannot have read the debates, and particularly the speech of his leader in this House, I think a year or two ago, when he made the statement that the time had gone past in this country for any reciprocity with the United States, that our markets was the market of Great Britain, and not the market of the United States alone. That is a difference between the hon. gentleman and his leader which they will have to reconcile between themselves.

But the hon. gentleman was happy in one thing : He laid down as his political belief and entire honesty of opinion that he was in favour of iron bounties. He was not like the Minister of Trade and Commerce, hampered with a past ; he had not stood up in the House and on public platforms year after year and denounced the policy of giving iron bounties. But the hon. gentleman goes further to-night and says that he is not content to give a bounty on iron only, but he proposes to give bounties on lead as well. That is another point in respect of which the hon. gentleman is to be congratulated on the fact that he has not a political past.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman said that we should endeavour to restrict ourselves to questions of trade and commerce, leaving out what might be termed extraneous matters, and I propose briefly to discuss some matters in that line. The First Minister yesterday drew a line between our policy as enunciated by our leader, and the policy of the government, in the course of which he made this striking statement.

> We agree with them that the revenue of the country ought to be levied by means of customs duties; but there is this difference between us, that while they would levy those duties only for the benefit of individuals, we levy them for the benefit of the revenue, first and foremost.

Now, if customs duties are only levied for the purpose of raising sufficient money to carry on the affairs of the country, then in the name of reason why do they tax people $8,000,000 more than is necessary for that purpose ? He went on to say :

> Our first consideration, in imposing duties, is to produce revenue, and if, as an incident, the manufacturers derive advantage, they are welcome to it. But gentlemen on the other side impose duties, not with a view of levying a revenue and putting money into the treasury, but of putting money into the pockets of private individuals.

Now, let us take the tariff as it stands to-day, and more particularly in reference to the articles which are imported from the United States, hardly a dollar's worth of which comes in from Great Britain, and consequently do not get the benefit of the preference. What does the Minister of Trade and Commerce say to his leader's proposition ? He almost admitted that the duty on furniture is the same as it was prior to these hon. gentlemen coming into power ; and will the Minister of Customs contend to-night that the duty on furniture is levied for the purposes of producing a revenue ? If it is levied simply for the purpose of

protection and not for revenue, why do hon. gentlemen not cut down the duties on furniture, let us have less revenue from that source, and let us have the benefit of the lessened price ? Take the question of carriages ; if there was any one part of the population to which these hon. gentlemen, when in opposition, did appeal, it was to the farmers of the country. How the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and the hon. Minister of Customs used to cry over the woes of the farmers ! The duty on coal oil was an abomination to them. If the hon. gentlemen only came to power there would be a revolution in trade matters, and the way in which the hon. Minister of Customs, who is present to-night, and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, hope to relieve the farmer is by increasing the duty on the cutter that he is bringing in from the United States. Was that to raise the revenue ? If taxing the farmer's cutter was for the purpose of raising the revenue, why did not the hon. Minister of Customs tax the jewellery of the rich in order to produce revenue ? The hon. Minister of Customs may follow in this debate, and it will certainly be amusing to hear the hon. gentleman try to reconcile himself to the position, that when he wants to raise the revenue, he does not increase the duty on the jewellery of the rich but increases the duty on the farmers' cutters. These hon. gentlemen wanted to increase the revenue, and as a result they have taxed the tobacco of the poor man, they have taxed the sugar of the poor and the rice of the poor, raising upwards of $2,000,000 of revenue by the increase on those articles. They are taxing the boots and shoes and some other articles which are not imported at all from Great Britain, upon which no preference is obtainable, but which come in from the United States, and these hon. gentlemen are not at all imposing these duties simply for the purpose of raising a revenue. but they are giving what they have to give, and what I am glad they have to give—protection to the manufacturing industries of the country. Had these hon. gentlemen been true to their pledges prior to 1896. they would have been swept out of Ontario and out of the whole Dominion on the 7th of November. The hon. member for South Wellington spoke of these hon. gentlemen having principles. We have found that their only principle is the principle of distributing amongst themselves loaves and fishes and hanging on to their salaries. If there was one question above all others that these hon. gentlemen have waxed eloquent over, it was the question of the duty on coal and iron. One could turn up in the newspapers of the time speech after speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Customs himself, in which he pointed out to the farmers that their agricultural implements were too high in price because of the duty on coal and iron. He said that high bounties were paid to the producers of iron, and for that reason agricultural implements were too dear. He said that if these men could not maintain themselves without these bounties and high duties, let them go to the wall. Now, the hon. Minister of Customs knows that he made that statement time and time again ; he knows that he waxed eloquent over it. The hon. gentleman sits there now, smiles benignly, and draws his salary, while he is false to his principles. There is another feature of this question, and it is that if these hon. gentlemen were afraid that by lessening the duties they would diminish the revenue, there was a good way for them to get out of the difficulty, and that was by making good the pledges of economy which they gave to the people. Why, they made the welkin ring from one end of the Dominion to the other. In regard to the number of cabinet ministers, they pointed to the example of the United States, where there is a less number of ministers, and they said : When we come into power there is going to be a lesser number of ministers, and all along the line large economies are to be practised. The hon. Minister of Customs knows how well that pledge was kept. As soon as the government achieved power, he was advanced from the position of a controller to that of a minister, and they paid him a year and a half of back salary, or, as an hon. gentleman says, two years salary. These gentlemen, who are compared with Cobden and Bright, with men who were willing to go out of office at any time by reason of adherence to their principles, have nothing in common with such statesmen. There is nothing in common between the two ; all their principles have vanished and gone to the winds. The hon. member touched upon the question of the British preference, but he touched that rather gingerly, and very little was said in reference to it. As the question is an important one to the people of the country, I intend to take up the time of the House for a few moments in regard to it. Where do the political parties stand on the question of the British preference ? The right hon. leader of the government was yesterday assailed by the hon. leader of the opposition in this, that he went before the electors, and, notably in his speech in London, committed himself to the policy of preferential trade with Great Britain. What can be meant by preferential trade if not a mutual preference conceded on either side ? These hon. gentlemen, realizing that this policy was a popular one, adopted it in the elections prior to 1896, went to the country, and told the people they were favourable to a preferential duty. We all know that at that time there was a strong feeling being worked up in England in that direction. Mr. Chamberlain's utterances on different occasions pointed to that fact, and when the movement was blooming, it

was all swept away upon the occasion of the fateful trip of the right hon. leader of the government to England, when he declared in London, at the celebrated meeting of the Cobden Club, that Canada did not want a preference at all. So, these hon. gentlemen are in this position that they are averse to having a preference for Canadian products in the markets of Great Britain, while we stand committed by the text of this resolution to the principle of a mutual preference between this country and Great Britain, and by that policy we are prepared to stand. In the same connection, I would refer to the question of trade with Germany, and I beg to state that we are here to-night to say, and the Conservative party are a unit on that, I believe, and not only the party here, but, I believe, a very large number of Liberals throughout the country, are in accord with the sentiment, that any country, Germany, or whatever it may be, which pronounces against us by an antagonistic tariff, will be met by us, that we are not going to lie under such a rebuke, but that we are going to hit back, and hit back with double force. That proposition should be doubly favourable in the Dominion of Canada, by reason of the fact that everybody knows that under this so-called British tariff, which is a sham and a delusion, there is no country which is getting greater benefits in Canada than Germany itself. What is the position of hon. gentlemen opposite on this question? When they first came here with that policy they made the statement that the policy would work out all right, that Canada would only import British goods; but it was pointed out that the British market was being invaded by German, Belgian and other European goods, and that we would of necessity be importing these goods under the British preference tariff. It was then stated that a considerable portion of the work on these goods must of necessity be done in Great Britain before they would be entitled to the preference. It was easy to tell the House that, but a difference arose in the minds of the appraisers of customs at different ports of Canada as to what really was a considerable portion of the work, and the result was that hon. gentlemen were forced to announce a new proposition, and that was, that so long as 25 per cent of the work upon these articles was done in Great Britain, they would get the benefit of the preference. To-day, as a matter of fact, the preference is not upon 25 per cent in favour of Great Britain, but upon 75 per cent in favour of Germany. While Germany is prepared to strike at us, I say it behooves the people of Canada to strike back, and, speaking for myself, I say that I believe that the interests of the artisans and the manufacturers of Canada should stand higher with any governemnt of Canada than the interests of Great Britain or any other country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) made some very wild statements as to the beneficial effect on Canada of sentiment in Great Britain. He told us that our exports to Great Britain had gone up by leaps and bounds by reason of this preferential tariff, but if he had taken the trouble to consult the statistics he would know that the reverse is the case. He told us that we exported more cheese to Great Britain than we did a few years ago, but in that he was mistaken. He does not seem to know anything about it. Here are the actual figures on that score. In 1898 we exported to Great Britain 196,220,771 pounds of cheese, and last year we exported 185,759,750 pounds, a decrease in round numbers of 11,000,000 pounds. Where does the question of sentiment come in there? In 1898 we exported 8,429,249 pounds of ham, and last year we exported only 2,793,078 pounds. We do not seem to have sold more hams because of the sympathy in Great Britain for our preferential tariff. I might go on and quote further to show that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) was far astray when he talked of sentiment increasing the trade between Canada and Great Britain. Why, the fact is, and every common-sense business man knows it, that the Britisher will buy the necessaries for himself and his family in the cheapest market, and he will not pay half a farthing a pound more for sentiment. I contend, Sir, that the preference to Great Britain is not in the interests of the people of this country as a whole. Experience proves that we import from Great Britain such commodities as are not used by the masses of the people, but rather by the classes, and therefore whatever benefit there is in the preference is a benefit to the more wealthy of the people of this country. Look at the Trade and Navigation Returns to prove that. In 1898 of silk and manufactures of silk we imported $1,413,973 worth, whilst last year we imported $3,151,697 worth. There is a marked increase in an article that is used by the wealthy classes of this country, and as a result the rich instead of the poor are getting the benefit of this preference. Take the importation of jewellery. In 1896 we imported $295,141 worth, and in 1899 we imported $578,785 worth. If you go through the returns it will be shown that the articles which are imported from Great Britain to a great extent are not used by the masses, but by the wealthy classes. The Minister of Finance in his budget speech announced that the time had arrived when the people of Canada should take heed as to the future. Any one who looks around the country and sees the existing conditions will know at a glance there can be no doubt as to that. In the town of Almonte a large woollen mill has been closed down. There are other woollen industries in the province of Ontario closed down to-day, and you cannot go into any

town in the province, more particularly in towns where there are manufacturing enterprises, that you do not see signs of depression. In the once thriving town of Paris in South Brant there is advertised a house for sale with a recommendation that it would be a desirable summer resort. Has it come to pass that the once manufacturing town of Paris is reduced to a summer resort? In South Ontario, the once thriving town of Whitby, where the Joseph Hall agricultural implement works were, has a place advertised as a desirable summer residence for people living in Toronto. All over, the fact stares you in the face that the time has arrived when we have got to do what the United States are doing, namely, make for ourselves a protective tariff and by that protective tariff stand or fall.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. There can be no doubt in the public mind as to where the two political parties stand on this question. The Conservative party stands where it always did stand, and that is: That so long as the great people of the United States are manufacturing as they are, there is only one recourse for the people of Canada, and that is to maintain a high protective tariff. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) made the statement that had there only been the question of the policy of the government brought into the last elections in Ontario, the government would have made a better showing. He did not assign any reason why the govenrment did not have a larger following from Ontario, but he must know very well why the Liberal saddles were emptied in that province. Year in and year out for eighteen years the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) and others of their ilk, proclaimed for commercial union at one time, for free trade at another time, for unrestricted reciprocity with the United States at another time, but they were always the undying foes of protection in every shape and form. They pictured to the farmers that they were being bled white for the benefit of the manufacturers, and that they were bearing the heat and burden of the day, while the manufacturers were growing rich. The farmers took them at their word. They believed they were honest men.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BENNETT. The farmers listened to them for years and believed them, but when the opportunity came these gentlemen deceived the farmers. The Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) knew the storm was coming. He saw the last Speaker of this House (Mr. Bain) quit politics because he had not the hardihood to go into his riding after his party friends had violated all their pledges, and that riding is represented to-day by a Conservative. Where is the former member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who posed throughout all Canada as the apostle of economy. He too has been buried with the Liberal dead. I could go along those benches opposite and name the member from Ontario who year after year denounced extravagance and iniquity when in opposition, but who, when in power, practiced what they denounced. And where are they to-day? Well, some of them who for years in this House denounced the Senate as charnel house for dead and decayed politicians, have been fortunate enough to secure a resting place in the Upper Chamber; others have got comfortable positions in the government service, and the balance are trying to get there. The government met us in the fight and they defeated us.

But there is no man knows better in his heart than the premier himself that this government has got the greatest slap that any government ever got in the province of Ontario. The reason they got that slap was that the people of Ontario were prepared to take these hon. gentlemen at their word, and they were weighed in the balances, and were found wanting. The hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) the other night said: 'If we have lost in Ontario, remember we have captured Quebec.' The hon. gentlemen are quite welcome to have Quebec on the terms they got it. They conducted a campaign of race and religion in the province of Quebec; and wherever they could introduce the same campaign in the province of Ontario, they did so, and did so successfully. They introduced it in Glengarry, which has a large French population, and that is the reason they carried that county. They introduced it in the two ridings of Essex, where there is also a large French population, and that is the reason they carried them. I was amused at hearing the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), in seconding the address this session, express the hope that these cries of race and religion would be buried and put out of sight. That hon. gentleman was in my riding in 1897, when there was a by-election. I had been unseated. At that time the French Canadians—and there are about 500 voters in that locality—were sympathizing very keenly with their fellow-countrymen in Manitoba, who they thought were deprived of their school rights. The hon. member for Bonaventure came there. He did not appear in the English parts of the constituency, but he could be found in the French settlements day in and day out. And the hon. gentleman never came back to redeem the pledge which he made on that occasion. The pledge was this: He first asked that

the government might be excused for not having passed a Remedial Bill in their first session, on the ground that they had not time ; but he said there was a session coming on in 1897, and if a Remedial Bill were not passed then, he would come back there and denounce the government at the earliest opportunity. The hon. member has not been there since. He will be like all the Liberal speakers who come into that part of the riding, firing the heather, as they do, with incendiary speeches on race and religion. I do not presume that he will ever come back. If he does, he will be the first of the kind who ever did. They always come with the same old story. Wherever they find a French Canadian population in Ontario, they are found making these incendiary speeches.

The hon. gentlemen have brought this fight on themselves. They have done it all through the province of Quebec, and I believe that as the people of Quebec rejected the Mercier government for pillaging the country, in the same way they will reject this government. These hon. gentlemen have won, but how have they won ? They have won by setting province against province. They have lost in the province of Ontario ; they have won in the province of Quebec. True, they have gained some advantages in some of the other provinces; but from the banner province of Ontario they have come back disorganized, broken up and battered in a way that no political party ever came from that province before. And when these hon. gentlemen again pass in review before the people of this country, then we shall be prepared to leave the issue to the people ; and the great issue that must divide the two parties in the next general election, so far as we on this side of the House are concerned, must be that Canada shall have, if it is in the power of a Liberal-Conservative government to grant it, that measure of protection to the artisans, the merchants, the manufacturers and the agriculturists, which will make Canada the happy and contented country that it has been under the benign influence of the national policy which was introduced by the Liberal-Conservative party in 1879.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose I should add much to the dignity of this discussion, if I were to follow the example which has just been set by my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) who has just taken his seat. The strength of the blow which the government received in Ontario, or the manner of their victory in Quebec, or anything appertaining to the elections which recently took place, are matters very far removed from the subject of the debate. I am not aware that the fact that there is a summer residence to let in the town of Paris has much to do with the great question now engaging our attention. But I take exception to one statement which the hon. gentleman made, that the British preference was of no use to the people of this country. If it has been of no other use than to reduce the burden of taxation by 25 per cent on all British goods, that in itself would be a justification for the introduction of the preferential tariff. It not only brought about that reduction, but it also reduced the cost price of all goods with which imported British goods come into competition. But I do not desire to enter into that phase of the discussion. I wish to confine myself to the question before the House. I am quite willing to leave the foraging around amongst elections and the history of Canada since confederation to our friends opposite, and try to deal with subjects which are germane to the conditions by which we are surrounded.

I desire, before I address myself to the resolution, to find a little fault with some remarks that fell from the leader of the opposition—not because they were grave in themselves, but because they assume a gravity coming from one who occupies the position he does as one of the leaders in this House. He stated—and he appeared to reproach us for it—that our trade with the United States was assuming larger proportions every day. Now, I do not think there is any reason why he should feel sorrowful because our trade with the United States is growing larger every day. A trade that is growing larger, no matter with whom it is being conducted, results to the benefit of those who engage in it, or they would not continue it for a single day. Our people do not import largely from the United States because they especially like goods from the United States. We buy there, because we can buy there cheaper than we can anywhere else in the world, and cheaper than we can produce the goods for ourselves. The fact that we imported from the United States last year a hundred million dollars worth of goods is not a matter of regret to me, but one of great satisfaction, which would be only enhanced were the amount two hundred million of dollars instead of one hundred million. No trade can be carried on between nations that is not mutually profitable ; and the mere fact that the trade exists between the United States and ourselves is the best evidence that it is profitable, or it would not be continued. I go still further, and say that if we bought from the United States large quantities of goods and they did not buy a single cent's worth from us, there would be no evidence that that trade was not profitable to us ; because it does not matter with whom we do trade, it is always bound to be profitable. Let us take the two items of coal and corn. The United States is the only country in the world where we can buy coal and corn as cheaply as we buy

them there. We can buy them there more cheaply than we can raise them here, and that is the reason why we get $5,000,000 worth of corn and about $5,000,000 worth of coal from the United States.

In those two items alone, roughly speaking, we get about $10,000,000 worth of goods. What do we do with those goods? Do we destroy or waste them? No, we simply convert that raw coal into heat and power, and the corn into cheese and bacon and butter. We become the manufacturers of these goods by the use of that corn and coal, and send the products to Great Britain, and that country puts them into the muscle, nerves and brains of her sons, who again re-export the outcome to Australia and the other various colonies, who in turn send it in another form back to the United States. In the meantime, what has taken place? We have converted $9,000,000 or $10,000,000 worth of the United States raw product into the manufactured article. We have sold it to the British consumers, who have converted it into another finished product, which they have sold probably to the people of Australia, who have reconverted it into another finished product, and they in turn sell to the United States something the people of the United States want. That $10,000,000 worth has gone around the world, and the nations that have handled it have made money in the transaction, and yet in the transaction the United States have not bought one dollar's worth from us. That is the secret of all trade. It does not matter whether our imports from the United States are greater than our exports, that must necessarily follow if our exports to Great Britain are greater than our imports. Those are some of the laws of trade, and, therefore, instead of being a matter of regret, it is a matter of great gratification that our trade was as great with the United States as it was during the past year.

The hon. gentleman also took exception to the statement of the Finance Minister with regard to tobacco. He said, that in the interests of the consumers of the country, the protective system introduced into the manufacture of tobacco should be removed. I object entirely to his ideas on that subject. If there ever was an item into which the principle of protection should be introduced, it is an industry that this country is capable of perfecting within itself, without the assistance of any outside country. We have the elements in our country, if properly encouraged, to grow the tobacco that the people want, and that kind of natural product which can be stimulated by protection, I am prepared to protect to a very high degree. What has been the result with respect to that tobacco industry? At the end of four years, it has been so stimulated that we now grow nearly one-half the tobacco we use; and if in a short period of time the promise put forth by that trade blossoms, as I expect it will, the growing of tobacco will be one of the established industries of this country, and the small sum which the people are now paying in the form of protection, they will be amply repaid in the very near future. Last year some $600,000 or $700,000 were spent among the farmers on the tobacco plant. Some twenty-five or twenty-six factories have been established for the purpose of manufacturing that tobacco, and those trade journals and tobacco dealers that a few years ago condemned the action of the government in protecting or encouraging this Canadian industry, are rapidly being converted to the view that the action of the government then was right, and that it inures to the advantage of the country.

I do not desire to occupy too long the time of the House. Many things have been said on the opposite side that deserve reply, but there are matters in this resolution of more importance than even some of the statements which hon. gentlemen opposite have made. The resolution says that:

> In the opinion of this House, the welfare of the country requires a pronounced policy of adequate protection.

The question then presents itself to my mind: Have we at present a policy such as our friends desire? If we have not, we certainly must have altered the policy which existed for eighteen years, and which the leader of the opposition says, in this resolution, he desires to restore and perpetuate. Yes, there was a change made in the tariff policy when the present government assumed office—a marked change. A tariff was adopted that was objected to by our hon. friends opposite. A policy was adopted that has resulted in an era of prosperity such as Canada never before experienced, and in order that we might realize the different conditions which prevail now, compared with those which prevailed during the last years of the protective policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, let me compare the results of the two policies during a short period of years, and see which is the best for the people. I can assure our hon. friends opposite that the people of this country do not care what you may call a particular policy. Call it free trade or revenue tariff or protection—call it what you like, it is the results that the people are after. And if these results are such that we have a condition of affairs in this country preferable to any we have had under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, it does not matter what you may call the policy to which that prosperity is due. Let me briefly draw your attention to the marvellous progress which we have made during the past three years, and then ask you if you are prepared to go back to the conditions that existed before the trade policy of this government was established. That policy has brought about a marked change in the financial conditions of the country. We were for years accustomed to add large

sums annually to the national debt, but we have arrived at the period when the amounts added to the debt are gradually growing smaller; and, in my opinion, if we practice the economy we should, there is no special reason why we should materially increase our debt in the future. We have every evidence during the past few years of magnificent success. Exception has been taken to the fact that during the past years we have had such a marvellous surplus. I admit that too large surpluses are not a good thing for the people to have. But what are we going to do? There has been such a tremendous development in the country during the past few years that a surplus was inevitable. Was the government to rearrange the tariff every few years? Every time there is a surplus must the government take the duty off this article, and every time there is a deficit increase the duty on the other? We have either to submit to a surplus or to tariff tinkering, and of the two I would rather submit to a surplus. This surplus is something our hon. friends opposite do not care to contemplate, and, therefore, they take us back to 1882-3 in order to show us that during the regime of the late government surpluses existed as large as those of to-day. But they have not learned the lesson which different conditions bring about. They have not learned that under one tariff a government may have a large surplus, while the people themselves are getting lean, and that under another form of tariff, the governemnt will have a large surplus, while, at the same time, the people are waxing fat.

Now, let us take these two years 1882 and 1883. In these years there was a surplus of $14,000,000—there is no doubt about that. But go to the savings banks and see what was left to the people after the government got through. In 1882, the savings of the people in the savings banks amounted to $97,900,000, and three years afterwards they had fallen to $95,000,000. In other words, while the government had a surplus of $14,000,000, the people were $2,000,000 poorer than before. Is that the condition under which the present government has accumulated a surplus of $14,000,000? Oh, no. We have a surplus of $14,000,000 in the treasury, but besides this $100,000,000 has been added to the savings of the people in the savings banks. Therefore, the conditions are entirely different and they must not think that because they had no cause of congratulation over their surplus, we have no cause of congratulation over ours. But I do not wish to dwell on this subject too long. I might go on to show how trade has increased during the past three years and attribute that to the trade policy. I might show how the goods entered for consumption have increased by $138,000,000 during the last three years over the preceding years or over 40 per cent; that our exports have increased by $117,000,000 or 35 per cent. I could go further and show how our exports to foreign countries have increased from $35,000,000 to $65,000, or 70 per cent; I could show you how our exports of manufactured articles have increased from $7,000,000 to $8,000,000 during the first six months of 1900. I could show that the exports of Canadian goods in 1895, were $105,000,000 and in 1896, $110,000,000, while during the first six months of this year, they have already reached the sum of $91,000,000. I could show how the exports of 1895, were $99,000,000, and in 1896, $106,000,000, while, in the first six months of this year they had already reached $108,000,000—that is our trade of the first six months of this year is as great as the whole year 1895 or the whole year 1896. These are reasons why we should not make sudden changes in the tariff policy of our country. If we can show such magnificent results, it is exceedingly desirable that we should remain true to the conditions that have brought them about; and I am in favour of approving the present condition at least until it brings about such a state of affairs as we used to know under hon. gentlemen opposite in days gone by. Looked at from any standpoint you like, you find that the conditions of this country are most satisfactory in every respect; I do not desire unduly to prolong my remarks, but I would like to say a word or two with reference to the second part of the resolution which the leader of the opposition has placed in your hands, that referring to the preference:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the adoption of a policy of mutual trade preference within the empire would prove of great benefit to the mother country and to the colonies.

I take exception to that statement entirely. It would be disastrous to the mother country and it would be disastrous to Canada. In the first place, I object to this resolution on account of its indefiniteness. Each man can put his own construction upon it. If this resolution had been brought down in such a form that it would have expressed itself clearly to each individual, we should all see it alike. As it presents itself to me, it would be attended with disastrous results if we place upon it the only construction we fairly can, in view of what we know to be the attitude of Great Britain. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think that all we have to do is to go across the water and ask our British friends for this preference, and we shall receive it. I would ask these hon. gentlemen, I would ask any speaker that follows me to mention the name of any British statesman on either side of politics that ever stated publicly that we could have mutual preference with Great Britain. I can give them the names of the leading statesmen of Great Britain who have said that this subject cannot be even discussed on any basis except the basis of free trade.

There is not an English statesman that has given any greater encouragement than that: We may give you free trade, but that is the only basis on which we can even discuss the matter. Are we prepared to discuss the mutual preference on the basis of free trade? Is there a man on either side of this House who would accept a mutual preference of that kind? And is there the faintest possibility of Canada getting a preference of any other kind than one based upon the principles of free trade? I challenge any hon. gentleman on either side of the House to mention the name of a British statesman who has ever given them the slightest encouragement to believe that they could get it on any other terms. The only man who has said that it was capable of being discussed even on the basis of free trade is Mr. Chamberlain himself. Lord Rosebery is against it, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, the Chancellor of the Exchequer is against it, the president of the board of trade is against it. All the great leaders of public opinion have spoken against this preferential policy; they have said that it would ruin the empire, instead of making it stronger; they have said it would be a standing menace to the nations of the world and would array against Great Britain and her colonies the powers of the world in a commercially hostile attitude. I can quote the words of Lord Rosebery and of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach and Mr. Ritchie, the president of the board of trade. And I will quote his words in order to set my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) straight. To-day, I asked that hon. gentleman to read all of the address from Mr. D. Ritchie. He did not have it handy apparently or he did not want to read it. I will read it now, in order that the House may understand exactly what Mr. Ritchie did say:

He thought that the strict Manchester school was passing away, and although England would never depart from her free trade policy, she might arrange a closer connection with Greater Britain. How this was to be done he did not indicate.

That is what the hon. gentleman said on that occasion, and what was read to-day. But he said more than that. His language was considered by some who were present to have given encouragement to the idea that a preference would be given to some of the colonies; and, later on, at the same meeting he craved the indulgence of the audience to disabuse their minds of any such idea:

Mr. Ritchie subsequently asked leave to say that he in no way favoured the imposition of duties on any manufactured article imported into this country. It seemed to him impossible to conceive that a 5 per cent duty on our foreign imports would help the colonies, and he strongly supported the fundamental principles of free trade. So that his remarks about a possible plan for a zollverein was a mere pious wish.

That is a portion of Mr. Ritchie's speech that the hon. member for East Toronto did not read, and the impression that he tried to convey to this House that the president of the British Board of Trade was in favour of this, was misleading, because he did not give us that gentleman's opinion, who says himself that he is opposed to interfering with the principles of free trade. What does Lord Rosebery say?

Of all the mad things we have heard in our days, the re-enactment of the corn laws is the maddest we can possibly conceive.

What does Mr. Chamberlain say?

But the principle which I claim must be accepted if we are to make any, even the slightest, progress is that within the different parts of the empire protection must disappear.

What does Mr. Mulhall say, the great statistician who has just passed away?

Mutual trade preference in favour of the colonies of the empire would be ruinous to the latter, and would ultimately break up the empire.

We have here the testimony of the men of Great Britain who speak with authority, and who state that they cannot discuss the proposition except on the basis of free trade. We have the authority of such men as Rosebery, Mulhall and others that it would be ruinous to the empire. Yet in face of these strong declarations of these men who speak with authority, whose position in the political world of Great Britain gives significance to what they say, our friends opposite deliberately introduce a resolution which they know is entirely impracticable, because it would be injurious to the people of Canada. They know that we can get no preference in Great Britain on any principle but that of free trade. Are they prepared to accept that? Not one of them has the courage to say that they value a preference in Great Britain high enough to be willing to destroy the manufacturing interests of this country. I am quite willing to accept any trade advantage that any country is prepared to offer us, but I am not willing that the industrial establishments of this country, which have been encouraged and built up with great labour and at great sacrifice, should be destroyed in trying to get free access into the British markets. I am hostile, as a Canadian, to an arrangement of that kind.

I believe that the future has in store for us a better fortune than to be limited in our trade, even with Great Britain and the islands beyond the sea. I believe that the development that is taking place in this country of ours gives promise of a condition of affairs that will enable Canada to take a more important place in the trade, not of the empire only, but of the entire world. It is only recently that we are beginning to realize the tremendous potentialities of this Canada of ours, the magnificent natural re-

sources that are the heritage of the Canadian people from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It is only now that capitalists are beginning to discover the magnificent mineral wealth stored up in the womb of nature, and they tell us that they are in a position in reference to steel, the great trade regulator, apparently, the great trade barometer of the world, where we can manufacture it $5 or $6 a ton cheaper than it can be made at Pittsburg. Within a short period of time we will be among the principal iron and steel producers in the world. Should we not halt before we tie ourselves up to a little bit of an arrangement that will stimulate our trade slightly with the islands beyond the sea, and will lose to us the tremendous possibilities that appear to be so near us in the future? I say yes. I say let Canada have her liberty. Let us keep the right to make what trade arrangements we like with Great Britain. Let us, if we choose, give to Great Britain a preference, and let us take it away if we find it to our interest. Let us make trade arrangements with Germany, if necessary, that will advance the interests of our own people; let us make trade arrangements with the United States, if necessary, that will add to the comforts and happiness of our people; but do not let us tie our hands with entangling alliances, even with Great Britain and those other Britons beyond the sea. I am a Canadian first, I want this Canada of ours to prosper. I do not want to be crippled in our liberty to do the best we can by nationality or by any other tie.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words more upon this question, but having quoted the testimony of those distinguished men that you have heard, that there is no possibility of getting a preference except upon the basis of free trade, it would be a waste of time to give my own opinion; and I would not have quoted those men but for the fact that they occupy positions so eminent as statesmen of Great Britain. It is simply a dream on the part of our hon. friends opposite to try to get through the second part of the resolution.

But what about the third part? Let me examine that for a few moments.

> This House is further of opinion that equivalent or adequate duties should be imposed by Canada upon the products and manufactures of countries not within the empire in all cases where such countries fail to admit Canadian products and manufactures upon fair terms.

Now, that is a resolution that appears quite reasonable, that is a resolution that I most heartily endorse. But, I claim it is a resolution that is not necessary to present here to-night. That is the law of the land to-day. Three or four years ago that was made the law of the land. That is exactly what we have been doing. But our friends opposite have been sleeping during the past four years, and now they trot out a resolution that they want us to endorse, and say that we should have two tariff policies, one for the people who use us well, and one for the people who do not. Why, that is the policy of the present government, that is what gave rise to the preference. We realized that Great Britain was the only country in the world that had been treating us as we thought right by admitting our goods free within her borders, and we selected her out from the world to enjoy a special benefit under our double-headed trade policy, a benefit that now amounts to 33⅓ per cent. Our hon. friends opposite remind us of Rip Van Winkle who slept for so long a time. They have been sleeping for four years, and now they try to make us believe that they have discovered a remedy for some of the ills that we are supposed to suffer from. No, this principle has been in force, it is the law of the land now; its wider applicability will doubtless engage the attention of the government. I am satisfied to leave our case in the hands of the government who, for the past four years, have managed our affairs with signal ability, with great fidelity and in the interest of the people. I have not the slightest doubt that the negotiations that are going on between our government and Germany will result in more good than the speech that was made by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) to-night on that same question. I am prepared to assist the government, I am prepared to leave the destinies of the country in their hands, and my reason for it is that during the past four years this country has been so exceptionally well governed that we can look forward with confidence to a continuation of that kind of government, and a continuation of that prosperity which this country has enjoyed from the time the present government took control of affairs until the present moment.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose following the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) who has just taken his seat, as I had only the pleasure of listening to a very short portion of his remarks, and am, therefore, unacquainted with his arguments. However, I presume, they are much the same as those we have listened to from other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, so that I may not be so handicapped as I otherwise would be. Nor is it my intention at this hour of the evening, and at this stage of the debate, to occupy the attention of the House for any great length of time, as the budget speech has already been so ably and fully dealt with by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that very little is left for me to say of an original character. I will, therefore, say what I have to say in as succinct and concise a manner as I possibly can. The financial statement of this session differs from previous budget speeches that have been delivered in this House since 1896, inasmuch as it does not partake

so much of the nature of a stump speech as those we have listened to from the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding); but, even yet, he has not arrived at that stage that he can cut himself entirely free from his old time proclivities in this respect.

However, this is a growing time, and we can at least congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance on his improvement along this line. He was candid enough to say that we are now on the crest of that wave of prosperity which has visited Canada during the last few years, a prosperity that, I may say, is not at all indigenous to Canada. It has been universal in its character, and it would be a strange thing, to my mind, if, in a country so favoured as Canada has been by the hand of a kind Providence, with her vast mineral wealth, with her great agricultural resources, with her fishing and lumbering industries, if, amidst this world-wide prosperity, she did not enjoy her share. While he has told us that we have reached the crest of the wave of prosperity, and that we may look for a contraction of our revenues in the near future, that we cannot expect our revenues to keep pace with their present rate of increase, our great expenditures, which have been going forward with leaps and bounds since the Liberal government came into power, will not, in keeping with this expected contraction of our revenue, suffer any material reduction On the contrary, he has intimated to us that his intention is to introduce an inovation in the method of book-keeping, by which as much as $1,000,000, which he intends to pay out in bounties on steel and iron, will be transferred from the consolidated revenue account and looked upon as capital account, in order that he may be able in future to make a better financial statement, and which will have the effect of destroying, for comparison's sake, future statements with those of the past. The contention of hon. gentlemen opposite that this great expansion which Canada has been enjoying of recent years is due to a new policy on their part is as ridiculous as it is egotistical. Is it owing to that policy that the highly-protectionist country south of the international boundary line is enjoying her great expansion of trade? Is it because of that policy that free trade England's commerce has gone forward with such great strides, and that she is experiencing such great commercial activity during these years? Do they also claim credit for the expansion of trade and great prosperity that have visited every country under the sun, with the exception of famine-stricken India? They might do so with almost as much reason as to claim that Canada's commercial prosperity is owing to any new departure on their part from the policy of their predecessors, which they roundly denounced with such vehemence for eighteen years. The only credit due this government in this connection is that they have followed in the footsteps of their predecessors, though the doing so has entailed the entire repudiation of their anti-election pledges and policy while they were in opposition. It is also owing to the fact that they have impressed upon capitalists the truthfulness of the statement that these hon. gentlemen, in advocating their free trade heresies and in giving these anti-election pledges along this line, were simply giving vent to so much claptrap intended to humbug the people, in order that they might reach the treasury benches. And, having arrived at the goal of their ambition they have thrown consistency to the winds, and have embraced the foster child of protection, which they previously declared had brought the country to the verge of bankruptcy under the Conservative regime. The cause of our national prosperity is not far to seek. It is owing to a succession of good crops, fair prices, caused by the world's demand, and hon. gentlemen did not increase the world's demand, the development by the investment of foreign capital of our vast mineral wealth, as well as the thrift, energy and enterprise of our population. These are subjects and elements over which the government had no control save the retarding of that prosperity to a certain extent by their obnoxious mining laws, and their general maladministration of the affairs of the Yukon.

Now, when our opponents are driven to extremities, they fall back upon that one-sided preferential trade with Great Britain, and give that as the reason of our prosperity; but, here again, they forget that while our imports from Great Britain have increased to a certain extent, we are increasing our trade with every country in the world. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) showed, the other night, that England stands eighth on the list of countries in this regard. While imports from Great Britain have increased to a certain extent during the past few years, they have increased in greater proportion from the United States. The explanation given by hon. gentlemen opposite is, that we import such a large volume of raw materials from the United States. But, as was shown by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) the other night, there has been an increase in dutiable goods of nearly 40 per cent in our imports from Great Britain, while there has been an increase in the imports of dutiable goods from the United States of over 41 per cent. Not only that, but the trade of the United States with Great Britain has increased in greater proportion than has the trade between Canada and Great Britain, notwithstanding the preference which England enjoys in our markets. The hon. Minister of Finance spoke as if there was some doubt as to the position of the Conservative party on the preferential trade question, and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard-

Cartwright) stated that he expected that with a new parliament, and with a new leader, the Conservative party would have some new policy to bring forward. That hon. gentleman was so accustomed, himself, while he was on this side of the House, to bringing forth a new policy after each succeeding defeat, that he thinks we are going to adopt the same course. We all know the course that he pursued—unrestricted reciprocity, free trade, freer trade, commercial union, and what not. Whenever he was defeated upon the cry that he had raised, he would announce a new policy, and he thinks we are about to do the same. We know a good thing when we see it, and we are quite contented with the policy which was laid down in 1878, and which has been adhered to by the Conservative party, subject to the changed circumstances of the country. If we have been defeated in 1896, and in 1900, it was not upon our trade policy, but upon other issues that hon. gentlemen opposite would do well to leave unresurrected. The hon. Minister of Finance has asked : If the Conservative party are not in favour of this preference, why do they not bring in a resolution to repeal it ? That is simply begging the question. Surely the hon. Minister of Finance has not so short a memory that he cannot recall the resolution introduced into this House by the Hon. Mr. Foster, on March 20 of last year, and supported by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. It read as follows :

> That this House is of opinion that a system of mutual trade preference between Great Britain and Ireland and the colonies would greatly stimulate increased production in and commerce between these countries, and would thus promote and maintain the unity of the empire, and that nothing which falls short of the complete realization of such a policy should be considered as final or satisfactory.

There is nothing very indefinite about that. That was the policy of the Conservative party during the last parliament. It is the policy of the Conservative party to-day. That policy has practically been incorporated in the resolution introduced by the present leader of the opposition, with the additional clause that Canada should take precaution to protect herself against unjust discrimination and unfair treatment on the part of such countries as Germany. That is a policy that I venture to say would meet with the unqualified approbation of the people if placed before them, divorced from any other issue. The position of the leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on preferential trade has been one of duplicity from its very inception down to this present day. Did not the Prime Minister in the campaign of 1896 tell the electors of Canada that he was just as much in favour of preferential trade with Great Britain as was Sir Charles Tupper ? What did he mean by that ? Did he mean this one-sided preferential trade we have now ? Not at all ; he meant a mutual preference. That was what was understood by the Liberal party, and that was what was understood by the people of Canada. Not only that, but the Prime Minister declared he would be more likely to get this preference in the old country markets with his tariff for revenue, than would Sir Charles Tupper with his protective tariff. The Prime Minister called to his aid the Colonial Secretary as an authority, who stated that the time had now arrived when this very progressive step should be taken. The right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier also stated that if he were selected to be leader of a government, one of the first steps that he would take would be to send a commission to Great Britain to negotiate the basis of such a treaty. You would imagine that a gentleman having respect for his sacred word of honour, the leader of a great political party would have at least attempted to implement his pledges. Did he make the attempt ? No. Did he not go to Great Britain and in the very first speech he made on landing, at a time which was most opportune for this movement, when this Imperialistic sentiment was gaining force day after day, and week after week; when the premiers from the other colonies were there ; when the olive branch was held out by some of England's statesmen ; did not our Prime Minister, instead of embracing that opportunity to do something for his country, did he not betray his country, by telling them what Canada gave to Great Britain she was giving as a free gift, and not only did she not ask a return, but she actually did not desire any. And we saw the extraordinary spectacle of the Prime Minister of Canada actually advising the statesmen of Great Britain not to give us any such return, because it would cause a departure from the free trade traditions of England which had made her so great. We therefore, see the Prime Minister of England's colony advising the statesmen of Great Britain what should be their internal policy. Was that what the people of Canada expected from him ? Had Sir Wilfrid Laurier told the people of Canada in 1896, when he was seeking their suffrages, that if he were elected leader of a government he would give a preference to the old country in the Canadian market for their products, while at the same time he would advise English statesmen not to give us a preference in their markets, do you suppose he would be occupying the position he does to-day ? Certainly not. The Prime Minister had dwelt upon the great advantage such a policy, put into practice would confer on Canada, and when such a gentleman threw cold water upon the scheme in his very first public utterance. After arriving in England is it at all strange that since that time some

discouraging remarks may have fallen from the lips of the Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain. The set-back this question has received is due to the Prime Minister of Canada, and upon his shoulders the responsibility rests. In 1896 Sir Wilfrid Laurier was the advocate of what some Liberal statesmen of to-day call this absurd policy, and even now some of these gentlemen seeing that it is gaining force in public opinion are afraid to state that we will not have it, and have it in the near future. What did we find at the meeting of the British Empire Trade League, which was held in this building a month ago? We found that in the annual statement presented by Col. Dennison, the president of the association, he lauded this enterprise; he advocated an inter-Imperial preferential trade; he stated that the time was most opportune for making these advances because now that the Australasian colonies were becoming a federation, he felt confident the people of Great Britain would meet such advances from the colonies with very favourable consideration, and we found further that this report met with the approbation and the vote of every member of that league present, Grit and Tory alike. There was not a dissenting voice against it. In fact the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) made a very eloquent speech in favour of what some of his friends term that absurd policy. What else did we see? We saw that the Hon. G. W. Ross, Prime Minister of Ontario, wrote a letter to that meeting strongly advocating this policy, declaring that he was in favour of it, and that he felt sure that this policy would at this moment meet with great commendation on the part of British statesmen. That, Sir, is a pretty good indication that a provincial election is looming up in the near future in the province of Ontario. We have had this hon. gentleman (Hon. G. W. Ross) making two or three speeches on this question, each contradicting the other, but adapting them to the occasions and audiences according to party necessities. He made a speech in favour of preferential trade a few years ago, and during the last election he went to the province of Quebec in order to help his political friends there, and he made a speech directly the opposite. It seems indigenous to Liberal prime ministers that they should have the faculty of making speeches on the same question, each differing from the other on different occasions. In fact they seem to be experts in this business, and wherever the bell wether jumps the flock follows. I have no doubt they surprise themselves at the celerity with which they adapt themselves to their contradictory and inconsistent course. Having, however, in view the fruits of office; having in view their reward, what do they care for consistency? The new and up-to-date Liberals believe in practical politics, and are not wedded to any theory no matter how high sounding the title of it may be. I have prepared a detailed statement of some of the imports into the province of Manitoba, and I have selected that province because it is an agricultural province, as well as the province one of the constituencies of which I have the honour to represent. It is also a province where the people have manufactures few and far between, and where they were told by Liberal speakers in years gone by what a great advantage it would be to put the Liberals in power, as they would be able to obtain the necessaries of life, and the necessaries of the farm at lower rates, because of the reduction of duty, and by the placing of many of them on the free list. I take the large agricultural machines and articles in which a great deal of money is invested by the farmers of that province, and the following table will explain the results:

Imported into Manitoba year ending June 30, 1900.

	Gen. Tariff, Value.	Duty.	Pref. Tariff, Value.	Duty.
Fanning mills.....	$ 1,674	$ 418 50	....	....
Windmills	6,647	1,661 75	....	....
Mowing machines.	63,779	12,755 80	....	....
Cultivators	630	126 00	....	....
Binding attachments	3,051	610 00	....	....
Drills (seed grain).	26,369	5,273 80	....	....
Harrows	22,141	4,428 20	....	....
Harvesters, self-binding and without binding	300,816	60,162 80		
Horse rakes	43,604	8,720 80	....	....
Ploughs	175,201	35,040 20	....	....
Portable engines..	150,405	37,601 25	....	....
Threshers and separators	107,198	26,799 44	....	....
Sewing machines..	13,103	3,930 90	....	....
Stoves	13,245	3,311 25	....	....
Farm wagons.....	2,290	572 50	....	....
Coal, bituminous..	40,674	10,809 19	....	....
	$970,827	$212,222 38		

I have heard Liberal members of this House tell the farmers that the duty has been reduced from 35 per cent to 30 per cent or 25 per cent on what kind of articles? Shovels, spades, pronged forks, and other small articles in which the farmers invest only a few cents every year; but of these large items, in which they invest a great deal of money, there has not been a single dollar's worth brought in under the preferential tariff, but they are subjected to duties ranging from 25 per cent to 35 per cent.

Now, passing from the trade question, I desire to discuss another feature of the government's policy. The government, and especially the Minister of the Interior, have taken great credit for what they are pleased to term the inauguration of a vigorous immigration policy. But wherein does their policy differ from that of their predecessors?

What new feature has been introduced of a meritorious character that would warrant them in claiming special credit for their efforts in this direction ? If spending about twice the amount of money as their predecessors did for immigration purposes ; if by largely increasing the number of agents and affording comfortable berths for numerous political friends ; if in order to pad out the immigration returns to make as good a showing numerically as possible for this large outlay, it is desirable to have the country flooded with thousands of Southern European immigrants who are totally unfitted for pioneer life in a new country, and who have in many instances become a burden on the public treasury ; if the system in vogue for calculating the number of immigrants who become permanent settlers in our country is the one formerly condemned by those now in power, as one entirely misleading and unreliable ; while no reliable method has been adopted to ascertain accurately the number of settlers who have actually remained in Canada ; if, I say, these are the features on which the government and its friends base their reasons for claiming that they are entitled to the approbation of the electorate, for this so-called vigorous immigration policy, then I am quite willing they should be judged on those grounds, and am not in doubt as to the verdict.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he is going somewhat outside of the question, and I may be permitted to state now what the rule is. When the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means is before the House, any question may be discussed ; but when some amendment has been moved, only the subject mentioned in the amendment can be discussed. If we turn to Bourinot, at page 549, we see the rule well stated :

> When an amendment has been moved to the question for the Speaker to leave the Chair, discussion should be properly confined to its subject-matter.

This rule has always been observed in England and has always been observed here also. I do not find anything in the amendment under which the question of immigration could be brought up.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Would you mind reading the amendment, Mr. Speaker ?

Mr. SPEAKER read the amendment.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I think my remarks are quite germane to that motion, which deals with the question of protection to our labouring classes.

Mr. SPEAKER. The immigration policy of the government and the question of protection are two different questions altogether. The rule has been observed so far, and I think it would be well not to bring into discussion any other questions than the questions which are dealt with in the amendment.

Mr. MONK. Surely—if you will allow me, without taking exception to your ruling—it is possible to refer to the condition of the labouring classes under the question of the protection of the labouring classes, which is mentioned in the amendment. Is it not possible for my hon. friend, under that part of the amendment, to refer to the classes in the North-west whose condition has been rendered so difficult by the importation of all these aliens into the country ? There is, I think, very great latitude given to those who address the House on an amendment to the motion to go into Supply or into Committee of Ways and Means. In fact, it has been the custom in the past, certainly since I have been in parliament, to allow the very greatest latitude on such occasions. We have perhaps drifted away from the rules in that respect, but we have discussed almost every grievance imaginable under such motions, and unless we depart from that custom, whether it is the rule or not, I think we should allow some latitude.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would not like to make any rule contrary to what has been the practice in previous years. In fact, I have looked over the authorities on the question, and it is very clear to me that when an amendment is moved to the motion that the House go into Committee of Supply, the question which should be discussed then is only the question which is mentioned in the amendment. Besides, I think the hon. member is quite mistaken when he says that it has been the custom in late years to discuss general questions under an amendment. The question was discussed in 1878 and in 1885, and it was decided in those instances in our Canadian parliament that when an amendment is moved, the discussion should be confined to the subject-matter of the amendment.

Mr. MONK. Of course, my hon. friend could wait until you put the main motion, and then repeat all the remarks he is making at present.

Mr. SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. MONK. It is for that reason, perhaps, that so much latitude has been allowed in the past, because my hon. friend would merely have to suspend his remarks until the main motion was before the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure there will be no question as to the accuracy of the ruling you have rather suggested than given. It may be that having called the attention of the House to the rule, you will not press it too closely, because the amendment is a somewhat broad one. While I know that the rule has been departed from, so far as I have any suggestion to offer, it would be that it

should not be pressed too closely now, but that you should be content rather to state it as a reminder to the House. There can be no question, however, that the rule which you have laid down is a good rule, and that the more closely we keep to it the better it will be for the order of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. After the budget speech has been disposed of, and amendments are made to motions to go into Committee of Supply, my recollection is that we have been kept closely to the rule ; but until the budget speech has been disposed of, we have been allowed to discuss different questions. But when the budget speech is disposed of and a specific amendment made, then hon. gentlemen must confine themselves to the amendment.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the case now.

Mr. CLANCY. You have not made a ruling, Mr. Speaker, but merely suggestions. It seems to me that my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) is fairly within the rules in discussing that special part of the resolution which relates to the labouring classes. He is pointing out that these classes are not being protected as it is suggested by the resolution they should be. And as an instance of the want of protection, he is pointing out that a very undesirable class of people are being brought into this country to displace our own labouring men.

Mr. SPEAKER. I merely wish to point this out to hon. gentlemen. Since the amendment has been moved, I have noticed that, in some instances, there has been discussion on matters which certainly do not come within its scope. I know that every member of this House is anxious to observe the rules as much as possible, and I thought it well to state the rule so that every one should do his best to follow it as closely as possible.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I shall certainly try to keep within the rule, Mr. Speaker, and will make my remarks as brief as possible. In fact I would have concluded them by this had I not been interrupted. I was merely going on to point out that a large number of foreigners have been brought into this country to enter into unfair competition with our labouring classes and that many of our trade societies have been passing resolutions asking the government to cease this policy.

I wish to draw attention to the number of immigrants brought in during this past year and the unfair competition to which the people of Manitoba have thus been submitted. I find, according to the immigration returns, that during the past year 41,499 immigrants were brought into Canada. Of this number there were 15,916 Galicians, Doukhobors, and miscellaneous nationalities, leaving but 25,583 of the better class of immigrants. These have cost Canada nearly half a million of money, or $434,562.61.

Mr. McCREARY. What are you quoting from?

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I am quoting from the report for the year ending June 30th, 1900.

Mr. McCREARY. There were no Doukhobors brought in then.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The report also claims that 14,215 settlers came in from the United States, but when we turn to the list of homestead entries, we find that there were only 1,307 entries made by people from that country and allowing 3½ persons to the family, which has been the custom in the past, that only accounts for 4,182 settlers, leaving upwards of 10,000 unaccounted for. And according to the evidence given before the Agricultural Committee by the superintendent of immigration, there has been no method adopted by which the department is aware whether those people remained in this country or not. As soon as they cross the boundary line the bonus of three dollars for every male over eighteen, two dollars for every female over eighteen, and one dollar for all under that age, has been earned and the check which the conductors keep of those people is the only evidence that they are supposed to become permanent residents. These people might stay in this country but a month or two, and then go back to the United States and we would be none the wiser.

To maintain the large staff of officials we have in the immigration service in the United States, Canada paid $86,171.18 during the last fiscal year. That is what those settlers from the United States cost us. We have over 400 agents on commission or salary, and when we take into consideration the large number of Doukhobors and Galicians, and miscellaneous nationalities amounting to 15,916, the greater portion of whom, notwithstanding what hon. gentlemen opposite may say to the contrary are totally unfit for pioneer life in a new country——

Mr. KENDALL. Did you ever see a Doukhobor ?

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Yes, the hon. gentleman does not resemble them at all. In my own constituency where several thousand of those Galicians are located in colonies, where they were dumped down so that they may retain their old habits, and refuse to become assimilated with the general public, there was, during the late campaign, no feature of the government policy which came in for so much denunciation at the hands of the electors, both Liberals and Conservatives as this feature of their immigration policy.

Mr. KENDALL. Doukhobors or Galicians ?

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Both. Our provincial government finds it necessary, because of this large influx of ignorant and uneducated people, to bring in a compulsory educational Bill at this session of the legislature and it is not right that they should be compelled to incur a largely increased expenditure for this purpose, that they can ill afford, on account of the policy of the Minister of the Interior. And I hope in this connection that this government will hand over to the province of Manitoba the school lands and the school funds now held in trust for that province and properly belonging to it, to be administered by the local authorities for educational purposes, as they are in a much better position to do so to better advantage than the Dominion government can possibly hope to be.

It has been claimed by our opponents that the days of the exodus are past, and our people no longer seek homes in the country to the south of us. But, I find on looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns that settlers effects to the amount of $1,095,536, were exported from our country during the last year, which is a pretty good index that the exodus against which they declaimed so loudly in years gone by, is still in existence.

Railway subsidies and steamship subventions which came in for so much denunciation at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite when they were on this side of the House, I notice are still being voted as in the days of the Conservative administration only more so. Millions of dollars of public funds are annually voted for railways without any adequate return to the people, which has possibly done more to create that agitation for government ownership, an agitation that first arose in the progressive province of Manitoba, and which is gaining force every day in other portions of the Dominion, than almost any other act of the government.

In the matter of steamship subventions, our farmers were told that the country was bonusing vessels to ply between Australia and Vancouver to bring into unfair competition with our mutton the mutton from the Australian colony. They did not tell the farmers that before a pound of that mutton could be landed on Canadian territory it had to pay a duty of 35 per cent under Conservative administration. Actually Liberal campaigners hawked about cans of Australian mutton as an illustration of the unfair competition our farmers were being subjected to. After carrying on such a warfare you would imagine these gentlemen, on coming into power, would have taken the first opportunity either to abolish the steamship subventions or at least to raise the duties, and thus give more protection to our farmers.

Did they do so ? Why, on the contrary we see that steamship subventions are continued as much as they ever were in the past ; and not only that, but, mutton is being imported in increased quantities under the tariff which gives a preference of 33⅓ per cent. In looking up the Trade and Navigation Returns, I found that in 1896 we imported into Canada 22,299 pounds of mutton, the duty being then 35 per cent. Last year, ending 30th June, 1900, we imported the enormous quantity of 565,401 pounds, which paid a duty reduced by 33⅓ per cent. So, if our farmers were suffering and burdened by this keen competition in 1896, how much keener must that competition be when thirty times as much mutton is being imported under the reduction of 33⅓ per cent. When the tariff was submitted to the House in 1897 by the present government, it created a great deal of dissatisfaction amongst the western people, and even among the western representatives, because they knew the pledges upon which they had secured their seats. They knew that promises were held out to the people that they should get their raw material free. When the tariff was brought down the Liberal speakers had to do what they could to let themselves down easy. They told us that, of course, we could not expect the government, at one feel swoop—to use a favourite expression of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright)—to give us free trade. We were to have free trade on the instalment plan. But year after year has gone by, and now instalments are overdue. No further instalments have been paid, and free trade on the instalment plan has not been effected, and is not the shibboleth of the Liberal party to-day. Free agricultural implements was the cry of the past. We heard denunciations of the rebates on duties paid to the manufacturers of implements to enable them to send machines to farmers living in foreign countries thousands of miles away, to enable them to buy those implements cheaply, and to compete with our own farmers at an advantage. I find by the return brought down in response to a motion presented by myself that these drawbacks are still continued, and that, for the year ending 30th June last, they amounted to $245,151.46. Now, I might go on and comment upon the extravagance of the government, but that point has been so fully covered that I need not occupy the time of the House. We all know that the public debt, which, we were promised would be reduced, has been increased by $7,000,000 ; that the expenditures which were to have been reduced by one, two, or three millions, have gone up by fourteen millions ; that the taxation of the country, which was to have been cut down has also been increased by

several millions—and still the carnival of extravagance goes merrily on. It is time that this government should call a halt to the useless waste of public money. If they are not able, during a time of great prosperity, when we have great expansion in our imports and our exports, when the trade of the country has been leaping up as it has been—if they are not able, notwithstanding that millions of dollars have been wrung out of the pockets of the people as a surplus by unnecessary and unjust taxation, to reduce our expenditure or to apply any portion of the surplus to reduce the national debt, how can we expect to effect such a reduction when we are sliding down the wave, upon the crest of which we now are, according to the Finance Minister. In the time of prosperity wise statesmen prepare for adversity. Otherwise the reaction that is sure to set in will create a commercial panic, and already there seems some sign of an approaching period of depression. While we are not pessimists—and, in that respect we differ from hon. gentlemen on the other side, for we do not believe in decrying the fair fame of our country for the sake of gaining a petty political advantage—yet, as citizens of the country, when we see the government drifting recklessly along, it is our duty to warn them of the approaching storm so that by cutting down their expenditure, and by judicious administration, they may fortify the country against commercial disaster. In accordance with my usual custom, I will not trespass long upon the patience of the House, but will content myself with these remarks, seeing that the subject has been so thoroughly threshed out.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 20, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Rathbun Company.—Mr. Britton.

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—Mr. Malouin.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette).

QUESTIONS.

THE DOUKHOBORS.

Mr. WILSON asked :

1. Have the Doukhobors settled in the neighbourhood of Yorkton petitioned the Dominion government, objecting to our land, marriage or registration laws?

2. If so, did the government refer said petition to Mr. Maude, the English Quaker who was chiefly instrumental in their immigration to Canada?

3. Is the government aware that the Doukhobors have issued an 'Appeal to all nations of the world,' asking if they will be given a refuge from Canadian tyranny?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. A petition was received from the immigration commissioner at Winnipeg, under cover of a letter dated July 10, 1900, purporting to be signed by twenty-nine of the Doukhobors, making certain objections to the land, marriage and registration laws.

2. The department sent a copy of the petition to Mr. Maude, in order that he might communicate with the signers of the petition and remove their misapprehensions in regard to Canadian laws.

3. The department is not aware that the Doukhobors had issued an appeal to all the nations of the world, asking if they would be given a refuge from Canadian tyranny. The department is informed that a Russian (not a Doukhobor) named Bojianski undertook to make trouble with the Doukhobors. He got up the original petition referred to, and has now caused to be printed a document, to which reference is made in the question, in a Winnipeg paper known as The Voice. The department has no reason to believe that the utterances of Mr. Bojianski represent the views of the 7,500 Doukhobors who are settled in the North-west, or any substantial portion of them.

COWAN'S BRIDGE, VICTORIA COUNTY, ONT.

Mr. VROOMAN asked :

1. Was a grant of money made towards assisting in rebuilding Cowan's bridge across Pigeon river, in the township of Emily, county of Victoria, Ont.?

2. Has said bridge been built?

3. If so, has the money been paid over?

4. If not, why?

5. If not, is it the intention to revote the grant ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. In the supplementary estimates for 1899-1900, the sum of $1,500 was voted as a contribution towards the renewal of Cowan's bridge over Pigeon river.

2. No report has been received that the bridge has been completed.

3. The money has not been paid over.

4. Because no report was received of the bridge having been completed, nor an application made for an inspection of it. The appropriation lapsed on August 15, 1900.

5. The government is making further inquiries before deciding to ask parliament to revote the amount. We are led to make these inquiries in consequence of the statement that has been made to us that the hon. member for South Victoria, in the course of the recent election campaign, in the western part of the riding, denounced the government for having granted this aid, declaring that the expenditure was unnecessary and extravagant. We are endeavouring to ascertain as to the accuracy of this report, and inquiring again as to whether there is any doubt about the propriety of the appropriation before making up our minds on the subject.

B. C. IMMIGRATION INDUSTRIES.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been drawn to an issue of 'The Province,' of Vancouver, B.C., dated November 24, 1900, in which a report of an interview with the Hon. Clifford Sifton, Minister of Interior, is given and of which the following is a portion, viz.:—

'I may as well tell you the importance of the mining industries of this province have never been so fully borne in upon me as during this last trip of mine. It is a subject of great scope and one that must be treated with all possible care and consideration. I shall therefore urge upon my colleagues the advisability of appointing a strong and thoroughly competent commission to inquire into the whole matter and report at an early date. The commission, if appointed—and I have every reason to believe it will be—would deal not only with mining but also with matters of smelting and refining; in fact, it would take up and report upon the whole connection which the mining industry has with the general business of the country, including of course its relation to the customs tariff and the bearing which that has on it.' Also the Minister of Interior stated that action on the report of the said commission might safely be expected within a year from that date.

2. Has the government decided to appoint said commission?

3. If so, when? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. No.

2 and 3. The matter is under consideration.

B. C. MINERAL RESOURCES.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Is the government aware that Mr. J. B. McArthur, president of the Rossland Board of Trade and Chamber of Mines, and also president of the election committee of Mr. W. A. Galliher, M.P., made the following remarks at an interview which members of the Rossland Board of Trade had with the Minister of Mines for British Columbia, during last autumn, viz.:—

'Mr. Sifton is going to take up the question of the advertisement of the mineral resources of British Columbia, and in fact of the whole of Canada. I am not prepared at the present time to disclose all he says, but he is going to take it up energetically in connection with the Yukon. He is also going to take up the silver-lead question, and there is no doubt whatever in his mind that the government will protect that industry, and an important announcement will be made by him shortly, in fact, something will be done within the next sixty days.'

2. Was Mr. McArthur authorized by the hon. the Minister of the Interior to make such a statement?

3. Is it the intention of the government to afford adequate protection to the silver-lead industry?

4. As the sixty days mentioned are now long past, when may the important announcement by the hon. the Minister of the Interior be expected?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. The attention of the government has not been drawn to Mr. McArthur's statement.

2. No one outside of the government has been authorized to make any statement regarding the fiscal policy of the government.

3 and 4. The question is under consideration.

CANAL EXPENDITURE.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth) asked :

1. What amount was paid by the government for construction or improvement of canals in each year ending 30th June, 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1900?

2. How much of this amount was paid on account of contracts entered into by the late government and not relet?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The amount paid by the government for construction or improvement of canals in each year ending 30th June, 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1900, is as follows :

Year ending	Amount.
June 30th, 1897..	$2,348,636.91
1898	3,207,608.29
1899..	3,899,277.31
1900	2,639,564.93

2. Of the above amounts, $4,132,251.32 was paid on account of contracts entered into by the late government and not relet.

VANCOUVER DRILL HALL.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Is the government satisfied with the manner in which the contractors for the new drill hall in Vancouver, B.C., have so far carried out the work?

2. Is it not a fact that a considerable portion of the building fell down, owing to faulty material or workmanship?

3. Has the government had any report from their agent in British Columbia, or the clerk

of works, in regard to this? If so, to what is the collapse of the building attributed?

4. Will the government insist on the contractors rebuilding the same without extra compensation?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier):

1. The manner was satisfactory excepting that a part of a gable wall was built during a period of bad weather.

2. A portion of one gable fell out. The officer in charge of the works reports that there is nothing faulty in the design or material of the fallen portion.

3. The government agent in British Columbia has reported that one of the gable walls is the only portion which has failed, and this he attributes solely to a period of bad weather.

4. Rebuilding without extra compensation is provided for in the contract.

DUTY ON LUMBER.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, duties should be levied upon lumber imported into Canada corresponding with those now existing upon lumber entering the United States.

He said: I caused this motion, Mr. Speaker, to be placed on the Order paper early in the session, but at the request of gentlemen interested in the lumber business, to a very great extent, in the province of Ontario, I refrained from moving it. I did so in deference to the opinion of these gentlemen, who believed that it would be in the interest of the lumber trade that the motion should not then be made, and the reason they gave for coming to that conclusion was that numerous representations were being made to the government for a change in the lumber duties. In view of the fact that the hon. Minister of Finance stated the other day in his budget speech that there would be no changes in the tariff during the present session, it may be rather superfluous on my part to make any remarks. I am prompted, however, to do so by a consciousness of the duty which I owe to my constituents, especially those interested in the lumber business. That business, not only in Ontario, but in the other provinces, is a very important one. In it millions of dollars have been invested and thousands of our Canadians find employment at remunerative wages. And it has been a matter of satisfaction in the province of Ontario, during the past few years, that the lumber industry has been encouraged by the local government to a great extent and is in a much better position than in former years. The improvement is due to the law passed by the Ontario legislature, which compels the manufacture in that province of all pine logs cut within its domain. That law has had a most healthy effect. Mills that were closed for many years are now in active operation, and a large number of new mills have been built, particularly on the north shore of Georgian Bay. While we have in Ontario a large output of white pine lumber, in the United States as well as Great Britain there is a great demand for that lumber, and the result is that we have had for a number of years past a large trade in that article, not only in Great Britain, but in the United States. But while the Canadian government has very generously allowed American lumber to come in free of duty, our lumbering interests are hampered to a great extent by the high tariff on lumber going into the United States.

Turning to the trade and navigation reports, I find that during the past year there was imported into Canada no less than $3,614,557 worth of the products of the forest. These imports came from various countries but more particularly from the United States. I shall not read the table in its entirety, but will ask hon. gentlemen to give their attention to this fact, that we are bringing into Ontario, into the Dominion, no less a quantity than $887,274 worth of oak. I have always understood that we have large hardwood areas in Ontario, and it seems rather strange that while the United States are imposing high lumber duties against us, we are actually permitting them to ship free of duty this large quantity of timber into our country. The effect of the introduction of that oak must be to lessen prices of our other hardwoods.

Coming to pitch pine, I find that no less than $398,211 worth was imported into this country. Now, pitch pine is a strong competitor with our own lumber. It is used largely for structural purposes, bridge-building, and in many other ways, and the result of bringing it into this country is to displace a certain amount of our own product.

Coming down further I find that of lumber hewn or sawed, square or sided, we imported $199,415; that, too, must stand on the basis of the other, displacing a certain amount of Canadian produced lumber. Coming down further I find that of shingles we imported $45,253; of staves, we imported $72,876. Now, I know that in the stave industry there is a considerable amount of business done in this country. In the riding of East Simcoe that industry has been developing for a number of years past, and it does seem unfair that we should permit the people of the United States to bring staves into this country free of duty while they are placing high duties against similar articles passing from this country into the United States. Then even in the matter of wood for fuel we brought into this country $28,421 worth. Surely we have enough fuel wood in this country without permitting the United States to introduce their wood here. While these importations amount to a very considerable sum, $3,614,557, I do not claim that they affect to a

great extent the prices of our Canadian lumber, although in many instances it is alleged, I believe, by those who are interested in the trade, that they have interfered to a great extent with the prices. But the pernicious principle lies in this circumstance, that if we are to permit that trade to increase, it will in all probability go on year after year, and we will find to our regret that they will introduce a larger amount of this lumber into Canada in competition with our own than they are doing at present. Now, I will not give my own opinion alone on this question, but I will read from a report of a meeting held in the city of Toronto of the Lumbermen's Association of Ontario, of which Mr. John Waldie, a gentleman well known in Ontario as a lumberman, is the president. In an address which Mr. Waldie delivered to the association on the 29th of last January, he made these among other remarks :

> Lumbermen have always been free distributors of money, and as another result of the manufacturing condition attached to the business, it has elevated the people of Ontario in the eyes of our neighbours and strengthened the sentiment of national self-reliance amongst our people. We must continue to insist that our Dominion government shall adopt a tariff against lumber and all wood products entering into competition, remove them from the free list, and relieve the lumber industry from the unequal competition of lumber manufactured and freighted under more favourable conditions. To-day, labour, machinery and mill supplies are higher in Canada than in the United States, and when low transportation rates on lumber are given from the southern states, we in Ontario are placed in competition with the cheap coloured labour of the south; and lumbermen in new Ontario and British Columbia are at a disadvantage when competing with Oregon and Washington Territory for the trade of our prairie province. The advantages given and favours shown by the whole country to Manitoba while a young and struggling province are surely entitled to consideration, and that province now being of age, may fairly be asked to accept the general policy of the government equally with the other provinces.

From the newspaper report that I read at the time, I believe that Mr. Waldie's views were approved of unanimously by the gentlemen who were present, all of whom were interested in the trade. Mr. Waldie appreciated and seemed to comprehend that the only trouble the government might have would be opposition from the North-west Territories and from Manitoba to a proposal to place an import duty on lumber. In reference to that, Mr. Waldie makes the very pertinent remark that the province of Manitoba and the Territories should be quite willing to bear their portion of the brunt of any tariff legislation, and that if it bore heavily upon them they, in return for the concessions that had been made to them in the past, should be willing to put up with any such burden, if burden there should be. Now, I might also quote from the same report a memorial presented to the government by the British Columbia Lumbering, Shingle and Manufacturers' Association, to show that not only in the province of Ontario, but likewise in British Columbia, men who are interested in this great industry find that they are suffering from an unfair, unequal and unjust discrimination.

Since the Minister of Finance has announced his policy, I suppose the lumbermen will have to bow their necks to the inevitable, and they cannot hope for any redress. But it is not only on behalf of the lumbermen that I speak, but to a great extent on behalf of the mechanics and labourers who are employed in the lumber industry. No man, unless one who has lived in the lumbering district, can appreciate the great change that has been wrought in the province of Ontario by that most wholesome principle that has been adopted by the Ontario government. I, Sir, living in a town where the business of cutting lumber is carried on to a great extent, have had the pleasure of knowing that three or four hundred men have come back to the province of Ontario who had been living in Michigan where the lumber industry had gone, transferred from Ontario almost in its entirety. These men, after working in Michigan ten or fifteen years, are returning to their own homes and to their own friends. Now, in face of the fact that the American government seems determined to harass and to heckle, as they are doing, the lumber industry in Canada by these high duties, the duty on white pine alone being $2 per thousand, is it not high time that our government should intervene ? And is there any wonder that gentlemen like Mr. Waldie, the owner of three large mills in the town of Victoria Harbour, seeing the stand taken by the government of the United States against this industry, should be one of those who, even at the risk of being called tariff tinkerers, have come here, and I presume almost on bended knees have asked the government to intervene and to make this change.

Now, I do not know whether I am correct in making this statement or not, but I am informed by gentlemen who are in the lumber industry in the province of Ontario, that the time has arrived when the prospects of that industry are not so bright as they were a few years ago ; that to-day the lumber yards are filled to a great extent by high classes of lumber ; that the high grades are not in demand to-day so much as they were. While the lower grades have met with a ready sale, the high grades of lumber are not meeting with the ready sale that they would wish. Now, in view of the fact that millions of dollars are invested in the business, in view of the fact that millions of feet of lumber are lying to-day in the province of Ontario, and I presume in the other provinces as well, is it not high time that the government should ask themselves whether some measure of fair-play should not be accorded to

these gentlemen who are in that business; and whether, since the people of the United States have turned a deaf ear to the applications of the lumbermen on this side to remove their hostile tariff, this government should not at least hit back against the American government to the extent of imposing duties as high as the duties that now prevail against our lumber passing into that country? For these reasons, I beg to move the resolution that stands in my name, hoping that before the close of the session in the event of the government making any changes in the tariff, should they be pleased to do so, the first and foremost among those changes will be one which will tend to produce the result that our lumber will be admitted free into the United States market, and if it is not admitted free of duty, that this government will then retaliate, if I may use that term, by placing equally as high duties agaist lumber coming into this country as are now imposed on our lumber going into the United States.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I am sorry that I cannot agree with the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) in his view of this question. He has mentioned that the province of Manitoba, and I think he read from a report that was sent out by the Manufacturers' Association, has now reached a stage in which they should give way and allow duties to be imposed on lumber coming into this country for the general good of the rest of the Dominion. It is not in the interest of Manitoba alone that lumber should be imported into this country free; it is in the interest of the Dominion at large. Some time ago I received a circular from this lumber association in British Columbia, and I wish to point out that it is only the British Columbia people who are asking to have this duty imposed on lumber.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is not so.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, I have not heard of any other. This is the only circular I have received from any institution of that kind asking to have a duty imposed on lumber. Any person who takes the trouble to read the circular will see that these people condemn themselves. The fact is, they are asking to have a duty imposed on lumber for their own special benefit, something that I for one, do not agree with. They say they believe they are the only manufacturing industry in Canada left without protection. I was under the impression that binder twine, barbed wire and other commodities manufactured in this country were placed on the free list. These industries can hardly be said to have protection. My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) read from the Trade and Navigation Returns the amount of lumber coming into this country from the United States, the value being $3,610,252. I submit that most of the lumber thus imported is the raw material of other manufactures. There is an enormous quantity of this lumber used by manufacturers of furniture, and these manufactories are not in Manitoba and the North-west, but chiefly in Ontario. The manufacturers of furniture and other commodities of that kind have to export their goods to Great Britain, where they must compete with goods coming from the United States. Now, if a duty were placed on their raw material, the effect would be to drive them out of the English market. Thus the proposition to impose a duty on lumber would affect far more than the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. So far as Manitoba and the North-west are concerned, we object to a duty on lumber. We have there very little lumber, but lumber is absolutely necessary to the settlers for the construction of their houses, and it is most important that it should be as cheap as possible. In fact, it is one of our main arguments as a means of attracting immigration to that country that we have cheap lumber. The same thing applies to cordwood. In certain sections where they cannot get coal, they are able to get cheap cordwood from Minnesota and other places. I have never heard of any demand for a duty on lumber in that country. In my own town, we have three saw-mills, but I never heard of those who own them advocating such a duty. Perhaps they are even more interested in the matter than the parties who are bringing it forward. Take the province of British Columbia—they are favoured above every part of the country in their railroad lumber rates. I showed the other day that they paid a rate of 50 cents a hundred all over the province of British Columbia for a distance of over a thousand miles, while people within a distance of three hundred miles of the market in Manitoba have to pay 20 cents a hundred. Besides that, the British Columbia saw-mill men are in a position to manufacture cheaply. They have Chinese and Japanese labour, which enables them to manufacture at a lower cost than the people in any other part of the country. Therefore, these British Columbia manufacturers are the last people who should bring a matter of this kind forward. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman who brought this motion before the House has not shown the usual sympathy for the agriculturists, for it is the agriculturists who would be affected if this resolution were adopted and acted upon. Coming back to this circular, they say:

> The chief burden of our complaint is that our trade is unfairly discriminated against under the present tariff, being, we believe, the only manufacturing industry in Canada which is left totally without protection in our own home markets——

I have already pointed out the case of binder twine and barbed wire.

> —whilst contributing largely to the prosperous conditions of other manufacturers and producers

—whose manufactures we use and for which we pay enhanced prices, consequent upon the protection which they enjoy under the present existing tariff from the competition and cheaper price of like manufactures and productions in the United States.

They go on to say :

Our industry contributes largely to the revenues of both Dominion and provincial governments in timber dues, and by customs duties on all machinery and supplies used in the production of our commodities.

It is well known that those who have acquired timber limits have often paid very little for them. It is true, since this government came into power these limits are put up to competition, and sold to those who bid the highest. But in the good old days gone by—and this was carried on in British Columbia to a considerable extent—parties who got timber limits paid very little for them, and the small dues they pay when the timber is manufactured is a mere bagatelle. One thing is certain and that is, that the man who acquired a timber limit seemed at once to step into the position of a lumber king. We know of men who one day, did not own ten dollars, but who managed, by a pull, to get timber limits, and became immediately worth two or three hundred thousand dollars. The signers of this circular speak of the large amounts they pay in customs duties on machinery. It is true that when they put the machinery into the mill, they may pay a considerable amount, but once it is installed, nothing is required except to replace a band-saw or something like that—a mere nothing. They admit in the circular itself that we can obtain cheaper lumber from Minnesota. They say :

We ask for our productions a mere living price, we are met with the reply that pitch-pine from the United States can be obtained at cheaper prices or that pine from Minnesota can be got at less cost.

If it be true that lumber from Minnesota can be got for less, I submit that the rule of greatest good to the greatest number condemns this proposal of an increased duty, because the people to be benefited are small in number compared with the farmers who have to buy this lumber. It is not reasonable to tax the great body of farmers to enable these few lumber manufacturers to get rich. These people say in their circular that they only ask protection from unfair competition. But they do not deny that if you put this duty upon the lumber, the effect will be to increase the price of the commodity to the consumer. They do not go out of their way to say otherwise, in fact they practically admit that that will be the effect.

But, still, they ask this parliament to pass a motion of that kind which will impose a burden on thousands and thousands of hard struggling farmers in the west, and they want that for the benefit of a few people who are engaged in the lumber industry. It is not only the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories for whom I speak, but it is also the people of the older provinces. Take the furniture dealers, take the people who have to buy this lumber coming in from the United States for the purpose of making handles of forks because they cannot get it here, who have to get their raw material from the other side, and if this duty is imposed they will not be able to compete with the manufacturers on the other side. The hon. member for East Simcoe professed to sympathize with the labouring men, the artisans. I suppose he alluded to the men who worked in the mills in British Columbia. I think I have pointed out that the labouring men he is sympathizing with are the Chinamen and Japanese, who, to a large extent, are employed in this industry in British Columbia, and have driven white labour out of the British Columbia market. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) says this is not so, but we find gentlemen coming from British Columbia year after year asking to have the Chinese excluded from Canada because they are doing all the work that the white men should do in British Columbia. That being so we must take it for granted that these Chinamen, having got into the mines and upon the railways, have also gone into the saw-mills and industries of that kind, so that, these are the people that the hon. member for East Simcoe wants to protect. The men I want to protect are the hard working artisans in Ontario and other portions of the country who are employed in the making of furniture and commodities of that kind. I also want to protect the hardy settlers in the North-west Territories, who are trying to get along. These people, when they come in first, are not wealthy ; they cannot get everything they desire, and if you are going to impose a duty on the lumber that they require to erect their homes and stables, you will be driving people out of the country and preventing others from coming in. The first question that a man asks when he comes into the North-west Territories to look for a location is : How much can I get lumber for with which to build my house ? If you increase the price of it you will eventually force settlers to go across the line. I do not wish to take up any more of the time of the House, but I desire to say that I am opposed to placing a duty on any commodity. My hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) often says that he is a free trader. So am I. I do not believe in any duties, and more particularly do I not believe in protective duties. If the hon. member for East Simcoe had said that he was desirous, in the interets of raising a revenue, that we should have a duty on lumber, there might be some force in his argument, but, when he comes out flat-flooted and says that we want this duty imposed in the interests of

protection, I want to say that I am opposed to protection on any article, and that I will vote against the resolution.

Hon. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Mr. Speaker, as the motion moved by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is one that is of vast importance to the lumbermen of British Columbia, I may perhaps be allowed to say a word on the subject. As the hon. gentleman has stated the lumbermen of Canada are badly handicapped, inasmuch as they have to compete in the American market against a duty of $2 a thousand on lumber, and 30 cents a thousand on shingles, whereas the American lumbermen can come in and compete against them in their own market and find no duty against them. The lumbermen of British Columbia particularly have to face, not only this tariff, but they also have to face a discrimination which is made against them by the shipowners who supply the ships for carrying the lumber into Puget Sound. The dues charged there for pilotage, the harbour dues, and insurance rates, I believe, are lower than in the ports of British Columbia, and therefore, the lumbermen have to suffer therefrom. In addition to that, at the present time, they have to pay a high rate of freight owing to the scarcity of ships, not only in British Columbia, but all over the world. I have here a few figures showing the shipments by vessel and railway in 1900 from British Columbia and the Pacific coast south. In that year there were 777,043,000 odd feet shipped. Of this British Columbia alone supplied only 85,000,000 feet. In the state of Washington there are 444 sawmills, with a capacity of 8,380,000 feet daily, employing some twenty-four or twenty-five thousand men, whereas, in British Columbia, there are ninety-seven mills with a capacity of 3,645,000 feet. Oregon and California have about the same capacity as Washington. The lumbermen of Washington and Oregon have a market of 75,000,000 people, their own market, and besides that they have Canada to which they can send their lumber free, whereas, our lumbermen cannot get into that huge market of seventy-five million people without paying the duty that I have mentioned, namely, $2 per thousand feet. It is contended by hon. gentlemen from Manitoba and the North-west Territories especially, and it was contended by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) who has just taken his seat, that it is not right for British Columbia in particular to ask that a duty should be imposed upon lumber, because it would heighten the price of the lumber that the people there require to build their houses and other structures. That hon. gentleman says that the lumbermen state in their circular that they are the only manufacturing industry in Canada that is wholly without protection, and he remarks that that is not so, because there is the binder twine, the barbed wire and several other industries that are not protected. Well, I cannot gainsay what he says in regard to that, but I may say that both of these industries have been pretty well knocked out owing to the want of protection, and there is no reason why the lumbermen should be knocked out in the same way. The hon. gentleman also says that the reason we are asking for a protective duty is that we may protect the Chinese. Now, there is no doubt that there are a certain number of Chinese and Japanese employed in the mills in British Columbia, but the reason that they are employed, instead of white men, is that the lumbermen are forced, owing to the want of protection, to work for such a small profit that they cannot possibly compete if they have to pay the wages which white men would naturally demand. The hon. gentleman says that he is a free trader. We all know that. He is a free trader in everything except where it affects his own pocket. I, in conjunction with the majority of the people in British Columbia, am a protectionist. We believe in protecting our own industries, and I think this House and the country, when they look at this matter in a fair spirit, will say that the lumbermen in the whole of Canada and in British Coulmbia, in particular, for which I speak, are in a position now in which they are entitled to demand from the government that that industry should be protected to a certain extent at all events. The reason that Puget Sound mills can cut cheaper than the British Columbia mills, is because they can get their supplies much cheaper. Supplies that they have to buy can be bought cheaper on the Sound than they can in the province of British Columbia, owing to the fact that a great many commodities, being manufactured on the Sound, have not to pay duty, whereas, these commodities, when imported into British Columbia, have to pay duty. We are not a manufacturing province, and although the goods may come from eastern Canada, there is a heavy freight rate to be paid on them. The lumbermen of British Columbia do not ask for protection in order that they may raise their prices to our friends in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, but merely for the purpose of being enabled to sell their lumber in Canada. As a matter of fact, prices in Manitoba and the North-west Territories have been very materially reduced. They have been reduced $5 a thousand on lumber, and from $1.75 to $3 on shingles.

I do not know that I can say much more in regard to the matter. I think I represent the opinion of the lumbermen when I ask that the government shall see fit to impose an import duty similar to that which the Americans impose, namely, $2 a thousand

on lumber, and 30 cents a thousand on shingles. I had hoped, from information which I thought was authentic, that the Minister of Finance would inform the House in his budget speech that it was the intention of the government to impose a duty upon lumber. I believe that was his intention and the intention of the government up to within a very few days of the delivery of that budget speech, but for some reason or other, which no one outside of the cabinet seems to understand, the government altered their mind and left the lumbermen out in the cold. I can assure the government that the lumbermen, Liberals as well as Conservatives, are not satisfied with the manner in which they have been treated, and they will continue to agitate until their request is granted by this government or some other government.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). The question before the House is of very great importance to a large interest in Canada, and of importance incidentally to all interests in Canada. The lumber interest ranks next to the agricultural interest in this Dominion in importance and in the amount of capital invested. I wish to present a few statements to the House which, in my opinion, would warrant the government, in the interests of the country, in imposing an import duty upon lumber coming from the United States to the extent of the duty imposed by the United States government on Canadian lumber entering that country. A policy has been adopted by the province of Ontario which has led to the transference from American points to Canada of a large saw-milling industry. A number of very extensive mills have been erected upon the north shore of Lake Huron, and parties who formerly manufactured lumber in the United States and found the market there free of duty are now manufacturing lumber in Canada, which, when sent to the United States, is met by a duty of $2 a thousand feet. These men very naturally feel that having been forced into Canada by the operation of a regulation adopted by one of the provinces, they are entitled to some consideration ; a consideration at least to the extent of giving them command of the local market in the country where they have established their industry. When their lumber is exported to the United States they are met by a duty, while their competitors in the United States send their lumber into Canada duty free. Now, while the Canadian millmen do not require protection against American lumbermen for the higher grades of lumber, yet, it is a great advantage to the Americans to be able to dump on this market lower grade lumber, of which there is a plethora in the American market, and which it becomes necessary to unload somewhere. This lumber is sent to this country and sold at depressed prices, and under conditions which demoralize the trade, and which inflict a serious injury upon the lumber industry of Canada. We have objections, of course, from Manitoba and from the North-west to the imposition of the duty which is asked for by this resolution before the House. We are too much in the habit in this country of giving undue prominence to special local interests and losing sight of the general interests of the Dominion. Two or three years ago, when discussing the lumber question with prominent members of the sub-committee of the Finance Committee of the Senate of the United States, I was very much struck with the view which was taken by these gentlemen with regard to the lumber duty. Both of the gentlemen with whom I was speaking avowed themselves to be in favour of free lumber. They declared that the states they represented in the Senate would be benefited by free lumber, and if they were governed by considerations of the interests of the particular locality whence they came, they would certainly favour to the utmost of their power the removal of the lumber duties. But, said they, we are governed in arranging the details of this tariff by broad national considerations ; we cannot afford to take into consideration the interest of one particular locality if the interests of that locality conflict with the general interests of the nation ; the lumber industry of the United States is a great industry spread over a great number of states, and we must bear in mind that the requirements of this industry are centred in some twenty-seven states, and so we must be governed by broad national considerations rather than by the desire to serve the purpose of our particular locality. That was a sound general principle, and upon that principle let my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) allow the broad general interests of this country to be served, and let him and his constituents, if need be, submit to some slight inconvenience, for we certainly have sacrificed a great deal of money for that western country—not sacrificed, but appropriated—and we have the right to ask the people there to give due consideration to broad general interests of national importance and of national scope. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) tells us that lumber is brought from Minnesota into the North-west cheaper than it can be obtained from Ontario. This may possibly be the case, although I do not believe that if the lumbermen of Canada were given complete command of the market, there would be any material appreciation in the price of lumber. But if the lumbermen of Minnesota find a market for their products in Manitoba and the North-west, and if the imposition of a Canadian duty upon lumber will have a tendency to impede their operations and curtail their output, and make them feel that the duty is a detriment to them, I shall be glad to

see them struck, because the head centre of opposition to free lumber in the United States originates in Minnesota and Wisconsin, and if these men can be made to feel that there are reciprocal arrangements in this matter, and that while the lumbermen of Canada are sufferers to the extent of $2 per thousand, that they will be sufferers to the same extent, they would see this question in a different light.

And if the trade relations between these two countries are ever considered again, I believe that the influence that would be exerted upon these negotiations by the imposition of a lumber duty would be a most salutary and a most powerful one. What we need, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the United States, is to try and secure their respect, and we can never secure their respect unless we have a proper care for our own interests.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. We can secure that respect by caring for our own interests in Canada, in the same manner as they care for and protect their interests, and if we decide to protect a great industry in Canada as they have decided to protect that industry in their own country, we will secure the respect of the Americans; we will secure the operation of influences upon negotiations which will be of a very important character, and in addition to that, we will do an act of justice to our own people. Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) tells us that the movement in favour of the lumber duties is confined to British Columbia. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) is not well informed. The Lumbermen's Association of Ontario held its annual meeting in Toronto not more than three weeks ago, and that association passed, with one dissenting voice only, a resolution asking the government of Canada to impose a duty upon lumber imported from the United States corresponding to the duty imposed by the United States upon lumber imported into that country from Canada.

I venture the assertion that throughout the entire Dominion of Canada you will find the lumber interest practically a unit in the demand that this policy shall be adopted. We imported from the United States last year $3,600,000 worth of forest products. We imported from them large quantities of the low, coarse grades of lumber, the kind for which it is exceedingly desirable that our saw-mill men should have a market. We can sell deals in the English market without any trouble; we can sell sidings and the better grades of lumber there, without doubt; but the lower grades, such as hemlock and coarse red pine, are dumped on our market by the millmen of Wisconsin and Michigan, and supplant our own lumber at prices perhaps lower than it costs the American millmen to produce them, and they make their profit out of the better grades. This is a condition of affairs which is unfair to the lumber interest of Canada, and in a general sense is detrimental to the general interests of the country. The lumber interest affords a very extensive market for farm products, employs an enormous amount of labour, and puts into circulation a vast amount of money. That interest is one of great importance and beneficence in its operations in every sense, and it is an interest which deserves consideration.

Our hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) tells us that wherever a lumberman acquires a timber limit, at once you have a lumber king crowned. Well, Sir, the lumbermen of this Dominion have to struggle with various difficulties. Where they are men of energy and capacity, after long lives of business enterprise and effort, they may secure a competence; but there are just as many failures among this class of business men as any other. They do not all draw prizes. And these men have a right to ask from the government fair consideration for the interest which they represent.

With regard to the British Columbia lumbermen, as my hon. friend from Victoria has pointed out, the lumber interest of the state of Washington has secured a very large development. The mills of that state have the markets of California and the entire Pacific coast, which they enter free of duty. They have the market of the Sandwich Islands, which they also enter free of duty. They have all the common markets which our lumbermen have, and they have exclusive control of American markets. They are placed in the same position as the lumbermen of the east. After selling the better grades, they have on hand a certain class of lumber which they are willing to dispose of at almost any price. They have advantages in many respects in the matter of freight, in reaching the markets in the mining regions of British Columbia and the other regions of that province; and the consequence is that the British Columbia lumberman is threatened with ruin. Now, it is a matter of consequence to us whether that great industry of British Columbia shall be allowed to be sacrificed or not, on the theory of free trade in lumber. I do not believe that the interest of the lumberman, in British Columbia, in Ontario, or in other parts of this Dominion, is a matter of so small consequence as not to deserve, upon broad general principles, consideration and protection from this unfair competition at the hands of an industry in a foreign country at our doors, which excludes our productions from its markets.

The imposition of a duty upon lumber would, I believe, exert a powerful influence upon any future negotiations that may take place between this country and the United States. It would be an indication to the commissioners from the other side that Canada at last intended to stand upon its own

rights and protect its own interests, and was abandoning to some extent the theory of free trade, which in its application in so many instances works so injuriously to the interests of Canada. Last year we actually bought from the United States, of lumber and farm products, $2,000,000 worth more than we sold to that country. Of farm products we bought nearly three times as much as we sold them ; we bought a vast quantity of manufactured goods ; and we were almost absolutely denied access to the markets of that country. Although we sold to them $25,000,000 worth of farm products in 1866, at the end of the reciprocity treaty, we sold to them last year only $7,316,000 worth, a little more than one-fourth the amount that was sold thirty-four years before. That country has taken advantage of our moderate tariff rates—12½ per cent upon the total imports from the United States, and 25 per cent on the dutiable imports—to pour in upon us $60,000,000 worth of manufactured goods, $110,000,000 worth of all kinds of imports, while allowing us the privilege of selling a beggarly $7,316,000 worth of farm products in that country, where we bought $18,000,000 worth from them. As a matter of sentiment, I believe in meeting these gentlemen. I believe in putting this duty on lumber as a matter of sentiment merely, if there were no other reason for it. But there are, as I have shown, powerful reasons for it, aside from the sentimental reason; and if we adopt the principle of putting a duty on lumber and protecting by that action a very important interest in our country, we shall certainly confer a benefit in the broadest sense on the Dominion of Canada, exert a salutary influence on any future negotiations with the United States, by putting ourselves in a position that will command the respect of those with whom we shall deal, and perform an act of justice to a great commercial interest. I believe that if the government, under all the conditions of the case, were to impose this duty, they would receive the approbation of nineteen-twentieths of the people of Canada, and would perform an act which they would never have cause to regret, but which would redound in all future days to their credit.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS (Russell). Mr. Speaker, while representing an absolutely agricultural constituency and being a farmer myself, I at the same time incidentally saw a small amount of lumber; therefore, I think I may be permitted to say a few words on this question. And in beginning, I wish to say at once that my views are diametrically opposed to those of the two hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House, and of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), to my left. The mover of this resolution spoke first of the benefits that had accrued to Ontario by the imposition of a condition which caused the sawing of logs in the western portion of Ontario, instead of allowing them to go to the American market. Well, so far as that is concerned, I hold exactly the same views that I held years ago.

I am not one of those who believe that Ontario has benefited to any extent by the fact that the sawlogs in the western portion of the province are being sawn in the province to-day instead of on the other side of the line. This proposition may appear very ridiculous to some minds, but unless the conditions have very much changed, the round log, before it is sawn, is worth more money on the banks of the Georgian Bay than after it is sawn into lumber. The hon. gentleman to my left (Mr. Charlton) says no, but when he was contending for a condition of things which would allow those logs to go across, he contended exactly for what I am now contending. The hon. gentleman changes his base according to the new conditions as they arise, but I, however, hold to one principle upon this trade question, and that principle I hold even if it attacks the industry in which I am myself engaged. I have no faith in the man who believes in free trade in everything but in that which affects his own individual interest ; and who, the moment free trade attacks his own individual interests, then becomes a protectionist. The hon. gentleman to my left (Mr. Charlton) said a few moments ago that the broad principle should prevail, and what is that principle, in so far as he is concerned ? It is this, that free trade should rule in Canada except when the lumber industry is attacked, and then with regard to that industry protection should prevail. But, I will deal more particularly with that branch of the question later.

The hon. gentleman who moved the resolution (Mr. Bennett) spoke of the invasion of Canada by American lumber. Well, why does American lumber come into Canada ? Evidently because some of the people in Canada want it. Is there anything wrong in those Canadians buying American lumber who require it ? Again, it is argued that American lumber may be laid down in Canada cheaper than Canadian lumber can be purchased. Well, that may have some immediate effect on some of the Canadian saw-mill owners. But what about the other fellow ? What about the man who buys the lumber ? Is he injured by the admission of cheap lumber into Canada ? Not at all.

Again, the hon. gentleman spoke of oak. He said he is not a lumberman, and it is quite evident he is not. Do we require oak ? Oak to-day is one of the principal woods used in the finishing of our best houses throughout Canada. Have we got it? Not at all ; we are obliged to bring it from the United States. Is it then reasonable that there should be a tax upon it ? I think not.

The hon. gentleman next referred to pitch pine. Well, there are many purposes for which pitch pine is required in Canada and

which no Canadian lumber can supply. And if our people want pitch pine, is it not reasonable that we should allow it to come in without a tax ?

My hon. friend next referred to the action of the Ontario Lumbermen's Association, and he spoke of Mr. John Waldie, a very respectable man indeed, but who is a free trader like my hon. friend to my left (Mr. Charlton). Of all men, Mr. Speaker, I think that the lumbermen should be large in their views. Lumbering operations are generally conducted on a large scale, which necessarily develops large ideas. I, therefore, think that lumbermen, above all men, should be too broad-minded and liberal to come to this House and ask for a petty duty upon lumber coming into Canada, especially when there is a far greater question which interests not only the lumbermen of Canada, but the producers of all our natural products, and a broad principle for which they should contend. I maintain that there is a policy by which very great injustice is done to lumbermen and to the farming classes and to all those who are developing the natural resources of Canada. Protection is the curse of the lumberman and the agriculturist and the miner, and of every man engaged in the production of our natural products. Are they not the men, therefore, who should combat for a far different condition of things—a condition that would do them even handed justice, that would enable them to buy their requirements as they have to sell their products ? I am a lumebrman, but the day will never come when I will ask for a small petty import duty on lumber coming into this country. On the contrary, so long as I am able, I will combat against the great injustice that is done to the lumberman, the agriculturist, the miner and the fisherman of Canada through our protective duties. I notice that hon. gentlemen on the other side laugh, and I know well what is in their minds. No doubt they are questioning my support of the government that pretends to be a free trade government.

Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are free traders and free traders, and there are protectionists and protectionists. The narrow-minded, bigoted, small, picayune protectionist, wants protection on everything he produces, but in everything else he is a free trader. So far as free trade is concerned, I am sorry to have to make the statement, but I believe that both in parliament and the country we have too few men who study the question out to its logical conclusion. The farmers of Canada are blinded to-day, as they were years ago, with the pretense that they are protected. But they have not one single iota of protection. He never had one single iota of protection, and he never can have one single iota of protection so long as he has to sell his surplus productions in the markets of the world in competition with the products of the world. The lumberman is in exactly the same position, and so is the miner, and so is the fisherman—but let me say here, that the miner, so far as iron is concerned, is the only man engaged in the production of the natural products of Canada who has any measure of protection at all. Now, there are, perhaps, those who believe that by giving a bounty on the exports of the farmer, he would be placed in an equal position with the others who are protected. But that is not true. If the farmer is to be placed in the same position as the protected manufacturers of Canada, he should have a bounty on that which he produces and sells in Canada. If that were done he would be in the same position as the protected manufacturer. I am not one of those who will ever stand up in parliament or outside of parliament and pretend that the farmers have any protection—they have none whatever. Now, are there gentlemen who, under these circumstances would impose a duty on lumber, I would ask: What would be the effect on the farmer ? Is the farmer not sufficiently abused and trampled upon under the conditions that exist ? Would it be fair to place a further embargo upon him by imposing a duty upon lumber ? For my part, I believe it would be a grave injustice. Now, let us investigate this matter a little. Some hon. gentlemen may say: Oh, the lumberman of British Columbia is affected, the lumbermen in other parts of Canada are effected, but you are not affected. I say at once that I am affected. The American lumber coming into this city and into Montreal affects my interests prejudicially. And my hon. friends on the other side say that I want protection——

Mr. CHARLTON. They say they want to protect you.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, if they will allow me to protect myself, I will do that as well as I can. I do not want any of the kind of assistance they propose. This matter of protection on lumber would affect the farmer injuriously, just as have all the other conditions of protection in Canada. Let us suppose that out in Dakota or somewhere in the American north-west, at a point near the border, there is a saw-mill, and that on the Canadian side of the line are a number of farmers who require lumber. It will cost them, perhaps, $2 or $3 per thousand feet to pay the freight on lumber coming from the nearest point in Canada. If you impose a protective duty on lumber, the consequence will be that these farmers must choose between paying the duty or paying the heavy freight charges on the lumber they require. I claim that this would be an injustice. It is perfectly impossible to place a duty on lumber coming into Canada without very materially injuring the farmers of Canada.

Now, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) spoke of culls and common grade lumber coming into Canada to-day at very low prices. Well, now, I can only speak of my own experience. The fact is that at this very point, Ottawa, one of the greatest lumber manufactories of Canada, the people are unable to get the common and cheap lumber they require. I myself, who manufacture a very considerable quantity of lumber, had to buy that class of lumber at other points last season and bring it here. So far as this district is concerned, therefore, that statement is not correct. The hon. gentleman also referred to red pine and hemlock coming into Canada. Again, I would like to answer the hon. gentleman. The fact is that the demand for red pine was so great during last season and the season before that everything that was to spare in the United States and Canada was absorbed by the British market, and everything that is to be produced the coming season in red pine in this section of the country is bought up for that market.

Now, I do not think I should take up the time of the House much longer on this subject, but I just say again that I am utterly opposed to any legislation of this kind. And I am sorry, and very sorry, to think there is a lumberman in Canada who is so small and contracted in his ideas as to ask for the establishment of a condition which, perhaps, might give him a little local benefit, but would be such a great injustice to the farmers of Canada and the people generally who need lumber, and who ought to be free to buy it where they can get it cheapest. In so far as the general principle of trade is concerned, what could be more contrary to reason and justice than the imposing of duties in order to benefit special individuals ? If you are to impose protective duties so as to help this individual and that individual, why, you must pass these benefits around and protect everybody, and when all are protected, in what position are you ?

An hon. MEMBER. The same as if they had no protection.

Mr. EDWARDS. You are in the same position as if protection had not been given to any. But, if all are not protected, injustice is done to some, while special benefits are conferred on others. For these reasons I oppose, and always will oppose, any proposition of this kind.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) started out by telling us that years ago he was a free trader and opposed the duty on lumber, and he wanted the House to understand that he had the same story to tell to-day, though he admitted that conditions had changed, and there might be some basis for argument on the other side. The hon. gentleman's statement reminded me of an incident that occurred in the experience of an assessor. A maiden-lady, when the assessor came around, gave her age as nineteen years. Five years later, when the assessor came and asked her age, she answered that she was nineteen. He said : 'Are you not the lady who, five years ago, gave me your age as nineteen ?' Her answer was, 'I want you to understand, my good man, that I am not the kind of a girl who would tell one story five years ago and tell another story to-day.' The hon. gentleman is not the kind of man who would vary in his story, even though conditions had changed, enough to justify a change even in his mind. I admire him for his consistency; but I would remind him that it is scarcely fair for him, an out-and-out free trader, as he says he is, to sit on one of the front benches, supporting a government many of whose members and supporters declare that their tariff is a protective tariff. He said that the narrow man, the small-souled protectionist wanted protection on everything. But carry out the argument, apply it by the same parity of reasoning to the hon. gentleman himself. He wants free trade in everything. What kind of man must he be ? The strictures that he applied to the protectionists would apply with equal propriety to himself, only on the other side. I was very much interested and pleased and amused by the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I have listened to that hon. gentleman in this House for a great many years, and up to the present he has always spoken strongly against protection, although at one time in his life he made a most admirable speech in its favour, I believe in the year 1876. I was reminded of the old couplet :

> While the lamp holds out to burn,
> The vilest sinner may return.

I thought he had got there at last. He said in the commencement of his speech that the policy adopted by the government of Ontario had led to the transference of a large number of mills from the United States to Canada, to the great benefit of Canada. That is a statement which, in my judgment, is absolutely correct. But I would remind the hon. gentleman, if he is within the hearing of my voice, that for the last 15 years, whenever he spoke upon the proposition to put an export duty on logs, he always argued against it, taking the ground that if we did put an export duty on logs sufficiently great to prohibit their exportation, it would not result in the transference of the lumber mills from the United States to Canada. It has done so, he admits it to-day. Now, the argument which he advanced to-day is a complete refutation of the arguments to which he has treated this House for the last 14 or 15 years, almost constantly. I do not condemn the

hon. gentleman for it, on the contrary, I rather admire his frankness, I admire his good judgment, because I think he is beginning to see what he either did not see before or did not want to see, that is to say, the importance to the people of Canada, not only to the lumbermen but to the farmers and labourers, that our lumber should be manufactured in our own country as much as possible.

Now the hon. member for Russell says: What are you going to do if we shut out American lumber? And he gives us one line of that article, namely, oak timber. He says we require a great deal of it in Canada, that we have not got it in Canada, and that we are obliged to get it from the United States. If we put a duty on lumber we are going to be obliged to pay so much more for it. I would like to ask that hon. gentleman how much oak we imported last year. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns we imported 29,548 thousand feet, which cost $887,000. Now, that is not a large quantity.

Mr. EDWARDS. We imported 29,000,000 feet.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not millions in the Trade and Navigation Returns. I am quoting from the official return.

Mr. EDWARDS. The letter M after the figures shows you must multiply that number by 1,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, we would not be so badly off even if we were confined to Canada for our supply. There is a considerable quantity of oak in Canada, I know it is taken out every year in my county. But the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) treated this House to a capital argument in favour of protection. I was glad to hear him, because I believe his argument is correct. I only notice it because it shows the lack of agreement between hon. members on the government side, some of whom say that their tariff is a free trade tariff, while others say it is a revenue tariff, and some others say it is a protective tariff. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) complained bitterly that it would be a great injustice to the people of the North-west Territories to impose a duty on American lumber. Now, out of curiosity I looked up the Trade and Navigation Returns to see how much of that lumber was used in the North-west Territories. I find that of lumber there was brought in $7,505 worth; of laths, $170; of singles, $331.

Mr. DAVIS. I want to point out to the hon. gentleman that if you add a duty of $4 per thousand, the people would have to pay that much more for their lumber.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, that is a different argument, it is very fallacious, and would bear a good deal of explanation from the other side. But he asked what they were going to do if they could not get this lumber. Now, all told, they brought in last year without any duty $7,987 worth. Surely they could not suffer so severely if they had to pay duty on that small quantity of lumber. I am in favour of this proposition of the hon. member for East Simcoe, because I have always been in favour of reciprocity of markets, or reciprocity of tariffs. If the Americans will not give us the advantage in their markets for the sale of our products which we give them, then I say we ought to look after our own interests and take care of ourselves. If they put $2 a thousand on our lumber going into their markets, I have always held that it was the proper thing for us to impose $2 a thousand upon their lumber coming in here.

I am in favour of a reciprocity of markets or a reciprocity of tariffs, because that policy would assist every important industry in Canada. We have many lumbermen in our district of the country, and I know from them that the lumbering industry is not in the condition to-day in which many of them would like to see it. There is considerable stagnation in the market and a weakening of sales; some of them are suffering a good deal and they believe that their suffering is increased by reason of the privilege which the Americans enjoy to-day of throwing their lumber into our markets without paying any duty. I support this proposition because it is in the interest of the farmers of our country. The more you build up the lumber industry, the better markets you make for the products of the farm and the better prices you pay for them. We know that by experience. Since the Ontario government changed their regulations, the cutting of pine logs has been done in Ontario instead of in the United States. The hon. member for North Norfolk very truly said that it had resulted in the transference of a large number of mills and of labouring men from the United States to Canada, and that is giving us an important additional market for our farm produce. I say anything that curtails the market of the farmers in their own country I am opposed to, and I am in favour of anything that will maintain and extend it.

Now, the hon. member for Saskatchewan said that this was only a cry raised by the people of British Columbia. Not by any means. I was glad to see the hon. member for North Norfolk enlighten him on that point by telling him that the lumbermen's annual meeting, held a few weeks ago in the city of Toronto, passed a very strong resolution in favour of it; there was only one dissenting voice, and I presume that was the hon. member for Russell, who wanted to be consistent.

An hon. MEMBER. He was not there.

Mr. SPROULE. I was told that it was he who dissented. I do not know whether

I am right or wrong. He is there to speak for himself. He does not say whether he was in favour of it or against it.

Mr. EDWARDS. I did not hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule).

Mr. SPROULE. I was saying that at a meeting of the lumbermen in Toronto, there was a resolution passed in favour of imposing this duty, that there was only one dissenting voice, and that I wondered whether that was the voice of the hon. member for Russell or not.

Mr. EDWARDS. I was not present at the meeting.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, if the hon. gentleman had been there he would have made two.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not think there can be a doubt upon that.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it for granted, from what the hon. gentleman said here. I merely mentioned this to show that the hon. member for Saskatchewan was entirely wrong when he said that this pressure had come entirely from British Columbia, but that, on the contrary, the great bulk of the lumbermen of Ontario are in favour of the imposition of this duty. I see by the Trade and Navigation Returns that a very large portion of the imported lumber came into the province of Ontario. But, I say that we should go farther still. We are doing something here, if we accept this proposition, that would be in the interest of the lumbermen and of the people of the country, but, we have still a very considerable movement of logs taken from the Indian reserves and exported to the United States free. I think that should be stopped, and that we should insist that they be manufactured in Canada. I regret that the government have taken no action in that direction. I regret as well, that, although the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), in his budget speech, announced that no changes would take place in the tariff, he has not seen fit to take into consideration the urgent request of the lumbermen of Canada for the imposition of a duty. It comes from a very large and important class, it comes from a class who are carrying on a most valuable industry in this country, and, if I am correctly informed, they were led to believe that they would be most likely to have their request granted, although they had no definite promise of it. It seems to be another acknowledgment that, in the consideration of the tariff, the lumbermen of Canada are to be thrown down, because there is to be no tinkering with the tariff. The beet-root sugar men have been thrown down, because this is a free trade tariff, and hon. gentlemen cannot allow any tinkering with the tariff. The woollen millmen have been thrown down, because there is to be no tinkering with the tariff. There is to be no change, because this is a free trade government. The hon. member for Russell did not think so.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL (Glengarry). Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to the discussion. So far as the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) is concerned, I shall not spend any time in answering his speech, because it has been altogether a disquisition on the question of protection. He has gone entirely afield from the matter before us. The resolution which was brought up is one asking for the imposition of an import duty on American lumber coming into Canada. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I think, gave the whole case away when he said that the head centre at which he wished to strike was the lumbermen of Minnesota, and that he was quite willing to use Canadian laws for the purpose of striking with a vengeance the Minnesota men who blocked the legislation to allow Canadian lumber to go into the United States free. He is quite willing to place the whole of Canada in jeopardy by placing this statute upon the books of Canada because a few of the pine lumbermen of Canada wish this duty to be put on so that they can strike this head centre. He spoke about a meeting in Toronto, as if that meeting represented all the lumbermen of Canada. I do not think that is a fact by any means. It only represented a very few of the lumbermen. It represented the pine men of Ontario only. There was some attempt made to have a hardwood section of the board, but the hardwood men never attended to form a board to any extent, because they have always been overborne by the pine men. Beside the question of a pine industry in Canada, in the constituency of nearly every hon. gentleman from Ontario, and largely from all over the country, you will find small mills engaged in handling hardwood lumber, and engaged, in the eastern districts, in handling spruce lumber. We all know that there is a statute on the American statute-books which says that if we impose this $2 a thousand duty on American lumber, we are liable to be met again by an addition to the American duty of $2 a thousand. I would ask what is going to become of our spruce industry, what is going to become of our hardwood industry ? We know perfectly well that the market we have for hardwood is the United States. We do not export 2 per cent of the ash lumber we manufacture to any other country than the United States. We do not export 3 per cent of the hardwood lumber we manufacture to any country except the United States. The pine men are quite willing to sacrifice that trade, to sacrifice the North-west Territories, and to sacrifice the rest of the country in order to strike this head centre in Minnesota. I believe with the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Ed-

wards), that it is a very small size to which these great men have grown when they are willing to use for their own personal interest the farmers and consumers, in fact, the whole people of Canada. Reference has been made by the hon. member for North Norfolk to the suffering of the men engaged in the pine lumber industry from not being able to make sufficient profit. He knows perfectly well that shipping cull lumber is worth from $15 to $18 per thousand at any shipping point in Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. Schell) is not very well informed as to the condition of the lumber market.

Mr. SCHELL. He knows very well that mill culls are worth here in Ottawa, $12 per thousand, while seven years ago they were selling at $4.50 a thousand. Since the improvement in the times, mill culls have advanced to this extent in price. Yet, these gentlemen ask that the farmers of this country should be required to support this extra duty of $2 a thousand that will jeopardize the hardwood industry for their own benefit. Who asked that this duty should be imposed? A few millmen in British Columbia, a few millmen about Rat Portage and the Georgian Bay, and not another man, from Prince Edward Island, all through the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario, not another single lumberman in this whole Dominion, except a small coterie about Toronto and the British Columbia men. I do not think that the sentiment of this House will be in favour of such a proposition if it comes to a vote. I do not believe it is in accordance with the principles of justice to ask to impose upon the people of the North-west Territories, and upon the people of this part of Canada, this burden which will bear so heavily upon those who require to import lumber. I am a manufacturer myself. Not only am I a seller of lumber, but a buyer of lumber, and I wish to state to this House, in reply to what the hon. member for East Grey said, that if you just go across the street to the Bank of Montreal you will find an illustration in support of the argument which I am presenting. When they put out the specifications for the Bank of Montreal they called for quartered oak. You cannot buy that timber in this Dominion to-day, either for the Bank of Montreal, or for any of the buildings that require to be finished in quartered oak. It is not to be had. There is a certain amount of oak in the hon. gentleman's section of the country, but it is of a very inferior class, which is not fit to be used for quarter-cut oak. Now, in regard to the question of poplar, in the city of Montreal, and in all the cities, you will find the specifications given out for buildings to be finished in American poplar. The hon. member for North Norfolk is quite willing to put a $2 duty on imports into this country, which will impose a burden upon the business of which I have spoken. I just wish to state this general proposition, that all the lumber brought into Canada is brought here simply because it cannot be got in Canada, or it can be brought in cheaper than it can be got here. They wish to put this duty on for no other reason than to raise the price of lumber $2 per thousand feet to the general consumers, and so far as I am concerned, I shall certainly oppose this resolution.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). The hon. gentleman from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said that the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) was sitting on the wrong side of the House because he was opposed to placing a duty on lumber. Where would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) sit if not on this side of the House, and in a front seat, with the party led by a government which on Thursday last announced their intention to keep lumber on the free list. I agree with the hon. gentleman from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that in view of the announcement made last week by the Minister of Finance, it is superfluous to discuss this proposition at any particular length now. However, as the matter has been brought up for an expression of opinion, I wish, Sir, to join in that expression of opinion. Coming as I do from the North-west, and following the hon. gentleman from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), who truly expressed the view of the people of the North-west on this question, it may also be superfluous for me to announce that I intend to record my vote against this resolution. Sir, I am entirely opposed to the principle of protection. While I do not say that I am an out-and-out free trader; while I do not believe that in Canada at the present moment free trade is practicable, I do say that the interests of the country demand that the tariff shall be narrowed down to the lowest possible point, in the interests of all the people of the Dominion. For this view I find some justification in the fiscal happenings in Canada since 1897, when changes were made in the tariff which reduced it by at least some 10 or 12 per cent. If we take in conjunction with this fact, the further fact that every industry in our country has been vastly more prosperous since that 10 or 12 per cent reduction in the tariff, we find ample justification for the view which I express. I am, I repeat, opposed to the principle of protection, and I am particularly opposed to its application in the form of a reimposition of the duty upon lumber. I am not actuated by any ill-feeling towards the lumbermen of the Dominion. If this parliament could, without injuring the Dominion as a whole, do anything which would be of reasonable benefit to the lumber industry, I would be very glad indeed. If by adopting this resolution the advantage to the Dominion as a whole

would overbalance the disadvantage to any particular class of our people, I would be willing to support the resolution. But, Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the disadvantage to the consumers of lumber in Canada would be very much greater than any advantage that would accrue to the lumbermen by the reimposition of this duty, and therefore I oppose the proposition. In opposing the resolution, I am of course to a large extent influenced by the feeling of the people whom I have been sent here to represent. My attitude on this question is based on the welfare of the present and prospective settlers in the North-west Territories. A proposition which receives very general assent everywhere in Canada is : that the greater the progress that can be promoted in the North-west, the better it is for the whole Dominion, and as this duty upon lumber would greatly retard the progress of the North-west, I am emphatically opposed to it. I shall quote some of the prices of lumber which prevail at present in the North-west Territories, and the House will see that even without any duty the prices are extraordinarily high. For spruce or fir boards up to twenty feet in length—this is lumber which would ordinarily be classed as rough lumber and is about the cheapest kind of lumber that can be procured—the price is $24 per thousand and 50 cents per thousand extra for every two feet additional in length. For dimension and scantling timber up to twenty feet, the price is $24 per thousand. For ship-lap, measurement 1 x 8 and 1 x 10 to 18 feet in length, the price is $25 per thousand. For siding, ceiling and flooring, from $31 to $35 per thousand. For red cedar shingles, $3.75 per thousand. For laths, pine or cedar, $5 per thousand. Pine for finishing and cedar for finishing, from $50 to $60 per thousand. These are the prices which prevail anywhere, say between Brandon and Medicine Hat, on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and possibly points off the main line have to pay higher prices. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it should be the duty of this House, in place of contemplating any measure which would be likely to bring about an increase in the price of lumber, to rather devote itself to the problem of endeavouring to devise some means to materially reduce the high prices which the settlers in the west have now to pay for their lumber. The application made to parliament this afternoon on behalf of the lumbermen of Canada, I think, the most peculiarly frank request for protection that ever has been made in parliament to my knowledge. It is usually the case that when manufacturers desire a protective duty on their products, they come to parliament with the plea that the duty will not increase the price of the article, but on the contrary that if they get the protection they will see that there is a contemporaneous reduction in price ; but our friends, the lumbermen, come to this House to-day asking for a duty on lumber, and they frankly tell us that if the duty is imposed it will likely result in an increase in the price of lumber. Although the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) endeavoured to impress on the House his belief that a duty of $2 a thousand on lumber would not increase the price to anything like that extent, I think my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) proved pretty conclusively, from the circular of the Association of Lumbermen of British Columbia which was distributed among the members of the House a few weeks ago, that their idea, at all events, in seeking a duty on the article, is to be enabled to collect a higher price ; for in that circular they say :

> When we ask for our production a mere living price, we are met with the reply that pitch pine from the United States can be obtained at cheaper prices, or pine from Minnesota can be got at less cost, and that even our own description of lumber can be bought cheaper on Puget Sound, which may be possible, as they can produce cheaper, because all their supplies cost less.
>
> We have had to base the prices of our productions on those of producers who have advantages towards cheap manufacture which we do not possess.

I think it is fair to deduce from that statement that it is the intention of the lumbermen, should this duty be imposed, to take the fullest possible advantage of it; and we in the North-west Territories would expect to see the price of lumber to us immediately advanced to the extent of $2 a thousand.

If there is any doubt in the minds of the hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution or those who support it that that would be the result, I would quote for their benefit a statement that was made in this Chamber some years ago by a gentleman whose views on questions of tariff at one time, at all events, met with considerable respect. I wish to quote from a statement made by the Hon. George E. Foster, ex-Finance Minister, in this Chamber, in 1894, which will be found in 'Hansard' of that year, at page 198. He said :

> I say that in the initial years of a national policy, with a protective principle in it, it will have the effect of enhancing the cost of goods, and that at the first the cost of goods will be very closely up to the measure of the protection which is given. If it does not have that effect, why should it ever be adopted at all, and what is the good of it?

So, according to a late Finance Minister in this House, if the measure proposed here this afternoon would not have the effect of increasing the price of lumber very nearly $2 a thousand, what would be the use of adopting the measure at all ?

Some years ago Canada did impose duties upon this article, and I am going to quote another statement which was made in this Chamber by the Hon. Mr. Foster to show the condition of affairs as he found it in Manitoba and the North-west Territories under the system of duties which up to the year

1894, was in force in this country. The members of the House will recollect that Hon. Mr. Foster and a colleague went to the North-west in the fall of 1893, with the purpose of looking into the conditions of commerce and agriculture in that country, and with the avowed object of revising the then existing tariff; and at the next session of parliament a revision of the tariff was proposed by Mr. Foster. In the course of the speech which he made in the House at that time, there occurs this statement, to which I would beg to draw the close attention of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House and any hon. gentleman on this side who may be disposed to favour the proposition of the hon. member for East Simcoe. Mr. Foster said :

There was no one feature of our examination into the condition of things in the North-west which impressed itself so forcibly upon my mind as the combine which existed for the distribution and sale of lumber. Every town was parcelled out. One or two men were selected, to whom were given the monopoly of selling in each place. The prices were fixed, and if they sold a fraction of a cent under the fixed price, their privilege was taken away and given to somebody else. That monopoly bore heavily upon the people of the country, where lumber is essentially necessary in the building of barns and houses, and I came to the conclusion that if possible help should be given by putting lumber on the free list.

There a condition of affairs is described which I would ask any hon. gentleman in the House candidly to say whether he would like to have brought into force again in Manitoba and the North-west Territories; and the measure proposed here this afternoon is a measure calculated to cause a return of that condition of affairs.

Another plea that is made in behalf of the lumbermen is that they want the control of the Canadian market. I have taken some pains to look up statistics in connection with this industry, and so far as I have been able to ascertain, the lumbermen of Canada pretty well control the lumber market of Canada at the present time without any duty. Our exports of lumber amount in round figures to $25,000,000 a year. We import a little over $2,500,000 a year. The figures prepared in any of the departments of the government at Ottawa do not show what the total production of the lumber mills of Canada is; but so far as I have been able to ascertain by figures and calculations, I would place the total annual production of lumber in Canada at about $70,000,000. Of that, as I have said, we export about $25,000,000 worth and we import a little over $2,500,000; so that it would appear that the consumption of lumber in Canada amounts to about $47,500,000 worth annually. If these figures are correct, and I believe they are, then the fact remains that the lumbermen of Canada at this time have control of 95 per cent of the Canadian market; in other words, that the total importation of lumber does not amount to over 5 per cent of the total consumption of lumber in this country.

Another argument which appeals to me as being the most weighty one urged here this afternoon, is that we should impose a duty on lumber as an international measure—a measure which might have some effect upon our neighbours to the south. I am free to say that if I believed there was any real ground to hope that the imposition of a duty on lumber by Canada would lead the United States to give us reciprocity in that article, I might be willing to agree to the proposition ; but it seems to me, in looking over the fiscal history of Canada and the United States, that there can be found not the slightest ground of hope that this would be the result. It seems to me that the history of the last eighteen or twenty years is bound to prevent any one who carefully considers the subject from believing or hoping that we can by the imposition of a tariff, bring about reciprocity between Canada and the United States.

So far as regards the statements made of the large sale of imported lumber, I have just given the House in round figures the amount of sales, and it is about 5 per cent of the total consumption of lumber in Canada. But even if the amount were larger, that would not be a good argument in favour of the imposition of a duty. It would simply be proof that our lumbermen were charging a little more than they ought, because Canada is one of the chief lumber producing countries in the world, and our lumbermen should be able to sell at prices which would prevent competition by the imported article.

Let me refer very briefly to a remark made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), which would lead us to believe that, in his opinion, the members from Manitoba and the North-west Territories have rather outstayed their welcome in this House. He said that the older part of Canada had sacrificed or at least appropriated a great deal for the benefit of Manitoba and the North-west Territories ; and I think it is a fair deduction to make from his statement that he thought it was high time for the western members to cease making any requests or taking any stand in behalf of the west in this House. Well, in my opinion, and in that of the other members from the west, the boot is entirely on the other foot. True it is that in the last thirty years considerable sums have been voted by parliament to be expended in and for the benefit of Manitoba and the Territories, and true it is also that large subsidies have been voted for railway construction there. But when we come to analyse this expenditure, we find that if there is any room for complaint by any one that complaint should come from our western people. When the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was made, $25,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres of land were voted to

that company. Something over half the subsidy was in land, most of which was located in the Territories, so that the people of Manitoba and the Territories themselves contributed more than half of Canada's total contribution to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. And with regard to the votes passed every year for the carrying on of government in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, it must not be forgotten that amounts are apportioned by the statutes to the other provinces for the carrying on of local government. And I am in the judgment of every hon. member who has studied the position, when I say that man for man the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories pay a greater sum into the common revenues of the Dominion and receive less back from those common revenues than do the people of any other of the provinces.

Mr. HENRY CARGILL (East Bruce). As I have been always an ardent supporter of the national policy, Mr. Speaker, it will not surprise the House that I should rise to announce myself in favour of the present motion. I could give several reasons for this support, one of which is that I am firmly convinced that this motion is in the interests of the people generally, and not specially in the interests of the lumbermen. I am also very much encouraged by the announcement of the Finance Minister a few evenings ago that we are on the crest of the wave of prosperity in this country, and by the remarks of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I have always looked upon that hon. gentleman as one of the most shrewd, level-headed, practical business men in this country, and ever since I came to this House I have listened with interest to his speeches. And although I have not always agreed with him, I have never failed to recognize the ability with which he invariably presents his case. On this occasion, I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman has been voicing the sentiments of the lumbermen and the agriculturists of this country. Some hon. members from the North-west have stated that British Columbia alone is in favour of an import duty on American lumber. I have the honour of being a member of the Ontario Association of Lumbermen, and although not an extensive lumber operator, I have been engaged in lumbering many years. That association had its annual meeting, and unanimously came to the conclusion that it was necessary for the Canadian lumbermen to have an import duty on American products.

The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) says that he is a free trader. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am a free trader. I am willing to trade freely with those who will trade freely with me, but upon no other conditions, and therefore, I say that the Americans, having imposed a duty upon Canadian lumber, the interests of our lumbering industry, which is second only to the great agricultural interest, demand the imposition of a duty upon American lumber.

In order to understand fully this question, I will have to give you a brief review of the legislation of the respective governments, provincial and Dominion, respecting the lumbering interests. In Ontario, limits have been sold by public auction, American purchasers and purchasers of all nationalities being invited to attend these sales. At that time, there was no restriction as to manufacturing logs taken from these limits. Sir William Meredith, who was then leader of the opposition in the legislature, wanted the government to stipulate that when any limits were sold the logs should be manufactured in this country. The government, in its wisdom, did not think fit to adopt this proposition, but continued to sell these limits. The government alleged as a reason why they did not wish to impose the proposed restriction that they would not be able to obtain as large a price for the limits as they would without that restriction. I suppose that that was all right. But let us see how the Canadian producer is discriminated against. Suppose that I am a Canadian lumber manufacturer and attend the sale and purchase a limit. An American attends the same sale and purchases the adjoining limit ; I invest, say, $100,000 in the erection of a mill, and providing plant to convert the logs on that limit into lumber. The American sends in his men and teams and removes the timber from his limit during the winter, takes it down the stream and transports it across the lake to his mill in the United States, say at Bay City or Saginaw. The offal of that mill, all the slabs and sawdust are valuable there. But I erect a mill on the Georgian Bay. The money that the American spends in taking out and transporting and cutting that timber is all spent in the United States. I employ Canadian labour, and every dollar I spend in taking out logs and converting them into lumber is spent in Canada. Suppose that the American, when he gets his lumber manufactured, does not find a suitable market for certain grades. He is permitted to ship his lumber into Canada, irrespective of quality, without payment of any duty. On the other hand, if I want to send my lumber into the United States I am met with a duty of $2 per thousand. That is not right. It is not fair or just to the Canadian manufacturer ; it means that he is discriminated against and a preference given to the American. After the subject had been agitated a great many years, the government refused to impose an export duty. But regulations were made by the Ontario authorities stipulating that in the case of all limits sold or to be sold, the logs should be manufactured into lumber in this country. That regulation is carried into effect,

and the result is that the Americans who bought our Canadian limits and who were taking the logs out of the country and manufacturing them in the United States are to-day manufacturing them into logs in Canada. But the injustice to the Canadian manufacturer still remains. That $2 per thousand is there. It should be removed. I know that very important and influential deputations have waited on the right hon. leader of the government and his colleagues who have met for the purpose of hearing their grievances. I believe the matter was very forcibly and ably put before these hon. gentlemen ; and I hope that, notwithstanding the announcement of the Finance Minister a few days ago, that no tariff changes would be made during this session, he will reconsider the matter. He should come to the conclusion that the poor lumbermen of this country deserve well at the hands of the government, and that, not only in their interest but in the interest of this country, he should impose a duty on common lumber coming into this country. One hon. gentleman said that the United States was the only market we had for Canadian hardwood lumber. I beg to say that we cannot supply the demand in our own country. The Canadian furniture manufacturers have to import considerable quantities of hardwood lumber such as oak. There is no reason why, if I ship five or ten million feet of lumber to the United States and pay $10,000 or $20,000 duty for the privilege of doing so, the American lumberman, when he ships the same quantity into this country should pay no duty.

Mr. EDWARDS. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cargill) a question ? If the Americans place themselves on a par with the Chinamen, is Canada to do the same thing ?

Mr. CARGILL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards), I think, said that the Canadian lumbermen were of too large a calibre to condescend to approach this government and ask for the imposition of a paltry duty on lumber. Now, I think there are as good, as wealthy and as large lumber operators in the United States as there are in Canada, and they have not failed to condescend to apply to the authorities for an imposition of a duty on Canadian lumber going into the United States. The hon. gentleman also says that such a duty would be detrimental to the interests of the farmer, and that the farmer cannot be protected. I claim, and have always claimed, that the farmers of this country have had more consideration than any other class in the community. Their grievances have always been redressed when the government has been appealed to. I represent a rural constituency and have succeeded in being elected. And I have always stated to my constituents, a large majority of whom are farmers, that the farmer was the first man considered by any government. How do we protect the manufacturer ? By placing a duty on goods similar to those which he produces, in order to prevent those goods coming into the country in competition with his. How can we protect the farmer ? By putting a little duty on beef, on pork and everything that would come into this country were no duty imposed to compete in this market with the products the farmer has to sell. As I said before, the consideration of the farmer has always been first with the legislatures and the governments of this country. Why ? All governments are elected by farmers in this country, for the farmers are the majority. Of course, politicians are always looking for votes, and the way to get votes is to try to give the people who have the votes as great consideration as possible.

Reference was made to Mr. Waldie. I think Mr. Waldie is pretty well known in this country. He has had the honour of occupying a seat in this House. He is a very extensive lumber operator, and is president of the Ontario Lumberman's Association. I know that he headed large deputations to Ottawa on two or three occasions for the purpose of asking the government to impose a duty on American lumber. I do think and sincerely believe that the Finance Minister will eventually come to the conclusion that it is his duty to grant the request of the lumbermen, both of Ontario and of British Columbia.

Now, the lumbermen have never had any protection. I remember well that when the national policy was first proposed in this country a good many years ago, the hon. member for North Norfolk was not in sympathy with it. I remember reading a very fine speech made by that hon. gentleman on that occasion, in which he contended that the national policy would ruin the lumber interest. For instance, he gave the increased cost of the saws, and rubber belting, and everything the lumberman was likely to use in his business ; the imposition of a duty would necessarily increase their cost and increase the price to the lumberman. Now, some gentlemen have said that the lumbermen have become millionaries. Well, I do not know many of them who have. I think probably if that statement had been confined to the limit holders it might have been within the mark. I do know several gentlemen in this country who have bought limits, and I presume they made money out of them. Limits are usually put up at auction, and the purchasers have got to pay a higher price than any one else. But, I think it usually happens that they only hold them for a short time, until they find some one else who wants them worse than they do, and they sell them at a profit of a few thousand dollars. But the lumbermen are unfortunately not in that happy position. We have got to go to the bush, cut our logs, hitch up our oxen, and draw the logs to the

mill; and there is a great deal of hard work to be done before we succeed in making much money.

One gentleman said that the British Columbia lumbermen had not much to complain of, because they had to pay 50 cents freight per hundred pounds on the transportation of their lumber from British Columbia to Manitoba and the North-west Territories. That would amount to about $15 per thousand feet. Well, I think that the British Columbia lumberman who has to pay $15 per thousand feet in order to get his lumber to market in the North-west or Manitoba will not find much of a market there. That is a very high rate of freight to pay.

One gentleman said that only a small fraction of the lumbermen in this country were asking for the imposition of a duty, and he said that there were many lumbermen and especially the small millowners throughout the country, who did not want the duty. I admit that. But it is to be remembered that the majority of the sawmill men have a home market, they can sell their lumber in the nearest town, because there is generally some live industry in the town that uses all the lumber they can manufacture. Consequently we do not expect them to join in with the larger lumbermen who are forced, compelled in fact, to ship their lumber either to the United States or to Great Britain. Of course a large market has been created in Great Britain for what is called deals, a great proportion of the stock of that article finds its way to Great Britain. But there are many other grades of lumber which do not find a market locally, and it is that kind of lumber which comes in competition with lumber imported from the United States.

A few years ago I remember lumber took a jump upwards, when times were very dull. I remember one year several million feet of two-inch plank were brought from Duluth into the city of Toronto for sidewalks. The local dealers in the city of Toronto found they could bring lumber from Duluth and sell it cheaper than they could purchase it of Canadian lumbermen. No doubt that displaced just so much lumber manufactured by Canadians. I think on the whole that the lumbermen have made out a good case and that they are entitled to the consideration of this government. We hope that the government will consider the matter and impose a duty on American lumber coming into this country.

Now, the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) denied that there was any benefit to Canadians from the imposition of an export duty on logs, or the stipulation that logs should be manufactured in this country. He also stated that logs on the Georgian Bay were just as valuable as they were after they were cut up, and the manufactured article was piled up in the yard. That appears to me a very singular thing. We have some lumbermen on the Georgian Bay who cut immense quantities of logs and manufacture them in their mills; and if they can dispose of the logs for the same amount of money that they can dispose of the lumber when manufactured, I should not think they would go to the expense of manufacturing. The hon. gentleman imputes motives to people who stand up and want to protect their own industries. Well, I suppose most men are built that way; and he would be the greatest philanthropist I ever saw if he did not condescend to say such things on some occasions.

Now, I think I am about through with all the remarks which I have to make on this occasion, but, I thought it was my duty to express my views upon this question. In conclusion, I will say that I do hope that after the frequent interviews which the Prime Minister and his colleagues have had with these important deputations that waited upon them for the purpose of getting that duty put on, they will give heed to the representations which have been made to them. I can only feel, and I believe, that the government will do what I consider would be most beneficial to one of the most important industries in this country.

Mr. ROBERT HOLMES (West Huron). Mr. Speaker, allow me to say a word or two in connection with this motion. I shall not take up very much time of the House, because I do not propose to say very much. If the people of the country gave to the government of the day a mandate at the recent election, that mandate was that there should be lower duties instead of higher duties. I think, that, in many of the discussions that took place throughout the country in connection with the election, the question of lowering the duties instead of raising them, was, to use a common phrase, a burning question with the people, and I am glad that the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) has sounded a note of warning, not alone for the benefit of the government, but for the benefit of hon. members on this side of the House, who, I am sorry to say, are drifting into harmony with protection principles, as shown in their speeches on the budget.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. HOLMES. It is not necessary to give the names ; you can draw any inference you like. Any one who has listened to the remarks this afternoon from hon. gentlemen who support this resolution, will be convinced by the coolness with which they have approached the proposition. They tell us that the matter is for the general welfare of the country, that it is for the general welfare of the people at large. The agriculturists, of all other classes, are the ones who are to derive the benefit therefrom. They try to convey the impression that there is no selfishness in connection with this proposition. It seems to me that a duty of this kind, if it is going to affect anybody at all,

is certainly for the benefit of the particular class in whose behalf the duty is being imposed. I am not surprised that the people of the North-west Territories should feel hostile to a proposition of this kind, because they are subject, perhaps, more than anybody else, to what would be the outcome of a tariff on lumber. The manufacturers in every part of the Dominion, the manufacturers in small towns, as well as in the large towns, would be affected by a duty of this kind. Manufacturers tell us, that the present competition is such that they have to reduce the cost of manufacturing to the lowest possible basis in order that they may compete, not alone with the manufactures produced in their own land, but with the manufactures that come in from elsewhere, and that, in order to do so, it is absolutely necessary for them to procure their raw material at the lowest cost. I agree almost entirely with the statement of the hon. member for Russell that we should guard as far as possible against an increase of duties and against an increase in the cost of manufacturing. It seems to me that the farmer bears the burden of it all. When the statement is made that the farmer derives a very great indirect benefit as the outcome of the protective system, the author of that statement is simply throwing dust in the eyes of the farmer. The farmers derive no actual benefit from any phase of protection. They are the burden-bearers, and if there is an increase of duty on lumber or anything else the farmer has to bear the burden thereof. Just let me say another word or two, and it is this : I think that Canada should not be influenced by the legislation of the United States upon this point, or upon any other point. I think that Canada ought to legislate for itself. We should legislate in the interest of the people of Canada because they are our first concern. It may be true, as it is said, that we are adjacent to another country with interests and resources very much like our own, but, I think the principle that should guide us in this House, is the principle of our own interests absolutely and entirely, regardless of the interests of the adjoining community. The policy that should be adopted is the policy of making the cost of manufacturing and the cost of living as low as we can consistent with the requirements of the revenue of the country. I think that the government are entitled to commendation instead of condemnation for their attitude in connection with the delegations that have come down here. We know perfectly well the pressure that is brought to bear upon the government by delegations that come down here representing their interests and asking that something shall be done for them. We know very well how hard it is for governments to resist the demands of deputations of that kind. We have, in the legislation of the past, evidence of the government having listened to the arguments that had been advanced, of having legislated in this direction, and then, having, the next day, to legislate in a counter direction in order to appease some rival interest. I think the government should be commended for not listening to the representations that have been made so far as the woollen interests, the lumbering interests, and other interests, are concerned, that have brought pressure to bear upon them in order to induce them to increase duties. I agree with the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in his admirable speech the other night, wherein he said that the policy of this government should be in the direction of freer trade, of freer trade relations, in the direction of reducing, as far as we possibly can, the cost of manufactured articles, and therefore, I think, that the government are entitled to credit from the fact of their not having listened to the representations that have been made and not having yielded to the pressure that has been brought to bear upon them. They would have met my views even more largely had they seen their way clear to make some reductions in the tariff. While hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are tendering advice to the hon. Minister of Finance, it would have been a gratification to myself, I will say frankly, if he had seen his way clear to make a reduction on some articles which enter into the general consumption. There may be inequalities in any tariff, there may be matters that call for readjustment, there may be incongruities and to my mind there always are, and I think a man who is a protectionist out and out is placed in a contradictory position. He is called upon continually to extract himself from a difficulty of one kind or another because of the very policy he is endeavouring to support and to put into the tariff. A policy of protection is a policy of contradiction, and therefore, the position that those who support it are placed in, is such that they have constantly to excuse themselves for the position that it has led them into. I want to record my hostility to the proposition to place a duty on lumber, because I do not believe it is in the interests of the people as a whole, but that it is in the interest purely and simply of the lumbermen.

Mr. ARTHUR W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). Mr. Speaker, my intention is merely to call attention to the interest of the North-west Territories in the motion which is under discussion this afternoon, and I do so because I think that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) probably left a misconception in the minds of some hon. members in quoting the Trade and Navigation Returns. He referred to the very small amount of lumber that is imported into the North-west Territories. But, I think he has only told half the story, because Manitoba and the North-west Territories gen-

erally go together in such matters as this. The hon. member for East Grey was correct when he said that the total importation of lumber into the North-west Territories was 707,000 feet, of a value of $7,505, but, he omitted to say that we imported into Manitoba 21,540,000 feet, of a total value of $272,471. The total value of free lumber imported from the United States was $574,233. Therefore, Manitoba and the North-west Territories put together imported 48 per cent, or about one-half of the total free lumber imported into Canada. The hon. gentleman will find that the other province which imported largely was the province of Ontario, and Ontario imported 8,768,000 feet, at a value of $205,452. Taking that lumber all round, it was lumber of the better class ; whereas, the lumber imported into Manitoba and the North-west Territories is of the cheapest kind, averaging only $12.50 per thousand. It would appear that the lumber imported into eastern Canada is principally for manufacturing purposes, or for finishing and the like, while the lumber imported into the west is for the erection of farm buildings, and for use by the man who puts up his wood shed until such time as he can raise money enough to build a house in front of it. The total import of lumber last year into Canada amounted to 36,309,000 feet, and of this quantity, 22,247,000 was imported into the North-west Territories and Manitoba. You will see that Manitoba and the North-west Territories imports more than two-thirds of this lumber, so that if the duty were increased there would be a most outrageous tax put on the people of the North-west, the people who have taken up farms, the people who have small means, and many of whom find it very difficult to gain a foothold for themselves and families. I wish to call attention to another matter which is in exactly the opposite direction to this. I assert that there is altogether too high a duty on lumber at the present time, and that it is too much protected. I find that last year there was imported into Manitoba 3,377,000 feet of dutiable lumber, valued at $45,279, and the duty on that was $11,319. The point is just this : that the dutiable lumber is lumber that has been dressed on both sides, or lumber tongued and grooved, but if we are to have free lumber, then I say that the duty should only be charged on the increased value given to that manufactured lumber by the labour spent on it in tonguing and grooving. As it is now, lumber is dutiable because it has gone through some manufacturing process, and the duty is charged on the original value of the lumber as well as on the labour expended on it afterwards. That is a grave injustice to the people who want free lumber. I am altogether opposed to this motion, which proposes to put a duty on lumber, and I am quite sure that the North-west Territories, as well as Manitoba —which the hon. gentleman from East Grey very discreetly omitted to mention—are absolutely opposed to any such motion being adopted by this parliament.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Quebec Terminal and Railway Company.—Mr. Malouin.

Bill (No. 68) respecting the McClary Manufacturing Company.—Mr. Hyman.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the St. Lawrence Power Company.—Mr. Logan.

Bill (No. 70) respecting the E. B. Eddy Company.—Mr. Champagne.

Bill (No. 71) respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Vancouver, Westminster, Northern and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

NOVA SCOTIA CLAIMS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to remind the hon. Minister of Finance, with whom I exchanged a word on the subject, that, if my recollection serves me rightly, the government stated some days ago that so soon as the award in the case of the claims of the Nova Scotia government against the Federal government was made, the papers would be brought down. It would take some time, of course, to make a complete return, and I merely wish to say that I would be greatly obliged if the government would cause to be laid on the Table the order in council under which the reference was made, giving us in that way an idea of the scope of the reference.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the answer to my hon. friend was given by the Prime Minister, and my recollection is the same as his. I will mention it to my right hon. friend, and I see no reason why the papers particularly mentioned by the hon. gentleman should not be brought down at once.

Mr. MONK. Can the hon. gentleman tell us what the amount of the award is ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I only know from the public press, which states that it is $671,000. I have not seen the document.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

On the order :

House in committee on Bill (No. 9) An Act to amend 'The Dominion Elections Act.'—Mr. Henderson.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend has already expressed his willingness to let this Bill stand until the government brings down its Bill on the same subject. I think it will be obviously more convenient that the several Bills dealing with this subject should be treated in this way, the hon. members in charge of them reserving their right to deal with them afterwards, if the government Bill does not meet their views.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am quite willing to let the Bill stand on that condition. I would be glad to have a copy of the government Bill, so as to ascertain that the provisions of this Bill are contained in it.

Order allowed to stand.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT.

On the order :

House in committee on Bill (No. 10) An Act to amend 'The Weights and Measures Act.'—Mr. Smith (Wentworth).

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue informs me that he has in contemplation to bring in at once a government Bill amending the Weights and Measures Act, and I would be glad if my hon. friend would adopt the same course with regard to his Bill that I have just suggested with regard to other Bills, namely, that the whole matter be discussed under the government Bill, leaving his Bill on the Order paper, so that if necessary he can move it at a later stage.

Mr. SPROULE. Can that be done if the government takes the only day which is left to private members, as I understand they intend shortly to do ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a very proper suggestion, and I think that before the government takes that day, there should be an understanding with regard to these Bills, so that the position of hon. gentlemen in charge of them would not be prejudiced.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand that when the government announced that they proposed to introduce legislation of a character dealing with a matter which is the subject of a Bill standing in the name of a private member, it was understood that if the government should change its plan, it should in good faith see that the hon. member who allowed his measure to stand at the request of the government should have an opportunity afterwards to bring it forward.

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite agree that if the hon. gentleman allows his measure to stand at our request, we should see that he has an opportunity of bringing it on later.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). May I ask if the government Bill embodies the principle of this Bill ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier). I have a Bill pertaining to weights and measures to which may be added the provisions of the Bill now on the Order paper in the name of the hon. member.

Mr. MONK. If that be the case, why should we not go into committee on the Bill, and let it pass the committee stage ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Another reason is that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is not here to-night, and I know that he wishes to take part in the discussion on this question.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I should like very much that the Minister of Agriculture should be here, as I know he is well acquainted with the subject of this Bill.

Order allowed to stand.

ALIEN LABOUR.

On the order :

For resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Clare : 'That Bill (No. 5) an Act to amend the "Act to restrict the importation and employment of aliens," be now read a second time.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think this stands in exactly the same position as the other matters referred to.

Order allowed to stand.

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

On the order :

For second reading of Bill (No. 18) to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—Mr. Richardson, Lisgar.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I think it will be better to let this stand, and it can be considered when the Bill of the government dealing with the same subject is before the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I have no objection.

Order allowed to stand.

BEET ROOT SUGAR.

On the order :

For resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Sproule : 'That, having regard to the large importations of sugar into Canada for home consumption, and that it has been de-

monstrated beyond a doubt that the cultivation of the sugar beet in the Dominion is not only feasible but is being successfully grown in many parts of the country at present; therefore in the opinion of this House, in order to stimulate the farmers of Canada to engage in the growth of this valuable product, and also to encourage the establishment of beet-root sugar factories, a bounty should be offered for all beet-root sugar manufactured in the Dominion during the next ten years.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). As the subject covered by this resolution is being discussed in the budget debate, I think the hon. gentleman would do well not to press this motion on the House.

Mr. SPROULE. As the budget debate covers the same question, I do not see the necessity of pressing this motion.

Order withdrawn.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—FREE TRANSPORTATION.

On the order :

For resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Robinson (Elgin) : 'That inasmuch as almost every mile of railway in Canada has been aided, to a greater or lesser extent, by the Dominion government, the local legislatures, and the numerous municipalities through which they run ; and large sums of money have been given, as well as charters, conferring upon these railways a valuable franchise.

That inasmuch as the railways of the country are continuously seeking legislation for the advancement of some particular interest, or for securing some specific object ; which legislation occupies the time of this House at a considerable cost to the country.

That inasmuch as such legislation, in order to be effective for the purposes intended, should be well considered, both by evidence and personal inspection of the location affected, by the members of this House, to the end that the best interests of all parties concerned may be safeguarded.

That, in order that these ends may be satisfactorily attained, the different railway companies, for many years past, have given free transportation to all the members of parliament ;

And inasmuch as such free transportation, coming, as it does, from the railway corporations, no doubt with a view of affording every facility to the members for obtaining the fullest information as to the needs and requirements, both of the railway corporations and the country, and, notwithstanding such free transportation is uniform to all the members of this House, the object and intention is largely misunderstood by the people, and construed into corrupt intentions on the part of the railway corporations, thereby subjecting both the railway corporations and the members of this House to an unjust and unfair criticism, which they are not always in a position to defend.

Therefore, in the opinion of this House, the present system of free transportation is unwise and undesirable, and should be discontinued, and a system substituted which would be free from the charges of corrupt intention or from adverse criticism.

That inasmuch as the railway corporations receive more than adequate compensation for that service as now rendered ; this House is of the opinion that an Act should be placed on the Statute-book making it incumbent on all railway corporations receiving a franchise or government aid either in money or land, to furnish free transportation to all members of this House, upon the certificate of the Clerk of the House ; and that no mileage indemnity be hereafter paid by the government to the members while in attendance upon their parliamentary duties.'

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I do not suppose I am entitled to speak again on this question. It was thoroughly discussed when before the House on a former occasion, and I would like to have a vote upon it so that we might see how many members there are in this House who hold the same opinion on this question as I do.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I think it would be more satisfactory to my hon. friend to have a vote when there is a larger House than at present. He certainly could not expect to-night to get a very clear exposition of the views of the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The members of the government evidently anticipated a vote on this question, judging by their absence.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And apparently the leader of the opposition also.

Order allowed to stand.

On motion of Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 8.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 21, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

STATIONERY PURCHASE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

What are the names of the members of the firm of the Ottawa Supply Company from whom goods to the amount of $2,017.09 were purchased, as shown in the Auditor General's Report for 1899 and 1900, page S—41?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. S. S. Stratton.

MR. DAVID HODGE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

Has David Hodge, preventive officer at Mallorytown, in the county of Leeds, been dismissed ? If so, when? Were any charges preferred

against him? Was an investigation held? Is it the intention of the government to appoint a successor to Mr. Hodge, if he has been dismissed?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) :

The services of Mr. David Hodge, acting preventive officer of customs at Mallorytown, were dispensed with on the 9th February, 1901.

No charges were preferred against him.

It was not considered that there is any necessity for an officer at that point.

It is not the intention of the government to appoint a successor to Mr. Hodge.

MR. A. FOSTER.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

Has Mr. A. Foster, lockmaster at Jones' Falls, on the Rideau canal, been superannuated. If so, when? If he has been superannuated, who has been appointed as his successor?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

Mr. A. Foster, lockmaster at Jones' Falls, on the Rideau canal, has not been superannuated. Speaking from recollection, I think he has applied for superannuation, but his application has not yet been entertained.

P. E. I. RAILWAY.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Did the government receive a petition, during the year 1900, from the inhabitants of lots 7, 8 and 9 in Prince county, P.E.I., asking that a branch line of railway be constructed from the Prince Edward Island Railway, at or near O'Leary station, to the Gulf Shore, at lot 7?

2. If so, what action does the government intend taking in the matter, and will they construct this branch railway as contemplated and recommended by the late government?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

It does not appear that any petition such as described in the above question has been received by this department.

SS. AMELIA.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. What is the nature of the contract entered into between the government and Leslie, Hart & Co., owners of the steamship Amelia, running to the Magdalen Islands?

2. What is the tonnage and class of boat required?

3. What is the accommodation for passengers?

4. What is the freight capacity and the facilities for handling same?

5. What is the speed of boat, number of trips required during season, and port of departure and ports of call?

6. Has any complaint reached the government about the service, and is the service to be improved? If not, why?

Mr. TAYLOR.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I beg to reply :

1. The service to be performed between the Magdalen Islands and Pictou is a weekly one, making each week one full round trip between Pictou and the islands and return, calling each way at Georgetown and Souris, in Prince Edward Island, at Amherst Island, Point Bossé, Etang du Nord, Grand Entry and Grindstone Island ; and once each month during the months of June, July, August and September trip to be extended to Bryan Island, and whenever the weather is unfavourable for landing mails at Etang du Nord, that for House Harbour and Etang du Nord, to be landed at Grindstone Island ; calls at Grand Entry need not be made after the month of September. The service is from the opening to the closing of navigation in each year ; and the contract terminates 31st December, 1901.

2. The tonnage is 356 gross, and 103 net. The vessel is classed 100 A1 at Lloyds'.

3. She holds a certificate for 250 passengers, sleeping berths to accommodate 20 passengers in the saloon, and the same number in the fore-cabin.

4. Her cargo capacity is 15,000 cubic feet, or equal to about 2,000 barrels. Have no special information with reference to facilities for handling the same.

5. Speed is about 12½ miles per hour. Number of trips, see answer to No. 1.

6. No complaint has reached the government about the service, which seems to be all that is required.

LONGUEUIL ORDNANCE LANDS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Who has rented the ordnance lands in the parish of Longueuil?

2. What is annually paid for the same?

3. Is the rental paid in advance?

4. Are there any arrears of rent due the government? If so, what is the amount of said arrears?

5. How many applicants were there for said lands, or portions of lands, and what were their names?

6. Were these lands advertised for sale, and when?

7. How many lots were sold?

8. If no sale took place, what cause prevented said sale?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. Joseph Lapointe.

2. Three hundred dollars.

3. Yes.

4. Fifty dollars of the rent for 1901 remains due and unpaid.

5. Two. Joseph Lapointe and A. C. Bernard.

6. Yes. July 17th, 1900.

7. No lots were sold.

8. The offers made did not exceed the upset price.

EXPORTS TO GERMANY.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth)—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What were the exports of the Dominion of Canada to Germany in the years 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1900 respectively, and what was the total amount of duty paid thereon each year?

2. What portion of these goods were entered at Hamburg, and what was the total amount of duties paid thereon in each year, 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1900?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) :

1. The total value of goods exported from Canada to Germany during the fiscal years 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1900, respectively, was :

1897	$1,045,432
1898	1,837,448
1899	2,219,569
1900	1,715,903

2. The Canadian Trade Returns do not show the quantity or value of goods exported from Canada which were entered at Hamburg, nor the total amount of duties paid thereon in each year, 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1900. The official record of exports from Canada as compiled from export entries show the destination of goods exported by countries, but not by cities.

CORRECTION OF 'HANSARD.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (North Victoria). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make a correction. At page 1355 of the revised 'Hansard,' in the report of my speech of March 12 last, the names are incorrectly given. I was speaking of a woman who had reported that her house had been broken into, and she herself insulted by British soldiers. The name of the woman was Mrs. Schalkwyk ; and the name of the woman she afterwards said had been insulted was Mrs. De Wahl. In case of any question arising about the matter in the future, I wish these names to be correctly reported in 'Hansard.' Mrs. Schalkwyk was the woman who claimed she was first visited, and Mrs. De Wahl was the one who, Mrs. Schalkwyk said subsequently, was the one insulted. The report is also incorrect in this way—the soldiers did not approach either of the houses, but merely spoke to the lady from the road, and the admissions show this fully.

UNITED STATES CATTLE QUARANTINE.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I see the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) in his place. I would like to ask him if he will lay upon the Table all agreements and arrangements entered into between Canada and the United States relative to the quarantine of Canadian cattle entering the ports of the United States. I ask this in order that business may be expedited when we reach the hon. gentleman's estimates.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. S. A. Fisher). The only agreement that is in writing is that which was made in 1897. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) can have that at any time. I will see to it that the agreement is laid on the Table.

EXPORTATION OF GRAIN—REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the government to the report of the Royal Commission on the exportation of grain, of which Mr. Horn was chairman. Some days ago, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) inquired with regard to that report—which is a very important one, and one that we should have before proceeding with the estimates—and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) stated that it had not yet been received. I have no doubt that it is now in the hands of the government. May we expect to have it soon ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It can be brought down at once ; I will give orders accordingly.

PROPOSED POLAR EXPEDITION.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I have another question to ask—with regard to the proposal made to the government to equip a vessel for a polar expedition under the conduct of Captain Bernier. I understand that proposal has been made to the government. May we expect that the government will consider it and give us its views with regard to the matter within a limited space of time ? The session is advancing, and those who take an interest in that expedition would like to know if anything is going to be done.

The PRIME MINISTER. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) favour it ?

Mr. MONK. Personally, I do—certainly.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is a matter which the government has had under consideration, but I am not prepared to say that we have reached any conclusion yet. It is only fair and reasonable that we should give an answer at an early date, and we shall do so as early as possible.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). I desire to call attention to the condition of affairs respecting the meetings of the Public Accounts Committee—the ex-

traordinary infrequency with which that committee now meets. There is a universal desire in this House, I take it, that the business of the House shall be so expedited that our labours may be brought to an end within a reasonable time. I do not recollect any session when it was so difficult to get that committee together. There always seems to be some reason given for the committee not meeting. The absence of the chairman has been given as one reason, but that is not a good reason, so far as I can see, for the work of the committee being neglected. For the present, there is a vast amount of work to be done. It is ridiculous to suppose that the committee can audit anything like a quarter of the accounts it is their duty to audit, even if we sit for two months more. This week but one meeting of the committee has been called. I understand that the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding), realizing that there had been delay in connection with the meetings, and also the anxiety shown on all sides to expedite the work, said that he would consider some way to bring about more frequent meetings of the committee. Another reason given for the infrequency of meetings of the committee is, that there are meetings of other committees to which members of the Public Accounts Committee belong, and the Public Accounts Committee must give way. As to that, I would only suggest that there has never been a meeting of the committee this year at which there has not been a very good attendance, even when other committees were meeting. And the committee, perhaps, is over-large for the public purpose for which it is formed. I mention this matter rather at length to-day because I know there is a determination on the part of certain gentlemen who belong to that committee to carry out the audit of two or three accounts, the work in connection with any one of which, unless we get together more than once a week, certainly at least twice a week, will necessarily be prolonged.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I quite agree with my hon. friend (Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that, with respect to the past, perhaps it would have been better ir we had one or two meetings more. As to the suggestion that it is desirable that we should have two meetings a week, I do not feel able to agree to that as a fixed policy, because other engagements might arise to interfere with it. For example, yesterday we had difficulty in getting the members together, though I admit that there was a fair attendance, but members were constantly leaving the room to go into the adjoining room, where the Railway Committee was in session. The meetings of these committees side by side had a very confusing tendency. I think it right that the committee should meet frequently, and without committing myself to two meetings a week as a fixed rule, I shall see to it that the members of the committee shall have ample opportunity to deal with the matters to which the hon. gentleman has referred. On the return of the chairman, who, I hope, will be here to-day or to-morrow, I shall ask him to join me in adopting means that reasonable frequency shall mark the meetings of the committee hereafter.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Fielding :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty, and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure). Mr. Speaker, the very kind and generous treatment which I was accorded in this House on the occasion of my seconding the reply to the speech from the Throne has led me to take advantage of this occasion to address the House a second time upon the very important issues which are now being discussed. I know that participating in the budget debate is always, more or less, an ungrateful task—the task of handling figures, for a man who is not very conversant with them is not always a task of the most inviting character. But, the subject is one of such deep interest to the country at large that I believe the representatives of the people in this House should make known their views and the views of the people they represent. I have the honour, Sir, to represent a county down by the sea, not in one of the maritime provinces, but one of the last counties in the province of Quebec, a purely agricultural and fishing county. There are no manufactures there, but I hope that when the railway communications are better established, we shall have an important agricultural development.

In the meantime the people of the county of Bonaventure are deeply interested in the fiscal policy of the government. Perhaps they do not take the same deep interest in the subject as do some of the manufacturing centres of the Dominion, but they are anxious that any policy which will advance the best interests of Canada at large should be adopted by the government of the day. The favourite policy in the county of Bonaventure is reciprocity with the United States. There never was on that coast a more prosperous era than that which extended from 1854 to 1865 ; in fact that period was the most prosperous ever experienced by the province of Quebec. We all know that the present government have made determined efforts to bring about a better understanding with the United States ; we know that the hon. the Prime Minister secured the holding of an

international conference, which after many months of prolonged sittings, was unable to agree. But, Sir, that task should not be abandoned. Nature, in placing us alongside the United States on a border of nearly 4,000 miles, surely intended that there should be closer communication, closer trade relations, closer business relations than exist at the present time. We know that a majority of the people of the United States favour a highly protective tariff. But changes are occurring every day and every year in the politics of the United States. A party may be in power to-day which does not favour reciprocity with Canada ; but we should not abandon the task of securing better trade relations with the United States. The present fiscal policy of the Dominion has been lately discussed upon every hustings throughout the length and breadth of Canada. The people of Canada to-day, I believe, are more conversant with our fiscal policy than they have been at any other time in our history. Since 1878, seldom has any other political question dominated the great question of our fiscal policy. Our people to-day are becoming better acquainted with the importance of a tariff which meets the requirements of the various sections of the country. I am at heart a free trader, and I would like to see, if it were possible, free trade to-day among all the nations of the earth. But, Sir, great and beautiful as is the theory of free trade, we all know that free trade is impossible in this country. We all know that a revenue must be raised, and the only way in which it can be raised according to our views is by a customs tariff. The present tariff is a protective tariff in a sense that it affords protection, but it is mainly a revenue tariff. That is the idea, so far as I have been able to gather, of the majority of the Liberals in our province, they favour a tariff for revenue purposes, but a tariff which will at the same time afford to our manufacturing industries that measure of protection to which they are entitled.

We have been told in this House that the present government have no policy, that the present government have stolen the clothes of their opponents, that the present government have adopted the policy of the opposition. Speaking for myself, I am willing to accept all that is good, no matter whence it comes, even if it comes from the Conservative party. That which was good in the old tariff should be maintained. But a tariff is like every other human institution, it varies according to the circumstances of the times. Not many years ago, within the recollection of men sitting in this House, the Conservative party were almost free traders. They supported a revenue tariff previous to 1872, when the French Liberals in the city of Montreal and in the province of Quebec forming the Parti National, had for their first and foremost plank protection to our native industries. Consequently there is nothing extraordinary in the fact that some Liberals should have remained protectionists, since we are the political heirs of those who, twenty years ago, were in favour of extending protection to our native industries. The upheaval following the Canadian Pacific scandal led the Conservative forces into opposition. Sir John A. Macdonald, with that cunning and astuteness in statesmanship which made him one of the greatest men this country has produced, saw that a party advocating the benefits of protection to the various industries of the country, would be popular, and he came out in favour of a high tariff. The Liberals of that day thought a high tariff was not in the interests of the country. The people decided in favour of a high tariff ; and for eighteen years this high tariff has prevailed. The Liberal party remained in opposition until there was a turn in the tide, until the people realized that this tariff was intended not only to protect the manufacturing industries, but, even more, to maintain in power the party which was then at the head of affairs. The city of Montreal prospered no doubt under that tariff, as did other sections of the country. But a turn in the tide took place, and when the people realized that this tariff was intended merely to protect the manufacturer at the expense of the farmer, at the expense of the mechanic, at the expense of the workingman, they declared in favour of a readjustment of the tariff.

The right hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues have been blamed for having maintained the tariff which we now have upon the statute-book. Mr. Speaker, what would have happened in this country had the Prime Minister and his colleagues, with one fell swoop, removed the old tariff and brought it down to 17½ per cent? There would have been disaster all over the land, and the Conservative party would not have been able to find words strong enough to denounce the Liberal government. The fact is that our friends opposite are blaming the government of the day for having acted wisely, for having framed a policy that was calculated to protect all vested interests, while at the same time promoting the best interests of all sections of the country. Sir, we all remember the dire predictions which were made from every hustings in this country by hon. gentlemen opposite that if the Liberal party ever attained power our tall chimneys would become smokeless, soup kitchens would be erected on every street corner in our cities, our workingmen would be driven to the United States to seek that employment which their native land refused them. Have those prophecies been fulfilled ? Sir, this country has enjoyed a greater degree of prosperity during the last four years than it ever enjoyed before in all its history.

Hon. gentlemen preceding me in this debate have produced figures to show that in sixteen years, from 1880 to 1896, there was an increase of $36,000,000 in the business of Canada, while during the last four years there has been an increase of $142,000,000. That fact is the best answer which can be given to the demands which are now being made for a change in the fiscal policy of the country.

The hon. leader of the opposition has brought forward an amendment which certainly affords a new policy to the Conservative party. That new policy, in appearance, is the old one which is brought forward in a new form. The first paragraph of the amendment now before us is in favour of protection. Where can you find more adequate protection than that which is now extended to the manufacturing interests of Canada ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Is there, at the present moment, a single industry in this country which is suffering unduly or unjustly from the effects of this tariff ? Sir, I do not believe it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). It is disappointing, probably, to our opponents that the Liberal party have not afforded them the satisfaction of being able to declare that the fiscal policy of the present government has killed this industry or that industry. They have been robbed of that pleasure, of that satisfaction, and they are sorry, as an hon. friend observes. They have thought that the best way is to bring in a rider to the protection clause in this amendment proposing that we should ask for a mutual preference from England. Down in our province the Conservative party has at all times claimed to be the pillar of the church and the state. It has lived upon prejudice, while in other parts of Canada, it has lived, to a certain extent, upon the loyalty cry. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what, during the twenty, or twenty-five years, that the Conservative party held the reins of power in this country, did they do to bring about a better and closer understanding with the mother country ? What, Sir, have you heard in the old days of the national policy about bringing about a better understanding with Great Britain, bringing about a preference of any kind, or of any character, preferential trade, mutual or otherwise ? Sir John Macdonald, for the purpose of obtaining power, did not hesitate to introduce a tariff which was anti-British, which tended to remove Canada, as far as it could possibly be done by tariff, from its connection with the mother country. He had no idea then of bringing about a better understanding with Great Britain. He introduced a tariff which stood until it fell into decay in 1896. Our hon. friends declare, in another part of this amendment, that they are anxious to bring about closer trade relations with Australasia. If my memory is not at fault, there was a former Conservative Prime Minister of this country who made a futile attempt at bringing about a better understanding with Australasia. That will be within the memory of some hon. gentlemen. About the same time attempts were also made to bring about closer trade relations with the West Indies and other portions of the British Empire. There is no sane man in this House, or in this country, who would not employ all reasonable means to bring about closer trade relations, not only with Australia and the West Indies, but with every other country under the sun. We have brought about certainly an increase of business with Great Britain, but the task of the government, great as it has been during the last four years and beneficial as it has been to Canada at large, as shown in the enormous increase in our trade by $142,000,000 in four years' time, is not yet finished, and the efforts of the government must not stop at Great Britain. There are other countries where the farmer, the mechanic and the business man of Canada can find a market. Germany has been mentioned. Great as might be the German market, great as is the German Empire, there is a country lying alongside of Germany where Canada should have a market of the first order. I refer to France. France's natural condition today is such that she should have a large and increasing trade with Canada. We should have a trade there which should rank, at least, according to our population, in proportion to the trade which the United States have with that country. There is a great trade to be fostered with Belgium and with other countries in the eastern parts of Europe. No doubt the government are giving their attention to this point and are trying to increase as best they can our markets with these foreign countries. The last paragraph in the amendment refers to the duties on foreign goods. This may properly be described as advocating a reciprocity of tariffs. A reciprocity of tariffs is a thing which certainly might be in the interest of the country at a given moment, but it is one of those questions which has to be settled gradually as occasion presents itself, as it comes forward and the government, which have been in power for four years, cannot be expected in that time to bring about a complete revolution in the business affairs of Canada. As far as we are concerned down in our province, and I believe the same may be said of all the other provinces of Canada, the people are satisfied. The last elections were carried out not upon the policy which has been brought forth by the opposition, but upon other cries with which the members of this House are conversant, but, the people of Canada at large, I have no doubt, are satis-

fied with the present administration of affairs. They are satisfied with the fiscal policy. That policy has been clearly defined by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), by the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). It has been said, very truly in this House, that there should not be any whimsical changes in the tariff of the day. If there is anything which unsettles business it is these changes in the tariff. These changes occurred very often under the late government, but they were not as complete as might have been desired by some friends of the administration. The permanency of the tariff is one of those things which is a guarantee in itself to the manufacturer, and through the manufacturer, to the workingman and to others who are interested in the progress of the country. Now, I have referred in broad general terms to the amendment which has been placed before us and I wonder whether the Conservative party really think that the country is going to accept this as a change in their old policy. I do not think so and the best reason for not thinking that is that it is nothing more or less than a repetition of the old policy except in the name. We have been told that during the eighteen years of the national policy Canada progressed to an extraordinary extent. Such may have been apparently the case in certain manufacturing centres, but the country at large made no progress. The country at large remained stationary and emigration remained unchecked. During the thirty years in which the Conservative party were in power in this country, thousands upon thousands of Canadians left the country and settled in the United States. It is an almost incredible fact, but nevertheless true, that there are in the United States to-day over a million of Canadians, that there are almost half a million, if not half a million, of French Canadians in the eastern states, and that there are more people from the maritime provinces in some of the eastern American cities than are to be found in the cities of Halifax, or St. John. These things occurred under the old wavering policy of the Conservative party, but that condition of things has changed for the better now. A change has been brought about, a wise policy has been inaugurated, a policy which has produced a better understanding among the various classes of the Canadian people, a policy which is keeping our people at home, which is keeping them employed, which is keeping the manufacturers busy and which is finding markets for our farmers.

We are told now that this new policy of the Conservative party is intended to benefit Canada at large. That is a matter for difference of opinion and for discussion; that is a question which cannot be settled off-hand; but I would like, Mr. Speaker, with your permission to answer certain statements which have been made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), and by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) as to what policy was really endorsed by the people of Canada at the last election. These gentlemen opposite have told us that the race and religious cry was raised in the province of Quebec, and that it was that cry that carried the election. Our friend from West York (Mr. Wallace), who I know is very advanced in his ideas on the subject, when speaking on this motion the other night, said, alluding to the right hon. the Prime Minister:

> But he never went to a French gathering in which he did not refer to them as his fellow-countrymen because of their French origin. I have read the reports of his speeches, and in these he was wont to say: I am a Frenchman and am proud of it. The same blood flows in my veins as runs in yours, and I want your vote on the ground that we are all French.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcil) permit me. I said: I want your votes because we are French. I supplied that myself. I gave the quotation as read by the hon. member: The same blood flows in my veins as flows in yours. After that, as the 'Hansard' report will show, when the Prime Minister interrupted I stated that the words that were added were mine, and that they contained the only inference that could be drawn from his argument, else why did he use such language. I asked that question. The further report of the debate will show that.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). When the hon. gentleman from West York (Mr. Wallace) used those words he was at once called to order by the premier, who denied having used them.

Mr. WALLACE. He was not called to order.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). That is the report that 'Hansard' gives and the Prime Minister denied having used these words.

Mr. WALLACE. He denied having used words I did not attribute to him.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I could quote other portions of the hon. gentleman's speech which all tends in the same direction. Here, for instance, is some language used by the hon. member for West York:

> Why, these men are in power to-day because they successfully raised that cry. They have fifty-eight out of sixty-five members of the province of Quebec, not because their public policy was acceptable to the people of that province, but because of the racial cries that were raised by the Minister of Inland Revenue, by the First Minister himself, and by all the ministers and by all the members on that side of the House.

Mr. WALLACE. Hear, hear.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I should like briefly to refer to the vote in the province of Quebec at the last election to show that no racial cry ever dominated in that province. The Conservative party in Canada has had a glorious past. The Conservative party of former days was led by men—and I do not wish to be personal to those who are now at the head of that party—but in the past it was led by men who certainly accomplished a great deal for this country. Confederation was brought about through the efforts of Sir George Etienne Cartier, supported as he was by the almost unanimous feeling of the province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). For thirty years the province of Quebec maintained the Conservative party in power, and during these long years was there ever a cry raised that the province of Quebec voted Conservative because Cartier was a Frenchman? Never, Sir, did we hear that. The province of Quebec in those days believed the Conservative party was the political party which could bring about the best understanding in this country, which could develop this young land of ours and lay the foundation of a great nation in the future. The Conservative party in those days had a dual policy. The French Conservative party in Quebec used the church; that is, impressed the people with the idea that it had the support of the church. That was one policy of the Conservative party, and the other part of the Conservative policy was furnished by the friends of the hon. member for West York.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). To-day the conditions are changed. On the 7th of November last, Quebec voted in favour of the best men and in favour of the best policy. There was a man in the province of Quebec at the last election who had sat for over twenty years in this House; an estimable gentleman personally; a gentleman who aspired to the leadership of his compatriots, but that man had the ill-luck to link his fortunes with the member for West York, and so we saw the French and Catholic county of Beauharnois discard its former member (Mr. Bergeron) and elect an English-speaking Protestant Liberal (Mr. Loy) in his stead.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. member permit me ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. I am asking the hon. member (Mr. Marcil) a question and not his backers. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Bergeron linked his fortunes with mine. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcil) read the Toronto Globe he would have seen the report of a speech made by Mr. Bergeron in the city of Montreal in which he bitterly attacked myself. I presume, Mr. Speaker, that that accounted for his defeat in Beauharnois; and by a Protestant.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I am sorry that the member for West York had to be disavowed by his own colleague, but I am still more sorry that Mr. Bergeron ever allowed himself to link his fortunes with those of the hon. member (Mr. Wallace). I do not wish, Sir, to wander away from the amendment before the House, but I think I am justified in my remarks in view of the statements made by the two hon. gentlemen to whom I have referred (Mr. Wallace and Mr. Bennett). I do not wish the statement to be allowed to go broadcast through the country, without contradiction, that the province of Quebec voted upon racial issues at the last election. There are in this House eighteen English-speaking members from the province of Quebec, thirteen of whom are Protestants and the other five English-speaking Catholics. Without analysing the vote in detail, I may mention some very conspicuous instances to show that the French Canadians voted for the best men regardless of race or religious issues. We have in the city of Montreal an electoral division composed of St. Lawrence and St. Louis wards, the latter ward being overwhelmingly French and the former largely Catholic.

The French Canadians of that division could have legitimately asked to be represented by one of themselves ; but they gave way, and my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) was elected by an overwhelming majority. One of the old historic counties of the province of Quebec, the county of Chateauguay, that piece of land which should be sacred to all Canadians, for there French Canadians saved the British flag to this country—that county, with its overwhelming French Catholic population, has been represented in this House since confederation by a Protestant. We have the constituency of Quebec West, which is overwhelmingly Catholic, represented in this House by one of the ministers of the Crown (Hon. Mr. Dobell). We have the county of Sherbrooke represented by my hon. friend (Mr. McIntosh), although the French Canadians are in a majority there, and could have insisted, had they so desired, on being represented by one of their own people. They preferred, however, to have an English-speaking Protestant, because they are represented by a French Canadian in the local legislature. That is an arrangement very often made in the province of Quebec. Then there is the county of Missisquoi, which for

many years has been represented by an English-speaking Protestant. An English-speaking Protestant (Mr. Meigs) represents it in this House at the present time, and a French Canadian represents it in the local legislature. We have the St. Antoine division of Montreal, which ranks as a Protestant division, though its population is almost equally divided between Catholics and Protestants. The religious question was never raised there, and it is represented in this House by an English Protestant (Mr. Roddick). Then, the county of Quebec, nine-tenths of the population of which is French, and in which it is rare to find an English-speaking man, is represented in this House by the Solicitor General, one of the most prominent Irishmen in the Dominion. The county of Jacques Cartier, also overwhelmingly French, is represented in this House by my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Monk). The united counties of Richmond and Wolfe, two former English-speaking divisions of the eastern townships, where the population is almost three-fourths French, are represented in the local House by an English-speaking Protestant, and in this House by an Irish Roman Catholic. You have here eighteen constituencies in the province of Quebec, in which, with very few exceptions, had the French and Catholic vote been used as such, the French Canadians could have elected an almost solid representation ; but they did not do so. They voted for the policy first and for the men afterwards ; and why should they not ? Is there a man in this country who has not been at all times proud of the Prime Minister of this Dominion ? Are the French Canadians to be called upon to vote against him merely because he is a French Canadian ?

In the debate in this House the other day it was stated that race issues were being raised in North Bruce. I do not know whether they have been or not ; but North Bruce has evidently remained, according to last reports, true to its old policy. I hope the electors of North Bruce did not vote on racial lines. If they voted on party lines, they had a right to vote as they did, it is a free country.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to tell the hon. gentleman, as one who was there, that the racial question was never mentioned, so far as I know, either on the platform or off the platform.

Mr. HORSEY. The hon. gentleman is not omnipresent.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). There has been an allusion by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) to the vote that was given by the French Canadians in the province of Quebec, and the hon. gentleman said the race cry had been raised in North Essex, that it might have been raised in Nipissing, and that it was raised in Glengarry. North Essex was formerly represented in this House by a French Canadian, and the French Canadians of that constituency might legitimately have hoped to be again represented here by one of themselves ; but they could not be better represented than they are at the present moment. The French Canadians are in a majority in the district of Nipissing, but they are represented by two English-speaking gentlemen—one in the Ontario House and one in this House. And I have the word of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell) that the race cry was never raised in Glengarry, but that the French Canadians there voted on party lines, and that he owes his election largely to the Scotch vote in that constituency.

Now, our friends opposite tell us that the last general election was fought on the fiscal policy and according to the ordinary rules of discussion. I hold in my hand a Conservative dodger which was circulated in the county of Albert, N.B., where there is probably not a French elector. It is entitled : ' Conservative victory all along the line ; every province gives Conservative gains,' and one of the paragraphs reads as follows :

> It is the turn for an English-speaking premier, and every lover of fair-play says Tupper should have a chance to show what he can do.

Was a straighter appeal ever made to racial prejudice than was made on that occasion? The Union Jack dominates this dodger, my hon. friend remarks ; but the best friends of the Union Jack in this country have not been the men who have exploited the Union Jack, but those who have stood by it when it was in need of friends. And since the South African war has been mentioned, I wish to declare, as my own personal conviction, speaking as I do from my knowledge of the province of Quebec, that it was the most fortunate thing that ever happened to Canada that we had at the head of affairs the right hon. gentleman who now leads the government, when our opponents for party purposes raised the cry of sending contingents to South Africa. The vote which was given in this House the other night is the most eloquent tribute that could be paid to the genuine patriotic services which the right hon. Prime Minister has rendered not only to Canada, but to the empire at large.

I shall conclude these somewhat disconnected remarks by alluding to a charge which was made against me the other night by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). That hon. gentleman charged that in 1897 I went into his riding for the purpose of raising the race cry.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I would ask him to read

from 'Hansard' exactly what I said and make his answer to that.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Here are the words of the hon. member :

The hon. gentlemen are quite welcome to have Quebec on the terms they got it. They conducted a campaign of race and religion in the province of Quebec ; and wherever they could introduce the same campaign in the province of Ontario, they did so, and did so successfully. They introduced it in Glengarry, which has a large French population, and that is the reason they carried that county. They introduced it in the two ridings of Essex, where there is also a large French population, and that is the reason they carried them. I was amused at hearing the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), in seconding the address this session, express the hope that these cries of race and religion would be buried and put out of sight. That hon. gentleman was in my riding in 1897, when there was a by-election. I had been unseated. At that time the French Canadians—and there are about 500 voters in that locality—were sympathizing very keenly with their fellow-countrymen in Manitoba, who they thought were deprived of their school rights. The hon. member for Bonaventure came there. He did not appear in the English parts of the constituency—

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure) (reading)—

—but he could be found in the French settlements day in and day out. And the hon. gentleman never came back to redeem the pledge which he made on that occasion.

Mr. BENNETT. Read the pledge.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I hope the hon. gentleman does not want me to read the whole of his speech. The pledge was this :

He first asked that the government might be excluded for not having passed a remedial Bill in their first session on the ground that they had not time, but he said there was a session coming on in 1897, and if a remedial Bill were not passed then, he would come back there and denounce the government at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. BENNETT. But you never came back.

The PRIME MINISTER. There was no necessity.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I was invited one day to visit the constituency of East Simcoe. I was told that on the borders of the Georgian Bay there was a large number of French Canadians, probably a thousand or more—people who had lived peaceably in the parish of Lafontaine and the town of Penetanguishene the last thirty or forty years. Lafontaine is one of the most extraordinary places I have ever visited. It is a purely French settlement in an English constituency. Those people, law-abiding, good citizens of Canada, industrious farmers—many of them are unable to speak or understand the English language. Where then is the crime in a speaker from another part of this country, from the province of Quebec, going up there to discuss the public questions of the day. My hon. friend tells me that I limited myself to the French districts of Lafontaine and Penetanguishene. Let me tell him that one evening, after speaking at one of those places and returning in company with Dr. Spohn, a former member of this House, I was invited to do a most extraordinary thing, and I did it. I was invited to address a public meeting in an Orange hall. I accepted the invitation, and I must say that I never obtained a more respectful hearing than I did that night. I do not know how these people voted, they probably voted for our friend who now represents the county, but I will give you, Mr. Speaker, the reason. It was —though I do not wish to be personal to a man who is not present—it was because of the unpopularity of our own candidate, Mr. H. H. Cook. I can inform the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) that if any other reputable citizen of East Simcoe had, upon that occasion, been the candidate of the Liberal party, the hon. gentleman would not have been returned to this House. I was often warned at some of these meetings that I could not bring forward Mr. Cook, who was then our Liberal candidate, because he was too unpopular. People would say to me : We are willing to vote for the government but we cannot vote for Mr. Cook. That was the reason which accounts for the election of the hon. gentleman. I am glad to notice now that the hon. gentleman and his late opponent in that election have become strong, steadfast friends. They are to-day concocting a scandal over the question of a senatorship.

Mr. HENDERSON. I rise to a point of order. I understand your ruling, Mr. Speaker, the other night, when the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) was speaking, to be that hon. gentlemen must apply themselves exclusively to the amendment of the leader of the opposition. I rise simply for the purpose of information, because if this hon. gentleman is to be allowed to travel all over the question, when I rise to speak, I intend to do the same.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is true that the other night I stated the rule which should prevail, but those hon. gentlemen who were present will remember that hon. gentlemen on both sides asked that no restriction should be placed on the discussion, and of course I was in the hands of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear. Let him go on.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). There is another point to which I wish to refer. The hon. member for East Simcoe spoke of a pledge that I made on the Manitoba school question. Well, I did not return to the

county of East Simcoe for the very good reason that I was engaged elsewhere during the last election. Since visiting the division of East Simcoe, I was given the opportunity of visiting the province of Manitoba and participating in the local provincial elections there. I went into the houses of the half-breeds, I went into their schools at St. Boniface, St. Vital and the other places in the three French counties of LaVerandry, St. Boniface and Carillon, and I am glad to be able to declare to-day that the French Metis and the French Catholic population of that province never had as efficient schools as they now enjoy. If I am not mistaken, the hon. member for West York visited Manitoba at the same time. He probably went up there to support the Greenway government, which had done away with the Catholic schools, or something else. But what happened was this, that the people who were interested in the Catholic schools of Manitoba, the people whom the Conservative party had sought to hold up to this country as victims, voted almost to a man in favour of the Liberal candidates and the men who had opposed the Remedial Bill in this House and out of this House, voted to bring about the downfall of the Greenway administration. There is my answer to the challenge concerning my pledge on the Manitoba school question.

Further than that I have nothing to say. I hope that an early opportunity will be given me to return to East Simcoe.

Mr. BENNETT. You are very welcome, I can assure you.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). And I will not only speak to the French of East Simcoe, but I hope an opportunity will be given me to speak to the Orangemen. We have Orangemen in the province of Quebec and some of them—the majority of them I must say—are, as a rule, peaceful, law-abiding citizens. They hold different views from ours on matters of religion and as to loyalty and the maintenance of the empire, and so on, but this is a free country, and I hope that as long as the hon. member for West York remains at the head of that distinguished order, he will inculcate among its members a love for this country.

Glancing the other day over Leggo's 'Administration of Lord Dufferin in Canada,' my attention was attracted to an address, which was presented, some thirty years ago, almost, by the then warden of the county of York, who now represents West York in this House. About that time Lord Dufferin, who was without exception the most illustrious Irishman Great Britain ever sent to Canada, made an appeal, subsequently to this address, to the Irish Protestant Society of Toronto. In that appeal he asked his countrymen not to bring to this country what has caused the misfortunes of Ireland for many centuries. I am sorry to say that the words of Lord Dufferin have had no effect upon the hon. member for West York.

Some days later, Lord Dufferin, on leaving these shores, on leaving the old city of Quebec, where he had been welcomed as French Canadians have always welcomed the representative of British authority in this country—Lord Dufferin, in parting, uttered these words at Laval University, and I shall conclude with his remarks. We should follow his advice and try to lay aside our racial antipathies, our racial divisions, and to bring about a better understanding among all classes of the community. I adhere to the declaration I made in this House when first I had the honour of addressing it—I desire that what little I may do in public life in Canada, what little I may do in this House, shall have the result of bringing about, if possible, a better understanding among all classes of the Canadian people. These were the words that Lord Dufferin uttered :

> At this moment the French Canadian race to which you belong is engaged in a generous struggle with their English fellow-subjects to see which shall contribute most to the advancement of the moral, material and political welfare of this country. There is not a student, a man of business or of science, a politician or an author of either origin who does not feel the inspiration of this noble rivalry. Upon the success of your exertions, upon the efficacy of your discipline and training, upon the character of the mental and moral atmosphere you create within your walls, will, in a great measure, depend the issue of the conflict. In that conflict I can heartily wish you success without compromising my impartiality, for it is a struggle wherein the defeated reap laurels as untarnished—benefits as universal—as those which crown the winners, since it is round the brow of Canada the wreath of victory will be twined, and into the lap of Canada the prizes of the contest poured.

Sir, there was the parting advice tendered to this country by one of the most illustrious men whom Great Britain ever sent here. And, as I have said to our friends from Ontario, men of another race, and another nationality—no, we are all the same, we are all Canadians, but of another origin—I would remind them that when they come in contact with the people they should try to bring about a better understanding, and inspire themselves with what we see in the province of Quebec down on the Plains of Abraham, where the fate of this continent was settled. There, Sir, beneath the protection of the British guns, stands a pillar of stone, and upon that pillar are graven two names, Wolfe and Montcalm—Wolfe, the victorious British general ; Montcalm, who died in the arms of defeat. Let us, in our efforts towards building up this country bear in mind that silent witness of the understanding which was brought about by our forefathers, so that we may perpetuate that understanding among the present generation of Canadians

and transmit it to those who shall come after us.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot take up the gauntlet thrown down by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and discuss the amendment of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) from the point of race and creed from which he has discussed it to-day. Nor can I, even in discussing so important a question as this, take advantage of this opportunity to tell the hon. leader of this House (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) what the echo from North Bruce was which he wished so much to hear when he discussed this question the other day.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) may tell me the echo from Prince Edward Island, perhaps.

Mr. MACLEAN. The right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) expressed a desire the other day to hear from North Bruce. But I can tell him that something is happening on his side of the House that is a surprise to us and a surprise to the country ; and if his followers continue to make protectionist speeches, such as that delivered by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) the other evening, that of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) yesterday, and that of the hon. member for Bonaventure to-day, when he was discussing the question on its merits, he will soon have no free traders behind him at all, but all will be on the protectionist, that is to say, on the Conservative, platform. In discussing this question, I wish to keep to the view of protection and free trade laid down by the Prime Minister. As he has challenged the relative merits of protection and free trade, just for a few moments I intend to discuss the principle underlying these two ideas. After that, I purpose discussing the attitude of the Liberals towards protection, the attitude of the Liberals towards mutual trade, and this new question of reciprocity of tariffs. Now, I have no hesitation in telling the House that I am a protectionist, and that, on that subject, I am, as the right hon. gentleman calls me, a stalwart. I have always believed in the principle of protection, and never in the principle of free trade. And when it comes down to a discussion of the two principles, we can say this—that protection has been vindicated, while free trade to-day is questioned in every quarter of the world. Now, what is the principle underlying protection ? Is it not this—that protectionists recognize the fact that life is a struggle, not only between individuals, but between nations ? The free traders tell us that underlying the principle of their theory is the brotherhood of man. Sir, there is no prospect of the principle of the brotherhood of man being accepted ; on the contrary, the nations, from one end of the world to the other, recognize that a struggle goes on among them, and that it is incumbent upon a nation to protect and maintain itself in that struggle as against other nations. Another principle that free traders go on is, that there ought to be competition, and that competition will settle all difficulties in connection with trade and commerce. As a protectionist, I say that the underlying principle ought to be a regulated production—it is this that will give the greatest value to industry, and not competition. Another thing that we protectionists say is, that the great object of a nation ought to be to keep its own work for its own people, and its own markets for its own products. The free traders tell us that the proper rule is to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest. We take issue with them on that point also. And how would we who are protectionists say that a nation should attain the end to be sought ? By what we call national policy. We recognize that there is a struggle among nations, and that it is possible for a nation, through its fiscal policy and its legislation, to make itself strong so as to be able to hold its own and build itself up in that struggle. How does it do that ? That is a point upon which I wish to lay considerable stress. How does a nation, through its fiscal policy, make itself strong and build itself up ? In a number of ways. It seeks to transfer industries from other nations ; it seeks to develop the industries that it has at home, and it seeks to give diversity of employment to its people—and in that way it adopts what Sir John A. Macdonald called (and it is a good name for it) a national policy. The tools, the engines of that national policy, as directed to this end, are many, and I wish to enumerate them here to-day.

In the first place, the great engines or means used in a protectionist policy is a customs tariff composed of specific and ad valorem duties. The next thing is a tariff with a free entrance of specific raw materials, or a rebate of duties on foreign raw products not manufactured within the country importing them. Another thing that protection resorts to is drawbacks ; another thing is bounties on productions and bounties on exports ; another thing it resorts to is putting larger duties on raw products exported ; another thing is treaties of reciprocity, or reciprocity in preference ; another thing is maximum and minimum tariffs with friendly and unfriendly nations ; another thing is countervailing duties ; another thing is subsidies to railways and steamship lines, or giving low freights and cold storage to exports, and low freights for essentially raw products when imported. Still another thing adopted by every protectionist government to-day is the policy of promotion, or taking part in exhibitions, exhibiting in foreign countries its own pro-

ductions, resorting to a consular service, appointing trade agents to build up trade, and in a hundred other directions making use of a promotion system. There are many other ways in which a national policy employs whatever measures will effect the end of building up the country.

Now, free traders pretend to ignore all these things. They say they do not believe in them, they say that the least government is the best—that is one of their great principles. They say a legislature can do very little to promote trade, and that the proper policy of a government is to do as little as possible in the way of promoting the industries of the country. On the other hand, we who are protectionists contend that it is the duty of a government to do everything possible, and to interfere, if necessary, as much as possible on behalf of manufactures with a view to building up the country. The national policy of interfering through legislation by parliament has proved a success. A national policy has proved a success, not only in Canada but throughout the world wherever it has been tried. Free trade is questioned to-day, and is almost a failure in the one or two countries that have adopted it. Now, what are the countries that have adopted the principle of protection ? Let me name some of them. There is the United States, the greatest country in the world to-day in the matter of production and export of its own productions. There is Germany, there is Russia, there is France, there is Italy, there is Canada, Australia is coming to it, South Africa will come to it, and every nation that is emerging or hopes to emerge and to take its place among the nations, is adopting a national policy and recognizing the principle of protection. All these countries employ these engines that are said to be paternal, that are said to be protectionist. But they are effective and accomplish the thing designed, they do build up a country, and every one of these countries that I have named has employed them, and is employing them, and intends to employ them hereafter to a much larger extent.

Now, England is the typical free trade country, and to-day I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite who declare themselves free traders, whether England has not employed many of these protectionist measures in the past ? She has employed them in the past, she may have disowned them for a time, but I believe she will employ a great many of them in the future. Englishmen are getting tired of this doctrine of this brotherhood of man, that the least government is the best, and they are casting about for ways in which they can help themselves. The Manchester school is dead. John Stuart Mill and all his free trade theories are nothing but ghosts. The little Englander party has disappeared from English politics. Many principles that Cobdenite free traders have advocated in the past are very much questioned to-day, and there are a great many people now who are ashamed to wear Cobden medals, even though the medals are bestowed upon them by the Cobden Society. The people of England see how things are going; and one of the most significant things we have seen in our day is the fact that the iron and steel industry is passing from free trade England to the protectionist United States. That is a most significant fact in regard to England's fiscal policy, it is a thing that is coming home to Englishmen, that is being discussed in all their boards of trade and chambers of commerce, that is being discussed in their papers and by their public men. It is a question to which they cannot at the present time find an answer. Perhaps we protectionists in Canada will yet be able to tell them where a remedy may be found. No protectionist to-day needs to apologize for his belief ; but the free trader finds all his former theories questioned to-day by his own supporters. Therefore, I say that protectionists have seen their principles vindicated, while free traders have seen every principle they have advocated disowned by other nations and questioned by those who heretofore have supported them.

Now, a national policy, or a principle of protection, is the policy adopted by nations who are rivals for the world's trade and have to struggle for their part of it. The principle of the brotherhood of men is for people who are brothers, but for those who are not brothers the principle does not apply. It may apply when the poet's dream is realized of 'the brotherhood of man, the federation of the world.' When the federation of the world takes place, that principle will be all right ; but so long as nation has to struggle with nation, the principle of protection has to be resorted to by every nation which wishes to hold its own.

Now, having laid down these general principles, I wish to discuss the attitude of the Liberal party on the question of protection. To find out where the Liberal party stands on this question, I must take the speech of the Prime Minister, made in this House on this very question ; and to ascertain his position I shall have to read a few sentences from his remarks. In the first place I will quote what he said about the Conservative party and the national policy :

> The same old national policy, with a few adornments which, instead of taking from its native deformity, only add to it.

And one or two of these adornments of the national policy the Reformers of this country are supporting to-day. He went on to say :

> There is nothing new in the Conservative policy to-day.

Well, there is something new, there is this new at least, that it is sticking to its principles and maintaining them on every occa-

sion. It is also enlarging the principle of protection as applied to Canada, and enlarging it, as I will show later on, to the whole empire. Now, what does the hon. gentleman say, speaking for his party, in regard to protection ? He says that they are free traders, they are for a revenue tariff, while we on this side are protectionists. Here are his own words :

There is this difference between us, that while they would levy those duties only for the benefit of individuals, we levy them for the benefit of the revenue first and foremost.

Then he admits there is no doubt that protection is an incident of the tariff.

Still further on he says :

It will be many years before we can have free trade as they have it in England.

Now, we have these four statements, and I hope I have the attention of the right hon. leader of the government, because I do not wish to misquote him, I wish to put in one sentence what he says is his attitude and the attitude of his party in regard to the fiscal policy of this country. I take it to be this: The Liberals are against protection; they believe in free trade as a theory, they are for a revenue tariff which of necessity implies incidental protection, but, of such incidental protection the less there is of it the more is such a tariff desirable; and also, they regret that it will be many years before we can have free trade as it is in England, but that is the goal. Now, I think that is the platform of the Liberal party; that certainly is the statement which the right hon. leader of the government made, and this side of the House and the country will hold him and his party to it. On that platform we take direct issue with them. We say we believe in protection, we say we do not believe in a revenue tariff, but that we believe in a tariff that will protect Canadian industries, we do not want free trade as they have it in England. Free trade as they have it in England is not the goal of the party sitting on this side of the House. Not only does he justify the national policy in that statement, but he is perforce made to justify all those instruments of protection which I have already outlined. But is his practice on the lines of these precepts which he has laid down ? Let us take some of the means that I have enumerated in connection with the national policy and of protection and see where he and his party are. Specific duties are one of the great instruments of protection. Does he use them ? Having condemned them, has he removed them from the statutes of this country ? They are protectionist instruments pure and simple. Take other instruments of protection, take rebates and drawbacks, bounties on production, bounties on exports, rebates on exports, the prohibition of exports a policy which the right hon. gentleman's friends in Ontario have adopted in regard to the exportation of logs and which the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) proposes to adopt in connection with logs cut on Indian reserves, reciprocity treaties, steamship subsidies and cold storage on steamships, trade agents purchase of products and selling them abroad. Has he not employed every one of these engines of protection under this so-called revenue tariff ? He is either a bogus free trader or a protectionist who is ashamed to admit that he is a protectionist. Where is he ? He has not employed all of them ? There is reciprocity of tariffs, which is to come, there are countervailing duties, there the system of the maximum and the minimum tariffs which is to come, and there may be some other instruments of paternal government as it is called and he may have to come to them. But, all of the others he has employed up to date, and yet he says he is a revenue tariff man. Now, what is the difference in degree between this so-called revenue tariff that he says he upholds and a protectionist tariff which we claim it was in former days and which specifically it is to-day What is the difference in degree between the tariff which he upholds to-day and the one which he denounced when it was introduced into this country ? How are they going to get over that difficulty ? The late Minister of Finance told us that the difference between the old and the new tariff was 79-100ths of 1 per cent or something less than that. The right hon. gentleman claims that there is a marked distinction between the two policies, but will any one tell what the difference in degree, as to the incidence between the two tariffs, is ? Now, I want to make some reply to the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and the right hon. leader of the government. Of this revenue tariff of which the right hon. gentleman says he is the champion, he states :

The result of the policy adopted in 1897 is that the country has never been so prosperous.

And then, he said :

Under our new tariff, our revenue tariff, the trade of the country increased in the four years from 1896 to 1900, $142,000,000. Under the national policy the increase under the same head was $36,000,000 for sixteen years.

On this statement of the results he left the people and the House to judge of the merits of the two policies. Why did the country boom when hon. gentlemen came into power ? Why did trade increase in volume? It must be for one reason and one alone, that hon. gentlemen declined to put into practice the policy which they announced they would adopt of wiping the national policy off the face of the earth. That is why the country has boomed. Up to that time capital had been frightened and labour intimidated. Men were of limited means

and they were afraid to put their money into manufacturing enterprises, because they were led to believe that if the Liberal party came into power the national policy, as they said in East York when I contested that riding, would be wiped off the face of the earth. It is because they did not wipe the national policy off the face of the earth and because they adopted the policy of Sir John Macdonald, because the whole country was so united in supporting the policy of protection that no one in a responsible position dared to get up in his place and propose to remove it, that the country prospered. What would have been the state of the country if hon. gentlemen had carried out their pledges and had wiped the national policy off the face of the earth? Instead of smoking chimneys we would have had smokeless chimneys, we would have sent our labour abroad and driven our capital out of the country. There would have been no increase in trade. The glory of hon. gentlemen to-day is that they did not do what they promised, and because they did not do what they promised the country has prospered. What was the conclusion of the apology of the right hon. gentleman for being a protectionist? It was this:

It will be many years before we can have free trade as they have it in England.

And his Finance Minister, in 1897, as has been quoted already in the House, said:

So far as protecting the industries of the country is concerned, eternal vigilance must be the price of protection.

This is a nice statement to come from two hon. members of the government. One says that free trade as they have it in England is far away and the other tells the people that if they have protection it will only be by the exercise of continual vigilance. The national policy has vindicated itself in the minds of the men who first promoted it and supported it. It has vindicated itself in the minds of all, because the Liberal party have had to adopt it, have had to support it, have had to maintain it, notwithstanding that they would destroy it, and if John A. Macdonald lives today in this country, he lives not only in the principles of his own party, which we are maintaining to-day, but he lives as a present force, in this country, to-day, because the men who decried him and decried his principle of protection are claiming, as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) and the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) have done, that the Liberal party are trying to maintain it in their own way. This is Sir John Macdonald's glory; it is a living glory and he is a most living force in the affairs in Canada to-day. Now, I want to discuss the question of the preference. The right hon. Prime Minister, said in dealing with that preference:

How are you going to secure mutuality of preference where you have protection in Canada and free trade in England?

Further on he said:

Canada will be protectionist and so will Great Britain, and what mutual preference could you have under such conditions?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Might I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) if the policy, as enunciated in the amendment of the leader of the opposition, is what he described it just now: reciprocity in preferences?

Mr. MACLEAN. I am coming to that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon gentleman (Mr. Maclean) has already stated that that is the policy of the opposition.

Mr. MACLEAN. I have been dealing with the record of the Liberal party on protection; I am going to deal with mutual preference now, and I am coming to the preference of reciprocity, and I will tell you exactly where we are as to that.

The PRIME MINISTER. I thought we knew it.

Mr. MACLEAN. The Minister of Customs has asked for information, and I am glad to give it to him. Now, the Prime Minister asked us: How free trade England and protectionist Canada could have a mutuality of preference, and he said: If England became protectionist and Canada remained protectionist there could be mutuality of preference. Well, there are numbers of instances on record which will answer the right hon. gentleman's question. Does he not know that the protectionist United States has, under its fiscal system, given a preference to free trade, or semi-free trade, nations, and that free trade England has given a preference to protected nations. It is all very well for the First Minister to make a fine rhetorical phrase in the House, but in common practice the thing is being done every day. The protectionist United States is making treaties with the South American republics and with Germany, and has sent her commissioners to France to establish some kind of mutual preference. There is an answer to the Prime Minister's question. It is possible to have this mutuality of protection between free trade and protectionist nations, but what we criticise the government for is the one-sided character of the preference they have given, and which I do not believe in, especially as towards England.

But what is the record of the Liberals when in opposition? They were in favour of giving a preference to the United States and against the mother land. They were in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, which its author, Mr. Erastus Wiman, defined it to be:

Free trade between Canada and the United States and the rest of the world, and involving discrimination against the mother country.

And Sir Richard Cartwright, speaking at Pembroke, October 21, 1890, admitted this was so, and said :

Some men, whose opinions I respect, enter objections to this unrestricted reciprocity proposition. They argue, and argue with force, that it will be necessary for us if we enter into such an arrangement to admit the goods of the United States on more favourable terms than those of the mother country; nor do I deny that this is an objection, and not a light one.

The present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) is on record as being prepared to give the United States a preference as against England, and he and his party now charge us because we do not believe in a mutual preference as between us and England, because it is a one-sided preference. Let us look for a moment at the efforts of the Liberal party in this country to establish unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States. I shall tell the House what was the real origin of that unrestricted reciprocity movement in Canada fifteen years ago. There was then in the United States a very able, a very clever, man, and at that time, a very wealthy man. That man saw the rise of his friend and acquaintance, Grover Cleveland, from an unimportant position, to be president of the United States. This man, who lived in New York, became very ambitious, and he said to himself : If Grover Cleveland can be president of the United States, why should not I, who am as able a man as he is, be president. But when he looked into the matter he found that there was one obstacle in the way, and that was that he was not native-born of the United States. He was a Canadian-born, and so he started out to qualify himself to become president of the United States, as Grover Cleveland had become president. I am telling no fiction to the House now. Erastus Wiman saw that the only way in which he could qualify for the presidency was to become native-born, and the only way he could become native-born, was to lead his native Canada into annexation with the United States. He came over here on that expressed mission, and he captured the Liberal party and the Liberal newspapers, and for years he engaged them to gratify his ambition to become president of the United States. That is the real story of the unrestricted reciprocity movement in Canada from 1886 to 1894. And it was the present Prime Minister, the United States senator from Canada, as he was called in the United States, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who went up and down this country preaching in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, which really meant annexation. And these are the men who are chiding us to-day because we do not believe in a one-sided preference. I am stating an historical fact, and when the memoirs of Erastus Wiman are written, and when the archives of the New York Sun are laid bare, as they will be laid bare before the people, the Liberal party of Canada will be on record as favouring unrestricted reciprocity, which really meant annexation, and which, to Erastus Wiman, meant nothing else but annexation so that he could qualify himself to be come president of the United States. That being the record of the Liberal party, what happened ? They got into power, and they had to find an excuse to get out of the trouble they were in, and to illustrate their predicament, I shall refer to the ancient history of the children of Israel and the law of the scapegoat, and I want to direct the attention of hon. gentlemen to what that law is. I am glad to see my hon. friend from the west (Hon. Mr. Sifton) in the House so that he may hear it for once :

The Scapegoat.

(Leviticus XIV.)

5. And he (Aaron) shall take of the children of Israel two kids of the goats as a sin offering.

7. And he shall take the two goats and present them before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

8. And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats, one lot for the Lord, and the other for the scapegoat.

9. And Aaron shall bring the goat upon which the Lord's lot fell and offer him for a sin offering.

10. But the goat on which the lot fell to be a scapegoat shall be presented alive before the Lord, to make an atonement with him, and to let him go for a scapegoat into the wilderness.

21. And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them on the head of the goat, and shall send him away by a fit man into the wilderness.

22. And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities into a land not inhabited: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness.

26. And he that let go the goat for a scapegoat shall wash his clothes and bathe his flesh in water, and afterwards come into the camp.

Who was the scapegoat for hon. gentlemen opposite ? The Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was Aaron the high priest ; the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) was the son of Aaron, and the fit man who was to lead the goat into the wilderness was the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), and he never washed his flesh or put off his clothes and had them made clean in that respect, until that night when in the basement of this building that celebrated panegyric was passed upon him which was read in this House the other day. The scapegoat which these gentlemen employed, as an atonement for their sins in being ready to give a preference to the United States instead of to England, was the industries of this country, which they turned loose in the wilderness ; and the industry which

most of all was made the scapegoat for their political sins was the woollen industry. That is their record on preferences. They are on record as being in favour of giving a preference to the United States. They are on record as sacrificing Canadian industries in order to give a bogus preference to the mother country—a bogus preference which I do not believe in. I would sooner take the word of Sir John A. Macdonald in regard to the views of the Canadian people in the matter of a preference to England ; and here are his views on that subject, contained in a letter written by him on April 6, 1891 :

> While Canada cannot promise a reduction of duties, she will be quite ready to give British goods a preference in our markets if our products receive a corresponding preference in England.

We hold that view to-day ; the people of Canada believe in it ; and the people of Canada will have no other preference than one which is mutual, as laid down in this statement of Sir John A. Macdonald. Sir John A. Macdonald never needed to sacrifice the interests of Canada ; he had no record which compelled him to do so ; and when it came to an issue between the rights and interests of Canada and the desires of England, he always put the interests of Canada first. If any hon. gentleman doubts that, let him read Pope's history of his life, as I have been reading it in the last few days, especially in connection with the Washington Treaty. He was besought day after day by the English members of the commission to sacrifice the Canadian fisheries ; but he said, 'I will not sacrifice them unless there is proper compensation,' and he stuck to that position to the last, and it is the position of every Conservative in Canada to-day, even in regard to England. We are ready to give concession for concession ; but we do not believe in a one-sided preference such as obtains to-day, which sacrifices Canadian industries and Canadian workmen, and which when analysed is not a tribute to the mother country, but only a tribute of Canadian mills and Canadian workmen to the mills and workmen of Lancashire. Surely, the woollen mill is as good an asset of the empire in Canada as in Lancashire. If it is, it should be kept here, and not transferred to Lancashire. That, I take it, is the feeling of the people of Canada ; that, I know, is the feeling of gentlemen on this side of the House ; and the day will come when the people of Canada will rise almost en masse to have the wrong put right, and to have a preference based on the principle of true mutuality, the principle of giving something for something in return. That is the record of hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to a preference ; and, in contrast to that, I have stated what I think are the views of Conservatives—that we believe in a mutual and not a one-sided preference, and we believe that a woollen mill is of as much value to the empire located in Canada as it is transferred to Lancashire.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If not, what ?

Mr. MACLEAN. If it continues to injure Canadian industries, I am prepared to repeal that law any day ; and my vote can be had for its repeal to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is the policy of the party ?

Mr. MACLEAN. That is my view of it. I am speaking for myself, and the hon. gentleman will find a great many gentlemen here who will express the same view before this debate is over.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Is it expressed in the amendment ?

Mr. MACLEAN. And this so-called preference to the English manufacturers is not, as a matter of fact, given to them exclusively. The Germans are getting the best of our woollen mills, because on the woollen goods imported into this country 25 per cent of the work is done in England and 75 per cent in Germany; and the thanks we get from Germany is that they are turning Canadian wheat and other food products out of their markets.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Your policy is to repeal it ?

Mr. MACLEAN. My policy is to repeal the one-sided preference.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And the amendment you offer ?

Mr. MACLEAN. The amendment we offer is exactly on my lines ; it declares for a mutuality of preference.

Now, I want to come to the third feature of the amendment, that is, in regard to a reciprocity of tariffs. An essential feature of the principle of protection in these new and later days is reciprocity of tariffs, or, to put it in another way, reciprocity of treatment. What our relations with Germany are has been already discussed. What are our relations with our neighbours of the United States ? The hon. gentlemen opposite spoke of our friendly relations with the United States. I do not believe they are friendly ; I do not believe they are neighbourly. How do the United States treat us, and how do they treat Great Britain ? What has happened within the last few days on the question of the Nicaragua canal ? The Congress of the United States, through their Senate, undertook within the last three months to abrogate the treaty defining the position of the Nicaragua canal, and to substitute

in its place one of their own making ; and if they had succeeded in that, what would have followed ? But they did not succeed. Canada had for the first time a true friend in the Foreign Minister of Great Britain. Lord Lansdowne has become Foreign Minister. He knows the people of the United States, and he knows the people of Canada ; and he knew that if he had surrendered to the United States in regard to the Nicaragua canal, and had allowed the Senate of the United States to interpret the treaty to suit themselves, three weeks would not have gone by until the Senate of the United States would have passed another Act defining the boundary between Alaska and Canada. That is the way the United States, if they were powerful enough, would settle every question between us and them. They are not liberal toward us ; they never have been. They have not been friendly toward us in connection with their coasting laws. They have passed alien labour laws against Canadians. In every way they have been an unfriendly nation. And all the time we have been giving them our markets. Now, the day has come when the people of this country believe in reciprocity of treatment in the matter of trade as between the Americans and ourselves. I myself believe in tariff for tariff.

I believe in the lex talionis—an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. There is no other way to bring the Americans to their senses and make them respect our rights in connection with our fisheries and the Alaskan boundary and in other respects. There has never been the slightest trace of magnanimity in their attitude towards us or any other smaller country. They are bulldozers, men of sharp practice, they take every advantage of an opponent, and yet the United States is the most vulnerable country on the face of the globe to-day. England could bring the United States to time in an incredibly short period. We import from the United States many things which we could just as well make at home, and England imports many things from that country which she could just as well get elsewhere, and which she could get probably better in her own colonies. And the day she announces to the world, and especially to the United States, that such will be her policy, on that day the American farmer will be brought to his senses and will put the screws on the tail twisters who live in the eastern states of the union. You will never bring the Americans to time until the American farmer finds that he is not going to get into the English market with his wheat and corn and pork and other products. Just as soon as England recognizes the fact—and she is rapidly coming to recognize it—that she is buying from the United States many things which she can make at home or get elsewhere, you will find Uncle Sam on his knees asking England for some kind of reciprocal trade arrangement.

Mr. GERMAN. I thought you were all for protection.

Mr. MACLEAN. So I am, and I say that Uncle Sam is in a position to turn England down just because England is a protectionist and has been foolish enough to give free access to the Americans into her markets, although Uncle Sam puts up a high barrier against the admission of her goods into his territory.

The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell), the other night, spoke about the position of England to-day, and depicted her as engaged in a life and death struggle with the United States and Germany. Well, the struggle is between free trade England and protectionist United States and Germany, and if England had the sense to adopt a protective policy, she would soon put an end to that struggle. We, however, are in a position, irrespective of England, to resort to reciprocity tariffs, and I believe that the sentiment of the Conservative party in this country to-day is that the only way to put a stop to our enormous purchases of goods from the United States, which we can manufacture in Canada, is to adopt the policy of tariff for tariff and preference for preference and nothing else. A man named De Witte, who is Finance Minister of Russia, has found out the value of such a policy in the trade relations of his country with the United States. He brought the American republic to time only the other day simply by imposing a retaliatory tariff. And to-day the manufacturers of the United States are doing, what the right hon. gentleman charged our manufacturers with doing at Ottawa—they are going to Washington and asking for tariff tinkering. The strongest representations have been made to Washington to abrogate the countervailing duty on sugar, and these representations are simply due to the course taken by this Finance Minister of Russia, the greatest living exponent of protection to-day, who has found a way of bringing the Americans to their senses, and that is by giving them tariff for tariff. Nations all the world over are finding out that the only way to bring a hostile rival to time is to extend to him the same treatment as he deals out to you—fair treatment for fair treatment, rough treatment for rough treatment, prohibitory tariff for prohibitory tariff.

The United States have a reciprocity clause in their Tariff Bill, and this great protectionist country is enabled by that clause to make trade relations with other countries. We should follow their example. The Liberals have repudiated in this House the efficacy of this doctrine of reciprocity of tariffs. The right hon. the First Minister spoke on this question as follows :

The tariff of the people of Canada is to be determined by the people themselves, not from any consideration of the tariffs of the United States or of other countries, but simply from the consideration of what best suits the Canadian people.

Further on, he said :

Let us face the situation bravely like men, let us resolve that whatever may be the American tariff, we shall be guided only by the measure of what is our own interest in this respect.

There the right hon. gentleman begs the question. The tariff that is in our own interest is a tariff that will keep out American productions and give work to our own people. We are bringing in a hundred million dollars worth of their goods every year, a great deal of which we could make better at home, and the only way to keep out these goods is to adopt a similar tariff to their own.

The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) spoke of reciprocity, and the good time enjoyed under that policy down in the province of Quebec, and he hoped that we would again obtain reciprocity with our neighbours. Let me simply quote what his leader said last year in this House :

I have no right to speak of what took place in the commission, but I have a right to refer to what is now in the minds of the Canadian people, and if we know the hearts and minds of our people at present, I think I am not making too wide a statement when I say that the general feeling in Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity.

Mr. CLARKE. Who said that ?

Mr. MACLEAN. The Prime Minister. I wish now to quote the language of a distinguished authority, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), on this question of reciprocity of tariff. That hon. gentleman went down to Boston last week and made a speech there, and, I find, in the Hamilton Times of March 18th, this report of his speech at the Free Trade League dinner in Boston. The hon. gentleman said:

Canada May Reciprocate.

I do not hesitate to say that if the repressive and ill-liberal policy which has characterized the United States in their dealings with Canada, especially since the passage of the Dingley Bill, continues to be enforced, Canada, failing to secure reciprocal trade, will be likely to adopt a reciprocity tariff of the most drastic character. The greater part of the $62,000,000 worth of manufactures that she imports from the United States can be manufactured in the Dominion, and an increase of duties from her own standard of 25 per cent to the American standard of 50 per cent, would go far to secure this result, and the favourable influence this scale of duty would have upon trade with the mother country could be obviated by the adoption of the rebate of 40 or 50 per cent on the duties in the case of any country that admitted Canadian natural products free of duty.

The question as to what the future relations of the English-speaking people upon the North American continent shall be is one of vast importance. No person who took pride in our race and antecedents and hoped for its happiness and prosperity in the future could be indifferent as to this matter. The trade policy of the United States towards Canada for the last thirty years or more had been one which was not calculated to draw the two peoples together in bonds of amity and friendship. Its practical operation was viewed by the great mass of the Canadian people as unjust, its character was considered narrow and ill-liberal, its tendency has been repellant and its influence had widened the breaches that existed between the two countries, originated animosities and creating as far as its influence extended, a feeling that the reverse of that which the friends of the English-speaking race could desire. He trusted that we might be upon the eve of a change in this respect, and that the overtures which Canada was prepared to make to the United States, and had, indeed, been making for a quarter of a century past, might receive adequate and proper response from the great republic.

Now, there is what a distinguished member of the Liberal party said on this question of reciprocity of tariffs—that our twenty-five years' efforts to get better trade relations with the United States have failed, and we must resort to reciprocity of tariffs. And I agree with him. And the other day in a discussion with some gentlemen interested in the lumber trade, he is reported to have said :

And if the trade relations between these two countries are ever considered again, I believe that the influence that would be exerted upon these negotiations by the imposition of a lumber duty would be a most salutary and a most powerful one. What we need, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the United States, is to try and secure their respect, and we can never secure their respect unless we have a proper care for our own interests. . . . . We can secure that respect by caring for our own interests in Canada, in the same manner as they care and protect their interests, and if we decide to protect the great industry in Canada as they have decided to protect that industry in their own country, we will secure the respect of the Americans; we will secure the operation of influences upon negotiations which will be of a very important character, and in addition to that, we will do an act of justice to our own people.

Now, if men in this country who profess to be free traders and to uphold free trade doctrines have felt obliged to retrace their steps and take the position now taken by the hon. member for North Norfolk, what have these hon. gentlemen to say when they decline to discuss the question of reciprocity of tariffs and when they say it is not in the public interest. To my mind, as I have said, it is in the public interest, and it is the only way in which we shall get fair treatment from the United States—and the sooner we come to the doctrine of reciprocity of tariffs the better. Hon. gentlemen opposite have taken the other planks of our platform; they might as well come to this one also and put in force not only against

Germany, but against the United States. When we do that, we shall get fair treatment and we shall compel the Americans to respect us, to respect our boundaries and to respect our fisheries. And in no other way shall we ever be able to compel them to do it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) apply that to all countries ?

Mr. MACLEAN. If it was essential for Canada to apply it to all countries, I certainly would do so. I am a believer in the maximum and minimum tariff. There are a hundred ways in which you can get even with a hostile nation—there are a hundred weapons put in your hands in these days—minimum and maximum tariffs, reciprocity of treatment, drawbacks, bounties and so on. If the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) will give me a specific case, I will give him a specific answer. But it is clear to me that the people of Canada, the government and the legislature of Canada, ought to be in a position in some way to bring the Americans to time and compel them to give us fair treatment and, if they do not give us fair treatment, to deny them the advantage of our markets.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Does the hon. gentleman mean that he would put the same duties on the goods coming from another country that that country puts on ours ?

Mr. MACLEAN. As I told the hon. gentleman, I would find a way to meet the antagonism of a hostile country. It would not necessarily be by imposing reciprocal duties. Perhaps the increase of our tariff on some articles by 10 per cent would do it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I mean, in the case of Great Britain, would the hon. gentleman go in for reciprocity of tariffs ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I have already discussed that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And what is the hon. gentleman's answer ? Would he have us put the same duties upon British goods that they put upon ours ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Could we not, as the hon. member for North Norfolk suggested, give them the preference that we now do, or even more—40 or 50 per cent ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But the hon. gentleman spoke of reciprocity of tariffs ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I propose reciprocity of tariffs as against the United States. But we could give England a preference of 50 per cent in order to trade more largely with her and to bring the Americans to time. Why, that is the government's own plan, it is the principle upon which they are working now.

I have endeavoured here to-day—and I am approaching a conclusion—to expound the doctrine of national policy and to show how that national policy can be improved and advanced. We on this side believe in national policy, we believe in protection, we believe in mutual preference and we believe in reciprocity of tariffs. But we also believe that the national policy that is suited to Canada can be extended and expanded into an Imperial policy for Great Britain and her colonies as against the world. That is the new doctrine to-day. Let me repeat it—that the national policy that is suited for Canada can be extended and expanded into an Imperial policy. And that Imperial policy, using these engines of national policy which I have enumerated here to-day, can be employed to build up Canada, to build up Australia, to build up England, to secure markets for the mother country to cause the colonies to become greater, to make Great Britain independent of the hostile nations by which she is surrounded. The right hon. leader of the government said the other day that he believed in that great free trade that would yet come between England and her colonies. Can it come in any other way than by the mother country and her colonies uniting in an Imperial policy for some kind of fairer or freer trade amongst themselves as against the outside world ? It can mean nothing else. Therefore, Canada is giving the keynote to the empire in this amendment—namely, that what we call national policy in this country can be so expanded as to apply to the rest of the empire. Hon. gentlemen opposite say it cannot come, they say that England will never come to protection. I have given some reasons why I think the people of England are moving on that line. And they will learn something from Canada, they will learn something from this debate. And the moment the English people see that there is something in it, the moment they see that the empire can be united as against outside nations, they will make some sort of preferential trade between us and them, and they will find some means of closing their markets to outside and hostile nations. Now, in what does statesmanship consist ? I wish to direct the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this matter. Statesmanship consists in compromising in some way antagonistic principles. There is a principle of free trade, and there is a principle of protection, and each is advocated by certain doctrinaires. But the statesman finds some way of compromising these principles and of doing something for his country by that compromise.

But England, which has been upholding the doctrine of free trade, and we who are upholding the doctrine of protection, each in our own way, can find a common ground.

What is the common ground ? What will be the cry of the empire from one end to the other ? It will not be free trade, it will not be protection, but it will be fair trade under an Imperial fiscal policy. Fair trade is the keynote, fair trade is the cry in England to-day, fair trade is the cry in Canada to-day; fair trade is involved in every one of those principles which have been laid down here by the opposition. We want first of all to be fair to our own industries, to give them the protection they need. In the next place we want to be fair as between ourselves and the mother country, to give her something and to get something in return. Most of all we wish the empire to be united, to be joined to its colonies, to be fair in its trade with all the world, and all the world to be fair in its trade with the mother land.

Now, in conclusion, I wish to say that Canada has led the empire in many respects. Canada has been given credit for doing many things that were not thought of in England, but are now being worked out. I believe Canada to-day is playing a most important part in the history of the empire by showing that this principle of a national policy, which has been so successful in Canada, can also be employed, in some of the many ways which I have enumerated, by the people of Great Britain. I believe the empire can employ many of these measures and work them out, and thereby make itself stronger and lead the world, instead of losing her supremacy, as she is now doing. I believe she can thereby make herself great and hold her own in the fierce struggle of the nations which is the characteristic of the day. It is not the brotherhood of man that is the characteristic of humanity to-day, it is a struggle for existence between the nations. Let me refer to a paper read recently by the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Mills) in this present government. He said the industrial struggle is so great that only four or five nations will emerge out of it ; Great Britain will be one, the United States will be another, Germany will be the third, Russia will be the fourth, and perhaps Japan will be the fifth, but all the rest must go under. This struggle is on, an industrial war the like of which was never known in the history of mankind, is on to-day. In this great struggle only that nation will survive that looks after its own interests, that resorts to these various protective measures that I have mentioned. Only that nation which will combine its industrial energies and develop them on the best possible lines, will come out of that struggle. It may be that Great Britain will have to go down, she will go down if she maintains her free trade doctrines and allows all outsiders to raid her markets. She must go down if she allows her iron and steel industries to pass into the hands of the United States, if she allows her woollen industries to go down, as they are going now, although we have given some of them back. But if she allows her great industries to be raided by an armed camp of hostile nations, who are becoming themselves intensely industrial, England will have to go down. But I believe England is coming to her sober senses, the doctrines of the Cobden school are being questioned. I believe England to-day is about to retrace her steps, and in some respects to resort to the principles of protection, to resort to the principle of a national policy, and in that way to renew her vigour and fortify herself for the great industrial warfare that is now beginning throughout the world.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I hope that while I sit in this House, I shall not offer myself as an antagonist to anybody. But it seems to be the custom in this debate for speakers to follow each other from opposite sides. I do not consider myself equal to the hon. gentleman who has just preceded me (Mr. Maclean) in knowledge of the abtruse doctrines which he has expounded to us. I do not purpose to follow him through the labyrinth into which he has entered this afternoon, nor to attempt to refute, even if I could, the arguments and theories which he has advanced. Perhaps many of those theories would require a whole evening to discuss and elaborate. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman has shown evidence of so much research. It does him infinite credit to have taken the pains to investigate the various features of the fiscal policies which we are discussing. I think that all the hon. gentlemen who have taken part in this debate on the other side have bestowed much study on the trade returns, and have evidently resorted to sources of information outside of this Chamber.

Another thing which I was pleased to notice was the fact that the hon. gentleman who has preceded me has studied the Scriptures. The subject which he treated this afternoon is one of deep interest, that was the subject of the scapegoat. If I remember the story aright, the scapegoat was set free in the wilderness. The hon. gentleman says that the industries of Canada are the unhappy scapegoat. Well, if he will let them free according to the divine ordinance concerning the scapegoat, I do not think we will have any cause to quarrel with him. If he will allow the industries of Canada to be free to pursue their own course and to work out their own destiny, we will not quarrel with him.

Now, the hon. and learned gentleman who offered the amendment, the leader of the opposition, referred to the old cynic, Diogenes. He told us that one day Diogenes went through the streets of the city where he lived with a lighted lamp, and when people asked him what he was looking for, he replied that he was looking for a man. Well, perhaps the hon. gentleman was reminded of the story when he looked around

among his own followers, and saw the straits they were in. But there is another incident in the history of the great philosopher which it may be useful to refer to. On one occasion he paid a visit to the philosopher Plato. Plato had imported, which was as great a heresy, perhaps, in those times, as it is now, a very elegant Persian carpet. Diogenes, to show his contempt for it, stamped vigorously with his feet and said: I trample on the pride of Plato. Monday, I think, was the visiting day of Mrs. Diogenes. Plato returned the visit. Diogenes had got out his old carpet, and displayed it to Plato in order to shame him because of his luxury and refinement. Plato said to him: I see the pride of Diogenes through the holes in his carpet. Now, the hon. Minister of Finance has brought out his carpet, and has laid it down, all woven in silver and gold tissues, and for ornament in the middle of it, he has placed his $8,000,000 surplus. The learned gentleman from Pictou (Mr. Bell), whose talents I recognize, and the learned gentleman who leads the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), looked into the old dust hole of the Liberal-Conservative party, drew out the old tattered carpet of the national policy and commenced to beat it. The learned gentleman himself took a sturdy whack at it, the hon. member for Pictou took another beat at it with a pretty long pole, the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) vigorously applied the lash to it, and my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) this afternoon has given it a fresh beating; but, there is no use, because all that will come out of the old national policy carpet is dust, with a liberal assortment of microbes.

Mr. WALLACE. Was it a Liberal assortment of microbes?

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Yes, a liberal assortment of microbes. My learned friend from York will excuse me, as my metaphors are not as legitimate a subject of warfare as were the metaphors of the hon. Minister of Finance the other day. In regard to the speech of Mr. Bell, I wish to say a few words. He will excuse me for mentioning his name, and hon. gentlemen opposite will excuse me for mentioning names, because I am not familiar with the constituencies from which they come. I mean no disrespect to them, but I mention their names simply to indicate the gentlemen to whom I refer. Now, the learned gentleman from Pictou (Mr. Bell) admitted that we had this surplus of $8,000,000. He could not dispute that very well, but he admitted it with the best grace he could. When he could not exactly deny that there was a surplus, and I think he had no intention of denying it, he tried to excuse the surplus and to minimize the effect of it in the country by saying that there had been surpluses before in the days of Sir Leonard Tilley, and he found fault, not with the surplus so much, although he intimated that there was some inaccuracy in the calculation, and claimed that there was an excess of money collected from the country by means of the tariff; but, because of the use that was made of the surplus. And here there is a legitimate cause of dispute or of a difference of opinion. He said that Sir Leonard Tilley used the surplus for the reduction of the debt, that Sir Leonard Tilley had also the Riel rebellion to provide for, as well as the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that, having applied sums for the payment of this service and for the reduction of the debt, this was a precedent which should have been followed by the Minister of Finance. Now, there may be cause for difference of opinion on this subject. I do not think that the circumstances will be repeated. Under the same conditions, no doubt, the argument of the hon. gentleman might legitimately apply, but when conditions are different the argument cannot be made to apply. I do not think this governemnt will have another Riel rebellion in the west, and if I can judge from the sentiments of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) who has preceded me, and the sentiments expressed by other hon. members in the House, the present government will not repeat the bargain which was made with the Canadian Pacific Railway. They will not pay $25,000,000, or grant the numbers of acres of land which the late government gave to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I beg the pardon of the hon. member for Pictou when I state that Sir Leonard Tilley and the Conservative government did not build the Canadian Pacific Railway. I believe that they gave a subsidy towards the building of that railway. I believe they made a donation of land, but they do not own the Canadian Pacific Railway at this moment. It may be that the Canadian Pacific Railway own them, but, from the expressions I have heard lately, and the opinions entertained on this side of the House, I do not believe the Canadian Pacific Railway will own this government. The hon. gentleman who spoke this afternoon laid down some of the essential features of protection, and he gave them with a certain amount of elaboration and in detail. My idea of protection is, that it is the whole of the inhabitants of the state giving, by their influence and by their authority, support to all the industries of the state, and support to all the employment of the people, and to do that in such a way as will employ the energies and resources of the people. Now, we believe that result is best attained by a revenue tariff. Protection, simply and in the abstract, is not the question which we have before this House. The theory of protection is not one which has been employed by the previous government or will be employed by this government. What took place under the national policy? The national policy was

the greatest pretense which had ever been exhibited before any civilized people, the greatest hypocrisy, the greatest deceit. What did it profess to do ? It professed to protect the industries of the people. It professed to afford assistance, either positively or negatively, to all the industries of the country, and to all the employments of the people, whereas it did nothing of the kind. It did not assist all the industries of the country. There were a few industries selected that were made the subjects of special care in the measure of protection afforded, but the other industries of Canada were left, like the scapegoat in the wilderness, to find refuge in free trade, or to support themselves on the scant herbage of the deserts of eastern lands. That was the national policy. The people of Canada in 1895 were as sick of the national policy as the people of Canada would be sick of the proposals of my friend from York (Mr. Maclean) if they could be carried into effect. What was the cause of the success of the Liberal party in 1896 ? It was not the racial cry, nor that it attracted the national spirit of Quebec, nor that the Liberals were sufficiently numerous to overcome their opponents ; but it was because the people of Canada were tired of the national policy and distrusted what would become of the country under that highly artificial system. A number of pronounced Conservatives believed that the national policy had worked its purpose and run its course, and rather than it should be allowed to wreck the country they voted for the Liberal government to turn down the national policy and to revive a revenue tariff. That is the reason for the return of this government to power. It was because the so-called friends of the national policy abandoned it and left it to its fate. Now, this national policy which has been lauded by gentlemen on the other side of the House to such an extent, was originally called the American policy. After the conflict between the United States and England, in 1816, the war party in the United States, under Mr. Crawford and Mr. Calhoun, launched what they called the American policy. In 1824 it was introduced into the House of Representatives by that distinguished American statesman Henry Clay, who, in his speech, set out all the arguments in favour of protection as well as any of these gentlemen opposite could do. And Henry Clay enforced his arguments with all the acrimony he could against England. He had been an ambassador to Ghent and had seen the power of England. His country had grappled with the power of England in war, and now the Americans were prepared to grapple with her in peace by means of tariffs. This policy which in Canada is dubbed the national policy was dubbed by Henry Clay and his associates the American policy, and these Americans intended by it, to reduce the pride of England. They intended by it to share in the trade of England, and to participate in all the advantages which would accrue from the growing commerce of the world. One of the principal articles which was aimed at under that American policy was the woollen trade. Henry Clay pictures it in its decay and tells how they were to grow American wool, how they were to put a high duty on British imported cloths, and imported wool, and how they were going to drive the British manufacturers out of the markets of the world. That was in 1824, but where is Great Britain with regard to the woollen trade in 1900 ? Three-quarters of a century after Clay introduced his policy, Great Britain holds the woollen trade of the world, despite the efforts of the United States and despite their great American policy. And when these gentlemen opposite speak of their desire to aid the suffering mother land ; when they speak of their desire to participate in the struggles and the triumphs of the empire ; when they tell us that her interests are ours, and that England and Canada must stand or fall together, I ask them to look back to the arguments of Henry Clay when he inaugurated his policy for the purpose of crippling Great Britain, and I ask them to answer us : If these considerations apply to the present exigencies, and if they will not, before they propose such a policy for the future of Canada, pause, and remember that this policy originated in the United States with the intent to endeavour to cripple the trade of England. The learned gentleman from West York (Mr. Wallace) made war upon a metaphor used by the Finance Minister. The Finance Minister said that perhaps we had seen for the time being as great an era of prosperity as we shall enjoy, that maybe we were on the crest of the wave, that perhaps that prosperity might be temporarily checked, that perhaps we might go on afterwards to a period of expansion ; but in the meantime it might be wise to be cautious. The hon. gentleman from West York (Mr. Wallace) made war upon that metaphor and he said that if we were on the crest of the wave it was the experience of those who had made a sea voyage that when the ship is on the crest of the wave she sinks down rapidly afterwards. Well, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) may have been on the crest of the wave, but I would suggest to him that if the ship went down afterwards he will at least admit that he was half seas over on the occasion. The gentleman (Mr. Wallace) went on to enlarge at great length on the disastrous appearance of the country, and he stated that although we really appeared to be prosperous there were signs on the horizon that that apparent prosperity would soon come to an end. I think the reasons that the hon. gentleman gave for forming that conclusion were insufficient. I think that the leader of the opposition, if he applied his logical and mathematical mind to the subject,

would say that they were conclusions formed on insufficient evidence.

What did the hon. gentleman give us as proofs on which he made that deduction? I do not believe that from his standpoint he could have made a more powerful address than he did. The subject was well considered; a great deal of his speech was on the spur of the occasion, and was given with that force which personal encounter evokes; he made, as he ought to make on every occasion, from his knowledge and experience in this House, a deep impression; and it was a pity to see a practical mind, an official mind like his, deluded by the insufficient evidence on which he formed his opinion. He may have had a great deal more in his mind, and he may have given us the result without stating the evidence; but while he stated that the trade in animals was decreasing and that the fisheries were decreasing, he did not give the amounts they were decreasing.

Mr. WALLACE. I did.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I may remark that if our exports diminish in one or two articles, the resources of this country are so large and so varied, and the employments of the people are also so various, that any temporary diminution in the export of any one article is compensated for by an excess of others. That this is the true state of the case was exemplified and proved by the general trade returns of the country, showing that for the period of five years the exports of the country have increased gradually and steadily, and that during the last year they have increased; and, the same thing is true of the imports. Now, these are evidences to a statistical mind like that of the learned gentleman from West York, to prove that he must look further and search deeper for evidence to produce conviction in this House and in the country that the state of the country is a serious or alarming one. There was no such conclusion conveyed by the sentiments he produced; and I am not so silly as to imagine that a gentleman of his character, reputation and experience in the House and the country would bring forward a mere bald opinion without fortifying it with some statistical evidence to justify the conclusions he formed.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was arguing that the hon. member for West York, instead of forming a judgment from a sufficient number of facts, had rather dipped into the returns for the purpose of making out a case against the government and their policy. The hon. gentleman gave some statistics to show that his contention was borne out by a decline in the exports of fish and animals. I do not mean to insinuate that the hon. gentleman attempted in any way to mislead the House; but I simply say that he arrived at that conclusion from insufficient data. We know that the fishing industry is a most variable one, that it does not depend at all upon tariffs and cannot be affected to any great extent by the policies of governments, but that it depends on the coming of the fish around the shores. Those who live in fishing constituencies know that during the past year the catch of fish was large and general, but that the price declined. From the figures of the official reports, it might be shown that there was a real decline in that industry, whereas the quantity sold and exported may have been equal to that of previous years. In the same way with animals, if the calculation be made merely from the value of the exports in dollars and cents, it may lead to a deceptive conclusion. You require to look carefully into the number of animals shipped and at the state of the market, to judge whether it paid the producers of animals to export them to foreign markets or to have them consumed in Canada. The hon. gentleman drew the deduction that our trade was suffering and that our finances were in a serious if not dangerous condition by stating that where we exported $188,000,000 and imported $199,000,000, the difference of $11,000,000 showed that we were in debt. An hon. gentleman the other day gave some statistics of the shipment of apples to the old country, going carefully into the details—and perhaps I might take that as an illustration. You may select from the whole list of shipments one or two articles of export that show a decline in value or in quantity, while the general aggregate shows that others have been substituted for them, and the whole volume of exports has not declined. For example, suppose a man ships 1,000 barrels of apples at $2 a barrel, and suppose he pays $1 a barrel for freight; that is $3,000; and he obtains for those goods in the market to which they are despatched $4,000. You have a return of $4,000 which would be counted in the imports; whereas if a man ships 1,000 barrels of apples, and they were badly packed or suffered from any of those accidents which sometimes happen to such articles, he might have to sell them in the market to which they were despatched for $2 a barrel; so that he would only obtain $2,000, and the returns would only show imports to the value of $2,000. In the one case we only imported $2,000, whereas in the other case we imported $4,000. Thus, while the statistics of imports and exports in general indicate whether the trade of the country has been

prosperous or the reverse, they are not an accurate criterion on all occasions. The balance of trade shown by contrasting the imports with the exports is sometimes a very delusive theory.

In this connection the hon. gentleman from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) gave some statistics, but they were culled and collected in the same way as these I refer to. He took, for instance, the exports of ham and cheese, and although those articles had largely increased in the four years preceding, yet when 1890 was contrasted with 1899 there was a small decrease. But that is not a comparison which can give a correct idea of the trade. You have to take a series of years and take the trade as a whole, and not select some particular articles in which there might be a decrease one year as compared with another.

Besides the amount in dollars and cents of our exports and imports may not represent the real value of the trade. The true value is the amount of profit derived from it, or the return from the material and labour used in producing or trading in the articles exported or imported, so that you cannot arrive at an exact estimate by the volume of statistics, although prima facie and on general principles that is the only means of estimating the production of any country.

The argument is advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite that the 33⅓ per cent preference has not accomplished the purpose intended, and has not come up to the expectations of those who inaugurated that policy. Well, I do not see how such a contention can be maintained, in view of the fact, which is unmistakable, that whereas previously our imports were declining, they have, since the preferential rate was established, recovered from that decline; and although the increase may not have come up to the full volume expected, nobody can say but that this preference has been effective in arresting the decline in our imports from Great Britain.

I fail to understand why hon. gentlemen opposite should lay such stress on the difference between British and American importations. Is it because they wish to encourage the introduction of articles of British manufacture to replace those of American manufacture? But why should they wish to displace the articles of American production? Is not $100,000 of profit derived from trade with our neighbour to the south just as good as if derived from our trade with the English manufacturers? But there are other elements which must be considered besides the mere question of dollars and cents. What has been the cause of the decline of British imports and the increase of American imports? Certainly not the lessening of any affection on our part for Great Britain. Not because we have lost the desire of dealing with British merchants or do not wish to encourage British trade, but because American producers are nearer to us and can give us articles at shorter notice. And there is this element further to be considered, namely, that the Americans have adapted themselves to the requirements of the times, and have taken advantage more promptly of the results of science and the latest achievements and discoveries in arts, and the application of new forces. They make better and lighter implements than the English. The English manufacturers adhere too much to the old style of cumbrous material, and do not consult to the same extent the requirements of consumers. Neither do they take so much pains to secure markets in the colonies and elsewhere as do their German and American competitors. They do not send out travelling agents with cuts of their instruments to solicit trade, as the Americans do. Owing to the rapidity with which his goods are produced and their adaptation to the circumstances of the country, the American manufacturer has to a great extent displaced the British manufacturer. That, however, is not going to continue. John Bull has no desire to see his exports declining. Although he exerts his material force in the acquisition of territory, he is quite as active in extending and securing by the arts of peace, markets for his manufactured products, and depend upon it he is still in the race. What science, skill, labour and capital can do to secure supremacy in the commercial world, he will be sure not to neglect. I have no fear for England.

To come back to a subject which was discussed this afternoon with a considerable degree of novelty and force, I would like to know if the hon. leader of the opposition coincides entirely in the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentleman from East York (Mr. Maclean). Is he prepared to go into a war of retaliation with the United States? Is he prepared to give his endorsation to that propaganda of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth? I should like to know if the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) estimates, as the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) does, the value of American trade. In the locality from which I come, we attach a great deal of importance to the American trade, and I think the hon. leader of the opposition holds it in similar esteem. There is not merely the dollars and cents view to be considered. That trade has quite another value. We know that Great Britain values highly the friendship of America. We know that Great Britain depends upon the neutrality of the United States in carrying out her schemes of foreign policy. The other nations of Europe are antagonistic and ready to combine in order to limit the power and reduce the prestige of England, and Great Britain depends on the sympathy of our American neighbours. Is there anybody here then who would disturb that mutual good feeling?

When the statesmen of Great Britain counsel peace and good-will, would he like to stand on the floor of the Commons and advocate a policy of retaliation, of attack, of ill-feeling? We know that in every country there are men who are ready to stand up for an aggressive programme. We know that there are men—I would not like to call them fire eaters—who do not calculate on the results that may follow a little ill-feeling, who do not realize that that ill-feeling may be taken up by moderate men and so extend until the surface movement, the sentiment which carries everything before it, sweeps on and hurries the nation into an unfriendly attitude and sometimes into war. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not intend anything of that kind—he does not mean anything rash or provocative. I know that the learned leader of the opposition does not intend anything of the kind. How many millions is a friendly feeling in the United States worth to Canada? Is it not worth all the difference between our aggregate trade with Great Britain and our aggregate trade with the United States? How many millions would it cost Canada to put herself into a position of defence in case of any hostile feeling arising in the United States? Would not such a thing be disastrous to all our interests? What, then, could be worse in the interests of Canada than that it should appear that such a feeling had been expressed in the parliament of Canada or promoted by men who are known as public representatives and Canadian statesmen?

In the province which I belong to, and the neighbouring province of New Brunswick, almost every article of our productions finds a market in the United States. They take our lumber, they take our coal, they take our fish, and the kinds of fish that are not taken in any other market, they take our gypsum—in fact, they take a liberal proportion of all the articles we produce. All this does not interfere in the slightest degree with out trade with England—it is larger markets we want. What does the United States take from the province of New Brunswick? Their lumber and fish and many other articles of which they have an excess. We wish to maintain, therefore, the most friendly trade relations with the United States. Nothing should be done to irritate them or to provoke them or induce them to make prohibitory legislation, or in the slightest degree interfere with the volume of exports we send to that country. What do we do for the province of Ontario and the North-west? One would think, from the utterances of some hon. gentlemen in this House, that patriotism was a sentiment that commenced about fifty miles west of Toronto and ended about twenty miles east of it. If you go to Halifax and visit the large sheds of the Intercolonial Railway, you will see that the province of Nova Scotia takes a very liberal proportion of the productions of Ontario. We get our breadstuffs from Ontario and the west; we take Ontario's oats, bran and other grain, we take furniture, we take poultry, we take beef, we take dry goods, we take farm implements, and a liberal supply of them, we take carriages, we take musical instruments—we take every class of goods produced in Ontario. We take them liberally and without stint, and we pay a good price, and we pay for them when we get them—for they take good care to draw at short-sight. From Montreal also, we take the woollen goods which are produced in the manufactories of Ontario as well as a large proportion of imported British goods, some of which are imported through Montreal while others are imported direct. And what does Ontario take from us? Nothing. What does Montreal take? It takes some of the coal from Cape Breton and a very small proportion of the fish we have, and that is all. So, a large part of our goods find a market in the United States, and we wish nothing to be done to hurt their feelings, to irritate them nor to bring about retaliation or reprisal or in any way to lessen the friendly feeling and so injure the trade we carry on with that great country.

I said in my opening remarks that the national policy was a tremendous deception, and I wish to repeat that remark without intending to give offence to anybody who thinks that that measure was of great importance and value. It was a deception in this respect—that those who advocated it endeavoured to identify it with protection, that is to say, they tried to make it appear it was of the essence of protection to Canadian manufacturers. As a matter of fact, it was nothing of the kind. It did not protect the interest of the country generally, nor even all the industrial interests. It pretended to protect industries generally, but the actual effect of it was to select certain industries for special concessions. In other cases, the duties were high enough to extract a maximum of taxation from the consumer, but low enough to allow the articles to come in from abroad. If these concessions had been extended to all the industries, we could not have found such great fault with the policy. I do not find such great fault with the first proposition from the hon. leader of the opposition. Nobody can differ with him as to the point. If we could obtain the markets of the world to the extent of our productions while retaining the privileges of charging duties on articles coming in from other countries, of course, we could build up a most flourishing trade. But, unfortunately for us, the other countries have the right of making their own tariffs, and they do not wish to see Canada flourishing at their expense; they do not wish to see us enjoy a prohibitive tariff against all the rest of the world, because that would be too much of a good thing. They want to have a share

of the profits of manufacturing, they want to take part of the trade, they do not wish Canada to enjoy all the advantages under a system of that kind. That would indeed be a jug-handled protection, with a good deal of the jug and very little of the handle.

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have suggested to us, and dwelt upon it with a good deal of energy, that all we have to do is to ask with sufficient persistence from the Imperial government and we will be allowed to send our productions into Great Britain on the most favourable terms, and she will allow us to maintain a protective tariff against her goods. Now, suppose we went over to Great Britain for that purpose; suppose we sent an emissary over there in the person of the hon. member for East York. I presume he would not refuse to undertake the mission, if he could thereby secure a title to his name, and the right to embellish himself with an ermine robe. Suppose he went over there and had an interview with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach. Our envoy would say to him: You are importing into your country a large quantity of tea on which you collect a duty of £19,000,000. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach would say to him: I want to increase my revenue, I want to get a larger amount than £19,000,000. Our envoy would say: There is a duty can be placed on American grain of £12,000,000. Sir Michael would say: Do you wish to introduce your Canadian grain? And our representative would say: Yes, most certainly. Well, Sir Michael would say, if you bring in your Canadian grain, and that is the object you have in view, I cannot get my £12,000,000, because you will supply the market and keep out American grain. If you bring in part Canadian grain I will only have a portion of my revenue, and you will not effect the object which you have in view in bringing in your grain. What would become of the millions of manufactured goods which we send to the United States, if we were to erect a hostile tariff against the grain of the United States and their raw material? That would be an obstacle, because if there is one thing which the British public regards with immense satisfaction, it is the fact that in spite of all the efforts of the Americans, the cheapness of their production and other causes, the British manufacturers are able to send a large amount of goods into the American market. I think that would be an answer to the question. Of course, if we could procure that market it would be most invaluable to us. But these treaties have to be made, and these customs have to be met. The hon. member for York could not make an arrangement with the mother country without she were willing. They have the initiative, and I think this proposal, if made from Canada, would be answered in that way, that they could not afford to burden their people with an extra duty, that they could not allow the price of bread to be raised to their artisans by the loss of American trade. But, suppose that our emissary was persevering, and said to Mr. Chamberlain: Mr. Chamberlain, I am desirous to conduct a propaganda among your people, I would like to show them—not from sentiment, because sentiment is discarded in this case—that it is to their advantage to receive Canadian grain instead of American grain. Suppose that Mr. Chamberlain asked our representative to address a meeting in Birmingham. I dare say they could collect a large meeting there. Suppose our representative said to them: We propose to you workingmen that you should abandon your tea duty, and that you should use Canadian grain, and should put a duty upon American grain. It will not make much difference in your sixpenny loaf. I can imagine that after making such an address to a meeting of workingmen, one of them would stand up and say: What has that got to do with our loaf of bread? Do you propose that we should drink tea all the time, and that we should put a duty on our bread? What are you going to give us in exchange for putting a duty on American grain? Are you going to allow us to take our manufactures into Canada free of duty in return for the free entry of Canadian grain? No, sir, we will go back to our beer, we will not drink any more tea, and we will send our goods to the markets where they will be received on equal terms.

Now, if we had the power to compel other countries to receive our goods, and if we could at the same time enjoy protection upon our articles, we would be a flourishing community, no doubt.

The hon. member for East York went on to say that the duty on sugar coming to this country was too high, and ought to be reduced, that a large sum ought to be taken off the duty on sugar, a million dollars, I think he said. He went on to say: Suppose that we were in power, we would take off the duty. Now, I would like to know how that comports with the policy of the hon. and learned leader of the opposition, a pronounced policy of protection. One hon. gentleman wants to take the duty off sugar, and another advocates a pronounced policy of protection. How would a proposal to take the duty off sugar suit the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), who gave us, the other day, an exhaustive speech on the beet-root sugar question? If our trade with Germany is to be maintained, how can we keep out sugar from Germany?

How do these two agree? The hon. member from East York says that about $12,000,000 are going to be saved to the consumers of this country, that the whole price of the sugar consumption is going to be saved because these beets are to be grown in Canada. It would be very consoling to the beet-root sugar producers that the German beet-root sugar importation is going to

be maintained or increased on the one hand, and that on the other they are going to produce the beets which will keep out the article that constitutes the bulk of our trade with that great nation. Now, there was, about the year 1878, an election to be held in the city of Halifax, and two gentlemen, most excellent representatives of that city were seeking the suffrages of the electors. Both of these gentlemen have since been honoured with the title of lieutenant-governor. I allude to Sir M. B. Daly and the Hon. Mr. Ritchie, who were successively lieutenant-governors of Nova Scotia. I do not see any reason why there should be any fault found in such a succession. If all the members for Halifax have been honoured with high degrees and emoluments, I do not see any reason why the representatives of the city of Halifax should fail in the slightest degree in receiving these honours when their time as representatives in this parliament has passed. I do not object to hon. gentlemen opposite making them lieutenant-governors. But, in that election, in the cards which were sent out by the Liberal-Conservative party inviting support for these candidates who were most eligible and reputable gentlemen, there was the plank set forth that the national policy was to secure the protection and improvement of our languishing West Indian trade. What has become of that ? Where is that in this programme? The hon. member for East York is going to supply the whole consumption of beet-root sugar and reduce the duty on beet-root sugar, that comes from Germany. How does that allow our languishing West Indian trade to be restored ? There is no provision made for it. If the beets come into the consumption and displace the beet-root sugar imported it will also displace the cane sugar imported from the West Indies. The promises which were held out to us under the national policy in that respect have not been verified, because the trade has been diminishing until it has reached a very low point. It may be restored. I cannot say how it will be done, but I leave it to these gentlemen who are so much concerned about it to show us some feasible plan by which these conflicting interests can be reconciled, and by which our unfortunate province and city will receive the benefits promised to us in 1878 from an increase in our trade with the West Indies. I know that in the explanation which was given of the decrease of our trade with the West Indies hon. gentlemen have not taken into account the fact that two of our principal markets have been wrested away from us, that the Islands of Porto Rico and Cuba are in the possession of the United States, while they were formerly possessions of Spain, and the trade which formerly went to them has now to pass through United States channels. Are we going to antagonize the United States in regard to that trade? Are we going to have that trade shut out from us if we flaunt our tariff in the faces of the people of the United States, and if we do, may they not cut us off from the enjoyment of the trade with their islands ? This is of great importance to the fishermen of Nova Scotia and to the people of New Brunswick, and I would like to ask the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) how he would justify it before his constituents if, as the result of the adoption of his measure favouring such pronounced protection, that valuable trade should be cut off from the province of Nova Scotia, in order to carry out a theory which looks remarkably like a very utopian experiment. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), who spoke the other night, gave us similar reasons why our trade is in a very dangerous and languishing state, and why we should recognize the wisdom of calling a halt in our expenditures. He told us, that, in the year 1899, we exported $8,400,000 worth of hams, and that, in 1900, we only exported $2,700,000 worth. As in the case of cheese, I would attribute this to some local circumstances which do not indicate any permanent reduction in the volume of our exports. I think this does not indicate that we have lost any of our markets. It does not indicate that any neglect is chargeable to the government, it does not indicate a failure of transportation facilities, or of any of the conditions which are favourable to the reception of any of these articles in the market. It may be that the farmers have sold their hog products in other markets, or that more have been consumed here, or that they have found it profitable to raise other products. It may be that the decline in the export of cheese has been a decline in the quality of the cheese. It may be that the cheese is not up to the sample which was previously maintained. I am informed by farmers that some of the producers and shippers of cheese have been very negligent both as to the quality of the article and as to the way in which the packages have been sent to the old country. I have not derived my information from statistics, I have not taken my information second-hand, but I have inquired of the people who purchase these products in the market. I have inquired of the people in various employments about the reception which our cheese and dairy products have been given in England. The sentiment of regard for Canada has had a great effect because, throughout all classes of the population of Great Britain, amongst the merchants, the public men, the artisans, the ship men, the shipping merchants and the carriers, that sentiment is found to exist very strongly. So great is the regard for Canadian products that a great

many of the shop-keepers in England take inferior American products and label them 'Canadian.' But, that sentiment, to some extent, has been destroyed by the fact that some dealers have sent over articles that were not what they ought to be, and the consequence has been that people, who were disposed to favour Canadian products in recognition of the preference which Canada has given to British goods, have found the quality of some Canadian goods not what it should have been, have regarded these goods as being fraudulent, and have rejected them on that account. The hon. member for East Simcoe went on to argue that the policy of this government was defective because a quantity of goods consumed by the poor man was subject to high rates of duty, while the luxuries which are consumed by the rich, come in at reduced rates. He referred to the article of silk, which had come in to the value of $3,000,000, which has now risen to the value of $5,000,000, and he regarded this as a proof that the preferential tariff is injurious to the working classes. I do not think this is a proof at all.

What lady in the land does not wish to have a silk dress ? What sweetheart of any gentleman opposite would think herself ornamented without a silk dress, and so it is that that which was formerly an article of luxury for the rich is now an object of common desire, and even the sweetheart of a workingman would feel herself degraded if her best gown was not of silk. One gentleman on the other side of the House thought the Liberal policy was defective because the importation of diamonds had increased while the import of articles consumed by the poor had decreased. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is married or not, I hope he is ; but if he was going to bring a present to his wife at the close of this arduous session of parliament, and he selected a diamond, would he not be thankful that the duty was so low that he could afford to buy that diamond for the lady whom he loved. Now, Mr. Speaker, we must do something for the women ; we must do something for the ladies of the land ; for the working-women of the land. The diamonds which were formerly the luxury of the rich are now common property to the middle classes, and they try to save up money to buy things of that kind. The articles used by ladies for their ornamentation should be at least equally considered with the Corby's 'I.X.L.' or 'Seagram's White Wheat,' for instance, with which we regale ourselves and reinforce our energies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall say a word about the racial cry. I regret that the racial cry should be raised by either political party. In my province in the amiable contest which took place between the leader of the opposition and myself to determine which was the more popular, because we had no great difference otherwise, there was no racial cry raised. We never said a disrespectful word of each other so far as I know, and I hope we never will. I esteem the talent of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax). I hope he will render good service to his country and that honours will be bestowed on him in return. I wish him well. I wish every Nova Scotian well because the country is beginning to appreciate the merits of Nova Scotians, and I hope we will all come in for our appreciation in turn. The racial cry did not penetrate the province of Nova Scotia. No party in this country can afford to resurrect it, because it is dead and buried, and there let it rest. Mr. Speaker, I believe in the tariff policy of the government. I believe in the revenue system, and I believe that as a result of the Liberal policy the country is prospering in a steady and uniform way. I have confidence in the men who lead the Liberal party. I like their appearance since I saw them here ; I like their devotion to duty ; I like the way they grasp the details of their departments. I venerate the esteemed leader of the Liberal party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I believe in the Liberal policy and I believe that that policy wisely administered along the lines of the natural resources of our country, will tend to great and lasting prosperity. I believe that our country under Liberal rule will go on in its career of progress and will become a valuable component of the British Empire. I believe that British statesmen and the British people will have confidence in our Canadian statesmen and in their policy, and that united hand in hand we will go forward in our great career of progress, peace and prosperity.

Mr. W. R. BROCK (Centre Toronto). Mr. Speaker, in entering public life as a representative of the people, I am very fortunate to be allied to a political party who have nothing to be ashamed of in their past, and who have no apologies to make for the present. The Conservative party of Canada do not require to announce their policy, or to say what changes they are going to make. The people of the Dominion know, as they have always known, what the Conservative policy is. The right hon. the leader of the government said in this debate, that in the streets of this city and in the corridors of the House there was great sensation and excitement at the rumour that something extraordinary was going to happen, for the Conservative party was going to spring something new upon the country, but he had found after all—and for my part I am happy he found it—that the policy we had to announce was the policy that had made this country prosperous for a quarter of a century. Sir, there was nothing to sneer at in that. The hon. gentleman from Hali-

fax (Mr. Roche) stated that the people of Canada were sick of the national policy. Most extraordinary that. If the people were sick of it why have the present government retained so much of it? If the Liberals were sick of the national policy why have they made so few changes in it, as they themselves tell us? If the national policy nauseated the Liberals, why is it that every canvasser for the Reform party found it necessary to go into every factory in this country and to assure every manufacturer that if the Liberals got into power there was going to be no change in that policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BROCK. We know that a member of the Conservative party in the North-west took it upon himself to say that if he got into power he would reduce the duty on agricultural implements, and we know what a howl went up from the agricultural implement makers of Ontario, the friends of the present government. Yes, Mr. Speaker, these agricultural implement makers were friendly to the government and they have been rewarded for their friendship. By the appointment of a member of that great agricultural implement firm as a senator, the present government have done this country honour, because the gentleman they have appointed well deserves the office. We know how the Reform party repudiated the idea of adding anything to the burdens of the people of Manitoba and the North-west.

But I wish more particularly to address myself, as a business man, to a subject which I think I know something about, and in which I am largely interested, that is, the development of the industries of this country. I contend that when the right hon. leader of the government did himself so much honour and this country so much credit in representing Canada at the Diamond Jubilee, he made one of the great mistakes of his life, not only for himself, but for this country. An opportunity was then offered such as we never had before for making an arrangement, or approaching an arrangement, with the great empire to which we belong for obtaining a preference in their markets in return for the preference we were willing to give to them. I have noticed a good deal of jocularity on the other side of the House on this subject, and some argument that England would never do anything of the kind. Why, England is doing something of the kind every day. This country and other countries have preferences in the English market.

An hon. MEMBER. How?

Mr. BROCK. Great Britain bonuses steamship companies to help the postal system and the commercial interests of this country. In speaking of an alliance with the Conservative party—because that is involved in the resolution which is before the House—I am pleased to be a member of a party which need not be ashamed of its consistency when the history of this country comes to be written. Can hon. gentlemen on the other side say the same? Are they at one among themselves at the present time? Did we not hear the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) speak out strongly in favour of complete free trade? My hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) told the government the other day that they had made a great mistake in taking the duty off binder twine; and another hon. gentleman last night, in addressing the House, turned to the members on his own side and stated that they were not at one—that many of them were too much inclined to favour the national policy. Therefore, it gives me the greatest pleasure to know that we on this side of the House are at one in our policy. We are following our leader loyally.

The hon. Minister of Finance, in his admirable address, stated that amongst the items of income was a large increase of duty on manufactured goods coming into this country. The farmers, the manufacturers and every other interest in this country know what that means. It means the displacement to that extent of goods manufactured in this country by Canadian people. The gentlemen on the other side cannot be unaware of this fact. I think the hon. Minister of Finance and other members of the government have been waited upon by deputations representing some of the largest industries in Canada, who laid before them in the strongest possible light the serious position in which the government by their policy was placing them. When the government first announced the preference of 12½ per cent, I am free to acknowledge that it was hardly noticed. Many of us were so delighted with the idea of giving a preference to England that for the moment we were carried away largely by sentiment, and I must acknowledge feeling something of that sentiment myself; for it was the first time that we had any indication from hon. gentlemen opposite that their inclinations did not run with that of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, who would rather be allied commercially with the country to the south of us. Instead of hon. gentlemen opposite being sick of the national policy, I can assure them that the people who are sick in this country at the present time are the manufacturers—not in one line alone, but in many lines. Take the manufacturers of woollens, one of the largest industries in this country, having millions of dollars invested in plant, machinery and buildings, having educated thousands, I might say hundreds of thousands, of the most respectable mechanics in this country, and having given employment to large numbers of people, women as well as men. In injuring a large woollen mill in a town, you may say you

are only injuring that woollen mill, and you may care very little for it, but remember, you are injuring every other industry in that town and in the surrounding country. There is a great deal of talk about getting new markets ; but my experience in a business career of fifty years in this country is, that the best market is the market nearest to your door. At the present time we have deputations coming here in regard to clearing a passage down the St. Lawrence, and getting rid of the high rates for freight and insurance. All these things have to be paid for by the farmers of this country, and the way to avoid them is to avoid these enormous imports which the Finance Minister is priding himself on. I was very much surprised when the hon. minister declared plainly and simply, but very strongly, that there would be no change in the tariff. I almost fancied that I detected a smile of gratification on his face at being able to strike back at the manufacturers of this country. What object has the hon. gentleman in striking at any of these great industries ? The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright)—I am sorry he is not here—is well aware that, by the votes and influence of the manufacturers of this country, his party were kept in the cold shades of opposition for nearly twenty years, and they cannot forget it.

An hon. MEMBER. Is it cold over there?

Mr. BROCK. Yes, you found it very cold This House knows very well that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has felt very sore at the action of the manufacturers of this country. We have his own express words, and he cannot get rid of them, that he would get back at the manufacturers. that he would do away with every vestige of protection. Is that not getting back at the manufacturers of this country ? The right hon. Prime Minister, in his address the other day, spoke of the manufacturers who were invading this House and this city as tariff tinkers. Well, Sir, I contend that this country should be governed on business principles ; and if it becomes necessary to deal with the tariff in the interest of the country, the tariff should be tinkered with. When gentlemen representing millions of capital and hundreds of thousands of people, come here and explain to the Minister of Finance how their industries are being injured, and when he has letters from the leading bankers of the country supporting their cause, the hon. minister passes them all by with a wave of his hand and sends them back home. I can assure this House that there is a very critical state of affairs in the manufacturing industries of this country. You know what credit means : you know that it requires money to carry on almost any business : and there is no class of business people who require more capital than the manufacturers of woollen, cotton and other goods.

Once the banks and the financial institutions lose confidence in them, these industries are injured to a greater extent than can be repaired by any tinkering with our tariff. There is surely some way out of the difficulty, hon. gentlemen will say, for I think even the Finance Minister will acknowledge that there is a difficulty. I think these hon. gentlemen have acknowledged that there is at any rate some measure of injustice, and I suppose they would ask a practical man what is the way out of the difficulty. There are several ways out of it. The worst way is to shut up the factories, but it is far better to have a factory shut than to run it at a loss. Another way would be to run the factories on half time, but everybody knows what it means to run on half time a factory fully equipped with machinery. If we cannot compete with the manufacturers of Yorkshire now, we could not compete with them if we adopt that course. There is another way and that is the one which will have to be taken. To begin with, we will have to reduce the wages of every employee, at any rate one-third. There is no escape from that. I have been in communication with some of the keenest manufacturers, some of whom, I am sorry to say, have been, for the last eighteen years, strong supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not know exactly where their political sympathies may be now, but when asked why they supported this government, they replied that it was because the party opposite promised them a market of 70,000,000 people. It was because they were promised unrestricted reciprocity. Support us, said these hon. gentlemen opposite, and you need not care so much for your Canadian market, as we will open to you a market of 70,000,000 people. Therefore many honest Reformers supported the government on this consideration. But I was saying that we will have to reduce the wages of our workingmen, and that is something which a really first-class workingman will not put up with. Botchers may, but first-class workers will not allow their wages to be reduced, and will go to the neighbouring republic, which enjoys the highest protection in the world, and holds out the largest inducements to workingmen. And I say that this government, in adopting the brutal measure they have, are driving these men out of the country, ruining thousands of manufacturers, and bringing desolation to many homes. I want you to understand, Sir, that in all the factory centres of the country, the leading men have their cottages and houses quite close to the factories. Take the town of Waterloo, there the workingmen have their houses in the town, some partly and some altogether paid for, and they are thus tied to the locality. These men will have to suffer considerably if forced to sell their

property, because in most cases these properties will be absolutely unsaleable. You know what a closed factory means. Take one of these factories that is mortgaged to the extent of one-half its value, should that factory be closed the mortgagee could not realize the amount of his hypothec if he were to sell it.

No one who knows me for the last quarter of a century will say that I am inclined to be pessimistic. My ambition has always been to hold up the best interests of Canada. In all my business I have endeavoured to assert the interests of Canada in preference to those of any other country, and it is very poor encouragement to those who are trying to build up our manufacturing interests to find the government adopting a policy calculated to nullify all their efforts. What we are trying to do is to make Canada, not a cheap, but a good country to live in. Before 1896, hon. gentlemen on the other side preached the doctrine in every corner of the land that the duty of the government was to make this a cheap country to live in. Well, Mr. Speaker, prosperous countries are not cheap countries to live in. Just as soon as Germany became prosperous, living in it became more expensive, but you could not induce any German to go back to twenty-five years ago when that country was a cheap one to live in.

I cannot understand how any one representing a manufacturing constituency, or in fact any constituency, can justify himself in giving his support to the gentlemen on the other side, if he is really a Canadian at heart. The preference which the right hon. leader of this House has given to England in the markets of this country is no preference to Great Britain or the British Empire—it is no Imperial preference at all. As my hon. friend from East York has pointed out, are we not a part of the empire. Why, then, should we give the manufacturers in Yorkshire an advantage over the manufacturers in this country, and it is seriously to the detriment of manufacturers in this country that this preference is given. But it is not only a preference to the Yorkshire manufacturers. I know of cases where hundreds of pieces of goods have been brought into Yorkshire from Germany, partly manufactured. They were then run through a machine, weighted up a few ounces to the yard, finished and sent out to this country, and 75 per cent of the preference went to Germany. In many cases German manufacturers at present are sending many fancy goods to London, Eng., with a small machine to do a little finishing, after which they are sent out to Canada as British manufactures. It is impossible to get at all the details of the ways in which this thing is being done, but the door is wide open for that sort of practice. I know of one case where a large quantity of granite supposed to have come from Aberdeen, really came from Norway, and was then sent to Aberdeen, where a little work was done on it, after which it was exported to this country to the detriment of the granite industry of New Brunswick and the eastern townships of the province of Quebec. That is another industry which is being injured, and in which the establishments in many cases will have to be closed and a number of workingmen discharged. And all this is due to this preference for which hon. gentlemen opposite take so much credit.

These hon. gentlemen throw across the House the rather cheap question : Why do you not move a vote of want of confidence? Why do you not move to cancel the preference ? Well, if my individual opinion is asked, I would assuredly, inasmuch as I think it is an injury, consider it my duty to do away with it. You will not get any cheap popularity through Ontario by preaching that you are giving a great preference to England. In Ontario, the people who read and who have made what money they have by hard work and industry, will understand the pettiness of that pretended preference.

The difference, to my mind, between the two sides of this House—for there are really but two parties in this country, and I think everybody who wants to have any influence should belong to either one or the other—the difference seems to be that the Liberal members of this House say that our tariff at present is only a revenue tariff. The Finance Minister knows that that is not the case. If it be only a revenue tariff, why raise millions of revenue over your expenditure ? If these hon. gentlemen are free traders, why do they not practice free trade ? I know that they found great fault with the Conservative government some years ago for having given to every one in Canada a free breakfast table. You may call them free traders in that ; but the Conservative party had consideration for the people, for the manufacturer, for every industry in this country—most of all had they consideration for the farmers of this country. We hear a good deal of the differences of opinion amongst the lumbermen here, and I think that the Finance Minister has had his hands full arguing with all those different people who have come to see him and give him reasons why he should give them a preference tariff. I think the reason for the Finance Minister's position is that hon. gentlemen opposite, after years of inconsistency, are endeavouring now, if possible, at the expense of the manufacturers—as my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) says, making a scapegoat of the manufacturers—to cover themselves with a mantle of consistency. But it is too late ; they are too well known. When the history of the last ten or fifteen years comes to be written, and the people judge dispassionately between the parties, I would rather sit on this side of the House for twenty-five years than to

take the place of hon. gentlemen opposite with their record. I would not like to hand down to my successors a reputation for making promises in order to get into power and neglecting to carry them out after attaining power ; a reputation for having advocated any number of principles and discarded every one of them. I say here, as a business man, that these hon. gentlemen sit on the Treasury benches without one particle of principle, except that principle of opportunism, which is the meanest kind of principle.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of taking up the time of the House except to put before the House, as I have said, my views as a business man ; views, that, I believe, are entertained by many business men whose sympathies in other respects, are with hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I believe that these hon. gentlemen are going to find a great deal of difficulty in explaining their opposition to the amendment resolutions now before the House, for many of them have supported these principles not only privately but publicly for the last twenty years. But we know what politics are, we know the influence that is brought to bear when men come to this House. I can respect a man who comes here stating: I have been a supporter of the national policy as it was; I shall be a supporter of the national policy as it is. In taking that position, a man will have the respect of his own constituents, even if he has been elected as a Reformer.

Mr. HEYD. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. BROCK. Certainly.

Mr. HEYD. How would a preference in Britain on certain Canadian products lessen the competition that the manufacturers are now subjected to in consequence of the British preference ?

Mr. BROCK. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) just consider the matter for a moment ? I have contended that the best market in any country, not only in Canada, a country, of immense extent, but even in a section of a country—is the market immediately at one's own doors. If we have fair competition to deal with, the Canadian manufacturers are not afraid of it. Put us on a level with the British manufacturers. The class of people they employ is different from ours, and the wages are about half what we pay. They have other great advantages. Take, for instance, the article of coal—they get coal more cheaply than we can get it, which is most important considering the great quantity that a factory uses, and, owing to the coldness of our climate we require more than they do. The manufacturers in Yorkshire—and any one who has lived there knows that I am stating the case accurately—pays for his money very seldom more than 2½ per cent—they get it at even less than the bank rate. I am happy to say that the paper of the merchants of this country is so good that the manufacturers can take it to London and have it discounted at one per cent below the market rate. Take the manufacturer here, particularly if he is hard up and wants the money, what will money cost him ? I suppose that the cheapest he can get it will be 8 per cent. If he does not want it very badly, I suppose he can get it a little cheaper. So, you will see that in advocating the case of the manufacturers I am doing it upon grounds of absolute justice apart from politics. And I do appeal to the Minister of Finance, who, according to the feeling throughout the country is himself the chief stumbling-block in the way. I do not know whether it is parliamentary to make an assertion of that kind, but that is the situation. The look on the hon. gentleman's face when he turned to this side of the House and said there would be no change in the duties, made me feel that he was the power in the cabinet that fought against the poor manufacturers. I would appeal to him to remember that they are Canadians and his fellow-countrymen, that he should represent them here and in every way endeavour to prevent injury coming to them. Even yet it may not be too late, even yet he may give us some measure of relief ; and I think I may appeal to him, not as from this side of the House, because the strongest appeal comes from hon. gentlemen on the other side—to forget his free trade theories for a time and practice a little of that protection which the leader of the opposition has put into these resolutions.

Mr. WM. ROSS (South Ontario). Mr. Speaker, I know that I have no apology to make for standing here, but I crave your consideration and the indulgence of hon. members while, for a few minutes, I discuss the questions which are so vital to the interests of us all. I am extremely sorry that I cannot agree with the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). We do agree on everything else but politics. I have the pleasure of buying his dry goods, and he sells good dry goods ; I have the pleasure of knowing him as a gentleman and a friend, and he is a good friend and a gentleman. But I must confess that I do not admire his politics, and in that we agree to disagree. When he says that this government have been faithless, that they have not kept their promises, that the party they represent is not worthy the consideration of this country, I disagree from him entirely. He tells about the Conservative party having the same old policy. It is the same old policy—and considering the wonderful development of the country for the last four years, that party is likely to

have the same old policy for many years to come. The hon. gentleman tells about the methods adopted in the last election in canvassing for votes in Ontario—that we went to the factories and promised that if the Liberal party was returned to power, there would be increased protection, or something of that kind.

Mr. BROCK. A continuation of the old tariff.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Very well, I am glad to be corrected. During the election I went into several factories in my constituency. I had the pleasure of going through the largest carriage factory in Canada, and one of the largest in the world. I had the pleasure of being permitted to speak to those workingmen and to ask them for their votes, and I am sure the question of a tariff change never came up at all. I addressed those men in that town and talked upon the public questions of the day, and in doing so the question of preferential trade came up. I supported preferential trade with all my might and main, conscientiously believing that it has been a good thing for this country, and that what was good for the Reformers was good for the Conservatives as well. Now, I know the hon. member for Centre Toronto is largely interested in manufactures. I know that he feels keenly upon this question, and I imagine that in his utterances with regard to it the instinct of self-preservation has, perhaps, come to the top. Are there no other classes in this country besides manufacturers ? Are there no farmers ? Are there no merchants ? Are there no labourers ? Are there no consumers in this country ? I say there are, and I mean to say that those classes of people need protection just as well as the manufacturers, and a great deal more. The member for Centre Toronto must have been thinking of his factories while he was advocating the principle of protection. I am sure he would be quite right looking at it from his view-point, but there are other view-points from which we may look at these matters.

He referred also to the presence of the Prime Minister at the Diamond Jubilee. We all know what took place there. We know that the first great advertisement that Canada ever received came from the visit of our premier to the Diamond Jubilee in London. We were proud of him, everybody was proud of him. The premier of Canada at that time stood foremost of all the foreign visitors at that jubilee—so we read in the newspapers. The hon. gentleman asked the question : Are gentlemen on the other side proud of the government and proud of their party ? I answer : We are proud of the government, we are proud of the party, and I propose shortly to give you some figures showing why we can stand up and face anybody, and say we are proud of our party, proud of our government, and proud of our policy. The preference, he says, means the displacement of a corresponding amount of goods in Canada. Now, that need not necessarily follow. It may follow to some extent, but not of necessity. He speaks of woollen goods. So far as I can understand, the objections to the tariff refer mainly to two or three items ; one is woollen goods, and the other is the item of oatmeal, and there are one or two other items in connection with the tariff which seem to be a little out of joint. Now, I do not think this whole country should be taxed in order that two or three trades should be benefited. That is not a fair policy to lay down. He says that if it becomes necessary to tinker the tariff it should be tinkered. We all know how the tariff was tinkered in days gone by. We know how, under the old policy of protection, manufacturers were here every session. Talk about railway promoters coming here ! I am told, and have read in the public journals, that scores and scores of manufacturers used to be down here every session asking the Finance Minister to tinker with the tariff. We know how uncertain the public was. One of the difficulties we had in buying goods was that we were never sure whether the duty was going on or off sugar, whether it was going on or off tea, whether it was going on or off tobacco, and all the leading staples. The tariff was not permanent. This constant tinkering is a menace to trade, and if by any means a staple tariff can be had in this country, it is an eminently desirable thing. The hon. gentleman says there is a critical state of affairs in the manufacturing interests of this country. Now, I do not understand it so. I have yet to learn that there is a general complaint by the manufacturers of this country. We have witnessed during the past four years probably the most wonderful development that any country has ever witnessed under similar circumstances. This development is still going on, we hope it will continue, and we expect it will continue for a long time.

The hon. member for Centre Toronto tells us that goods partially made in Germany are taken into England, and that 75 per cent of those goods are German and 25 per cent of them are English. Now, I think that is a matter that might be looked into. I understood the Finance Minister to say that the intention was to benefit British goods only. If it can be proved that these goods are coming in as the member for Centre Toronto says they are, that is a matter that ought to be inquired into, it is a matter in which we are all interested, it is a matter which I am sure should be attended to. I am sorry that the member for Centre Toronto takes such a gloomy view of affairs—ruined factories, towns all gone, workingmen's families ruined, and all that sort of thing. I apprehend such a state of things may come, because we know that

there are cycles in commerce and industry, that good times are often followed by hard times. We know that these changes take place independently of tariffs, but let us remember the old adage : Never cross the bridge till you come to it. And I am prepared to-day to uphold the preferential tariff so far as we are yet acquainted with its results.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House about six weeks, and I have had the pleasure of sitting alongside of hon. members of the opposition. I have had the pleasure of making the personal acquaintance of most of them, and I assure you that they are a genial, fine lot of gentlemen. During these six weeks I have had occasion to admire the freedom which these hon. gentlemen enjoy. They put numberless questions, they are constantly rising in their seats and do most of the talking, and do not seem to have any trouble. None of their constituents are bothering them, and asking them to secure patronage—although I call this a trouble it may oftentimes be a pleasure. In fact, I was almost feeling a little jealous of their freedom from care. But, Mr. Speaker, from the day I heard the Finance Minister make his budget speech, when I realized the import of that budget, when I realized how this country had been going forward by leaps and bounds, I began to feel more satisfied, and even proud of my position. I was proud that the Finance Minister was able to make such a statement, I was proud of the government which could give such an account of their administration, I was proud of our party, and the result is that all the envy and jealousy has departed from me.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a county which has some manufactures, notwithstanding that the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) says that we have a summer resort. So we have, at Whitby. The county town of Whitby is beautifully situated, as the hon. member for East Simcoe knows well. We have a salubrious climate, an excellent position, a fine water coast, where some of the people from the neighbouring city of Toronto come down and build residences. Whitby is destined to be one of the greatest summer resorts on that whole coast.

I presume that I may speak for one of the towns in my native county, the same as the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) spoke for the town of Midland, the great gateway to the wonderful summer resort of this country. I have the honour of representing a county that has some important manufacturing industries, though it is largely of a rural character. The district which I represent is composed of four townships and three towns. One of these towns is the town in which I live, and there is no better town in the world, and that is saying a great deal. Another is the one which I have just mentioned, a large summer resort, and destined to be a still greater summer resort. The third town is the town of Oshawa, which we call Little Birmingham. It is one of the finest and smartest towns between Toronto and Montreal. I say this honestly, not jokingly, and I mean exactly what I say. There are manufacturing industries in Oshawa of which we are justly proud. I have spoken of the McLaughlin works, which employ 300 men, which cover a floor space of four or five acres and which expect to manufacture this year 10,000 buggies. That does not look much like as if the country were going to ruin. We have the malleable iron works at Oshawa, owned by the Malleable Iron Company. This industry is as busy as it can be and employs between 400 and 500 men. We have, besides that, the knitting factory, which, at the time of the election, was running night and day, and which could not turn out the knitted goods fast enough. We have the agricultural implement factory, the manager of which is an old school-mate of mine. During last summer he told me that business had never been so good. We have the canning factory, which turns out goods of an excellent quality and which is a most successful industry. We have numerous other factories which are incidental to these large enterprises. I might go on and mention them all, but I have mentioned the ones which I have named to show that the town of Oshawa was prosperous at the time of the election, that it is prosperous at the present moment and I hope that this prosperity will continue for years to come. In my riding we have a large farming community, and I want to tell the House that South Ontario turns out the best Shorthorn Durhams in Canada. I want to tell hon. gentlemen that I am going to boast a little now about my native place. If I cannot boast about that it seems to me a strange thing. Last fall at the Fat Stock show at Guelph our county carried off a great many prizes and won the sweepstakes for fat animals. I represent my county, I speak for it, and in speaking for it I think I voice the sentiment of a majority of my constituents when I say that the British preference is all right. I must confess that there may be occasions when the tariff should be changed. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) declared that he was a born protectionist. On the contrary, I was born a free trader ; I was reared a free trader, but I do not know that I am what you would call an out-and-out free trader myself. I have not departed from the principles of free trade, but, as I engage in the business of the country, I try to find out the necessities of the country and see what is best for the country, and, under the circumstances, I have come to the conclusion, that, if this tariff should be changed at all, it should be changed in the direction of lowering the duties. Now, the tax which each individual

is bound to pay should be certain and it should not be arbitrary. A man should know exactly what he has to pay upon commodities which he consumes and these rates should run along for a series of years, it may be for three, four or five years. The tariff should be able to accommodate itself to the conditions as they exist. I do not mean by that altogether, a changing policy. That seems to be a contradiction, but, it seems to me, that, in looking at the tariff and in studying it, the English tariff is the ideal one. It is a certain tariff, continuing for several years, and it is only for revenue. A tariff should be productive and economical, and if these two considerations are kept in view, I think we would have an ideal tariff for the times in conjunction with the preferential tariff. I do not say that the preferential tariff is perfect. Far from it. In my own constituency my attention was called lately to one matter which seems to indicate that there is something wrong about it, but I think that can be arranged by the readjustment of the duties on the raw material and the finished product. A rearrangement of that kind might be very well effected, the country would derive a revenue and there would be some permanence and stability about the tariff. Now, it is claimed that the preference is one-sided and unjust. I think we can safely say that such is not the case. There are some complaints which have been mentioned, amongst them that of the woollen men which was brought to our attention by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). I do not propose to prolong my speech, this being my first one in the House, but, I would like to call attention to the imports into this country, especially to the imports from Great Britain. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) referred to the imports from Great Britain. He said :

> In view of the discussions which have occasionally taken place in the House with regard to the increase of imports from Great Britain for home consumption, I have placed together the figures for a series of years :
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | 1895 | $31,131,737 |
> | 1896 | 32,979,742 |
> | 1897 | 29,412,188 |
> | 1898 | 32,500,917 |
> | 1899 | 37,060,123 |
> | 1900 | 44,789,730 |

There is no doubt that there has been a large increase in our trade with the old country under the preferential tariff, which, I think, is a desirable thing. Hon. members will say that it is all very well to bring articles into the country and to displace goods which are produced in the country, but, I say, that, if there is any country under the sun with which we should trade, that country is Great Britain, Great Britain which has fostered our trade, which has cared for us, and does care for us now, which contributes to our safety by her navy and her armies. We should be grateful to her and if in any way we can bind ourselves to her we should do so.

Now, take the question of exports from this country. A striking feature of the development of Canadian commerce is the growth of our export trade. The bearing of the tariff of 1897 upon the general promotion of trade has been in great measure for the common good. Let us look at some of the figures. In 1896 we exported products of the mines to the value of $8,059,650, and in 1900 to the value of $24,580,266, showing a total increase of $16,520,616. There are two very important items which contributed to that increase. The first important item is that of coal. In 1896 we exported $3,249,069 worth of coal, and in 1900, $4,599,602 worth, showing an increase in four years of $1,350,533.

Mr. KENDALL. There will be another clear million next year.

Mr. ROSS (South Ontario). The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) says there will be another million next year, and I presume he speaks only for his own county. In addition to that you know the untold wealth we possess in the Crow's Nest Pass, and we learn from the literature that is sent us day by day that the possibilities of coal production in that region are not equalled in any place on the face of the globe. We may therefore expect the coal trade to increase enormously in the near future. In conversation with Mr. Rogers, who is the manager of the company, he told me how his company had spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in the pursuit of that industry. Some people may wonder how the coal industry in British Columbia would benefit eastern Canada, but there is no doubt that it helps to distribute wealth, because thousands of dollars are expended for the purchase of supplies in this part of Canada, and the wages paid the workingmen goes into circulation all over the Dominion. Again let us take our export of gold. In 1896 we exported $1,099,053 worth of gold, and in 1900 we exported $14,148,543 worth, showing an increase of $13,049,490. This is largely due, of course, to the opening up of the Yukon, and the government can well take a great deal of credit for the manner in which law and order has been maintained in that country, as well as for a good deal of the development and progress which has been made there. The government, of course, does not take credit for all this production of gold, but they can safely say that the manner in which they have preserved the peace of the country has enabled that large quantity of gold to be mined, and further, that they have accomplished all this without a cent of cost to the older provinces. The tariff as applied there was that all the gold that came

out of the country was assessed 10 per cent, and now that the country is becoming more self-sustaining and the output larger, that royalty is to be reduced to 5 per cent. That is the principle of the tariff we advocate ; a tariff that will some day, I hope, become exactly a revenue tariff ; a tariff that will not bear harshly on any particular section of the community, while being a benefit to all. The product of our fisheries during these five years I have mentioned have increased only by $391,318, and the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Roche) has told us the reason of that. Take the products of the forest. The total exports of the products of the forest in 1896 amounted to $27,177,686, and in 1900 to $29,663,668, showing an increase of $2,487,982. That is not a very great increase. It is not so marked as in the products of the mines and some others of our exports, but it is large enough to show that the trade is in excellent condition, and that the exports are at a very high water mark. The next item, the export of animals and their products, affects the largest part of our community, and its condition is quite gratifying. In 1896 we exported live animals to the value of $11,426,667, and in 1900 to the value of $12,201,595, showing an increase of $774,928, notwithstanding the embargo which was placed against the shipment of our live cattle to England. The total export of provisions or products of animals in 1896 was $21,200,808 worth, and in 1900, $40,063,218, being an increase of $18,852,410. This increase was largely in our cheese, our bacon, and our pork products, and notwithstanding the fact that during the last year the quantity of cheese exported had decreased the value of it to us has been greater. Take agricultural products in grain. In 1896 we exported $14,083,361 worth, and in 1900 that had risen to $27,516,609, showing an increase during the five years of $13,433,248. This increase has been largely in wheat and coarse grains, and we hope soon to see our vast prairies of the west growing a still greater quantity of beautiful wheat, for which they are so justly celebrated, and which will be transported to the seaports by our Canadian national railways, and shipped to the old land, there to be made into the best bread the world can produce. Notwithstanding this wonderful development in our agricultural and natural products, which after all, are the main source of our wealth, the manufacturers of Canada during this time have not ceased to be active. The export of manufactured goods in 1896 amounted to $9,365,384 worth, and in 1900 it had increased to $14,224,287, being an increase during the five years of $4,858,903, or nearly a million dollars a year. That, Sir, is very creditable for a young country like ours. There are many lines of manufactures in Canada which are capable of extension for export purposes. Do we not see that every country under the sun, having its own home market, is reaching out to the markets of other countries and endeavouring to increase their export trade. They want an oulet for the productions of the country ; and so we will help the manufacturers. Have we not the lumber, the ore, the agricultural products ? Can we not turn our cattle into dressed beef ? Do we not grow wheat, and can we not turn it into flour ? These things can be exported either in the finished form or in the raw state. Of miscellaneous articles we exported in 1896 $109,265 worth, and in 1900, $208,070 worth, showing an increase of only $98,805. We come to the grand total of exports of the produce of Canada, and we find that they amounted in 1896 to $109,915,337, and in 1900 to $170,642,369, showing in the five years during the reign of the party to which I am proud to belong an increase in our exports of $60,727,032. This is a record of which we ought to be proud ; and if I had no other justification, these figures are sufficient to justify me in asserting that the tariff which has been in force for the past four years has been for the benefit of our country.

Mr. A. E. VROOMAN (South Victoria). Mr. Speaker, I claim the indulgence of the House while I speak for a few minutes on some features of the budget which interest in a special manner a large, intelligent and important class of the people of this country ; I speak of the agriculturists.

But first I desire to do—as many of the speakers who have already addressed the House have done—congratulate the House and the country upon the present prosperity of the people of Canada ; and I am glad that I belong to a party who can rejoice in the prosperity of the people whether they sit on this side of the House or on the other side. Mr. Speaker, this was not always the case. It is hard to calculate the immense amount of injury which was done to this country by the propaganda of blue ruin which was carried on during the time the Liberal party sat on this side of the House. The exodus has been mentioned two or three times in this debate. It occurred to me, when I heard it mentioned, that those blue ruin speeches which were made on public platforms throughout the country and on the floor of this House, and were printed in the Reform press of the country, and thus found their way to the homes of the people, especially the farmers, had bred discontent in the hearts of the people and made them desirous of a change ; and as the migration of the people of Ontario and Quebec set in, and they began to trek towards the west, we found this curious fact—and I was an interested spectator, because it occurred in a very forcible and prominent way in the part of

the country where I live—that a farmer going west, if he happened to be a Conservative, went to Manitoba or the North-west, while, if he happened to be a Liberal he went to Dakota or some of the other north-western states. From that I draw the conclusion that the farmers were influenced in this way by the kind of literature they read in their homes. And to-day we find that immigration agents are engaged in Dakota and Michigan, coaxing those people to come back to Canada. That is a fact which I gleaned from the report of the Minister of the Interior, in which he says :

> A glance over the reports sent in from time to time by settlers and delegates will show that a large number of those who have moved to western Canada from the United States are ex-Canadians, people who have gone from Ontario and Quebec to the States some years ago, and who have failed to secure what they looked for, and now that they find the rich lands of western Canada being opened up for settlement, are anxious to return to their home-land under their own flag.

I will venture to say in regard to this Canada of ours, that no man who goes out of it to find a home elsewhere can better himself, and if he has tried that experiment, he is glad to return.

Now, I am one of those who think it was not an unmixed evil for this country when the Liberals came into power. I think it is a fair thing, in a country with institutions and governed like ours, with the electors divided into two great parties, that the legislation of the country should be divided between the parties, and that each party should come into power occasionally as the country demands it. Even though the policy of the party in power might do some harm, it is better to do with that harm than to have such discontent in the country as would breed sedition and disloyalty.

I think it was a good thing for the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) to address the House in the interest of the manufacturers, and I was glad when the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Ross) began to talk about the farmers, because it is in the interest of the farmers that I intend to talk to-night. I do not intend to give the House any statistics ; I simply want to talk in a general way about the farmers. I am closely in sympathy with the farmers ; I have had a great deal to do with them all my life ; I have lived among them ; I have practiced my profession among them, and I know perhaps more about them than most of them know about themselves. I can say for the farmers that they are perhaps of all classes in this country the class who work the hardest and who perhaps get the smallest return from their hard labour. They enjoy less of the luxuries of life ; they know less about the superfluous concerns of life : every day of their life is given to hard toil ; and they are not so wealthy as most other classes. Of course, their wants are few, and perhaps for that reason there is less attention paid to them. But it must be remembered that they are the producers of the country, and a man in a country like this who produces something is worth a dozen men who are looking for office. The farmers of this country form about one-third of its population.

An hon. MEMBER. Fifty-two per cent.

Mr. VROOMAN. I was not aware that they formed so large a proportion ; but that makes my argument all the stronger. And when they come to this House and petition the government by delegation or otherwise, I think they should receive the greatest consideration. While this is essentially an agricultural country, the province from which I come is par excellence the farming province of the Dominion, followed closely by the province of Manitoba. I represent a rural constituency composed to a great extent of farmers. We have one town of considerable size, with perhaps 7,000 people, where I live, and we have two or three incorporated villages. The farmers of that constituency as a class are well-to-do and intelligent people, who regularly read the papers, and are keenly alive to what takes place on the floor of this House.

As the province of Ontario is largely composed of farmers, we have had a number of reasons advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite to account for the way in which the government was turned down in that province. The hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) said it was because it was not properly organized, and that he was going up there to organize it. Well, that hon. gentleman has been absent some days, and it has occurred to me that perhaps he was up organizing in North Bruce. But judging by the result, I can assure him that he would do better to leave the organization of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario in the hands of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), who will do the work much better, because the people of Ontario do not want the Minister of Public Works up there. Another hon. gentleman said that if the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) would look up the records, he would discover that there had been a gerrymander in 1881 and another in 1891. That seems to me to have been going a long way back to find a cause for the defeat of the Liberals in Ontario in the year 1900, especially when we consider the facts that in 1896 the Liberal party had been returned in that province by a considerable majority, and that the same constituencies which returned Liberals in 1896, rejected them in 1900. I do not think that any of the reasons given by the other side to account for the defeat of the Liberal party in Ontario are the true reasons. In my opinion if there

had been no Liberal campaign in that province in 1900, and the election had taken place without any excitement and without any of the influences which a powerful government is able to exercise, there would have been no government candidate returned at all. How can we account for the fact that so many government candidates, who had been elected in 1896, were defeated in 1900 ? Most of these were men who had sat in this House during a whole parliament, and they had been elected on a special contract between them and their electors. They promised to do certain things. They promised to give the electors free trade, free barley ; they promised to reduce the expenditure and the public debt ; they promised to do away with railway subsidies and give us free markets in the United States. And after making all these promises, they came down here and became political acrobats and swallowed all their pledges without a wry face. When they returned to their constituencies for re-election, their constituents replied: Not for Joe. You may fool all the people some of the time, you may fool some people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time.

I do not intend to detain the House longer, but I see members coming in who have been absent several days, and they might possibly be able to give us some report from the west.

Some hon. MEMBERS. How would the east do ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Compare the majorities in the two places.

Mr. BENNETT. How much did it cost the country.

Mr. VROOMAN. Let me take the constituencies that lie next to mine to illustrate my contention that it was not any mere question of sentiment which defeated the Liberal candidates in the last election in the province of Ontario. Take the constituency of North Ontario, in 1896 that constituency was represented in this House by Mr. Graham, who ran against the present member in 1900. Mr. Graham represented the Patrons and the Independents and the Liberals. He was a sort of trinity in unity, and had been returned to the late parliament by a goodly majority. He came down here and was a good party man, and when the government said : 'Thumbs up,' he promptly complied. But when he came back, he had to meet again his old opponent and was defeated by a majority of 500. The next constituency bordering on my own is West Durham, which Mr. Beith had represented for years. No doubt Mr. Beith was a very fine gentleman or his constituency would not have sent him here. But in 1900, when he again courted its favour, the people said : No, we do not want you any more. And they elected Mr. Thornton by a considerable majority. Why is Mr. Thornton not here to-day ? Simply because a partisan returning officer stepped in and said that the Conservative party should not be represented in this House if he could help it. The first thing the government should have done this session was to pass a Bill giving Mr. Thornton the seat. More than that, they should have applied the Criminal Act to the returning officer and had him fined $1,000 and put in jail as a warning to other officials not to tamper with their official duties. To the east of my county, there is the riding of West Peterboro, which sent a Conservative here in 1896 and again in 1900. Then there is North Victoria, which has the same representative to-day, supporting the opposition, as it had in 1896, so that all around me are counties formerly represented by Liberals which are now represented by Conservatives, and those which elected Conservatives in 1896 re-elected them in 1900. In my riding Senator McHugh was elected in 1896. He was a very popular and estimable gentleman, and he has since lost none of his popularity, but like the rest he made pledges which he did not carry out, and the people turned him down. All he had to say to them, when confronted with his broken pledges, was : Look at the good times. But the people refused to re-elect him, and the result was that he was left at home.

Mr. HEYD. No, he is in the Senate.

Mr. VROOMAN. Yes, and I may pause here to congratulate the government on having made that appointment. Senator McHugh was my opponent and is my personal friend. He is a gentleman whom I esteem, and I know he will make a good senator, and the people were pleased with his appointment. But I have no doubt he will be as good a partisan on the floor of the Senate as he was in this House.

In my election, the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) and the hon. the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) came in and took a hand. They paid a great deal of attention to the down-trodden farmer, and I was very much pleased to listen to the Minister of Customs, as with his persuasive tone and his patriarchial appearance, he declaimed to the unsophisticated farmer, who could hardly help believing him as he said : Gentlemen, when we came into power what did we find? We found the great Department of Agriculture at Ottawa, which presides over your interests, controlled by a professional man, a doctor. And what did we do ? We brought in a practical farmer, like yourselves, a man who is used to toil with his hands ; he knows how to sympathize with you. I was a little curious when I came down here to see the Minister

of Agriculture. As the ministers came in at the door, I asked which was the Minister of Agriculture. And when he was pointed out to me, I smiled. I would suggest a reorganization of that cabinet, and I would give the portfolio of Agriculture to such a man as my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Robinson). If that were done, you could go to the country and say to the farmers : We have for Minister of Agriculture a practical farmer, a man like yourselves. It was stated, I think by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) that when this government came into power in 1896, they introduced a new tariff, and that tariff was criticised—it was fought tooth and nail, as he said—by the Conservatives, who said that if it was brought into force it would ruin this country. They did oppose that tariff, and they did say that it would ruin this country. And, after the government had listened to the criticism, they withdrew that tariff in order to revise it. And they sought the help in revising it of a very estimable gentleman, a clear-headed man, the late lamented member for Centre Toronto, Mr. Geo. Bertram, a man I knew well and respected highly, a former resident of the town in which I now live. He changed that tariff for them and saved the government. Was it not a peculiar thing that the government should call in one of these 'scoundrels great and scoundrels small' to assist them in revising their tariff ? We know that when the Conservatives were on that side of the House, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) used to say that if his party got into power the tariff would be revised in the interests of the farmer. The farmers of Manitoba were told that agricultural implements would be put on the free list. But the tariff on agricultural implements remained just what it was before. But, the government said : We will have to do something for the farmers, for there are a great many of them, and some of them may vote against us. We must give them a sop of some kind. And so they put Indian corn on the free list. It has been a question among farmers themselves whether that was a good thing or not. If a farmer is a Reformer he is apt to say that it was a good thing, and if he is a Conservative he may argue the other way. But there is one thing I noticed —that the pork buyers have been advising their buyers to keep clear of the districts where this Indian corn is fed to make pork, because it destroys the pork for the British market. When this business government knew that the farmers had been seeking for years a market for their barley in the United States, why did they not, instead of taking the duty off corn at once, say to the United States : We will give you a market for your corn if you will give us a market for our barley. But that was not done. The interest of the farmers was lost sight of. Our farmers, particularly those of Ontario, have been for years and years looking for a market in the United States for their barley. That market was a great thing for them before the duty of 30 cents a bushel was imposed by the Americans. The government put another thing on the free list —binder twine ; and we hear on the floor of the House that some of the supporters of the government are not satisfied. One thing we know, and that is that when binder twine was put on the free list, the price of it went up. And when barbed wire was put on the free list, the price of it went up also. Some other things were put on the free list—mushroom spawn, for instance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. And ice.

Mr. VROOMAN. Was ice put on the free list ? I am glad to hear that. But I would like to ask how the farmer was helped by putting the duty on sugar ? There is a question which touches every man. A little additional duty was put on cottons also, and on tobacco. The labouring man likes to take a smoke at the end of his hard day's work. But when he sends out his little boy with a five-cent piece for a plug of tobacco, the boy comes back and says : I want another cent. It is true that to meet that, the manufacturers have cut the size of the plug down to fit the charge so as to leave it five cents. We have delegations coming to this government, and it is right that they should come. But when a delegation comes in the interest of the farmers, how are they received ? Farmers are not millionaires, but men of moderate means. There was a delegation came here the other day in the interests of the beet-root sugar industry, and this government gave them the go-by. But, I would refer the Minister of Agriculture to what the Minister of Agriculture in Ontario has done. Of course, I understand very well that the Ontario minister expects an election soon. Still, it is a wonderful statement he makes. He says that Ontario can grow 100,000,000 pounds of sugar annually. I think he knows what he is talking about, because he has been an efficient minister there for many years. This would employ a million and a half of people. It has been proven that the farmers can clear a profit of $43.50 per acre in raising beet root. And the Ontario government have agreed to give to that industry $75,000 annually for three years. But when the farmers came down here they got no help. Yet, the government could make concessions to a lot of Standard Oil magnates when they came here—millionaires from the United States. It was stated here the other night that when this government came in they reduced the duty on coal oil from 7 cents to 5 cents a gallon. Of course, that was a mistake—what was meant was that they reduced it from 6 cents to 5 cents a gallon. But concessions

have been made to the Standard Oil Company, and the result is that oil was never so dear in Ontario as it has been since. The condition of things is this—if you go into a store with your can and ask the dealer for a gallon of American oil, he will give you what he calls American oil, but you never know whether it is American oil or not. I understand that the oil inspection of this country is practically no inspection at all. The Standard Oil Company has a monopoly of the oil business in this country. I would ask the government why they have not reduced the duty on coal oil so as to make oil cheaper. There was a time when it was necessary to protect the oil industry in the interest of the country. But now that it is in the hands of foreigners, why should we protect it ?

Now, as to this preference, I have looked at it, read about it, and considered it ; and, so far as the farmer is concerned, I cannot see that it is of any use to him at all. If it is true that many of his products were imported into England last year, but that would have been so in any case. There was an increase, because there was an increase in all branches of that kind of business. But the preference had nothing to do with it. If the farmers receive no benefit from the preference as it is to-day, they are on the other hand directly injured in the German market.

Now, when this government undertook to give a preference to England in our markets why did they not ask the English government to remove the embargo on our cattle? Before this embargo was placed on our cattle they had a preference in the English market, as there was at that time an embargo on American cattle. Every head of cattle taken into England from Canada was worth $10 or $15 more than a like animal from the United States. That embargo was put on our cattle ostensibly because there was pleuro-pneumonia among them, when in reality there was not. Before the embargo our cattle, after landing in England, were taken into the country and fed for two or three weeks on the rich grasses of England, until the beef attained a flavour like that of English beef, and became more toothsome to the fastidious palate of John Bull. Now, when our government gave a preference to English goods, they should have said to the English goverment : We have given you this preference in our market, now we want you to take the embargo off our cattle. But the Prime Minister says we did not want to ask anything in return from the English government, that what we were giving them was out of pure gratitude for the many favours we had received from them in the past and were still receiving.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the policy of mutual preferential trade, I think that nothing would be of greater benefit to the farmers of this country if we could obtain it. The moment that we get a preference in the markets of England every foot of land in this country would increase in value, all the products of the land would increase in value, wages would immediately go up. You could call in all your immigration agents, because all the best immigrants from the British Isles would come to this country. The volume of production would immediately increase, and in a short time the colonies themselves would be able to supply all the food products required in England.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have reminded us that the Minister of Finance did not claim direct credit for the good times. It is true he did not in so many words, but there was running through his speech an assumption that the good times were due, in part at least, to the legislation which this government had enacted. The First Minister, in a speech made, I think, at Bowmanville, touched upon this question in a very ingenious manner. He said that if Providence had blessed the people because the people elected a good government, no one need complain. Well, that was another way of assuming that the good times were due to the government. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that Providence has blessed this country, and it would seem as if Providence, knowing that the hon. gentlemen opposite had made pledges which they could not fulfil, had taken pity on them and had prospered the country so as to enable them to carry out their promises. But although Providence has showered all this wealth upon us, the government still refuse to take the hint, and therefore we are justified in expecting that Providence will punish them for their ingratitude. The Finance Minister in his speech the other day told us that he could see a little cloud arising no bigger than a man's hand. Well, you would suppose that if he was a judicious man, seeing this little cloud arising, he would begin to take in sail and trim for the approaching storm. But he does nothing of the kind ; and I believe that when he next looks up he will see the handwriting on the wall which will seal the doom of his government.

Mr. GEO. A. CLARE (South Waterloo). Mr. Speaker, I have been listening with a great deal of interest to this debate, which has been proceeding for the last three or four days, and I desire to address the House for a short time on some of the questions that are before us. In the first place, I wish, as a member of the Conservative party, to congratulate the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Ross) on being able to tell us that the town of Oshawa is very prosperous, and that the manufacturers in that town are in a prosperous condition. The Conservative party are always happy to know that any section or any town in this country is in a prosperous condition. I would like to say to that hon. gentleman,

who I see has left the House, that if there had been a town in his constituency which was injured by this preferential tariff, it is likely that he would not be in the House to-day to represent that constituency. But fortunately for him and fortunately for his county, the carriage industry is not affected by the preferential duties, because there are no carriages imported into this country from England. He also stated that this government does not tinker with the tariff. But I would like to remind him that this government has already tinkered with the tariff in respect to this very industry, and has raised the duty 5 per cent in its favour. We are pleased to know that the malleable iron works in his constituency are in a flourishing condition, and why should they not be, when they get a rebate of duty on iron and steel used in the manufacture of goods for export? Sir, I have been trying to understand the position of the government on the tariff question, and I have to say honestly that so far I have been unable to do so. The right hon. the Prime Minister says that this is a revenue tariff; but the Finance Minister told us the other day that we have a large surplus, and are likely to have a large surplus next year. Now, I would like to ask him to explain how it happens that he has a large surplus under a revenue tariff. If it is only a revenue tariff, how does it come about that he is taking so many millions out of the pockets of the taxpayers?

Now, I would like to call the attention of the House for a few moments to what took place when we had a revenue tariff in this country, and when the Liberal party was in power. At that time everybody in this country, Conservative and Reformer, acknowledged that we had a revenue tariff. I remember when the artisans of this country, the agriculturists and the manufacturers all came to the government of which the Minister of Trade and Commerce was then Finance Minister, and asked for some measure of protection. The government refused to do anything, because they believed, and, I suppose, believed conscientiously, that their policy was the best for the country. Well, let us look at the trade during the few years that they were in power. In 1873 the imports to this country were $127,514,974, and the exports were $76,538,000. The aggregate trade in 1873 was $204,000,000 in round numbers. In 1878 the imports were $91,000,000, the exports $67,000,000, and the aggregate trade $159,000,000, or a falling off of $45,000,000. During that time deficits were the order of the day. Business was decreasing in every channel, manufactories were closed down, artisans and labourers were leaving this country for other countries looking for work, the grain and flour of the United States were competing with the natural products of the farmers of Canada, but, still, the party that were in power believed that a revenue tariff was the best for the country. The Reform party at that time declared that they would sooner fall than stand for the policy that we believed to be in the best interests of the country. At that time the county which I have the honour to represent was almost purely an agricultural county. The people there felt the hard times, North and South Waterloo were the two banner Reform constituencies in the Dominion of Canada up to that time. But the people believed that the government were not carrying out the policy which would best promote the interests of the country, and, for the first time in its history, the riding of North Waterloo, in 1878, sent a Conservative to represent it in this House, and the south riding of Waterloo elected a Reform supporter of the national policy. These gentlemen were elected to assist the Rt. Hon. Sir John Macdonald to carry out the policy of protection. They came here, Sir John Macdonald and his government brought down their tariff and almost immediately the times became better. I remember well, that, in the campaign of 1878, the Conservative party said in their arguments before the people that if you put us into power we will protect the interests of the country, with the result that factories will be built all over the country and you will see the tall chimneys grow. The Reform party used to take great pleasure in twitting the Conservative party and in asking where those chimneys were. Mr. Krantz, the member for North Waterloo, replied, and I remember the speech very well in which he showed that in the county of Waterloo, at any rate, the towns were growing, factories were being built up, and a home market was provided for the farmers on account of the growth of the towns. In that county the village of Hespeler had a population of about 1,000. I am pleased to say, that, to-day, that village is a town and has a population of close upon 3,000. The village of Preston at that time had a population of some 1,400 people. It is my native town, the home in which I take a great deal of pride, and I am glad to say that there are to-day about 3,000 people in that town. The town of Galt has more than doubled in population; Berlin has more than doubled in population, and I claim here that this is entirely due to the national policy. It is true that prosperity has kept up for the last four or five years since hon. gentlemen opposite have been in power, but, during the time that these hon. gentlemen were in opposition they attacked the national policy most bitterly. They advocated every conceivable policy, they advocated a revenue tariff, commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity, free trade as they have it in England, and, in 1896, on a side issue, they got into power. Would you not have supposed, Mr. Speaker, that when these hon. gentlemen got into power, they would have carried out some one of the policies they had advocated? But, not

so. They appointed a commission. You would think that after eighteen years in opposition they would know the requirements of the country, but they appointed a commission for the purpose of finding out whether they could carry out free trade as they have it in England or not. I believe that these hon. gentlemen thought it was impossible to carry out that policy and they appointed a commission so that they could fall easy. I remember well the consternation that the Reform manufacturers were in immediately after the election. I remember that they came to me as a manufacturer and asked me to go with them to Ottawa to show the Reform party the policy they should adopt. I remember the furniture men, during the election, signing a letter, published in the Globe newspaper, stating that they could compete with the world, yet, Mr. Speaker, these very same gentlemen were down at Ottawa, during the first two weeks after hon. gentlemen opposite were elected. When the commissioners got through with their work, and when delegates from all over the country had interviewed the government, hon. gentlemen opposite brought down a tariff, and, lo and behold, to the great surprise and relief of the people of the country, we had a protective tariff as we had before. They swallowed themselves and all their policies, and brought down a policy of protection. They have broken every promise they have made to the electors. Instead of decreasing the expenditure by $3,000,000, or $4,000,000, they have increased it by over $10,000,000; instead of giving us the trade policy that they promised, we have protection. Of this policy I certainly do not complain, nor do the Conservative party, but it seems to me very laughable to see the right hon. Prime Minister of this country and the hon. Minister of Finance, all the members of the government, and all the members on the other side of the House, trying to explain to the country that this is not a protective tariff, but that it is a revenue tariff. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he believes the giving of a bounty of $3 a ton to the manufacturers of pig iron was a protective policy or whether it was a revenue tariff policy ? In regard to that matter I wish to say that, while it was promised to the agricultural community that they would have agricultural implements free of duty, instead of doing that, a dollar a ton has been added to the bounty which is taken directly out of the pockets of the people and is no benefit to them, although they have to pay it. In 1896, when the Prime Minister was in opposition, he spoke in the town of Galt, and there being mostly iron manufacturers in that town he tried to explain his free trade speeches. He told the Galt manufacturers that he would take the duty off pig iron so that they could buy that iron $3 a ton cheaper and thus be able to compete with the American manufacturers. In the town of Berlin the very next evening the Reform candidate, Mr. Snider, delivered a protectionist speech, and the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier offered to adopt Mr. Snider and take him into his fold whether he was a protectionist or a free trader. To make this perfectly plain I will give the language which was used on this occasion. Mr. Snider, speaking at Elmira, said :

> It is true that in our constituency some of our manufacturers have been doing well. I believe that some of our industries, in Berlin and Waterloo in particular, have sprung up owing to the national policy. I believe that a few of the industries might not have been there if it had not been for the protection they have had. So far as protection is concerned, my views on the tariff question are these: I should not venture to support any government, if I should happen to be the choice of the electors of North Waterloo, and I should not want to go down and represent you with the idea in your minds that I would endeavour to help free trade, that is entire free trade, for I don't think we could possibly have it. I don't think our party, as a party, would think of introducing it at the present time.

And, Mr. Laurier speaking at Berlin the next day, said :

> I understand that some of my fellow-countrymen in this town of old protectionist views say that my friend Mr. Snider made a protectionist speech at Elmira yesterday. So far so good. If the protectionists of the towns of Berlin and Waterloo are satisfied with the declaration of Mr. Snider, if they claim he is a protectionist, let them send to Ottawa such a protectionist as Mr. Snider. 'What's in a name?' A rose by any other name smells just as sweet. I do not care what you call him. For my part, I am ready to admit him to the ranks of the Liberal party just as he is and will be, and he will be a good supporter, I am sure, of the Liberal cause.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Did he get there ?

Mr. CLARE. He was left by 300 majority. This shows conclusively that the great object of the right hon. gentleman was to get into power no matter how, and no matter what policy was to be carried out. However, Sir, it is very fortunate for the people of Canada that these gentlemen did not carry out the policy, or any of the many policies they advocated while in opposition. It does not matter to me at any rate which party is in power, so long as the affairs of the country are carried on economically and well, and so long as in the interests of the people the policy of protection is maintained to the strict letter of the law. In the matter of their preferential tariff the Liberal government has adopted a policy of their own, which will in time hurl them from power. The preference they have given to Great Britain, of 33½ per cent, is ruining the second largest industry in Canada, because next to the raising of foodstuffs the clothing of the people is the most important. The riding I have the honour to represent has five or six woollen mills, and if this policy of the

government is continued it will entail great loss to the people of that constituency. The same remark applies to almost every other constituency in Canada, because most of them have a woollen mill or two within their limits. This policy will reduce the wages of the mechanics and workingmen in these factories, or else it will close them up entirely. I appeal to the government to reconsider their determination not to give more protection to these large manufacturing concerns. The right hon. the Prime Minister has told us that he gives this preference to the English people in order to show our loyalty and good-will towards them, and in the same breath he tells us that the workingmen of England will not pay one cent more for their flour and bread which can be shipped from this country. And so, the right hon. gentleman, just in order to obtain the good-will of England wants to have the wages of Canadian workingmen reduced, and our factories closed. That is the only logical way of looking at his argument. Mr. Speaker, we have been loyal to the British Crown ; we have been loyal to the British Empire ; we sent our soldiers to South Africa to fight the battles of the British Empire. We showed them that the soldiers of Canada are equal to any soldiers on the face of the globe, and these soldiers came out of the factories of Canada which were built up by the national policy. I remember when I was collecting for the Patriotic Fund in my constituency, the workingmen in the woollen mills were the most liberal in subscribing to that fund. I again appeal to this government to reconsider the position they have taken and to treat these workingmen as they deserve to be treated. Now, in reference to the increased quantity of woollen goods which have been imported into this country since the preferential tariff, I find that that increase is close on to $3,000,000, and every cent's worth of these goods should have been manufactured in Canada, and would have been manufactured in Canada had it not been for the preference given to England. In conclusion I call the attention of the government to the following fact. The correspondent of the Galt Reformer, writing on March 12 from Hespeler, a town which is entirely dependent on the woollen industry, makes the following statement :

> Another grist of our people are pulling out eastward towards New York state, part of them having gone to-day. The spring exodus bids fair to be a record-breaker.

I shall vote, Mr. Speaker, for the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. OLIVER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Mr. CLARE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 22, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PAPERS RESPECTING TELEGRAPH CONSTRUCTION.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I move that the papers brought down to this House under order, 18th February, 1900, respecting telegraph construction, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts. Now that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has returned from North Bruce, I would like to call his attention to some papers that have gone astray—many things go astray. By an understanding between him and myself some accounts in connection with this matter were already before the Public Accounts Committee. They were not laid on the Table of the House, that being an unnecessary formality. But one of the officers of the Auditor General's Department, Mr. Reid, was subpœnaed to attend, as he was the auditing officer. Before attending the next meeting of the committee he was desirous of looking over certain books. On inquiry at the Public Works Department, information was given that these documents had been sent over in compliance with this order of the House, to be brought down. No doubt, they are under the charge of the hon. minister, and I would be very much obliged if he would give immediate orders so that the Auditor's officer may see the books. I do not wish that they be formally laid on the Table, as that is not necessary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have a box full of papers in my room. They will be brought down.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. So far as I am concerned, the original understanding is quite sufficient. I know that the papers are of considerable bulk. If the hon. minister will allow the Auditor's officer to see these books of account, that is all that will be necessary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. With the greatest pleasure.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 87) to amalgamate the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company, the Winnipeg Transfer Railway Company (Limited), the Portage and North-western Railway Company, and the Waskada and North-eastern Railway Company, under the name of the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Canadian Nurses Association.—Mr. Clarke—by Mr. Horsey.

Bill (No. 89) respecting the Grand Falls Water Power and Boom Company.—Mr. Costigan.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company (Limited)—Mr. Bickerdike.

CANADIAN ORDER OF NURSES.

Mr. SPROULE. I move for leave to introduce a Bill to incorporate the Canadian Order of Nurses.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say that a Bill has already been moved to incorporate the Canadian Nurses Association.

Mr. SPROULE. I merely raise the question whether the Bill was regular. I understand it was only introduced in blank, and consequently was no Bill at all.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not see the Bill when it was presented a few moments ago, and I do not have an opportunity of seeing whether Bills are printed or in regular form.

Mr. SPROULE. The Bill introduced by the hon. member for North Grey is only a blank form, is, consequently, no Bill at all, and I raise the question of his right to introduce a Bill in that form. I understand the rules do not allow it.

Mr. SPEAKER. No doubt the rule does not allow a Bill to be introduced which is not in regular form. But, a few moments ago, a motion was made to the same effect as the one made just now by the hon. member; that motion was carried, and the Bill was read a first time without any objection being made to it. I did not look to see whether it was printed and otherwise regular; because the hon. gentleman knows that a Speaker is not always able to see whether a Bill is printed or not. Therefore, a motion having been carried of the same nature as that made by the hon. gentleman, I do not feel that I can admit this motion.

Mr. SPROULE. I rose at the time to take objection to it, but another gentleman was on his feet, and I was obliged to sit down, and could not enter my objection until the motion was carried. Therefore, I had to wait for another opportunity.

TRANSLATION OF THE DEBATES—QUESTION PUT BY MR. ETHIER.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Two Mountains). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I rise to call your attention to a matter which concerns me personally and which is in the nature of a matter of privilege. Here are the facts which I wish to bring to the attention of the House: On Monday, March 18, I as a member of this House and within my right as such, prepared and placed in the hands of the Clerk of this House the following question:—

1. Is the government aware that, since the beginning of the present session, the translators of the Debates have each day translated into English all the French, and into French all the English by them received for that purpose from the Government Printing Bureau, notwithstanding that the amount of matter for translation is equivalent at times to as much as 128 columns of Hansard, in a single day?

2. Is the government aware that since the opening of the present session, the translators of the Debates have also corrected and returned to the Printing Bureau each day, all the proofs sent to them therefrom for that purpose, notwithstanding that such proofs amount at times to as much as 125 columns of Hansard, in a single day?

3. Is the government aware that, up to this date (March 18), the Bureau has sent to the translators of the Debates, matter for translation up to the 12th only, and proofs for correction up to the 11th only; and that of the French version it has paged and published the Debates up to the beginning of the sitting of March 4 only, notwithstanding that the amount of matter for translation in the hands of the printer is sufficient to bring the work up to the 14th at least, and the paging and publishing up to the 11th?

4. Is the government aware that the delay in the printing and distributing of the French Hansard is due to the management of the Printing Bureau and not to the translators of the Debates, who labour day by day and even Sundays and holidays, if necessary, in order to translate forthwith as it is received, all matter furnished to them?

5. Is the government aware that the delays and tardiness of the Government Printing Office in printing the French edition of the Hansard, is the means of depriving the representatives of the people, the press and the public in general of the advantages they should derive from the steady labour of the translators?

6. Is it the intention of the Government to put a stop to the delay caused by the Printing Bureau and to secure the paging and publishing, in due time, of the French edition of the House of Commons Debates?

This question was placed on the Order paper and it still stands there in my name. It will probably be put on Monday, when comes the time for calling it. It seems that, this question has started quite a controversy this week.

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) Let me call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. A. C. Ethier) to the fact that he cannot at this stage go beyond a mere recital of the facts alleged. I understood that he is now raising a question of privilege, but cannot go into the discussion of the facts without moving the adjournment of the House.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER. (Translation.) I do not intend to provoke a debate on a question of privilege as I reserve that right for a later stage. Nor is it my intention to go

into a review of the circumstances which gave rise to this question ; but as the public press, and even certain committees of the House have grappled with this question, and as a certain writer in one of those newspapers has thought it proper to anticipate the position of the Debates Committee by misrepresenting the attitude which I had taken, in an editorial which appeared in the columns of that paper yesterday, I deem it my duty to set myself right.

Let me first quote from the last paragraph of an editorial of La Patrie, of March 11th, in reply to two editorials which had appeared in the columns of Le Journal, on the 27th of February, and on the 8th instant, respectively. This article, under the heading : 'The Translation of the Debates,' winds up as follows :—

Le Journal lays the blame on the government and makes it still more responsible for that condition of affairs than the translating staff. The matter ought to be throughly sifted and probed to the bottom once for all, and justice should be given to whom justice is due.

Now, on the 20th instant after this question had been placed on the Order paper and printed, La Patrie, in its daily parliamentary correspondence, struck the right note about the merits of this question.

But on the 21st, that same paper, not in its parliamentary correspondence but in an editorial under the heading :

'The Hansard trouble,' referring to my absence from the House—for, as a matter of fact, on Monday night I was absent from the House, and in so doing, I have only been using a common privilege to all members of this House, and for which I do not think I am called upon to offer any excuse or explanation. La Patrie, I say, made a statement which was not in accordance with the facts ; and it even contained an insinuation which would show, had it been made with premeditation, that the mind of its author was under a false impression. It reads as follows :—

Mr. Ethier being absent from the House yesterday, his question in connection with Hansard was dropped.

Well, Sir, I say without hesitation that the first statement in this paragraph is without any foundation whatsoever, and that the question placed in my name on the Order paper was not dropped. It still remains on the Order paper just as it stood on Monday, and I say that it is most unfair to put the public mind under such a false impression. Such a way of proceeding would afford me quite sufficient ground for complaint. But the writer goes still further :

Still, it may not be found without interest to bring together this momentary absence and the action taken yesterday by the Hansard Committee for the purpose of finding out who supplied the member for Two Mountains with the information on which was based the question placed in his name on the Order papers.

It is stated here that there is a report of the 'Hansard' Committee before the House, and one by which the writer was enabled to write such a paragraph as I have just quoted from the editorial published in La Patrie. I am not aware of any such report having been brought down. As a matter of fact, there is no such report from the 'Hansard' Committee ; and yet, the writer here seems to insinuate that the member for Two Mountains was afraid of the attitude the 'Hansard' Committee might take in connection with his question bearing on the translating of the Debates.

Were I called upon to give any explanation as to my absence from the sitting of the House on Monday last, I would say that such absence was not a momentary one, as stated by the writer in the article referred to, but, that having been called away on Monday by my professional duties I went home and returned to the city last night without troubling myself in the least about the position the 'Hansard' Committee might deem it proper to take as to the question placed in my name on the Order paper. The writer says further :

The Debates Committee takes offence at——

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) I will ask the hon. gentleman to remember that he is not allowed to refer in this House to what took place before a committee. He cannot avail himself of what is published in newspapers in connection with the proceedings of a committee in order to discuss a report which is not yet before the House.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER. (Translation.) It is not my intention, Sir, to refer to any future report either of the 'Hansard Committee or of the Committee on Printing. I am only dealing with that paragraph of the editorial in which the writer makes the statement that the 'Hansard' Committee 'takes offence.' Now, Sir, I think that the writer here makes a gratuitous assertion when stating that the committee 'takes offence.'

Even were this allegation well-founded, at all events, I hold it to be the privilege of any member of this House who does not belong to any committee to obtain from the proper source information about matters which concern the House, the public and the press.

The House will agree with me, I think, that I had a right to offer a personal explanation bearing on statements which I take exception to as imputing to me motives which never existed.

However, I have to offer my congratulations to the writer in La Patrie on the last paragraph of his editorial which reads as follows :—

The treatment which the French Canadian press received at the hands of the Printing Bureau or of the Hansard Committee is one which is no longer tolerable, and it is high time that the responsibilities for such a condition of

affairs were placed on the shoulders of the proper parties.

I hope, Sir, that prompt action will be taken in the matter so as to place the responsibility for such a condition of affairs where it rightly belongs.

I do not believe that the writer in La Patrie meant to be unfair to any one, and I am glad to be able to state here and now that the parliamentary correspondence of the 20th puts matters in the proper light and makes up for any inaccuracies that may have crept into the editorial referred to.

When I rose to give a personal explanation to the House, I only wished to rectify the statements contained in the two first paragraphs of the article referred to, and to tell the House and the country that the question put by me on the Order paper was not dropped, by reason of my being absent from the House; and in the second place, that such absence was not momentary, and that it was not prompted by any fear on my part of the attitude that any committee of the House might think fit to take with regard to this question.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Fielding:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, as the announcements of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) necessarily cover every department of the fiscal and commercial policy and administration of the country, it is only reasonable that the discussion of these announcements should wander far and wide, a privilege which has been very fully availed of by, I think, most of the hon. members who have taken part in the discussion so far. But, while our discussion may cover a great deal of ground, our vote is narrowed down to the point of whether we shall endorse the policy and administration expressed by these announcements, or whether we shall accept the resolution in amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). In deciding which of these motions we shall support it is not necessary, nor is it possible, that we should all absolutely agree with either the one or the other. In any country, and particularly in a country so widespread as Canada, there must necessarily be many points of view in regard to the policy of taxation, the trade policy and the fiscal policy of the country. I assume that members are elected to parliament for the purpose of representing those several interests and sections, not by endeavouring to force absolutely their particular views upon the whole House so much as to, as far as possible, find a common ground upon which they can stand to work together for the common good. I hope, then, that in discussing the budget from the point of view of the interests of the locality which I am particularly identified with, I will not be accused of any greater lack of patriotism, or any great sectionalism than any other hon. member, representing other interests, may be accused of. In discussing the question of taxation raised by means of a tariff, we find that the full meaning and purport of the taxation is not represented merely by the rate of duty nor by the average rate of duty. A certain level percentage rate of duty levied on all articles alike would be eminently unfair to those classes of the community who would be affected by the tariff through their purchases of necessities rather than of luxuries. A 10 per cent duty on everything would be a greater burden upon the community at large than a 30 per cent duty might be if applied to certain articles. So, too, on the protective side of the tariff because a tariff, in so far as it is a tariff, must necessarily be that far protective,—or, possibly, destructive—those industries which depend on an export market for their ultimate prosperity cannot by any possibility derive the same advantage from the protective features of the tariff as those industries which depend on the home market. So, there are very wide differences in the point of view both in regard to taxation and in regard to protection. I need not tell the hon. members of this House that in that part of Canada lying west of Lake Superior the purchase of necessities is immeasurably greater than the purchase of luxuries. I need not say that that part of Canada depends on the advantages it receives in the export market rather than on the advantages it receives in the home market for its ultimate success. Therefore, west of Lake Superior, the conditions of the country are favourable to low taxation on necessaries and low protection; in other words, the country west of Lake Superior is, in its own interest, necessarily a low tariff country. I need not say that the country west of Lake Superior is not the only part of Canada that is so interested. Wherever, in all this broad Dominion, the majority of the people are buying necessaries instead of luxuries, and wherever, in this broad Dominion, the prosperity of the producer depends upon exports rather than upon home sales, their position is necessarily the same as that of the country west of Lake Superior, and their interests are also identified with a low tariff.

In so far as the tariff which has been put in force by the present administration is concerned; in so far as that tariff has given to the consuming and export producing class of this country relief from the burdens

which they formerly bore, in so far it necessarily has our support. In so far as it has not done that it necessarily must meet with our criticism. There are features of the present tariff which some of us do not consider satisfactory. We believe that there are articles upon which the tariff is unfairly high, and if it were possible for us to secure a reduction in these particulars we would take such means as would be necessary to secure that reduction. Having recognized the advantages which we have derived under the present tariff policy and administration; having stated the points on which we feel inclined to criticise that policy, the question for us to decide is : Where do we stand or how do we stand in regard to the alternative proposition placed before us by the leader of the opposition ? Is it to that proposition that we are to look for greater advantages than we enjoy under the tariff policy of the present administration ? I will not read the amendment to the House, because the House is no doubt familiar with it. It is divided into three paragraphs, and if I might be allowed to give my poor judgment in regard to the meaning of those paragraphs, I would say that paragraph No. 1 declares for a protective tariff for all industries in Canada ; that paragraph No. 2 declares for trade advantages to be given to all parts of the empire, and that paragraph No. 3 declares for a tariff war against all the rest of the world. For my part I am a protectionist in principle and in practice. I believe that it is the business of any government to protect the interest of the country over which it is called to govern, and if the leader of the opposition or if his friends behind him can show me a reasonable means whereby he can protect and advantage the labouring, the agricultural, the manufacturing, the mining and other industrial interests in Canada by a tariff adjustment, he can have my vote.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. But judged in the light of past events; judged in the light of the events transpiring in this country since the adoption of the so-called protective tariff in 1878; our experience leads us to believe that so-called national protection means protection for one class and one interest of the community, and the sacrifice of every other.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. It will be for our friends opposite to explain in what way they propose to advance the agricultural and mining interests of the west by changes in the tariff. They have not attempted to do so yet, and we would be glad to hear from them on that point. The so-called protective tariff; the mis-called national policy was framed in 1878. It was framed, we are given to understand, by a master hand and by a master mind; but that policy framed by a master mind and administered by a master hand never did give protection to the agricultural and mining interests of Canada any more than it did to any of the other of these interests and industries which depended upon the export market for their success.

As to the policy of mutual trade preference within the empire, I would be glad to know how our friends propose to adequately protect every interest within Canada, and at the same time provide for a trade preference throughout the empire. Do they propose to get something for nothing ? The world has changed, if they can get a preference throughout the empire without giving something in return. And then I ask them : What interest which they have pledged themselves here to absolutely and adequately protect, are they going to sacrifice, and to what measure are they going to sacrifice it, in order to secure this mutual trade preference throughout the empire? I would ask them further : What they propose to do about the trade preference that exists at the present time between Great Britain and Canada. I understand that our friends on the other side are not in favour of that trade preference, although they have not specifically declared themselves against it. We would like them to come off the fence and say just exactly what they are going to do about it, because I would like them to understand that the principle of preferential trade with Britain as it stands at the present time appeals to the views and the interests of that section of the people of Canada who depend upon the export market of Great Britain for their ultimate success. Under the present preference, we who depend for our success upon the export of our products believe that any measure that tends to improve our market in Britain is a benefit to us, and when we secure that preference in the British market, not by giving something, but by taking something—that is, the privilege of buying what we want at a lower rate of duty—I say that preference is good enough for us until we can get something better at any rate, and it has our endorsation not only as a matter of sentiment, but as a matter of practical business. In regard to the third paragraph of the amendment which declares for a tariff war with the world, I would ask again: If we are to regulate our tariff, not as is stated in the first paragraph for the purpose of protecting every interest within our country, but for the purpose of attacking every interest in every other country. It seems to me that there is as great difficulty in meeting both conditions as between the first and third paragraph as between the first and second. I believe in the principle of regulating our tariff according to our own needs and requirements and in our own interests I do not think it is a principle capable of general application that whenever any other

country sees fit to put up a certain tariff against us, we should therefore put up the same tariff against it. For these reasons, while I still criticise the fiscal policy of the government and their administration in any particular wherein I consider they have not done the best that can be done for the well-being of the part of the country in which I am most deeply interested, I am compelled to vote for the resolution of the government instead of that of the opposition.

The amendment of the leader of the opposition is a statement of policy on the part of a great political party, a party which hopes again to rule the destinies of this country ; and I would be glad to understand exactly what is meant by what is said. When the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) was replying to the speech of the Finance Minister, he criticised the fiscal policy of the government, and it seemed to me with fairly good reason. He said that he thought a time when the revenues were swelling was a time when either the taxation should be reduced or the debt decreased. He said that in his speech, but it is not embodied in this resolution. I ask you to reconcile if you can the wording of the first paragraph of the resolution, which declares for pronounced and adequate protection, or in other words high duties, with the statement of the hon. member for West Toronto that a rising revenue should be accompanied by reduced taxation. If hon. gentlemen opposite will give us a policy which will appeal to the interests and provide for the well-being of the great producing industries and the great consuming classes of this country, then they can have the support of the representatives of those classes and those interests. But so long as they see fit to declare in this House, if not in resolution, at any rate in speech, that every interest of this vast country is governed by and involved in the one single and minor interest of manufacturing, just so long must they depend on the manufacturing interest for their support, and just so long will I take the liberty of returning to them the accusation of sectionalism and narrowness which has been levelled on several occasions in this House against the representatives of the western country, because they upheld western interests. I wish it to be always understood that the people of the west have no animosity towards the manufacturing interests. We wish them nothing but an abundant success. We are not sectionalists. We like to see this eastern Canada built up ; we are proud when we see it prospering. We like to see these tall chimneys rising ; we like to see those thousands of people employed in manufacturing ; we like to see those great pay rolls. That is one side of the question. But we do not like to see gentlemen who represent the manufacturing interest stand up in this House and assume and declare that the manufacturing interest must be protected at all hazards, and that every other interest is secondary to that—that the prosperity of this country is dependent on whether those gentlemen get a cent more or a cent less on their cottons and their woollens. So long as we are levying our taxation by means of the tariff, just so long are these gentlemen entitled to all the incidental protection which a revenue tariff will give them. They are more than heartily welcome to it, and any success which they can achieve under these conditions we shall rejoice to see them achieve. There is no sectionalism in that respect. But we are told—I have heard it stated from the front benches of the opposition—that so soon as any manufacturing industry is found to be languishing, then is the time to increase the tariff. The trouble with the manufacturers of Canada—if I may be allowed to be a judge—is that they have been living rather on the strength of the tariff than on the merits of their own case; and it is a happy thing for this country, instead of this being a time when one or more manufacturers can come down here and get another turn of the tariff screw in order to help them out, the time has come when these gentlemen have to stand on their own feet and fight out their own salvation, just as we in the North-west have to do. If any particular industry cannot maintain itself under the protection accorded to it by a fair revenue tariff, then let the industry be changed ; just as in the North-west, when wheat raising becomes unprofitable, we are told from every platform, in every newspaper and from every seat in parliament : Go into mixed farming. In the same way, if certain manufacturing industries cannot thrive under a revenue tariff, it is time for them to change to some other line of manufacture, instead of coming down to this House and putting themselves in the position of mendicants on our hands.

I do not want to go into a very extensive discussion of this question ; but one thing has attracted my attention in the plea which has always been put up on behalf of high duties in favour of the manufacturers. Whenever a demand is made for a high duty in favour of the manufacturers, or whenever an attempt is made to reduce a duty, these gentlemen of the manufacturing industries forthwith barricade themselves behind a breastwork of petticoats and pinafores. It is the wives and children of their operatives who are going to be injured by any change in the tariff ; and an appeal is made to humanity when no other ground exists to keep up the tariff. But when the tariff is kept up, when it is thought advisable to form one of these great combines or trusts, when

business gets a little slack, or when somebody is making a big donation for a public library or something of the kind, and a cut is made in wages, we do not then hear anything about the suffering of the workmen or operatives in the factories.

Might I give a suggestion to these philanthropists who are so very anxious about their labouring men. Labouring men depend upon the necessaries of life the same as everybody else, and have less money with which to buy them. We have all heard about the iniquity with regard to coal oil, about the high duties on coal oil, and a good many of us believe that they are altogether too high. Well, coal oil is an article which absorbs a large part of the wages of these unfortunate operatives, but I have never yet seen or heard of a manufacturing association of Canada, or any representative of such associations, getting up in parliament and advocating a reduction of the duty on that article. No danger of their doing that, because that would be attacking the sacred principle of protection. It is with them a case of hang together, for if they do not hang together they will hang separately, and they support the duty on coal oil and every other high duty simply on the principle that the duties must be kept up, although it takes money out of the pockets of the operatives, which these operatives need so much.

The claim is made that the present tariff is the same as the old one, that the tariff policy of the present government is the same old national policy of the late government. If it is, why move this resolution ? Why not endorse the policy of the government by accepting the motion of the hon. Minister of Finance ? I assume that in moving this motion, hon. gentlemen opposite acknowledge that there is not only a radical difference between the tariff policy of the present government and that of the late government, but that the tariff policy of the present opposition differs from that of the present government, and differs because it does not give higher protection to manufacturing industries. If the resolution does not mean that, then it does not mean anything.

Another side of the question I would like to touch, and one I have not heard dealt with yet, is with regard to the great prosperity which has flowed over this country during the past four or five years. I read from the speech of the hon. the Finance Minister :

> But in summing up the affairs of the country, we are able to describe it as one of unexampled prosperity. Prosperity in trade and manufactures has brought prosperity to our national finances, and enables me at the close of the year to announce results which, it is not too much to say, form the most satisfactory financial statement that ever fell to the lot of a Minister of Finance to make in the Dominion of Canada. At a time of very considerable financial stringency, at a time, too, when our expenditures were being conducted on a very liberal scale, we found our revenues so generous that we were able to provide for all our needs without having to resort to fresh loans, or even to an issue of treasury bills.

I want to call the attention of the House to the statement, which has not been challenged, that we are to-day financially and commercially in a most exceptionally prosperous condition, and the question arises, is that condition likely to continue ? If it is, we are to be congratulated. If it is not, we are to some extent to be deplored. The hon. the Finance Minister deals with that question as follows :

> I think we have probably now reached about the crest of the wave of prosperity. I do not expect that we shall have any serious reverses. I think the business of Canada has been developed during the past four or five years upon very safe and sound lines. I think there has been, to a very large extent, an absence of that inflation which is so apt to mark a period of good times. I am of opinion that the business of the country as a whole has been so carefully conducted and is on such a sound basis that we are not likely to suffer any serious reverse, but I do not think it is reasonable to expect that we can go on increasing our business as rapidly as we have during the past few years. What may happen is that we might suffer a check.

I would be very sorry, Mr. Speaker, to hold out false hopes with regard to the future prosperity of our country. If we are liable to suffer a check, it is desirable that we should know it beforehand and prepare for it, and certainly the Minister of Finance is entitled to every credit for his prudence in calling attention to that unfortunate possibility. That point I propose to discuss in a few minutes, but the question I propose to consider now is, whence comes this great prosperity, because upon the source of that prosperity depends its continuance. That is a point which has not been fully brought out in this debate. Our prosperity comes not from the fact that we have been doing business, but from the fact that we have been doing an increased business. It is in the fact of the increase that our prosperity lies, and it is on the question as to whether that increase will continue or not, that the continuance of our prosperity depends. Where did this increase in trade come from ? Did it come by accident ? Did it drop from the clouds ? Where did it come from ? Have the farmers of Ontario produced so very much more crops during the past four years than during the preceding four years as to account for our increased export trade to the amount, I think, of $155,500,000 ? Is it due to the increase in our lumbering industry ? Is it due to the increase in our fisheries and our manufactures? No doubt there has been an increase, and a very satisfactory and desirable increase, in those lines. There is no doubt that the sound administration of the Finance Minister, and his

sound policy, have aided in increasing the general trade of the country a very considerable number of millions of dollars. But, I submit, not to the extent of $155,500,000 in the period of four years. Where does that increase come from ? I claim that the increase of trade within the past four or five years is due to the development of the country west of Lake Superior. From there and only from there could that stupendous increase come, and from there and from there only did it come. I feel constrained to dwell upon this point particularly, because of certain slurs which I have heard cast in this House as to the propriety of certain acts and policy respecting that western country—not so much, I admit, in recent years as in former years. It was the accepted idea in the public life of Canada not so many years ago, that the development of the western country was a mill-stone around the neck of eastern Canada. And that idea, I am sorry to say, is held yet in a good many of the back townships of this eastern country. I draw attention to the fact that we are enjoying unexampled trade prosperity in Canada ; and I draw attention to the fact that the only possible source from which that unexampled trade prosperity could come was the development of the country west of Lake Superior.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) if it was from there that the large increase of exportation in hams and bacon came, and also the increase in our export of wheat ?

Mr. OLIVER. Not the hams and bacon, but certainly the wheat.

Mr. SPROULE. And the cheese ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. And the butter ?

Mr. OLIVER. Partly, but not altogether. I said that the improvement of conditions in eastern Canada did account for millions of dollars, under the wise administration and policy of the present government. I acknowledge that ; but, I ask, and I challenge the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), did the increase in the exports of cheese and hams and bacon account for this increase of over $155,000,000 in our exports ?

Mr. SPROULE. A share of it.

Mr. OLIVER. Undoubtedly, but only a share of it.

Mr. SPROULE. The larger part of it.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, we will see about that later—for that is the very point. We do not wish, remember, to set up as sectionalists ; but, we will not accept the position that the country which is—I will not say the hope, it has been the hope for many years—the foundation of the prosperity that Canada is enjoying, prosperity that is keeping the factories of eastern Canada busy, and is causing this House to discuss day after day questions of transportation and terminal facilities—I say we will not accept the position that that country is a drawback or in any way a detriment to the welfare of Canada at large, or that any policy which tends toward the development of that country is not a good policy and a sound policy for the Dominion at large.

Mr. SPROULE. Nobody disputes that ; there is no need to argue it.

Mr. OLIVER. I am glad to have the support of the hon. member (Mr. Sproule). I hope I shall be as successful with his colleagues on that side. Prosperity has come because of this increase, and the increase has come because of the western development—that is, the larger part of it. It is the exports that pay for the imports, and, when we find out where the exports come from, we know where our prosperity comes from. I find, on looking over the Finance Minister's statement, that our exports increased from 1899 to 1900 to the extent of about $32,000,000. I find that of that increase of $32,000,000, the increase in the products of the mine represented about $11,000,000. How much of that came from Madoc or Marmora ? I find that the increase in the export of animals and their products amounted to about $9,500,000. I find that the increase in the export of agricultural products amounted to about $4,500,000. That is to say, out of this total of $32,000,000, the increase in these three items represented $25,000,000 ; and I submit that of the increase in these three items the greater part necessarily and actually came from the country west of Lake Superior. No man can argue that the mining industries of the eastern country produced $11,000,000 more for export last year than in the preceding year. No man can argue that there was $9,500,000 more of animals and their products exported from eastern Canada than there was in the year previous. No man can argue that there was $4,500,000 more of agricultural products exported from eastern Canada than there was in the year previous. The greater part of this increase, necessarily and as a matter of fact, came from west of Lake Superior, and it was this increase of exports from that western country that, as I say, kept your factories going and your wholesale houses busy. This is the secret of your prosperity ; and, inasmuch as the development of that western country is not ended, is only beginning, I believe that we are not necessarily at the end of an era of prosperity, but that, if a wise and careful policy is pursued, we shall find that we are but at the beginning of an era of prosperity which will grow greater even than the present.

I have given the increase of exports in three great lines. Now let us see the other side. I find that our exports of manufactures

increased about $2,500,000—a very desirable increase, an increase that we are pleased to see and that we are proud of, but an increase that was a result of the prosperity of the country rather than the cause of it. Our fishery exports increased by about $1,250,000. Our exports of the products of the forests increased about $1,500,000. These are interests and industries particularly connected with eastern Canada. We find that in these items our exports have been increased to the extent of about $5,250,000, as against an increase of about $25,000,000 in the products of the mine and the farm. Had we been depending, then, upon the pleasing and satisfactory increase which has taken place in these lines, while we should have had fairly good times, we should not have had the unexampled prosperity which the Minister of Finance speaks of so fully in his opening remarks, and which is beyond challenge or question. Not only has there been an increase in our exports as between last year and the year before, but, taking the figures given us by the Finance Minister, we find that there has been an increase very much in the same proportion, in the period of four years from 1896 to 1900, as compared with the period from 1893 to 1896. As between these two periods the total increase of exports was $155,500,000. Of these exports $37,500,000 were of mines, and $83,750,000 were of farm and animal products, or a total of $125,250,000, of the products of the mine and of the farm. Manufactures increased $13,500,000, the products of the forest, $12,000,000, and the fisheries, $750,000. On the one side of the slate you have $121,250,000, and on the other side $26,250,000.

I claim that there is something more required in the administration of the public affairs of this country than mere tinkering with the tariff. The tariff is not everything, though I admit that the tariff is important, inasmuch as it touches every one in the matter of taxation. It affects, or can be made to affect, every current of trade. I do not wish to minimize the importance of the tariff, but I do think its importance has been greatly exaggerated in discussions of this subject. From the figures I have placed before this House, I think it is clear that a policy that will tend to the still greater development of the mining and agricultural interests of this country, which particularly belong to the country west of Lake Superior, is the policy which will maintain and increase our prosperity.

Now, as to whether this increase did come from west of Lake Superior or not, is a question I will briefly consider. Of course, we cannot separate, in the trade returns, that which came from one part of the country and that which came from another. It all goes out and all comes in through our great ports and our great wholesale centres, and everything coming in through these ports is credited to such ports and to the provinces in which they are found. Therefore, we have to go to other sources for our information as to the increased production of the western country. I find from the speech of the Finance Minister that from 1897 to 1900 the government collected a royalty of $2,000,000 upon the gold output of the Yukon. That royalty was levied, supposedly, at a rate of 10 per cent on all the gold mined over, I think, $2,500 to each mine. Now, I do not throw any aspersion upon the honesty of the people of the Yukon, nor upon the ability of the officials there; but I think if you will deduct the $2,500 exemptions, and if you will make a reasonable allowance for the dislike of people to pay royalty unless they are obliged to, and for the facility which the handling of gold allows to parties to escape the royalty, you will agree that $2,000,000 does not represent by any means 10 per cent of the total output of gold of the Yukon. Indeed, I think it does not represent more than 5 per cent of the actual output. There must have been not less than $40,000,000 of gold mined in the Yukon territory from 1897 to 1900, judging by the returns of the royalty collected. On that point I desire to say a word. I have heard it argued that because it did not cost $40,000,000 to mine the gold, that therefore the country did not profit to the amount of the gold mined. I can only say, as one who has some little knowledge of mining conditions, that the idea is a fallacy, and that the mining of $40,000,000 worth of gold in the Yukon territory does mean a transaction of not less than $40,000,000 worth of business in connection with the mining of that gold. It is an accepted principle that it costs a dollar to take out a dollar's worth of gold from the ground, and some think more than a dollar. If it were not so, gold would sometime become cheap; but it is so, and any man who has gone into gold mining as a speculation—and I think some of my hon. friends opposite will bear me out in the statement—is aware that it often costs more to take out gold than the value of the gold itself. The way it works is this: The richer the mine the greater the rush of people to it, and therefore the greater the waste of money by those who have joined in the rush; and of this waste of money the country gets the benefit in trade. So that although it did not cost $40,000,000 to mine that $40,000,000 of gold that was taken out of the ground, there was $40,000,000 expended, because of that $40,000,000 taken out, and the trade of this country or of some other country benefited to that extent because of that gold being mined.

It has been said that the United States has benefited entirely by the trade of the Yukon, that Canada has only benefited by the royalty that has been levied. I find from the speech of the minister that the customs duties levied on goods entering the Yukon in those four years, is about $1,000,-

000. Now, that $1,000,000 of duty levied on goods brought into the Yukon is not the trade that Canada got—is not the benefit that Canada got. It is the trade which Canada did not get. Taking a 33⅓ per cent duty, $1,000,000 of duty collected would mean $3,000,000 of outside trade, and the balance was Canadian trade, representing the turnover of our merchants, our manufacturers and our dealers in this country, and particularly in the eastern country. Because of those articles which paid the $1,000,000 duty I think I am safe in saying the greater part consisted of agricultural products from the western states. The manufactured articles which went into the Yukon in recent years, at any rate, have been essentially Canadian goods, and Canadian trade has benefited therefrom.

I find from the report of the Minister of Mines of British Columbia, dated June 30th, 1899, that the production of the mines has increased between 1895 and 1899 from $5,500,000 to $12,250,000. Now, just as in the case of the Yukon, so in the case of the mines of British Columbia. My hon. friends from British Columbia will pardon me for alluding to their province, but I think they will bear me out in saying that the rule which I have stated in regard to the Yukon holds good in a large measure in regard to the mines of British Columbia, and that for the $12,250,000 taken out in 1899 not less than $10,000,000 of trade was necessarily done in connection with the mining of that amount. I will not put it any higher. It may have been a great deal more, but it certainly was not any less.

Then, we come further east, and I find it difficult to get returns that will answer the questions raised by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), but, on looking into the Statistical Year-Book for 1899, I find the increase of crop in the province of Manitoba therein stated, and I find that there is a difference between the crop yield of 1896 and the crop yield of 1899 as between 32,000,000 bushels, and 59,000,000 bushels, a difference of 27,000,000 bushels, almost double in three years. I think my hon. friends from Manitoba and the North-west Territories will bear me out when I say that, although the production in the Territories is not yet as large, the proportionate increase is very much greater. So, the crop of Manitoba and the west has absolutely and actually doubled in the three years from 1896 to 1899, and that doubling has meant an increase in the crop of between thirty and forty million bushels of grain which is worth just that much money. Now, I ask you, whether, in this eastern country, it is possible for such an increase to be shown. It is not that this eastern country is not a good country, that it is not one of the fairest countries that the sun shines on, that it is not one of the finest countries in the world, but the opportunity for expansion is not here that is there. There can not be the increase where there is not the opportunity, and if Canada is to increase in her prosperity as she has done, then we must look to the development of the country west of Lake Superior, on the prairies and in the mountains for the future great prosperity and development of Canada, and we must be prepared to support a policy designed to promote the development of the country. Allow me to say that I am not one of those who are always calling for government expenditures in order to secure development. I believe that wise expenditures are ofttimes necessary, but wise and judicious administration is just as necessary as any possible expenditure of actual money. We had large expenditures in the period from 1882 until 1896, we had liberal expenditures, but we did not have results because we did not have wise administration, and it is greatly because of the wiser administration in regard to that country that we have enjoyed since 1896 that this prosperity has come about. With a continuation of a wise policy —I do not say that we have reached perfection by any means—with a continuation of an improved policy, we will have still greater prosperity, in that country and in this eastern country, from whence you must look to the west for your ultimate and final greatness and prosperity.

As other hon. members have wandered far afield from the letter of the resolution, so, I may add a word which I do not consider afield at all, but, as a final conclusion to what I have already said in regard to this eastern and western question. It was a principle held by the late government that it was not good policy to aid the movement of people from one part of Canada to another, as they put it. That it was not good policy to aid the movement of people from eastern Canada to western Canada. And we find to some extent, in fact, to a large extent, that idea is followed by the present administration as well as by the present opposition. It is against that idea that I wish to argue upon the present occasion. I say that if you are to have development, you must have opportunity. If you are to have development, you must give opportunity. You cannot make bricks without straw, you cannot expect a man in eastern Canada who is confined to the limits of a fifty, sixty or a hundred acre farm, or who is trying to wring a living out of soil that will not and cannot be made to produce to add largely if at all to the wealth of the country. That man, let him be the best man there ever was in the world, cannot produce the results that will be of general benefit to this country, that he could produce were he to transfer his energies to a wider and better opportunity. There is, and has been the idea that the progress of the west meant the injury of the east. I have read to the House to-day and have shown on the authority of the hon. Minister of Finance that it is upon the progress of the west that the

progress of the east has depended, is depending and must necessarily depend. Then, I say, instead of standing by this idea that we must keep our people at home, that we must keep them fenced up in little, confined, rocky fields, in poor parts of the country, it is the interest of every man to induce people so circumstanced to change their situation and to take advantage of the wider opportunities offered by the western country. We have looked in the past to outsiders to develop our western country. We have, under the late government and under the present government, expended large amounts of money and we have advocated large policies for the purpose of settling that western country from the outside. Let me, in this House, say that what that country is from Lake Superior to the Alaskan boundary, it is, principally because of the exertions, the abilities and energies of the people of eastern Canada who have gone there to make their homes and to build up a new and greater Canada. It is because of what has been done, by the people who have gone out there from your midst, here, and who, because of the wider opportunities, have achieved greater successes. It is because of their abilities and energies that this addition has been made to our finances and to our prosperity. You have not lost by their going, but you have gained and you will not lose by the further going of such people to that country and building up there a market for your manufacturers, building up a market for your wholesale dealers, and providing traffic for your lines of transportation and great ocean ports, as they cannot cooped up as they are in many parts of this eastern country wearing out their lives in trying to wring a living out of the soil under circumstances that cannot yield them one. It is to our own people that we owe the development of our western country as far as it has gone, and now, when we see as we do see, the benefit that accrues to us from the development of that country, it is for us to unite and consider it, not as an outside place, but as part of a great Canada. It is our common interest to build up a country that will be great in the west and so be great in the east.

You may ask : What would you wish to have done in order to bring this about. I would wish to have a change in sentiment ; I would wish to have our public men look at this matter in the light I have viewed it to-day. Instead of men of light and leading in this eastern country holding to the idea that they must keep their people at home in eastern Canada—keep them settled on some rocky strip of land in New Ontario or some such region, I would ask them to realize that our manufacturers require a market, that our wholesale dealers require a market, that our railways and our ports require traffic. And how can we get that traffic so well as by transplanting our people from insurmountable difficulties here, to illimitable opportunities there. If we adopt such a policy, then, I say, we need not look for that check to our prosperity which the Minister of Finance has foreshadowed. There will we find a solution for the financial problems of this country ; there will we find a means to maintain and increase the prosperity which has so astonished us within the last four years. That prosperity did not come by accident. It came by hard toil, it came by enterprise, it came by sound judgment, it came by men who took risks, and it came from the efforts of men of our own blood and our own name who transferred their energies from this country in the east to that country in the west ; the men who have built up our western country as far as it has gone, but who have only touched the fringe of that vast empire that lies between Lake Superior and the Pacific coast.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I intend, Sir, to confine my remarks, in supporting the amendment introduced by the leader of the opposition, to the subject-matter which we are discussing. I am a firm believer in the recent ruling of Mr. Speaker, that it conduces to the dignity of debate that the rules of the House should be strictly observed and that there should be no wandering from the subject before us. Although there is a great deal of latitude permitted on going into Supply, the present is an entirely different occasion. This amendment, Sir, is an affirmation of the principles upon which the Conservative party stands, upon which they intend to stand, and upon which when the opportunity comes they will appeal to the people of Canada. The first part of that amendment is virtually an affirmation of the principles by which the Conservative party have stood from 1874 to the present day, namely : The protection of the mining, agricultural, and manufacturing industries of the country, or, in other words, the protection of home industries by high tariff duties on manufactures or products which can be produced within the country itself. That is a doctrine of political economy not belonging peculiarly to the Conservative party of Canada, but common to the progressive governments of nearly every civilized nation in the world. It seems strange that at this late day we are called upon to affirm this principle, but there is a departure from it here, and although the government have followed to a slight degree the principles of protection, these principles are not being followed up to the extent which we think is necessary to protect the manufactures of this country. Our opinions on this side of the House are entirely different from those of the last speaker (Mr. Oliver). He says that protection of the manufacturing industries of Canada is an injury to the agricultural, and other classes of our community, while we hold that the principles laid down by us in 1874, and which have been followed

by most nations of the civilized world since, are the true economic principles for us as a young nation to follow. These principles are no longer sneered at as contrary to political economy, but, as I said, they are being adopted by every intelligent nation. These principles which are the true political economy upon which nations build their fortunes are affirmed in the first part of this resolution. Almost in the very words of this resolution the political economists of Europe say : That protecting the home industries of a country has the effect of giving markets to the agricultural classes, tends to build up the country and to place it in a position commercially to compete with other countries in the markets of the world. The latest convert to that proposition is the Russian Finance Minister, Mr. De Witte, one of the foremost financiers of the world. He has recently written on the subject, and his language so embodies the principles and the doctrines of the Liberal-Conservative party of Canada, and his arguments are so concisely put that I shall read an extract from De Witte's article to the House. He says :

> History shows that exclusively agricultural countries, even when they are politically independent and internationally powerful, are economically restricted to the role of tributary colonies to industrial countries which are, so to speak, their metropolis. In exclusively agricultural countries neither intensified agriculture nor the accumulation of capital is possible.

I draw the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) to this language :

> A large spirit of enterprise is never found there. Technical knowledge is rare there, and as our own experience shows even the food of the people depends upon considerations now of one kind, now of another, and against which agriculture cannot contend. The best protection that can be afforded to agriculture consists in assuring for it a market at home for its products, and remunerative wages for labour which finds an occupation in the land.

The ultimate aim of the protectionist is, after all, the high ideal of the present policy in England. The ultimate goal is that your industries shall receive a status which is the prerequisite to your becoming a nation, and after they receive that status to abandon as nearly as possible all protective duties. But, Sir, we are far from having attained that status in Canada to-day. Look how Mr. De Witte's words correspond with the doctrine laid down by one of the ministers of the present government when he was addressing an audience in Boston, and when he pictured to them the advantage of commercial union between the United States and this country, saying, that it would tend to develop the industries of Boston and New York, and that our country north of the St. Lawrence would be a fringe of states added not politically but economically, which would in every way help to make the United States a great nation.

They ventured away from these opinions. They found that the people of this country understand what protection is. They found that a party can only govern this country for many years to come which is a party of protection to the industries of the country. We do not ask for a tariff which prevents manufactured goods of other countries from coming into this country. We ask for a tariff which will allow a moiety of the manufactured goods of other countries to come in and compete with the manufactures of this country. That is in the interest of the manufacturers themselves, and in the interest of the country in the raising of our revenues. What we contend is that the policy of the present government, by raising so large a revenue from customs duties, is having the effect of shutting up the factories of this country, notably the woollen factories. Look at the great increase in the importations of woollen goods—$13,000,000 worth, more than double what was imported in 1897. Say $8,000,000 worth of these might have been manufactured in the country, providing employment not only for the mills that are shut down, but for others. If I remember rightly, each set of looms produces an average of about $60,000 worth of material. Divide $60,000 into $8,000,000, and you will see the extent to which the woollen industry of this country would be increased if that quantity of woollen goods were manufactured here. There are other manufactures in the country in precisely the same position ; and when you once close an industry, you stop the progress of the country in that industry ; you stop the competition with countries ; because, after all, countries are just like individuals, striving for position, and the same law of existence applies to them. This principle of protection the Conservative party will apply to the mother country as to any other country in the world, for the first duty of this country is to the inhabitants of the country itself. The people of Great Britain know that, and they ought to be proud of a country which understands the principles of political economy, and which intends to develop itself in manufactures and every other industry, and to become more powerful commercially than it is at present, so as to be of more assistance in the end to that mother country which we pretend to assist at the present time by the preferential tariff adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite.

As to this preferential tariff, there is not a man in this House, whether he is a member of the government or not, but must admit that if we had differential treatment in favour of our goods in the English market in return for the preference which we give to English goods coming into this country, it would be an advantage to Canada. What is the argument against it ? It is that the various propositions on that sub-

ject have been brought before the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, the Colonial Minister, and that the only one he would entertain was a proposition for a zollverein between the colonies and the empire ; and the right hon. leader of the government has made the statement that the fundamental condition of that zollverein is free trade between the different portions of the empire. I deny it. I think I can prove that the language of Mr. Chamberlain will bear a different interpretation. I need not read the whole statement, but I will read the portion which the right hon. leader of the government referred to in his speech the other day, and on which he relies, as does also the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell), for the position they take, that the people of Great Britain would entertain no proposition which was not based upon the principle of free trade between the colonies and the empire. Mr. Chamberlain said :

> Now, if I have rightly understood it, these articles would comprise corn, meat, wool and sugar, and perhaps other articles of enormous consumption in this country which are at present largely produced in the colonies, and which might be, under such an arrangement, wholly produced in the colonies, and wholly produced by British labour. On the other hand, as I have said, the colonies, while maintaining their duties upon foreign imports, would agree to a free interchange of commodities with the rest of the empire, and would cease to place protective duties upon any product of British labour.

Does the right hon. gentleman who leads the government ask us to believe that that means free trade between the different portions of the empire ? Was Mr. Chamberlain asking the colonies to do away with customs duties which are necessary for carrying on their governments ? No man who reads the language will put any such interpretation upon it. What Mr. Chamberlain meant was this : Put your duties as high as you like for the purpose of raising a revenue to govern and manage the affairs of your own country, but give a preference to England, or, in other words, have no protective tariff against Great Britain, and we will give you equal advantages in the interchange of goods between the different portions of the empire. The right hon. gentleman says that the principles of free trade are so engrafted in the minds of the British people and statesmen that they will not entertain anything else. Is he aware that the right hon. the Colonial Secretary stated in the English House of Commons that the principles of free trade, which apply between England and foreign nations, are not applicable at all between the different portions of the empire. The prospect of a preference to the colonies in the British market was held out to the right hon. gentleman as plainly as it could be by statesmen in England, who are very careful about what they say. They said : Make your proposition to us, and we will at least entertain it or consider it. The right hon. gentleman fully understood Mr. Chamberlain in this sense before he went home, for before the elections in 1896 he said at a meeting in some town west of here : We will be successful in November next, and if successful the first thing we will do will be to appoint a commission to go home and meet the right hon. the Secretary for the Colonies, who is a man of advanced ideas, and this commission will be sent for the purpose—of doing what ? Offering preferential treatment to British goods coming into our country without asking anything in return ? No, but to secure preferential treatment for our goods in the mother country. The right hon. gentleman understood what the Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain meant, and his intention was to take advantage of the suggestion thrown out by Mr. Chamberlain. But what did he do ? Why, immediately when he landed upon the shores of Great Britain, he was seized by a sudden inspiration. By some unexplainable flash of intuition he became convinced of what was in the minds of the people of Great Britain, he saw at once what was the consensus of opinion among the British people, and felt that it would be entirely useless to make any proposition of the kind he had previously declared it was his intention to make. No sooner did he land than he made the announcement to the mother country : On account of the great advantages which you have given us, on account of the great things which you have done for us, we find that we ought to be generous, and we will give you a preferential trade without asking anything in return.

What could any statesman of Great Britain do under the circumstances ? Could you expect him to reply : You are foolish to make such an offer without asking quid pro quo ? No, that announcement of the right hon. gentleman closed the mouth of every minister of England, and absolutely precluded the making of an offer by any English minister of any interchange of tariffs or fair treatment to the colonies.

The right hon. gentleman, by that announcement, also hit a slap in the face to free trade doctrines. Is it not as much opposed to the free trade or open-door doctrine to give a preference to English goods in our market as anything possibly can be ? If the right hon. gentleman has any doubt on this question, I will read from a debate in the English House of Commons, which occurred in 1898, on a Bill introduced for the purpose of giving a constitution to the state of Rhodesia. A question arose as to the powers to be given to that state—which was not a self-governing, but a Crown colony—with reference to a customs tariff—whether it should be given power to discriminate in favour of British against foreign goods. This proposition of Mr. Rhodes roused the ire of the free traders in the House of Commons. Sir William Harcourt,

followed up by Mr. Courtney, John Morley, and all the great authorities on the subject, denounced it as one of the vilest abandonments of the principle of free trade and the open-door that ever was propounded in a British House of Commons. The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Chamberlain) in reply, said :

> The right hon. gentleman would not allow a British colony to make a preference in favour of the mother country, and to make such a preference was considered by them as an abominable protectionist piece of business and a reversal of the free trade policy of this country. Both the right hon. gentlemen opposite agree to that.
>
> [Mr. John Morley acquiesced.]
>
> Then they are entirely opposed to the offer which we have had, and which was made to us by the free trade premier of Canada, and by which a preference of 25 per cent is given to British goods imported into Canada.

Then the Secretary of State for the Colonies went on :

> It is quite true that a self-governing colony can make any offer it pleases, just as Mr. Rhodes can, but it is for the Imperial government to say whether or not it shall be accepted, and if it be right for the Imperial government to refuse the offer made by Rhodesia, it would have been right for the Imperial government to refuse the offer made by Canada. We ought to have said to Canada: No, inasmuch as we are a free trade country, we cannot accept the offer, although, no doubt, you intend it most generously, unless you extend it to all other countries. That is the argument of the right hon. gentleman. Had he ever heard of an institution called the Cobden Club? Does he think the Cobden Club exists in order to bring about a reversal of our free trade policy? Yet the Cobden Club gave its gold medal to Sir Wilfrid Laurier. And we are told, forsooth, that we are unfaithful to the doctrine of the open door.

It seemed to me, when I heard that the Cobden Club gave this gold medal to the right hon. gentleman, that it was a reversal by the club of all the principles that were laid down as underlying the free trade principles which had been advocated from the time of Cobden down to the present day. The explanation given by Sir Wilfrid Laurier is that he was a member of that distinguished body. The explanation given by Mr. Courtney, in the English House of Commons, and Mr. Morley, was that they did not know of any such offer as this to the Imperial government, or they would have never given a medal to the right hon. gentleman. And the suggestion is made by the Secretary of State for the Colonies that if the right hon. gentleman is entitled to the Cobden medal, so is Mr. Rhodes who proposed a similar tariff in the case of Rhodesia. I would like to see both the right hon. gentleman and Mr. Rhodes walking down the streets of London as champions of free trade principles in England. Why, a child knows that the very principle of a preference to the mother country is an abandonment entirely of the open-door and free trade policy. Yet these gentlemen talk of free trade principles so permeating British society and the British people that they would not entertain any idea of a preference to the colonies in the home market and say it is only the stupid thick heads of the opposition in Canada who would make a proposition of that kind. But did it never strike the right hon. gentleman that there are other colonies at present offering England a perference in their markets and asking for a quid pro quo in return. Is not that being done by Australia ? If the right hon. gentleman wanted to carry out his anti-election promise, which he made when he had the statement of the Secretary of the Colonies that the free trade doctrine should not apply to the relations between the empire and the colonies, what has he done to carry out that pledge ? Has there been any correspondence with the Imperial government urging upon them that, as for three years we have given British goods a preference in our country, they ought to give us some return. I have seen no correspondence of the kind. I have heard of no correspondence of that kind. Has there been an interchange of ideas with the Australian colonies for the purpose of carrying out that same principle ? Not a word of it that I have ever heard of. Hon. gentlemen opposite rest upon their oars, and this pre-election promise, like so many others that they gave, is left unfulfilled. They occupy the Treasury benches because of the promises they made, but their performance is wholly different from their promises. They abandoned their policy of free trade. The people of the country have forgiven them for that. But the people will not forgive them for the abandonment of every other one of their principles, and especially that one upon which the people of the country have set their hearts—that if we give a preference to British goods, we shall have some advantage in return. I wish to read the statement of the Secretary of State for the Colonies to show that in the opinion of that right hon. gentleman the principle of free trade does not apply as between the mother country and her colonies. He said :

> I deny that absolutely, but I am delighted to find that the opposition are prepared to follow their leaders in this direction. I say it has no resemblance whatever to the policy of the open port and the policy of free trade. That policy is as between nations and not as between branches of the same nation.

This shows that the Secretary of State for the Colonies does not believe that the mother country is bound to the principle of free trade in the matter. He is willing to consider the question outside of the principle of free trade. Yet, not a single proposition has been made by any member of this government for the purpose of having carried into effect that which was supported by the consensus of public opinion

in this country, that a preference should be given in our markets to the products of the mother country on condition of getting some advantage in the markets of Great Britain. There is a little paragraph following what I have read, which, perhaps, I might read for the edification of the right hon. leader of the House (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This is said by the Secretary of State for the Colonies :

> The right hon. gentleman suggests that we should treat them differently. No ! If we are willing to accept this favour and to thank Canada for it, and to give a gold medal to her Prime Minister for having proposed it, then, I think that the next thing is for the Cobden Club to give a gold medal to Mr. Rhodes.

This aroused the ire of Mr. Courtney, Mr. Morley and others. Mr. Courtney gets out of the difficulty by saying that the right hon. gentleman who leads the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is something of an orator, but that he does not understand the principles of political economy :

> What my right hon. friend says is this: that as between different divisions of the same political organization—the British Empire——

This, it will be seen, is the interpretation that Mr. Courtney puts upon the words of the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

> —there is no departure from free trade, although there is differential treatment of one part of it as against the outside public. That is his point.

And here is Mr. Courtney's reply to the taunt flung at him that the Cobden Club had abandoned the principles, and had gone in favour of protection by honouring the right hon. leader of this government by giving him a gold medal :

> My right hon. friend has referred to the presentation by the Cobden Club of a gold medal to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, adding he was thus recognized by the highest authority as an eminent free trader. I am an honorary member of that club, but I have never been an ordinary member, and I have never associated myself with any of its actions; and when I read that a gold medal had been presented to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, I could not but think that the Cobden Club had committed a betise. Sir Wilfrid Laurier is a person of eminence and of great standing and a man who possesses fine rhetorical powers; but whether he is a master of political economy or of the principles of free trade, I do not know. But I am certain that his action in proposing to reduce the duties on British produce imported into the Dominion of Canada was not of a character which should have recommended itself to Mr. Cobden. I think that he would not have accepted it. Mr. Cobden would have known a good deal better than that, and he would have been the last to approve of it.

Now, the only argument of hon. gentlemen on the government side against the principles embodied in the second part of the resolutions at present before the House is that the English people will not entertain it, that the English people cannot do it. But these hon. gentlemen have never tried, they have never made application to Great Britain for a preference. How is there to be a closer union between the different parts of the empire unless it is based upon the principle proposed by Mr. Chamberlain, the only principle he entertained—a zollverein of tariffs ? We must make the material interests of the mother country and of the colonies identical. Of course, we are not going to part with any portion of the right of self government, even to the Imperial authorities. We have the right to govern ourselves, as have other colonies of the empire. There is no proposition for Imperial federation or for closer union of interests as between the different parts of the empire, but the proposition of Mr. Chamberlain of a zollverein of tariffs between the different parts of the empire. That is the goal which the Conservative party are approaching. The right hon. leader of the government and the Minister of Finance, in discussing the subject the other day asked this side of the House : If you are opposed to the preferential tariff, why do you not move to strike it out ? It never struck the hon. gentlemen that there was another way out of the difficulty. We can give protection against the manufactures of Great Britain coming into this country, and at the same time give preferential treatment to British goods. We do not abandon our protectionist principles, nor are we flying in the face of the preferential tariff. We can carry out the principle embodied in the second part of the resolutions without the abandonment of the preferential treatment of Great Britain. On the two parts of the resolution introduced by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), I am in complete accord with him; and I believe that the universal sentiment of the people of this country is in favour of carrying out the principle of political economy as laid down by all the great men of the present day, and in every civilized country of the world, with the single exception of Great Britain.

If at any time the industries and manufactures of the mother country were being swept out of existence by foreign competition, you would think she would protect her own industries. A few years ago she stood at the head of the manufacturing industries. She had cheap labour, skilled labour, any amount of capital for the purpose of distributing her products to every part of the world. If rival enterprises were started in any part of the world, she was able to send her goods into that country so cheap that she could undersell them and stifle their industries, and keep the market for herself. The ultimate goal of every country in this world, as plainly laid down by Mr. De Witte, is to have industrial and manufacturing centres surrounded by an agricultural population which will fur-

nish the food products for the purpose of keeping up those industries. That doctrine is the fundamental doctrine of the Conservative platform. As I have already said, it may be that for a time the purchaser will suffer ; but the result is always beneficial ; and, as Mr. De Witte has pointed out, the people who adopt that policy always become the wealthiest and most intellectual.

Now, as to the remaining clause of the resolution introduced by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition :

The House is further of opinion that equivalent or adequate duties should be imposed by Canada upon the products and manufactures of countries not within the empire in all cases where such countries fail to admit Canadian products and manufactures upon fair terms.

That opens a very wide field, it touches upon our relations with every other country in the world in respect of which Great Britain has bound us by the most-favoured-nation clause. It must apply to all, because no nation which has a most-favoured-nation clause with Great Britain could apply exceptional tariffs against this country, they would be void. They are similarly bound in their contracts with the empire to afford the same treatment to the colonies as to the empire. There are perhaps only three countries in the world to which we could apply that principle, namely, the zollverein of Germany, Belgium and the United States. Those treaties were denounced, and concerning the denunciation of those treaties I have some very interesting correspondence between the Colonial Secretary and the government of this country. It is in reference to the proposition that was introduced by the Finance Minister, offering most favourable terms not only to Great Britain but to any other country in the world that fulfilled the conditions. On this side of the House we pointed out the impossibility of anything of that kind being done. I remember the Minister of Marine and Fisheries getting up and, with that style of his which seemed to say that after he had opened his mouth nothing further could be said, he stated in the most positive manner that he had read carefully the most-favoured-nation clause of Great Britain, and that the argument of the opposition was groundless. I was wondering why the government dropped that particular clause in their tariff arrangements, and I find the reason in a despatch from the Colonial Office which completely upsets the ideas those gentlemen had when they first introduced their resolution, and brought them back to the position where they now stand :

But I should add that there is another question which is still more difficult, but about which I only wish to offer a word of warning to the representatives present. Besides these two treaties which are very special in their terms and which prevent the preferential arrangement, or which appear to prevent the preferential arrangement——

Because the Colonial Secretary was very careful not to bind himself by saying that it did prevent the preferential arrangement ; he wanted to leave a way of escape.

—we have a most-favoured-nation clause in all our treaties to which most of the colonies are parties. I may explain that under the terms of the Canadian resolution, if any foreign nation were to offer to Canada beneficial terms as defined in the resolution, Canada would then be bound to give to that country the same preferences as offered to Great Britain. Let me suppose, for instance, that it was a minor country like Holland, and assuming for the sake of argument that Holland offered these conditions, thereupon Canada will be compelled to give the same terms to Holland that she now offers to the mother country. She would then be bound by the most-favoured-nation treaties to give the same terms to practically every commercial country in the world.

Repeating the words of the Colonial Secretary, nearly the ipsissima verba used by the leader of the opposition when he pointed out to the Finance Minister what would be the result of the proposition he made.

It would be, I think, a matter of impossibility to denounce those treaties because that involves the whole trade of the empire. In some cases there is no term of denunciation in the treaties. But, of course, the whole difficulty can be avoided by any colony which desires to make preferential arrangements with the mother country, if that colony will confine its offer nominatim to the mother country, and not make it to a foreign country.

That suggestion was made to the Finance Minister. He found out the solution of the difficulty that he was in, and that is the cause of the change that he made in the resolutions after they were first introduced. But it never was the intention in this House, when those resolutions were introduced, to give virtually a 25 per cent tariff to the countries whose treaties we had denounced, to Germany, Belgium, and the rest of Europe. The result of the reduction in favour of Great Britain is virtually a reduction of nearly that amount in favour of the whole of Europe. Great Britain had practically the commerce of Europe at her disposition, and could carry her trade to all parts of the world, and could send even the products of Holland, Belgium, France and Germany into every part of the world.

What are these hon. gentlemen requiring under this preferential tariff ? Is it that 25 per cent of the original value of the article shall be finished in England ? I do not clearly understand the words of the order in council. I may be mistaken in that particular. Or, is it 25 per cent of the value of the article as it leaves the British shore? If it is the first proposition, suppose that an article costs $80 in Germany, and if 25 per cent of the finish is to be added in England, that would be only 20 per cent of the value of the article, and then you could add the cost of the package, the commission and

all these amounts to the value of the article sent to this country and you will find that the amount of the finish, or the expenditure to be made on the article in Great Britain, itself, will not amount to more than 20 per cent, or 15 per cent of the value of the article. That, as I understand it is the practice of the custom-house. Then, virtually, nearly every country in Europe is at the present time entering into competition with the manufacturers of this country on terms nearly equal to those accorded to the British people. That is what the people of this country will not permit. Germany has a hostile tariff against the people of this country, other countries have hostile tariffs against us, notably Germany, but, notwithstanding this fact, the policy which we adopted, not only in favour of the empire itself, but in favour of the different colonies, has been availed of to the fullest extent by Germany and there is an increased importation of German goods into this country under this preferential arrangement. What is the result of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite ?—a prohibition, nearly, or at all events, a reduction to a large amount of the trade that we formerly did with the German people. Then, it is asked how the policy which we propose can be carried out. I heard the hon. Minister of Customs, the other day, ask the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean): Would you have a reciprocal arrangement with Great Britain ? Who ever contemplated such a thing ? There is no duty upon our goods going into that country and reciprocal treatment would be the taking off of the duty altogether on the goods coming into this country. We never contemplated any such absurdity as that, and the Conservative party have not fallen to such a depth of ignorance as to be propounding propositions the absurdity of which strikes the hon. Minister of Customs. What we propose to do is this: we know the difficulties in reference to the treaty arrangements by which we are bound to different countries in the world. Surely we can make such a tariff arrangement as Germany and France have, that is, a maximum and a minimum tariff. Why should we not apply that principle to our own country ? It may be mechanical and self-working, so that, under certain circumstances and rules, as a result of the tariff which any country may adopt in reference to our trade, our tariff would go mechanically into force. That is one way of getting over the difficulties, and I would like the hon. Minister of Customs, when he is answering, to express his opinion in reference to it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). Would the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) answer one question ? When he says 'we' does he mean himself, or does he mean the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) ?

Mr. HAGGART.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am speaking metaphorically for the people of this country. The Tooley street argument in reference to the tailors may apply, but it is the habit and custom of this House to speak of 'we,' and when I speak of 'we' I speak as if I am here representing the people of the country. I speak for my country and I am voicing the opinions of my country.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Mr. Paterson). The impressions left on my mind by the speech of the hon. member for East York and the speech of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) are entirely different, and, therefore, I wanted to know which view was the view of the party ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) makes a statement of fact which I controvert entirely. My views and the statement, as I heard it, of the hon. member for East York are quite consonant. He has an intelligent view of these matters and I, following in the wake of the hon. gentleman who spoke here the other day, am perhaps voicing in the concrete his opinions. These are the opinions that we hold in reference to this resolution. The hon. Minister of Customs, if he has any fault to find with them, or if he can find anything wrong with our principles, will be at liberty, in a short time, in discussing the matter, to show their fallacy, or falseness. Then, what is, after all, the resolution ? The resolution is an affirmation of the principles which, as I have said, since 1874 have bound the Conservative party. We state further that these principles have been departed from by the present government in order to make a revenue showing to the people, and that the present government are neglecting the manufacturing interests of the country. The right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in his argument, says that the people of this country are sick of changes in the tariff. In order, under the protective system, to afford sufficient protection to home industries, or to encourage the development of home industries, the tariff must of necessity be a changing one. Whenever we can manufacture articles cheaper in this country the tariff must be lowered a little to raise revenue and to afford competition which is a necessity in the interests of the manufacturers themselves. There is no fixed rate to be maintained. We will vary the tariff when we get in in order to carry out the system as we believe it should be carried out, to produce revenue in the country and to carry on, in accordance with the underlying principles of the Conservative party, the building up of the country, the building up of industries which can be in no way done but by the adoption of the principles which this party have advocated from 1874, down to the present day. We further contend that the first duty of the people is to the country itself. For that reason we are

opposed to the one-sided arrangement which the right hon. gentleman made with the empire. There was no necessity for it. He, himself, made a statement before he went over to the old country entirely at variance with the policy which was adopted. His pre-election pledges to the people were in line with the second part of the resolution and the only way he gets out of his promise to the people is by presenting the argument, which was repeated by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell), that the British government will not entertain a proposition of that kind and that no proposition of that kind will be entertained by any colony. They are making such propositions in Australia, and perhaps, before a couple of years have passed over the doctrine which the right hon. Secretary of State for the Colonies has laid down as the doctrine which will bind him in reference to the dealings between the different parts of the empire is that free trade principles shall not apply as between them. We have had statements made publicly in the House of Commons in England going to show that the Australian colonies are marching in that direction. Why is it that the man who made the nation, or woke up one morning and found that Canada was a nation, is not advancing the interests of the people by urging upon the Imperial government that free trade principles do not apply between the different parts of the empire and that they should give us something in return for our abandonment of the open door. and for our abandonment of every principle which the Cobden Club, and every free trader throughout the country has advocated for a number of years. I know that the conditions are altered, and that there is now no such limitations as there formerly was upon the assent to be given by the Governor General to tariff Bills. But, before that change was made, if you discriminated in favour of any country, the Bill would be retained, and you would not be allowed to do so. In some of the constitutions given to the different colonies, they are restricted in that sense. But, the information given to the people of this country through the Colonial Secretary was, that we should not discriminate even in favour of England. The Imperial government of the present day have abandoned that policy, and have come more than half way to meet the right hon. gentleman. Why is it he cannot see the signs of the times ? Why is it he cannot see the Imperial spirit which pervades the empire from one end to the other, and which can only be voiced in a zollverein of tariffs, as Mr. Chamberlain says, because England will insist upon the freest government in her colonies, and the only advantage must be an Imperial one, they giving us a preference in their markets in return for the preference we are giving them. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I shall have great pleasure in supporting the resolution which was introduced by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 35) respecting the Mather Bridge and Power Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Great Northwest Central Railway Company.—Mr. LaRivière.

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—Mr. Fraser.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

GUELPH JUNCTION RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 23) respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

On section 2,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this clause be adopted ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yeas and nays.

Mr. H. GUTHRIE (South Wellington). I think that, perhaps, a little further explanation upon this clause might be well before we are asked to pass an opinion upon it. There was not a very full meeting of the committee, so that the explanations which I made then may be quite new to many who are now present in the House. The Guelph Junction Railway is a road extending sixteen miles from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the city of Guelph. Power is now asked to continue that road seventy miles further to Goderich. The road is practically the property of the city of Guelph. Its capital stock is $30,000, of which the city owns $20,000, fully paid up, the remaining $10,000 being in the hands of ten individuals, who are each entitled to $1,000, upon which each has paid 10 per cent, or $100. When the road was originally constructed in 1888, these ten men were active as directors. They were prominent business men and shippers in Guelph, all or nearly all large manufacturers, for whose benefit chiefly the road was built, because they wanted competition with the Grand Trunk Railway in freight rates. They were consequently the most active people in getting the road, and when the matter was submitted to the citizens, the citizens ratified it. When these men

tried to sell the bonds of the road, no one would buy them, and they were taken over by the city of Guelph, which invested $173,000 in them, making a total investment by the city, in bonds and stocks, of $193,000, whereas the private shareholders had invested only $1,000 in paid-up stock. These private shareholders have changed considerably since the road was constructed. Three of the most prominent are dead, and two of the shares are now held in the United States; but the board has never changed. While the mayor of the city of Guelph, representing the $20,000 of stock, has the controlling vote for the board, he can only vote for five of these ten individuals who held the stock, as there were no other shareholders. The city of Guelph has taken the matter up. The board of trade of the city first passed upon it, then the city council passed upon it, both to the effect that the city should be given a larger selection—that as every ratepayer of Guelph was just as much interested in the road in reality as the stockholders, it would be reasonable to permit any bona fide ratepayer of the city of Guelph to be eligible as a director. A request was made before the Railway Committee that the Bill be amended in that way. Now, since the matter was first talked of in Guelph, the directors of the company have become active, and have complained that it is not fair to displace them now, after they have given their service freely for a number of years. That is true, but the service has been a very slight one, involving only the receiving of a cheque each year, and the handing of it over to the city. The road, as soon as it was constructed, was leased for 999 years to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the rental being 40 per cent of the gross earnings. Each year the Canadian Pacific Railway Company sends to the directors a cheque representing 40 per cent of the gross earnings, and the directors hand it over to the city. The bonds held by the city bear 5 per cent. The road has never paid any interest on the bonds, and there is a default in that respect amounting to about $10,000. If the city were disposed to be vindictive, it could apply to the courts and have a receiver appointed to collect this overdue interest but there is no intention of going to that extreme, and when this Bill to permit further time was coming before the House, the board of trade and the city council both thought that the cheapest and most expeditious way of obtaining the result would be to ask for the amendments which the Railway Committee have placed in the Bill. No real injury is being done to anybody; no one is to be deprived of any property. The stock now held by the directors is to remain their stock; they are still all to be eligible as directors; but the anomaly of the present position is very apparent. By the original Act the city council is allowed three representatives on the board, the mayor and two others; the stockholders have five representatives on the board; and the anomaly of the situation is that two-thirds of the stock has a minority on the board, and one-third of the stock, of which only 10 per cent has been paid, has a majority on the board. It would cure that anomaly to permit this amendment to pass. However, I understand that the city council would be quite willing to allow the stockholders a proportionate representation on the board, giving the city six representatives and the stockholders three. That would be a representation on the board according to the stock. All the city council desire is to appoint more active men as directors. If an amendment to that effect would be satisfactory, I think that would meet, probably, the views of both the citizens and the directors themselves, if their views are at all reasonable.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In that case, you had better move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Therefore, I would move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before the motion is put, I desire to say a few words on this Bill. The offer made by the promoter of the Bill may appear to be a very generous one; but, to my mind, it will not meet the views of the railway company which is interested, nor the views of the best business men of the city of Guelph. To give the directors only three on the board, while the city council has the privilege of naming six, of whom one will be the mayor, two aldermen, and the other three ordinary ratepayers, I do not think will be acceptable. The ratepayers selected by the mayor may be men of very small financial interest in the city, and very little interest in the success of the road. The present mayor will not always be the mayor of the city of Guelph, and while the rights of the railway company may be safeguarded at the present time, there is no guarantee that the same safeguards would surround the future board. I look upon the treatment which these ten shareholders are to receive as altogether unprecedented in the history of legislation in this House.

Here are ten men who made themselves liable to the extent of $1,000 each, on the distinct understanding that they were not expected to pay more than $100 or 10 per cent on their stock. These men had given their services to the railway company, and practically to the city of Guelph, for some twelve or fifteen years. They have never exacted one cent as compensation; they have given their services freely in the interests of the city and the people generally, and now this amendment seeks to place them in such a position that they will be

liable at once, if called upon by a majority of this board, for the full amount, and only three of them can now be on the board. Even if the amendment suggested by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) be carried, they will be entirely powerless to protect themselves, and will be liable for the entire amount of their stock, which it was distinctly understood they never should be called on to pay. That would leave them in a very unfair position, and unless the promoter of the Bill will grant these ten directors absolute relief from the payment of the remainder of their stock, as well as recoup them the amount of money they put into the railway with reasonable interest for the past ten years, I fail to see how this House can pass the proposed legislation. I trust the House will deal fairly with these ten enterprising men, leading citizens of Guelph. It is true that three of them have passed away, but one of them, the late J. D. Armstrong, well known to many members of this House, is succeeded by a young man of enterprise, ability and means, Mr. Lindsay Torrence, who represents his stock. Another succeeds his father—I refer to Col. Davidson of Guelph. So that there are not three men who can not act on the board. I believe that one of the shareholders sold the stock to a person who since moved to the United States, and I am also informed that it is his intention to get back the stock, so that as a matter of fact most of these enterprising business men of the city of Guelph are still shareholders of the company, and still available to be elected directors on this board. No better material could be found for a board than the very men who at present hold the stock of the company, and to displace these men, or displace even all but three of them, and place citizens upon the board, who may have no direct interest in the railway and little or none in the welfare of the city, is a step we should pause before taking. How are you going to expect men of enterprise and means to put their money into any investment in this country, if, after they have done so and rendered themselves liable for a considerable sum, this House is going to legislate away all the rights and safeguards with which they were surrounded and treat them in a way they never expected to be treated by the city of Guelph. I can scarcely believe that the citizens of Guelph, if their sentiments could be voiced to-night, would agree to the legislation proposed. Therefore, I cannot agree to the motion that the committee rise, with the intention of changing the directors so as to give the shareholders three seats on the board instead of the six they have now. I hold that until refunded their money and released from all liability, they ought to control the board.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). It would be very unfair to pass this amendment, of which no notice has been given at all. The understanding was that these men, who took the risk, should control the board, and now it is proposed, without any notice, to make a change. If the city of Guelph thinks it in its interest to take over the road, these gentlemen should be first relieved of their liability and refunded the money they have paid with interest. I hope my hon. friend will not press this motion.

Mr. JOHN McGOWAN (Centre Wellington). I am thoroughly in sympathy with the opposition to this motion. These directors paid 10 per cent each on their $1,000, and the understanding was that they should have one paid up share and be relieved from all further liability, but under this amendment they will be still liable for the balance of their stock. These men should be paid back their money with a reasonable amount of interest.

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). I can hardly agree with my hon. friends who have spoken on the other side. As I understand it, this scheme was really a municipal one, one that was promoted and encouraged and all the expenses paid by the city of Guelph. It is true that some residents of the city, in whose interests, especially this scheme was being promoted, became shareholders and paid into the treasury of the county $100 each.

Mr. COCHRANE. And did the work.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). No doubt they did a great deal of good work at the time, as was explained on a previous occasion. But many of these men have now passed away from this world, or for some other reason have lost all personal interest in this enterprise. Here is where I think a great injustice is done—these men contributed nothing except $100 each in connection with this matter ; but, as I understand it, the city of Guelph and the district are anxious that this railway should be extended ; and it may be quite possible that these men, not being represented on the board, may not have the same interest as the enterprising inhabitants of that city, or they may have some views with regard to this matter different from those of the people, and, by a majority vote, though they have but a small holding, they can override the wishes of the municipality which, as I understand it, holds a large majority of the stock in this enterprise and has contributed all the money to defray expenses. Any person with municipal experience knows that it is a common thing for men in large manufacturing or other businesses to contribute something in a small way, as was done in this case, to some important enterprise. The hon. gentleman from Centre Wellington (Mr. McGowan) refers to my hon. friend from South Wellington as pressing this matter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) is

simply acting upon a petition under the seal of the municipal council of the city of Guelph, expressing the wishes of the council, and, I suppose, of the people of the city. I quite agree with my hon. friend that it should be made clear that the gentlemen now living or their heirs, or assigns should be relieved of any future responsibility. I thought that was the understanding. And I believe my hon. friend from South Wellington is quite prepared to ask an amendment to this clause so that there can be no doubt about these persons being relieved of future liability on account of their subscription.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland, Oxford) allow me a word ? I do not know much about this particular case, but a very simple way to achieve what he speaks of would be for these gentlemen to transfer their stock to the city in consideration of the amount that has been paid upon it.

Mr. SEYMOUR E. GOURLEY (Colchester). May I ask one question ? Why should a man who holds stock in a company be compelled to accept for it any amount that the city of Guelph may offer ? If he took it and became responsible for the balance, why should he be compelled to accept for it an amount fixed by another ? Take the case of the Bank of Montreal whose stock stands at $290 per share.

If I held a share of that stock for which I had paid $100, would it be fair to compel me to give it up on payment of $100 ? If we want to do that kind of thing in this case, there should be some way to assess the value, and, if you compel the holders to give up their shares, you should pay them what the shares are worth on the market to-day.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). The hon. gentleman propounds a theoretical question, but I will tell him the exact state of affairs and will then ask him what he would do. He wants to know why a man should be forced to accept a low price for a valuable share. Of course, any legislation of that kind would be wrong. But, in this case, it is well known in this House or out of it that there is no value in these shares.

Mr. GOURLEY. I do not know it. There is no evidence to that effect.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). There is plenty of evidence to show that there is no value in this stock. But, even if there were value in it, why should a few men or their representatives be able to block the will of a municipality, and the surrounding district, by stopping a public enterprise ? I do not know that that is the case there, but I do know that the representatives of the people have petitioned the government to grant this amendment and have given the reasons for it. I think we should be perfectly right, even if the principle which the hon. gentleman states were being violated, if we provided that the municipality that granted this large bonus and held the principal amount of stock should be free to carry out their enterprise in the direction indicated by the petition of the municipal council. As I understand it, a good many of these men are dead and the holdings have gone into the hands of other people. And if, owing to some arrangement made fifteen or twenty years ago, the enterprise has drifted into such an unfortunate position as indicated, it is the duty of parliament, on the petition of a municipality to place them in a position to get the benefit they should have.

Mr. COCHRANE. What unfortunate position have they drifted into ? I am a member of the committee and I have heard nothing of it.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). In such an unfortunate position that a small minority of the stock can control the whole enterprise as against the vast majority of those interested as represented by the municipal council.

Mr. GOURLEY. But they have done the business thoroughly well.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland, Oxford) has not answered my point. Perhaps I did not state it clearly. As I understand it, when the bargain was made and all these risks were taken, they were willing to trust these gentlemen to control the board. Now, they say —and this is why I cannot see my way— we want parliament to change that without recouping these gentlemen. I would be perfectly willing to carry out this, if that difficulty were removed—pay these gentlemen their $100 and interest and take over their stock.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). As I understand it, my hon. friend from South Wellington was ready to move this subsection :

> The directors of the said company may and shall, upon the request of the present shareholders of the company upon whose shares 10 per cent only have been paid, issue a fully paid-up share or shares to such person or persons in exchange for and to the extent of the aggregate amount paid by him or them upon his or their present shares.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. That does not cover the other point.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). It does not cover the $100. But my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) will see that there is nothing in that point, because the most of those for whom it is proposed are dead and gone.

Mr. COCHRANE. No.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). There are some who are alive. But I understand

that in the committee the statement was made and not disputed that many of them were dead and their stock assigned to those who did not take a personal interest in the enterprise. I am informed that three of the directors are dead and gone. One hon. gentleman suggested that there was no notice. I think parties interested had notice, for the simple reason that they were present here and were able to state their case before the committee. But the majority of the committee thought that the Bill should be reported in its present form.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I am sure there is no disposition on the part of this committee to take up a great deal of time on this matter.

We are all interested in pushing the work as rapidly as we can, and I suggest that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, and that then a motion be made that the Bill be referred back to the Railway Committee. It is clear that some new proposals are intended to be made, the hon. member who is moving in the matter desires to amend the Bill as it passed the Railway Committee. The terms of that amendment, before agreed upon, will likely require to be thoroughly looked into. I think the Railway Committee would be the proper place to do so ; it would facilitate matters to send it back there and let us have the question settled there. I second the motion of my hon. friend that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, with the understanding that when the Speaker is in the Chair a motion may be made referring the whole matter back to the Railway Committee.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am willing to accept the proposition of the Minister of Railways, but I think it should be accompanied with a promise on the part of the promoter of the Bill, or a statement of how far he will go in the amendment which he is about to propose. If he will say to-night that he will submit an amendment authorizing the city of Guelph to pay these men back their hundred dollars and interest on the money from the time they invested it, and indemnify them against any further claim, I have no hesitation in saying that the Bill will go through ; but it is only on fair terms of that kind that I think this House should permit that Bill to go through. I believe that will be satisfactory to the railway company, they will then step out of the matter altogether, they will have no further liabilities, their money will be returned to them, and it will be to a certain extent a matter of fairness to all concerned. Now, with regard to that petition, I am going to venture a statement which came to me pretty directly, that even the city council of Guelph was taken by surprise when this petition was presented to the council and approved of ; that the members of the council were not aware that such a petition was coming before them, they had no notice of it, and they were rather taken by surprise. I say that subject to correcttion, but the information I have is obtained from one of the directors of this road, so that we should not lay too much stress on the fact that the city of Guelph had petitioned for this change. I am willing that the committee should rise, and give the hon. gentleman time to prepare his amendment, either in this committee or in the Railway Committee, perhaps better in the Railway Committee ; but I wish to say before doing so that I expect he will go as far as I have stated, that he will be willing that these men should be recouped their hundred dollars and interest, and be relieved from any further liability.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would be difficult at present I think to come to any understanding as to the terms of settlement. The hon. gentleman would have to confer with these people. It must always be in the power of the Railway Committee to pass a Bill in such shape as will be found just and fair all round. We are not going to be precluded from freedom of action in the Railway Committee by consents which may be arrived at. Let us see that justice is done in the legislation.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I think we should go further than that. Before we refer this Bill back we ought to see that certain instructions accompany it to the Railway Committee to amend it in that direction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We do not know what we will decide upon in the Railway Committee.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I want to say a word with regard to this Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My suggestion was to save time.

Mr. SPROULE. When the Bill is referred back with the understanding or instructions that it is done for a certain purpose, it would be easier to change it in the Railway Committee. In the first place, this Bill proposes what we have never done before, that is to allow the appointment of a director that is not worth a dollar. The Railway Act provides what is the qualification of a director. He shall own so much stock, he shall have an interest in the road, so that he shall be something more than a man of straw. But this amendment provides that a man may be appointed a director who is only a tool or a catspaw of the mayor ; he may not be worth a dollar, and not a dollar's worth of property in the world, so long as he is a citizen of Guelph. That looks suspicious on the face of it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He may be entitled to represent the town in its minor interests.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no provision that a director should be worth a dollar.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He is qualified to be an alderman.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no qualification in this amendment for a director. The Railway Act provides that no person shall be a director unless he is a shareholder holding stock absolutely in his own right and qualified to vote for directors at the election at which he is chosen. But this does not provide that he shall own a dollar's worth of stock; but any one may be picked up off the street to suit the mayor's purpose. Now, it must not be forgotten that the parties who are being crowded off the board to-day are the parties that took hold of the scheme when it was of no value, either to the corporation or to anybody else, they are the parties who engineered it, and financed it, and built the railway and gave the city of Guelph all the advantages it is receiving from the railway to-day. The parties who now desire this scheme were quite content to let the company go on and do the work and raise the money when it seemed to be impossible to raise the money to build a railway. But they succeeded in doing that, and putting it on a good financial basis, until the railway is a paying concern to-day, and now an effort is being made to force these men out who paid up all that was necessary for their stock, to force them out without giving them a cent for that stock or relieving them from the liabilities which they are under to pay the balance of that stock if they are called on. Now, the proposal made by Colonel McRae, I think, was a reasonable one. He said: If these parties want to get our stock, let them pay us back our money, take the stock from us and release us from any further liability. But they did not choose to do that; and will this House pass a law to compel men to abandon their rights and to give up their property without any consideration after they have made it valuable, when they are the only parties that have made a reasonable endeavour to give the city of Guelph the advantages of a railway that to-day is on a workable basis?

Progress reported.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved that the said Bill be referred back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. SPEAKER. That can only be done at this stage with the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. I dissent.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Union Railway Company.—Mr. Demers (St. Johns and Iberville).

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Fielding:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. F. B. WADE (Annapolis). If I had consulted my own feelings upon this occasion, I may say that I would have retained my seat, but, as a resolution is before the House, as an amendment has been moved and as a debate has taken place which has brought up certain questions of supreme importance, not only to the county which I have the honour to represent, but also to the province of Nova Scotia, as well as to the rest of the Dominion, I feel that I would not be properly discharging my duty did I not rise to say a few words. It is not my intention to delay the House for any great length of time. My purpose in rising is to address myself exclusively to two or three subjects which have been presented to our consideration during the course of the debate. The question which is raised by the first clause of the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is the old question of protection, the old question of the national policy. That national policy was before the people for a number of years, it was tried, it was weighed in the balance, it was found wanting and the people pronounced against it upon two separate occasions with no uncertain voice. The tariff which was framed after that by the present hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has been before the people and has been endorsed by such an overwhelming majority of the electors as should satisfy that hon. gentleman. It was said, however, after the introduction of the tariff of 1897, that the people had been deceived by the Liberal party, that they went to the country in 1896, not upon the tariff which was framed by the hon. Minister of Finance, but on a free trade tariff as opposed to protection. Now, it does seem strange to me that hon. gentlemen will, at this late day, repeat that contention when it has been falsified over and over again. Every one knows—and there cannot be found an utterance of a solitary man who stood in the position of a leader of the Liberal party to the contrary—every one knows that the tariff which the Liberal party promised previously to 1896 was a revenue tariff, or as we call it a free trade revenue tariff, as opposed to the protective revenue tariff which was in force under

Conservative rule. The distinction between these two tariffs is so evident, that I feel like apologizing for referring to it on this occasion. The Conservative tariff was designed for the purpose of protecting certain selected industries, whether it protected the other industries or not. It has been stated in this House that the Conservative tariff protected the manufacturers, but that it did not protect the natural industries of the country, and revenue was only an incident of that tariff. Now, the Liberal tariff is exactly the reverse of that. It is framed for the purpose of producing revenue, and if it incidentally gives protection to certain industries so much the better. That is the distinction between the two tariffs. We stood by this tariff, and on it we went to the country. But, as I have said, our opponents in the last election went before the people and told them they had been deceived by us. Our opponents said—it was pretty hard to follow their meaning too—they said in the first place to us : You promised the people free trade and you did not give them free trade; what you did give them is our old national policy. Well, we felt like saying to these gentlemen: If we have given the country your old national policy, what are you growling about, you should be satisfied; if we have put on your garments you should feel flattered, but you certainly have nothing to complain of; if we have made these promises the only people who can complain are the people we made them to and surely you should be the last to complain because you always said that you never would believe a word we uttered or credit a promise we made.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit that we made no promise of free trade, but that the promise we did make was simply the promise of a revenue tariff. When this tariff which was introduced by the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) in 1897, was placed before the House, the first authoritative utterance we had upon it from the Conservative ranks was the speech made by the then leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). It is a very lengthy speech. I have read it all with great care as it appears in 'Hansard,' and I shall quote one passage from it to show what Sir Charles Tupper's idea was of the Liberal tariff introduced in 1897. He said :

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

That was the first utterance from the Conservative party with reference to the tariff of the Liberal government. Well, the wail did not materialize. The industries of Canada were not destroyed. On the contrary, the country became very prosperous under this new tariff, and the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) who was responsible for the words I have quoted attempted on various occasions afterwards to explain away how he came to make that statement. He and his friends said that the tariff was altered after the speech was made. It is true that the tariff was altered slightly. There were some necessary changes in the tariff the total effect of which upon the whole revenue collected during the next year was less than half a million dollars, and the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) and his friends told us that was the excuse for saying : 'Oh, this tariff as introduced was a thing that was going to destroy all the industries of the country, but with these slight changes it becomes the old national policy.' Now, Sir, I wish to assert in this House, and I think I have evidence before me to bear out the assertion, that the people of Canada previously to the election of 1896, were displeased and dissatisfied with this national policy. It was a disappointment to them. I do not know that I can prove this in any better way than by quoting the words of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). Every one knows that he had been a strong admirer and supporter of the national policy, but he in common with thousands of others throughout the Dominion became disappointed and discouraged and disgusted, and in 1891, Mr. Bell delivered a most excellent lecture I am told in the city of New Glasgow where he resides, and he spoke these very forcible words on that occasion—because he is always forcible in his language as we all know. He said :

> I consider the argument of the free trade as unanswerable. I believe that this moment if Canada took a liberal step in the direction of free trade it would go a long way to place her upon the road to the greatest prosperity.

Now, that has the true ring about it. Well, Canada did take a step in that direction. We are told by the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) that the effect of the tariff he introduced has been to reduce the taxes that would have been collected under the Conservative tariff by one-eighth or by about 12½ per cent. But the hon. gentleman from Pictou (Mr. Bell) on that occasion proceeded to give his reasons for the faith that was in him and his reasons were most cogent, and they were reasons which must carry a great deal of weight. He said :

> The reasons why I consider Canada should turn about and adopt a free trade policy are : (a) that we might free ourselves of the dominating influence of the United States.

But, to-day my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) tells us that the only way by which we can free ourselves from the dominating influence of

the United States is by adopting protection; protection pure and simple. The question therefore is: whether he was right in 1891, or whether he is right in this present year, ten years afterwards. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) gives another reason. He says :

(b) On account of the failure of the national policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a terrible heresy coming from the gentleman who stood up here the other night to laud and defend the national policy.

(c) Because of the startling revelations of the census.

You see, Mr. Speaker, he voices the very arguments that we Liberals made use of, and he gives the very reasons that we assigned. We said the national policy was a disappointment ; we said the country did not prosper under it; we said the population had not increased as it should have increased, and we said that the national policy was not doing anything to remove us from the dominating influence of the United States. And so the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) was on our side of the argument in 1891, and I only quote his words as an authority for saying that there was dissatisfaction in 1896 against the protective tariff policy, or the national policy as it was styled.

But there was a new feature introduced in the tariff proposed by the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) in 1897. You know, Sir, that during all these years in which we wandered in the wilderness of opposition the Conservatives monopolized almost entirely the loyalty of all Canada. They appropriated the old flag and they would scarcely allow us to have a bit of it. They were very loyal in speech, but they never had done anything to prove their loyalty. But, when the Finance Minister brought down this preferential feature of his tariff by which he allowed goods from the mother country to be brought in at a lower rate of duty than goods from other countries which did not treat us as the mother land did, what did these hon. gentlemen opposite say ? In the first place their statement was : Oh, you have made a vast mistake, you never can work this out because of the German and Belgian treaties. In the next place, they said it would amount to nothing anyhow; it made no difference. Well, this Belgian and German treaty bugbear was removed, and ultimately they had to face the situation; ultimately they had to take a stand and say whether they were in favour of this preference to the mother country or not. They were driven to that; and what position did they assume ? They assumed the position of talking against it, but they never challenged it by a vote or a motion, and I doubt if they will do so, no matter how valiantly they may talk.

Now, I submit to all reasonable parties, that the granting of a preference to the mother country was a most wise step. I believe that plank in the platform of the Liberal party contributed most largely to the success of the Liberal party in the last election ; and for this reason. I believe there is abroad throughout the Dominion of Canada a sentiment of attachment to the empire, and I believe this—and I would be ashamed to believe anything different—that there exists in the breast of every honest Canadian, no matter what his race may be, a sense of gratitude towards the mother country for what she is doing for us. We are living here to-day under the protection of the British flag ; we have British guns at Esquimalt and at Halifax ; we have the British navy ready to defend us on all occasions ; we have the full use of British diplomacy and the British consular corps all over the world, so that no matter how humble the Canadian may be, no matter in what part of the world he may be found, if the government of the country in which he finds himself does not do him ample justice, or if it inflicts an injury upon him, the whole force and power of the British Empire is brought to bear to defend him. And who has paid for all this ? The British taxpayer. Have we ever paid one dollar ? Have we ever been asked to contribute one cent ? Never. And yet, Sir, when we have given to the mother country simply this reduction in the tariff which we raise against other nations which have tariffs against us, we are condemned. All our manufactures, all our foodstuffs, everything we have to sell in the markets of the world, are admitted into Great Britain free of duty. But when England sends her wares to us, we meet them with a tariff, and we have been condemned solely because we have given her a preference. Do any of these gentlemen ever pause to consider what would be the effect upon Canada if England treated us exactly as we treat her —if she raised the same tariff wall against us that we have against her ? It seems to me that some of the gentlemen who have spoken with regard to the industries of Canada have not paid any attention to that part of the question.

Now, I wish to address myself for a few moments to the terms of this resolution, in order to come to the matters which I have to bring to the special consideration of the House. The first paragraph of the resolution is this :

That in the opinion of this House the welfare of this country requires a pronounced policy of adequate protection and encouragement at all times to the labour, agricultural, manufacturing, mining and other industries of Canada.

I have listened for days with the greatest attention to almost everything that has fallen from the lips of hon. gentlemen opposite ; I have read, I think, most that has been said by the leading men on that side since the inauguration of the national policy ; and I have yet to discover where

agriculture has been protected by the national policy. Perhaps I had better speak of the farmer of Nova Scotia, with whom I am most familiar, and I would like any hon. gentleman to tell me how the farmer was protected by the national policy, or how he proposes to protect the farmer, if he were allowed to put his policy into force. Is he going to do it by putting a duty on apples or meat or potatoes, or anything else the farmer produces? There is only one way he can protect the farmers of Nova Scotia, that is, by preventing the farmers of Ontario coming down there and making use of that market as a slaughter market. But, that cannot be done, for we are a part of confederation, and we must take the bitter with the sweet. Is it not folly to speak of protecting the farmer when it is impossible to do so? Then, how are hon. gentlemen opposite going to protect the miner—the gold miner, for instance? How did they protect him when they had the opportunity to do so? They protected him by increasing the prices of the things he had to consume, and that is the only thing they could do for him. The same remark applies to the fisheries, and the other industries of the provinces down by the sea.

This brings me to the consideration of one of the matters which I rose to speak about; that is, the question of transportation. The hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Smith), speaking here the other night, brought up the question of the transportation of fruit. It is a very important question, and, to a certain extent, I agree with some of the statements he made and some of the deductions he drew; but I entirely disagree with him as to others. In the first place, he told us, and in a complaining manner, that the great apple industry of this Dominion was going to the dogs because of the neglect of the government. He told us that the orchards of Ontario were going to waste, that apples were allowed to rot on the ground, and all that sort of thing. Well, I knew that his remarks with regard to the fruit industry of Nova Scotia were wrong; but I had no means of saying that his remarks with regard to Ontario were also wrong: but, having some curiosity on the subject, I went to the Trade and Navigation Returns, and I find that the hon. gentleman was entirely in error. I have made up a short statement from those returns, and, starting with the year 1891, I find that the exports of apples were as follows:

	Barrels.
1891	450,836
1892	690,951
1893	1,187,665
1894	278,238
1895	853,268
1896	567,182

Or an average of 671,000 barrels per year.

Then, I take the years following, and I find the exports were as follows:

	Barrels.
1897	1,668,470
1898	439,418
1899	1,075,068
1900	956,458

Or an average of 1,034,000 barrels per year.

Therefore, instead of there having been a decrease, as the hon. gentleman told us, there had been this large increase.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I wish to correct the hon. gentleman. I did not say there was a decrease.

Mr. WADE. Well, I have his words here:

> It is not only the immediate loss, but the prospective loss, that has to be considered. The farmers became discouraged because of the low price they received for their apples in consequence of the bad condition in which they arrived in England. Some years the apples rotted on the ground; some years they sold for 40 and 50 cents a barrel in the orchard, when, if they could be properly exported to Great Britain, they would have brought from 75 cents to $1 a barrel.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to one other fact in connection with this matter, and that is the large quantity of fruit taken by England. I find that in the year 1891, out of 415,000 barrels of fruit shipped, Great Britain took 390,000. In the year 1892, out of 690,000 barrels shipped, Great Britain took 668,000. And in 1893, out of 1,187,000 barrels, Great Britain took 946,000. I would like to ask what would be the effect on this industry, if Great Britain were to impose a tariff against those apples similar to the tariff we now exact on her goods.

	Bbls.		Bbls.
In 1894	184,956	out of	278,238
" 1895	756,232	"	853,268
" 1896	504,680	"	567,182
" 1897	1,579,272	"	1,668,470
" 1898	414,181	"	439,418
" 1899	972,125	"	1,075,068
" 1900	896,935	"	956,458

These figures in each case represent the crop of the preceding year.

The hon. gentleman from Wentworth (Mr. Smith), speaking of the transportation of these apples, said that only a small portion of the loss in shipping arose from the bad packing. I think that he is in error, if we are to take the report of the gentlemen who were appointed to examine into that matter. According to them, in the case of apples coming from the province of Ontario, the disaster to the business results largely from bad packing. I am not in a position to speak of the facilities of shipping by rail from Ontario to Montreal, but there is a report which shows the condition of the apples at Montreal and their condition when they got to the other side. In the great Annapolis valley, where the good apples are grown, the people are dependent for shipment upon one railway, the Dominion and Atlantic Railway Company, which car-

ries the freight to Halifax or Annapolis where it is shipped on board sea-going vessels. Many of the apples from that valley have arrived in bad conditon, but not in as bad condition as those coming from Ontario, and I will show the reason why later. The people of that valley are labouring under the disadvantage of having only one railway, which therefore enjoys a monopoly. They are seeking, it is true, to have another railway constructed which will put them in a better position, but one of the hon. gentlemen on the other side has put his face against anything of that sort, and I will have to refer to that later on. At present there is a line of steamers plying between St. John and Halifax and the old country. These steamers are subsidized, but are not carrying the fruit as the farmers desire it should be carried. The subsidy is not given solely in connection with the fruit-carrying business, but is given as an inducement to the steamship line to run to those two ports. Last year there was a strong representation made that another line should be subsidized to run to the town of Annapolis, and it did make five or six trips, but the farmers found great fault with these steamers. They said they were not properly ventilated, were too slow and so on. The steamer owners, on the other side, said that the apples were not well packed, and so there was a dispute between the parties, just as there has been between the transportation companies and the producers and shippers for a number of years. The people of Nova Scotia, as far as I have been able to gather, have come to the conclusion that these steamers can be made to do the work, and do it properly, if they will incur a small additional expense. All that the people ask is that these steamers should be compelled to expend that additional sum by a provision in the subsidy contract, and that no subsidy should be given any steamship line unless it agrees to provide the necessary accommodation. There was a time when the farmers demanded swift steamers, equipped with refrigerators, but they have changed their views and have come to the conclusion that steamers, such as the new ones of the Withy Furness line, if provided with the proper kind of ventilation, would meet all the requirements. I would like to read a resolution passed by one of the agricultural societies in this connection :

It was moved by Dr. A. P. Reid, seconded by F. Miles Chipman, and after free discussion, was carried unanimously :

'That as shown by S. C. Parker's letter, we have this year suffered uncalled-for losses ; and

'That in the shipment of apples, though cold storage is desirable, it is not indispensable, for, as the atmosphere on the ocean in late fall and winter is rarely over 40° Fah., if the cargo were stowed so as to favour air currents and sufficient ventilation were carried on continuously this would suffice.

'But that this be properly carried out, it would need forced ventilation all the time, a government officer should have control of the loading and unloading, and one or more registering thermometers (locked so that records could not be tampered with), should be suitably distributed through the cargo. The government officer at the unloading could thus certify as to the condition of the hold of the vessel during transit, and if this were not satisfactory, the subsidy to be withheld and freight rates not collectable.'

That seems a very simple proposition, and one that could be easily carried out. It ought not to be difficult to provide these steamers with forced draft ventilation, so that the fresh air could be driven into the hold, and the foul air driven out.

I have another resolution of the Nictaux Agricultural Society, which I wish to lay before the House :

That in the opinion of this society, government inspection of apples should be compulsory in the interest of the fruit-grower, the foreign market and the credit of Canada. That if once established but few samples are likely to be rejected.

They were pleased to learn that the forced ventilation of the holds of fruit-carrying steamers was a probability, and they would recommend that the air be forced into the hold, not exhausted, as this latter method would bathe the fruit with air from the boilers and furnaces, and also other cargo, including bilge water, conditions not calculated to improve the keeping qualities or flavour of the fruit ; the vessels' compartments are no sufficient protection.

This is what the fruit-growers of Annapolis have been asking for. It is true that the fruit-growers' association, some months ago, passed a resolution asking that a royal commission be appointed to inquire into all these questions relating to the transportation of fruit, and that is a matter, I presume, which the government is considering. But in the meantime I can see no earthly reason why this reasonable request on the part of the fruit-growers should not be acceded to. Let me impress upon the House that the fruit-growers are of opinion—and I believe their opinion is well founded—that the granting of a subsidy to a line of steamers, unless the grant contains this provision regarding ventilation, is an injury to the fruit-growers, for the reason that the subsidy enables these steamers to keep out competition. That is a position which, I believe, will commend itself to the judgment of every hon. member who is conversant with this matter.

There is another thing in connection with transportation, and that is the question of inspection. I do not propose to say much about that, because there is a Bill before the House on which, when it comes up, this question may be discussed. As to whether that Bill goes far enough I do not know. I have the opinion of a man of authority in my county upon that point.

Producers say : Unless our fruit is inspected so that every man will have to pack his fruit honestly—shippers as well—our market will soon be ruined. And, as far as selling at home, speculators have adready been driven out for that very reason. If not too late, I think it would be advisable to have inspection come in force this next autumn.

The reason why these gentlemen are in favour of this inspection, I take it, can be gathered from the reports that we have on file. I would first refer to the report of Prof. Robertson. The first is his address before the Ontario fruit-growers. He goes into the question very fully and says that a number of trial shipments have been made, and gives the result of the inspection of these shipments as they came down to Montreal. That result is set forth on page 41 of this report. It is very long, and I shall not weary the House by reading the whole of it, but I would like to read one paragraph :

The inspector has no official power to disturb the fruit very much, so he did not disturb the barrels very much. He took a few apples off the barrel and looked down in them. Then, October 23, I will read you the comment on each lot in this report straight through: 'Fruit all No. 1'; 'fruit only medium'; 'fruit A No. 1, good barrels'; 'fruit A No. 1'; 'fruit poor and rotten'; 'fruit A No. 1'; 'fruit very poor'; 'fruit A No. 1, good barrels'; 'fruit very poor'; 'fruit poor stuff'; 'fruit rotten trash'; 'fruit A 1'; 'fruit fair'; 'fruit poor and bad barrels'; 'fruit only fair'; 'fruit A No. 1, good barrels.' That is the summary of all the car-loads reported on that one sheet.

Now, that is the result of the examination in Montreal. These were all Ontario apples. Now, let us turn to the report of the inspector sent to Halifax and St. John. I should have said, in quoting the figures from Nova Scotia and Ontario that Quebec gets the credit for a considerable portion of the fruit shipped from Ontario; and New Brunswick gets credit for a proportion of the fruit shipped from Nova Scotia, because it goes there in schooners. I will read you only two extracts from the inspector at St. John, N.B., and Halifax, N.S. :

'The ventilation in most of the ships might be fairly good if only such care in looking after it could be secured as most people give to the preservation of their own property. Extreme roughness in the barrels, received both in the unloading from the cars as well as in the stowing of the ships, cannot fail to injure the fruits, and it seems to me under present conditions very difficult to control. In St. John the apples are unloaded from the schooners alongside the steamers, and fare rather better in that respect than in Halifax, where they are unloaded from the cars and then rolled through the freight shed that in wet weather is often very dirty, and the barrels get blackened up very much. This, however, is easily remedied, but certainly somebody should have more control of the rascals that smash and tumble the barrels at their sweet wills.'

That is right, but who can control it ? Surely hon. gentlemen do not expect the government to go out and take these officials by the throat. They have no power or jurisdiction over them. But they can aid the producers to procure this competing line that they are now struggling for, doing that, they will place in the hands of the producers a means of protecting themselves; because, if one line will not carry the apples and handle them in proper way, the other line will get all the business.

'Then the loading of these steamers is done mostly at night off the railway. Barrels are rolled across the warehouse and loaded into the steamers outside. It is quite impossible in this rush to catch anything from the marks on the barrels.' There is what you find reported from intelligent, competent men, examining the fruit at our own ports before it leaves.

Now, it is not surprising that bad reports and bad sales come back from at least that class of fruits; and I have not picked on, and they did not pick on, any particular lots, but spent their time during September and October examining different lots, giving me a full report like that every week. There is something radically wrong to allow so much waste and so very great loss to go on in an important business like this.

Now, I cannot refrain from reading another part of this report, because it is flattering to Nova Scotia.

I want to say a little now as to what the agent we had found on the English side. He also was an independent man, outside of commerce. This is in regard to apples :—

'September 2.—A lot of Nova Scotia apples were sold to-day at from 15 or 17 shillings a barrel, and that in a market glutted with English apples of all kinds, including windfalls. I noticed barrels with a thick paper at each end, as I suggested in my report to you last spring. I noticed the barrel opened up with a much handsomer appearance than barrels without paper, which had a bruised and, in some cases, a dark, bruised appearance. Neglect of that little point caused shippers a loss of one shilling a barrel. The best Nova Scotian apples are far better than the Ontario boxed apples in every way. Nova Scotia apples are not sold as Canadian apples. As I pointed out to the convention last year, in examining account sales, the percentage of wastey and slacks in Nova Scotia apples was about 6 per cent, and the percentage in Ontario and Quebec—so-called Canadian apples—was something over 60 per cent.

These are striking things. I might go on and refer to the reasons for this. But, briefly, the reasons are that the fruit is better and better packed and the growers do not grow so many varieties.

The Nova Scotia people have some advantage; still they complain of the handling at St. John and Halifax, the rough handling; but the Nova Scotia orchards, perhaps, each produce a larger quantity of one variety than in Ontario. That is very important, and the Nova Scotia apples are nearly all handled by men trained to the apple business.

Now, these things show that there is a difficulty in the packing as well as in the transportation. The government is introducing this Bill for inspection, which I deem

to be most essential to the successful transportation of the fruit of this country. If they do that, and, at the same time, so far as the farmers and shippers of Nova Scotia are concerned, if they have any intention of removing this subsidy from the steamship line running now, or they carry this Bill and at the same time either remove the subsidies to steamships, or if the subsidies be continued in making the contract they will introduce a clause requiring that these things be done, they will have gone a long way to satisfy the shippers of fruit in this country. At any rate, they will satisfy the present demand and do all that is believed to be necessary in order to accomplish the purpose sought.

Now, there is just one other matter I wish to refer to and that is the question of railway subsidies, because it is interwoven with this question of free transportation, as I have stated. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) solemnly declared—forcibly declared I should say—on behalf of the opposition, I assume, for he was sitting next to the leader of the opposition at the time, and that hon. gentleman seemed to be well pleased with his remarks and, though he and other hon. gentlemen have spoken since then, not a word of discredit has been thrown on his utterance, that it was time for the government to call a halt. It makes the hon. senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) smile. I do not wonder, when the hon. member for West Toronto was the one put up to say that thing. In Nova Scotia we commenced early to agitate for railways—away back in the fifties. If my memory serves me right the first legislation in that direction was passed in 1854. It was the policy of the government in that day to build and own the railway. In this they were strongly denounced by the opposition. But they went on with their scheme and, in 1858 they had a railway completed and in operation from Halifax to Truro and from Halifax to Windsor. And, when the government railway building was interrupted by confederation in 1867, we had completed the line from Truro to Pictou; and I have not the slightest doubt that had we not gone into confederation, the government policy would have been pursued, and every part of Nova Scotia, which, to-day is clamouring for railway communication would have had it years ago. But we came into confederation, and, necessarily, a different policy was adopted.

Mr. WALLACE. Why did not you secede with the Finance Minister ?

Mr. KENDALL. We might have done so if we had not got the railway extended into Cape Breton.

Mr. WADE. The Finance Minister does not seem to have seceded very materially.

The complaint that was made the other night by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) was that the Finance Minister is a gentleman who sticks to office, and I believe he does. He is not a seceder. When the hon. gentleman opposite talks about secession, I think he is ill advised on the subject. If he had been down in Nova Scotia and heard the discussion that took place on the question of secession, or rather on the question of better terms and the question of revising the union, he would be in a better position to talk upon the subject than he is now. If he wishes to know what the Nova Scotians said on that occasion, I do not hesitate to tell him, but that is beside my argument now.

When we entered confederation we had a certain quantity of railway built. The policy of the government was to keep on building railways, and I believe that if they had not been interrupted we would have had all the railroads we are now clamouring for. After we entered confederation a bargain was made with British Columbia by which this country undertook the burden of building the Canadian Pacific Railway. Then another condition of affairs existed, and we had to wait and take our chances to get our roads built. We are not complaining of that. I am not complaining to-night because the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, I am not complaining because we had to wait to get our roads. What I am complaining of is that after we have waited for roads which are in the interest of the country and should have been built long ago, we should now be met with the statement that there should be no more subsidies granted to railways, and that from a gentleman coming from the place he does, and representing the company he does. Now, let us inquire for a moment what has been expended on works of this description. I find that since confederation we have given in cash bonuses the sum of $48,130,000, in addition to some other things. We have given 39,725,000 acres of land for railroads, that is outside of the Intercolonial Railway. On canals there was spent before confederation over $20,000,000, and since confederation we have spent over $58,000,000. The construction of the Intercolonial Railway, including the purchase of the Drummond County Railway, has cost the country upward of $60,000,000. In addition to that, we have expended immense sums upon river and harbour improvements and upon canal improvements in order to build up the country and make it more prosperous. I was pleased the other night to hear the Minister of Public Works declare that he was going on with this policy of public improvements. I submit that it is the duty of the government to go on. They can get cheap money, they can get money to-day for a trifle over 2½ per cent interest,

where a private individual has to pay double that amount. Then is it not their duty to go on with these public works until every want of the country is satisfied ? Is not this a fair proposition, that a section of country which to-day demands and requires a railway, fifteen years ago did not require it ? And would it be honest or fair towards those sections which have contributed towards opening up other sections of country by railways, to be told now : We are going to call a halt, we are going to give no more subsidies to railways, we are going to have no more public works. We have gone far enough in our public works, we have our railways constructed, now we are satisfied, and you have got to be satisfied. Now, where does this statement come from ? It comes from the province of Ontario, a province which is gridironed with Government aided railways. It comes from a province where the bulk of the money for canals has been expended ; it comes from the city of Toronto which has been made what it is by these great transportation systems which have been brought into existence by the liberal use of public money ; it comes from a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway, nearly every spike of which has been paid for by the Dominion of Canada. That is the position.

Now, I protest against that, I protest against it in the interest of the province that I come from, I protest against that policy in the interests of the county that I represent. The people of Annapolis county are clamouring for the construction of a railway from Victoria Beach to meet the Central, to connect with the Dominion and Atlantic Railway at Middleton. The people on the south shore of Nova Scotia are clamouring for a railway to be finished from Halifax to Yarmouth. A portion of that subsidy has been granted to the shore road, a portion of the subsidy has been granted by this government to the Victoria Beach road as far as Bridgetown and it only requires the granting of the additional subsidy upon the remaining 14 miles between Bridgetown and Middleton. Now, some hon. gentlemen, when I mentioned the South Shore road, said, hear, hear. Am I to understand that there are gentlemen opposite who claim that the South Shore road should be subsidized and completed ?

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes.

Mr. WADE. Well, I am glad to hear him say so, I am glad he has got the courage of his convictions. But what does the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) say ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He will say the same.

Mr. GOURLEY. We want 2,000 miles of railway in Nova Scotia the next two years.

Mr. KAULBACH. The county of Lunenburg wants all the railways it can get.

Mr. WADE. What about the South Shore Railway ? Does the member for Lunenburg favour the granting of a subsidy for the South Shore Railway ?

Mr. KAULBACH. If they will give us the Central road and that also, I will be greatly pleased.

Mr. WADE. The Dominion government does not own the Central road. I know where his interest lies, I know where his inclination would be, but he does not like to go against his leader.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am in favour of railways.

Mr. WADE. Are you in favour of the Dominion government granting a railway subsidy to the South Shore road from Halifax to Yarmouth ?

Mr. KAULBACH. I am not going to be catechised now.

Mr. WADE. That is all right, that is perfectly legitimate. Now, I regret that the hon. leader of the opposition is not in his place, because I was going to ask him the same question, and I wanted to bring to his attention the fact that the Board of Trade of Halifax the other day sent an influential delegation to the premier of the province of Nova Scotia urging him not to grant the ordinary subsidy that is usually granted to railroads in the province of Nova Scotia, but to grant extraordinary assistance to this South Shore railway. And who was the spokesman of that delegation? The same Mr. Campbell that the leader of the opposition so strongly eulogized here the other day, and from which eulogy I do not wish to detract in the slightest degree. Now, it seems to me that these gentlemen find themselves in the position that they must get upon one horn of the dilemma or the other. I am certain of this, however, that if the Conservative party had come to the conclusion that there should be no more railway subsidies, then it would only have been fair and honest on their part to have announced that policy before they went to the country last year ; and I think I am safe in saying that if they had announced that policy they would have had to search somewhere else for a leader. I submit we have a right to have these roads built : at any rate, we have the right to come to parliament whenever we want a public work in any part of this Dominion, and if we can show parliament that it is a work which is entitled to the assistance of the government, then I say in all honesty we should receive that assistance. It would not be just, it would be most selfish if any other system were to prevail. I regret very much that the hon. leader

of the opposition did not define his position in this regard, but, perhaps somebody else will be good enough to do so before the debate closes. Now, I have only one other remark to make in closing. I listened some time ago to the very forcible speech delivered by the hon. junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). I think he had one well-grounded cause for complaint, and that was when he complained of the manner in which the hon. Minister of Finance always clings to office. It is true that that hon. gentleman went into the government of Nova Scotia in 1882 and stuck there until 1896. During part of that time the hon. member for Pictou was the leader of the opposition, which, under that leadership, grew most beautifully less. There was one peculiarity about his leadership of the opposition in the provincial legislature, and it was that he always spoke against every measure that the then premier of Nova Scotia introduced; but, he never voted against one, as far as I recollect. The hon. gentleman and his friends tried all these years to turn the hon. Minister of Finance out of that office, but he remained there until a friendly voice called him up to a higher sphere of operations, to a higher sphere of usefulness, and, judging from the temper of the country, from the high esteem in which that hon. gentleman is held, the high esteem in which his colleagues are held, and the high esteem in which his leader is held, I can give the hon. member for Pictou not the slightest reason to hope but that the hon. Minister of Finance will cling to office here until another friendly voice calls him to a higher sphere.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) who has just taken his seat, is, in some respects, to be congratulated, and I am glad that I can join with the trend of congratulations that have been extended from the other side of the House, during the course of this debate. Rather, I may say, that the riding of Annapolis is to be congratulated upon having as its representative a gentleman, who, for probably the course of half an hour or more, has, I will not say delighted the House, but, has endeavoured to entertain the House with subjects, which, I venture to say, have no more relation to the subjects we are debating to-night than they have to South Africa. The hon. gentleman, however, realizes, perhaps, that it is important to let his constituents know that he is pleading their case before this parliament, and whether the time is opportune or not, in season or out of season, he has decided to enter upon his pleading. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman belongs to the legal profession or not. I am inclined to think, that, probably, he may. The manner in which he advanced his special pleading, the manner in which he endeavoured to conduct a cross-examination, which is not usual in this House, the manner in which he multiplied cases, almost suggested to me that he must belong to the legal profession. I, myself being more in the nature of a farmer, know hardly how to grapple with the arguments put forward by the hon. gentleman. He made a difficulty between himself and the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). The hon. member for Alberta asked: 'Why do you bring in these resolutions?' He said: 'If it is because of the old national policy principle that you desire to reaffirm, then there can be no sense in bringing in these resolutions.' On the other hand, the hon. member who has just spoken says, that beyond all question these resolutions mean the reaffirmation of the principle of the old national policy and nothing more, and I think I may say, speaking for myself, that I am quite prepared to agree with him. I understand that these resolutions aim at enunciating the grand principles that were inaugurated in 1878, adapting them to the circumstances which have since arisen, and bringing forward to the present day the principles of the policy then introduced, and which, for eighteen years, were so successfully carried out by the late administration. Circumstances have changed. The new administration have been in power for about five years, they have tinkered with the policy, they have introduced some innovations, and the circumstances of the country have so materially altered that it is necessary perhaps to add an additional statement to the old principles inaugurated in 1878, namely, that we recognize the fact that it is necessary for us to stand upon even terms with other countries, and to say that we shall not give a preference unless a preference is given in return. Now, the next case that the hon. member for Annapolis makes is the case of Nova Scotia against Ontario. We are not very much concerned with that. It is another of those 'apples of discord' that are sometimes thrown into the discussion. He shows us that the apples in Nova Scotia are ten times better than the apples of Ontario. I am not much concerned about that, nor is the House. Then, he comes to case number three. This is an old sore, I believe. He comes to the case of Nova Scotia against confederation. This is a matter of more serious import. It either means something, or it does not mean anything. It either means a complaint, or it means no complaint. Does the hon. gentleman wish the House to understand that Nova Scotia is complaining at the present time? It is not a matter with which we are concerned in the present debate, but he tells us that it is not secession. He mentions secession, and he says it is not secession. We are not concerned, I think now, when the present state of harmony is maintained, in knowing whether it was secession or what was the cause of the difficulty. It is sufficient, that,

at the present time, this province is living in harmony with the rest of the confederation. Now, he also speaks in complaining terms of what the city of Toronto has got at the expense of his province and at the expense of the Dominion. He speaks of the province of Ontario. Has the hon. gentleman studied the railway history of Ontario? Does he know that throughout the Dominion there is no province that has, to the same extent, contributed to railway building as the province of Ontario, and, therefore, if Ontario has paid out its good money for the development of railways for its own benefit, and, incidentally, for the benefit of the rest of the Dominion, what right has the hon. gentleman, or any other province, to complain? I notice that my hon. friend says that he has devoted a large portion of his time to the study of the financial history of this country, and of the financial depressions that are incident to it. He could not very well get better reading. He tells us that he has studied also the speeches made on the Conservative side of the House. If he had studied them with an open mind, I venture to say that he would not only have gained valuable information, but would have been able better to understand the financial questions that are involved in the history of this country than he appears to be to-night. I think he must have gone in a dreamy state to the study of the trade questions of this country when he tells us that to-day we have nothing but a revenue tariff. Why, Sir, on every page of the tariff of this Liberal government there are evidences—I admit they tinkered and spoiled to some extent the tariff of the Conservatives—but on every page of the existing tariff there are evidences to a large extent of the principles of protection as opposed to the principles of a free trade or revenue tariff. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) 'wants to know;' and in that respect he is much like greater men; he is very much like the First Minister and almost every cabinet minister on the other side of the House. They all want to know, and God knows if they knew more about the correct principles of governing this country and put their knowledge into effect, Canada although prosperous to-day, would be abundantly more prosperous still. However, I like an inquiring mind, and I will give my hon. friend (Mr. Wade) the information which he seeks. He asks: 'Has agriculture ever been the subject of protection under any tariff policy in this country,' and he exclaims: 'How can you protect the agricultural interests of a country; how can you protect apples and potatoes and grain, and things of that kind.' Let me give him a little of that reading which, in the pursuit of knowledge, he has overlooked. Here is the tariff, and on page 9 of the tariff I read:

Animals (living), 20 per cent; mutton and lamb (fresh), 35 per cent; tallow and stearic acid, 20 per cent ad valorem; candles, 25 per cent; pearline, 30 per cent; feathers, 30 per cent.

Feathers are an agricultural product to some extent.

Apples, including the duty on the barrel, 40 cents a barrel.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) was very much troubled about apples, and here he sees that there is a duty upon apples. And let me tell the hon. gentleman and his friends that about the time of the elections last year, apples were only worth 50 cents a barrel in the orchards in Ontario, and probably in other provinces as well; and 40 cents a barrel is a pretty good protection on an article of that value.

Buckwheat, 10 cents a bushel; potatoes, 15 cents a bushel.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) was troubled about the potato, and the potato has often given trouble, and potatoes have a duty of 15 cents a bushel. Now, let me give the hon. gentleman oats.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. Oats is another thing which sometimes we are greatly troubled about. The American oats comes into sharp competition with our oats, and we have a duty of 10 cents a bushel on oats, and a duty of 12 cents a bushel on wheat. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) not see now that agriculture is protected? Does he want to have that changed? After all the reading and all the deep study which he has brought to bear on the question, does he fail to recognize now that agriculture is protected? Well, as long as the lamp holds out to burn, you may turn from the error of your ways, and I ask the hon. gentleman if he recognizes even now that this government has allowed to remain in force some measure of protection to the farmer—but as I claim not enough protection for the honest agriculturists of this country. The hon. gentleman understands, and many of his friends opposite seem to understand it in the same way, that we are not at present in any degree working under anything but simply a revenue tariff. That has been announced by several prominent gentlemen opposite, and so I shall refer them to a few items of the tariff:

Locomotives for railways, 35 per cent; iron and steel bridges, 35 per cent; spring axles, 35 per cent; wrought iron or steel tubing, 35 per cent; iron or steel shoe tacks, 35 per cent; screws, commonly called wood screws, 35 per cent; gas meters, 35 per cent; shovels and spades, 35 per cent; skates of all kinds, 35 per cent.

And so you could go on and multiply them ad infinitum. It may be said that these are but instances, but the very gist of the

argument of the hon. gentlemen opposite is that you are protecting and building up one industry at the expense of another, and so they can take whichever horn of the dilemma they like in that regard. Now, Sir, I think I have pretty clearly shown that we can protect agriculture, and that the Conservative party by the policy they inaugurated in 1878 did protect agriculture. And, Sir, one and all of us on this side of the House stand for the protective policy of the Conservative party, and the country stands behind that policy, and when I say this, I do not mean only those who voted for the Conservative members last election, but I mean that practically all the people of the Dominion are for adequate and reasonable protection for the various industries of this country.

Now, Sir, I wish to say a few words with regard to the question of preferential trade. Let me interject here, that I regret to notice that members of the House of Commons upon the Liberal side do not show a very keen interest in the affairs of this country when they follow the rule (which has been but too noticeable within the last few days) of staying in the House to applaud when Liberal members are speaking, and of gracefully retiring whenever a Conservative member rises. If we had a photograph for the people of Canada to-night of the empty seats of the ministers of the Crown, and if we had a general photograph of the empty benches opposite, there are those who would say that it would better become the members of the government and their followers to be here to listen to what is said in parliament. Whether the remarks made are feeble or not, it would be well for these hon. gentlemen opposite to listen to them, and weigh them with an honest mind; to take their medicine if need be, and stand up like men—not run away. Now, Sir, in reference to this preferential tariff. The arguments which have been put forward are these: First, in reference to retaliation; that if we repeal this one-sided preferential tariff, Britain may retaliate.

Does any hon. member of this House believe that? If he does, he is more simple than I take him to be. If he does, it is not what the intelligent people of this country believe. The hon. member who has just spoken has said: England allows our goods to go in free, and is it fair that we should build up a tariff against her? Does not the hon. gentleman know that England allows the goods of all nations to go in upon the same terms as the goods of Canada? And will the mother land deny to her children that right which she accords to all mankind? I do not think that argument is very well taken. Does he not know also that Britain continues to trade with the United States and other countries which build up hostile tariffs, and far higher tariffs against her than does the Dominion of Canada? Therefore, the idea of retaliation is about as weak an argument as can be advanced by a gentleman of the ability of the hon. gentleman who just sat down.

But, the hon. gentleman made, as many others have done, a strong appeal, if you measure it by words, upon the question of loyalty to Britain: Do something for Britain, and never mind other lands. It comes a little late in the day, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker. When these gentlemen were preaching continental free trade with the United States,—not with Britain; commercial union with the United States,—not with Britain; unrestricted reciprocity with the United States,—not with Britain; that was the time for them to wave the flag. But what did they do? They went on and on, from one state to a worse state of political economy, from day to day, until the public sentiment of this country became aroused, and they had to find something that would give a colour of patriotism to their policy; and then, for the first time, we heard these gentlemen preaching loyalty to Britain in commercial matters. I do not think that Britain wants—and when I say this I want to be perfectly fair to both parties—from either the Liberals or the Conservatives of this great Dominion any certificate of loyalty. Britain knows from many a day gone by, and she knows emphatically from the history of recent times in South Africa, that Canadians, whatever may be their politics, will unite at any moment to help the mother land. Whenever the empire is assailed, whenever the principles which underlie the empire are in danger, then all Canada will be a stepping stone and the ocean the bridge over which the people of Canada will go to help the mother land. Oh, let us talk sense; is this not a very different thing from talking on a business matter? If we are sending a gift to Britain, let it be a gift through and through; but when we are talking of business, as a member of the government has said, 'business is business.' I am sorry he is not in his place, but he is no worse than many of the others in that regard. When you are talking of a policy in reference to trade, I want these gentlemen to understand and take it as a warning, that business interests, like the wasp, have a business end, and they had better be very careful how they fool with it; because, if they go on playing with the trade of this country, bringing our expenditure up to the enormous figure at which it stands to-day, disregarding the lessons of the past, they will find that the sting of depression, failure and commercial bankruptcy will follow very soon.

Another argument is that of cheap goods for Canada; but I will leave this, because it has probably been answered, and it will

be answered later on by an hon. gentleman who is to speak. I merely say in passing that I do not understand that the preferential tariff gives cheaper goods to Canada, and I pass to an argument which has not been much made use of.

Members of the cabinet have asserted in this debate that it is impossible to secure a fair trade with Britain on any other terms than the terms they have—in other words, that mutual concessions between Britain and Canada are absolutely impossible. But, let us remember that the gentlemen who are saying this are led by the right hon. First Minister, who when he went to Britain gave away all we had to give; and it is not until after he has done this and had said 'Canada wants nothing in return,' that they come and tell us that the grand advantage which would result from an arrangement of mutual trade preferences between Britain and all her colonies cannot possibly be obtained. This is of a piece with the action of these gentlemen in other commercial matters. It is of a piece with their action on the Joint High Commission which went to Washington. Did they go like business men? No. What they did was to give corn and wire fencing, and several other things, free to the United States; and then they wanted the United States to give them concessions, and of course they got no concessions.

Now, the resolution before the House has been read more than once. I want to ask the members of the government and their supporters: Do you object to the whole of it? If not, what part of it do you object to? We ask for adequate protection and encouragement to the agricultural, manufacturing and other interests of the country. Do hon. gentlemen object to this? If they do, we want them to put themselves plainly upon record in that regard, because the people of Canada want to know just where they stand. Then, the resolution says that the time has come when, in the opinion of this House, the adoption of a policy of mutual trade preferences within the empire would prove of great benefit. Do the hon. gentlemen object to this? If they do not, we will expect them to vote for it. Again it is said that the time is opportune. Is there a doubt about that? It is opportune, not only in view of the inauguration of the Australian commonwealth, but also because the policy upon which the rebellious states in South Africa are to be governed has not yet been settled. There is going to be an enormous trade in that part of the world. It is important that Canada should secure a measure, and a large measure, of that trade. It is within the competence of Great Britain, without disturbing her present fiscal policy at all, to give us a preference in these markets, and, therefore, emphatically, taking into account the situation in Australia and South Africa, this is a most opportune time for a movement in this direction.

Do hon. gentlemen opposite claim that they have reverted to the policy which obtained prior to 1878, when the Mackenzie administration was in power. I do not think that any of them will be quite daring enough to do that. The disastrous and ruinous conditions which then prevailed were so startling that it would be dangerous for these hon. gentlemen to announce that they had reverted to the policy of those days, which was a policy of tariff for revenue only. At that time our trade fell steadily, year by year, from $216,000,000 to $170,000,000 or an average of $30,000,000 a year, or 14 per cent during every year the reform party was in power. What is required now is not a one-sided preferential tariff, but a firm, well defined, protective policy, which will develop, upon the old lines, the various industrial interests of this country.

Let me read you a few figures which will dispose of the claim of hon. gentlemen opposite that the preferential tariff has been the means of increasing the trade of Canada with Great Britain. In 1897 our aggregate trade with Great Britain was $106,000,000 in round numbers. In 1900, it had increased to $152,000,000, or a gain of 43·21 per cent. That, you will say, was a substantial gain, and I began with 1897, because that was the year in which the government announced its policy. Until then they were hedging, and inquiring, and issuing commissions. Well, our trade with Great Britain increased 43 per cent in that period, but let us see how that increase compares with the increase in the aggregate trade of Canada with the whole world. If we find that the trade with Great Britain advanced much more rapidly than our trade with the rest of the world, then of course that would be an argument in favour of the preferential rate, but the facts show that from 1897 to 1900, our trade with the rest of the world shows an increase, not of 43 per cent, but of 49 per cent. So that although we did a fairly good trade with Great Britain, it did not keep pace with our trade with the rest of the world.

Then, how does our trade with Great Britain compare with our trade with other countries? We have no preferential tariff with Germany, at least no direct preferential tariff. But, we have an indirect and unjust preferential tariff with that country, by way of England, and also with a great many other foreign countries, who send their goods to England, whence they are shipped to us and get the advantage of the rebate. Well, our trade with Germany from 1897 to 1900 increased 33 per cent. Our trade with the United States, with which we have no preferential tariff, increased from 1897 to 1900, not 43 per cent, but 60·74 per cent—an increase far greater than that with Great Britain. Then take France, with which we have no preferential treaty, but we have a commercial arrangement; and if hon. gentlemen like to advance that argument, I would ask

them do they pretend that France obtained a preference in Canada by reason of this commercial arrangement. But our trade with France increased 74·47 during the period I have referred to and our trade with Portugal increased 128·10. There are many other figures which go to show that our trade with Great Britain, under the preferential tariff, has not increased in the same ratio as our trade with many foreign countries with which we have no preferential arrangement at all.

Coming for a moment to the budget, the keynote of the budget speech is : 'We are having a good time.' The hon. gentleman who last spoke says that the Finance Minister will cling to his position. I think he will as long as he possibly can, and that is just in harmony with the keynote: We are having a good time, and as long as it lasts we will cling to the position. But the budget speech is notable for what it omits rather than for what it contains. Look through it for a financial policy, search from the first to the last page, and you cannot find any policy defined. It is simply a collection of figures, a blue-book coloured by the somewhat picturesque language of the Finance Minister.

But when we come to examine the figures, we find that they have been juggled with and not placed honestly before the people, so that the people may clearly understand our financial condition. Take the question of the surplus, and we find that, according to the hon. minister's statement, we have a surplus of $8,000,000. How does he show that surplus ? Why, he says, that we are prosperous. That I do not admit, in the sense in which the hon. gentleman states the opinion : I do admit that our trade is large, but there is a great deal of difference between a large trade and prosperity. But the hon. gentleman says that we have a surplus of $8,000,000. I deny that. The net result of the financial year ending 30th June, 1900, does not put one dollar of surplus in the coffers of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman tells us that the amount chargeable to consolidated fund for the year is $42,975,279.51. We have expended on railways, &c., as stated by the minister, $7,468,843.24; subsidies, including Crow's Nest Pass, $725,720,-35; South African contingent, $1,547,623.74. This makes a total of $52,713,466.84. The admitted revenue from all sources is $51,-029,944.02, leaving a deficit instead of a surplus, leaving us worse off than we were at the beginning of the year, to the extent of $1,687,472.82.

I do not care about the argument that some of these are unusual expenditures. I say that the time has come for honest, straight book-keeping in the affairs of this Dominion. And whether you like it or whether you do not like it, whether one party is in power or whether another party is in power, the people of this country have come to the position where they demand and will have a straight statement of their affairs, such a straight statement as a business man would give. We have taken in a little over fifty-one millions, and we have expended a good deal more than fifty-two millions, leaving us nearly two millions behind. Hon. gentlemen opposite say : Oh, when in power, you kept the books in much the same style. I do not care, I say again, for the traditions of the days gone by where they were wrong. I think the time has come when men should say : If we have been wrong in the past, now is the time to be right. We live in the present, and the history of the past can only be usefully resurrected in order to teach us to do better things in the future. In the present we are preparing for the future—the past can take care of itself. Now, whether the administration like it or not, the people are taking stock of the financial situation, the state of the accounts between the administration and the commonwealth. And what is that situation ? We have admittedly an exceptional revenue, due largely to exceptional circumstances and exceptional values ; mining has been booming ; we are on the crest of the wave, as the minister says. And on the other hand we are face to face with new problems in relation to transportation, involving, if we are to retain our trade instead of letting it be diverted to foreign ports, very large expenditures in the future. We are confronted with enormous expenditures, by reason of iron bounties. We are confronted with the fact that, as stated by the hon. member (Mr. Wade) who spoke last, the province of Nova Scotia is clamouring for more money for the building of railways, while a minister of the Crown lends a wiling ear to the claim. And we are confronted with the fact which is, perhaps, worse than all, that we have a Minister of Public Works who advocates freely the expenditure of money, and a Minister of Railways who has demonstrated that he also will spend largely. The people are asking how it comes that if we are on the crest of the wave of prosperity, every dollar, and more than every dollar of our revenue has been spent, and this in the face of the professions of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies), that the expenditures, that years ago stood at $38,-000,000, were too great. The people demand a halt and they demand of the government a more rigid economy in the expenditure of public money. Now, that the country is taking stock of the situation is emphasized by a little incident which was brought to the mind of the ministry last night, to them not a pleasurable incident—the news from North Bruce. I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Public Works succeeded in getting into North Bruce and delivering

orations in the interests of this government or not; but I do know that there was a desire on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to do all that could be done in North Bruce, and to present the policy of the government to the farmers of North Bruce in the best possible light. But I want to say—and the government and their following will do well to take note of it—that the people of North Bruce have been following the history of this administration, and following perhaps this very account that I have been referring to. Whether the Minister of Public Works spoke in North Bruce or not, a greater orator than he spoke on that occasion. The people of this country have spoken through the ballot box, and they will continue to speak until they have an administration which will administer the affairs of this country upon the principles laid down in the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the opposition.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) What about Prince Edward Island?

Mr. LENNOX. I will tell the hon. gentleman about Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman who spoke to-night showed us a contract between Nova Scotia and Ontario. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that I come from a riding, old South Simcoe, which I regard as the Garden of Eden. It is in the province of Ontario. I think it is quite right that the hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island should appreciate that tidy little island. Yet, from my point of view, the vote of Prince Edward Island does not speak so loudly for the intelligence of the people of Prince Edward Island, as does the vote of the people of North Bruce for the intelligence of the people of Ontario.

I was going to refer to the fact that the government took an undue amount of credit for what they termed the prosperity of this country. Now, I want to ask those who are yet to speak, to explain to this House how that prosperity has been brought about. Was the foundation of that prosperity laid by the Reform party or by the Conservative party? Whether the government admit it or not, the people of this country, many Liberals as well as Conservatives, know and declare that the reason why Canada is prosperous is not because of anything done by the present administration, but in spite of the present administration; it is because the present government have not dared to put in practice any of the theories they advocated while out of power; for had they done so, disaster would inevitably have supervened. Canada is prosperous because the foundations of prosperity were laid by the Conservative party when the policy of protection was inaugurated. That policy was faithfully administered while the Conservative party was in power, and although the present government have rather weakened that policy than adhered to it in its entirety. the prosperity of the country has still flowed on. Why should these gentlemen take credit for what the Conservatives have achieved?

I am glad to see the Minister of Agriculture in his place, and I will illustrate my argument by a reference to that hon. gentleman, who represents the agriculturists of this country. We will suppose that the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) has two farms, both good, but one a little better than the other. The Minister of Agriculture comes along about harvest time, when all the work of preparation has been done, when the crop is about ready to be harvested. He gets possession of one of the farms, honestly, I will say, though I cannot say that the present administration honestly got possession of power in 1896. But the Minister of Agriculture gets possession of the better farm belonging to the hon. member for West Elgin. After the crops have been harvested the Minister of Agriculture comes along, and in that bland happy manner of his says: Why, my good friend, I am a better farmer than you are. Look at these crops on my farm, and look at your crops, and deny if you can that I am the better farmer. That is just what these gentlemen opposite are doing. They have been taking off the crops that have been sowed on ground prepared and cultivated by the Conservative party. They are enjoying a prosperity which has resulted from the magnificent public enterprises that the former Conservative administration inaugurated. I want to say to these hon. gentlemen that it is not all honour that they bring upon themselves when they stand here committed to the policy of protection, with a large revenue flowing in in consequence of a measure of protection. If our industries have not languished it is because the hon. gentlemen opposite have not kept the promises they made to the electors, and have broken all their pledges.

Now, I said that the budget speech was, perhaps, more notable for what it omitted than for what it contained. Of course, in speaking upon the budget I do so with deference, although I have, like my hon. friend who spoke last (Mr. Wade), endeavoured to familiarize myself with budget speeches. But, I understand that a budget is intended to outline the commercial and financial policy of the government, that in it we are to find great schemes suggested and great measures proposed by the administration. The hon. gentleman who last spoke dealt with the question of subsidies. Now, subsidies have been a burning question in this country for a long time, but the budget speech does not give us the slightest idea of the policy of the government in regard to that question. The subject of opening up new markets for the produce of the country, of developing the trade of this country and turning it into new and better channels, is not treated

in the budget speech. The labour questions are not dealt with by it, although, to some extent, they have been dealt with by the House. But the encouragement of labour too is one of those matters which might well form the subject of discussion in a budget speech, and I venture to say that if the Minister of Finance had had the courage to tackle the question he would have dealt with it. But, there is one great question which is going to require more thought at the hands of the honest representatives of the people of this country in the near future than any other, and that is, the best way of bringing to market the great resources of this country from the west. A comprehensive policy upon this question is what the people require, and what an administration that is powerful enough and wise enough should outline at this time. Read the budget speech from end to end, and where do you get one idea, one indication of what the policy of this government is to be as regards the carrying trade ? We are developing mines, the products of which have helped to swell the coffers of the Dominion treasury. But, although this is the case, and although the farmers are putting forth every effort to develop new lines of industry, and looking to the best means of getting their produce to the markets of the world, the administration seem to have given the subject no attention.

Where a multiplicity of routes is suggested and with routes in almost every direction, with railway schemes looming up from almost every township, it is of the utmost importance that we should give our attention to this question and it was the duty of the government to consider this question well so as to be able to outline a plan clearly before the people, in order that those who want to invest money in future in commercial enterprises will know exactly by what means the products of this country will be carried to the ports of shipment. Coming from an agricultural district, there is one question that interests me still more immediately and it is as regards what is to be done for the people who seem to me—and probably I differ from some hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House in this regard—the backbone and stay of the Dominion of Canada. The class to which I refer are the farmers. What, in the budget speech is done for the farmer, what is done to give recognition and encouragement to the efforts which the farmers are putting forth for the development of the country ? There is not one step taken to benefit the farmer or to give him any encouragement. Oh, but, I am wrong ! There is something. Why, the farmer is allowed a benefit, percolating through the men who will build a factory to grind up the sugar beet. The farmer has received a concession at the hands of the present administration and the farmer should ask no more, but should be grateful accordingly. In order to encourage the beet-root sugar industry and so to benefit the farmers, the government have decided, as the only change that they will make in the tariff since 1897, that they will allow machinery to come in free for the period of one year. I congratulate, as congratulations are the order of the day, the farmers upon the magnificent treatment they have received from the present administration.

Now, I want to refer to some of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, but, as the hour is getting late, and as these hon. gentlemen have all absented themselves, I am not going into it as extensively as I intended to. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), who is a very eloquent speaker, made some remarks that I think deserves a passing reference. He compared the resolutions brought in by the Conservative opposition to 'the emergency rations.' I want to tell that hon. gentleman, and I want to tell those who cheered the allusion, that whatever divergence of opinion we may have as regards the difficulty that arose over the emergency rations to South Africa, it does not come well from that side of the House to refer to that question in this way. I cannot say whether, in the inception of that matter the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence was to blame. That is a debatable question. But, I am here to say, and I say it with a feeling of the full responsibility, that the government cannot be acquitted of blame in this, that when the difficulty had been shown to them, when the wrong had been shown to have been perpetrated, when it had been shown that a crime, than which it would be difficult to find one more dastardly, had been committed with reference to our brave soldier boys in South Africa, there was a duty cast upon the government and that duty has not been discharged. Therefore, I say, it does not become the hon. member for South Wellington or any other hon. gentleman on that side of the House to say any more about emergency rations than they can help. Now, these hon. gentlemen differ so much amongst themselves as to what the policy of the government is that it is probably better to let them fight it out amongst themselves. For instance, the hon. member for South Wellington is in favour of bounties, and there is no more definite or distinct system of protection than bounties. He says he is for bounties up to the hilt. Then he proceeds to struggle with the questions of the surplus and to point out, or to try to show, that a surplus is not inconsistent with a policy of 'a tariff for revenue only.' He struggled with a ghost, because there is no surplus and he met ghosts because the ghost of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) and the ghosts of many other hon. members confronted him in that regard. I will read just a line in reference to the question of bounties from a statement by

the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). He was making a tour of the maritime provinces and say in regard to bounties :

> This country cannot be made poor; it must continue in wealth and prosperity. But he was not satisfied to be contented with a mere existence, but desired to see Canada take the fullest advantage of its great resources. This could only be accomplished in one way, by means of free trade. This was the key with which they would unlock the golden door of prosperity. . . The Liberals maintained that any trade which required subventions to keep them alive, not only do not contribute to the natural wealth, but actually hinder the prosperity of a country.

This is pretty clear upon the question of bounties. I leave my hon. friend from South Wellington to fight it out with the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, although perhaps, it may very well be that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has varied his opinion very much since that time. We had a very eloquent speech from the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), and I must say that after the eloquent manner in which he seconded the address it was unfortunate indeed that he should be the first, and I am glad to say, the only hon. gentleman,who introduced the race and religious cry in this House. I followed the hon. gentleman through his somewhat labourious argument designed to show that certain constituencies in Quebec with an admittedly Roman Catholic majority had sent hon. gentlemen of another religion to represent them on the floor of this House. I did not know until then, living in the province of Ontario, and I regret it if it obtains in Quebec, that these questions are taken into account in the matter of elections. I have always found, in the province in which I live, that whatever a man's religion may be, or whatever his nationality may be, it cuts no figure in the question as to whether he should or should not represent a certain electorate in the Dominion, or any legislature, and I regret exceedingly to find that we should have an argument to show that in any province of this country, or in any part of this country, another state of things prevails.

We had a speech from the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) which certainly had no very direct bearing on the question before the House. It was a speech which should not be lost sight of, because it was unique. The hon. gentleman congratulated us on this side upon the research and deep study which we have evidently given to the financial questions which are being discussed. I can endorse his remark there. We on this side of the House have brought to the consideration of public questions an honest determination to sift them to the bottom, to get facts and figures to support our arguments, and to submit them in a fair and honourable way. Having paid us this compliment, it would seem that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) must have dived into the coal mines of his imagination, because he brought up a considerable amount of that material by which he tried to blacken the position taken by hon. members on this side. However, we must to some extent forgive him for he concluded by whitewashing us again. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) stated that the third paragraph of the resolution introduced by the hon. leader of the Conservative party (Mr. Borden), is a distinct declaration of a tariff war against the world. Do hon. gentlemen upon the other side of the House concur in that statement ? Surely any one who brings a fair mind to bear upon the question must recognize that the principle we enunciate is that we shall expect the same treatment from other nations that we are prepared to extend to them. There is no declaration of war there. Did not the hon. gentleman from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), when he spoke on Mr. Bennett's motion, tell us that if we wanted to be respected by the people of the United States we must assert our rights and show that we are ready to maintain them. That is the principle of the amendment which the Conservative party have enunciated in parliament, and that is the principle which the people of Canada are prepared to maintain.

I had not the pleasure of hearing the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), although he is the gentleman above all others whom I particularly desired to hear, because I believed it would be more difficult for that gentleman than for any other to deal with these financial questions. He is upon record on all the questions that enter into this discussion. Beginning his life with associations better than the associations which surround him now, beginning his life as a staunch Conservative, and having the variegated history that he has had since, if there is a pathetic picture upon the floor of the House of Commons to-day it is the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Trace him through the unfortunate circumstances which have compelled him to take the position he now occupies. See him leave the old Conservative party without a cause. See him next, as he was represented here the other evening, a believer in protection, but an enforced advocate of free trade. See him go through this country from one end to the other denouncing the policy that he loved and upholding the policy of free trade which was perforce to be his road to the portfolio of finance. And in the end see that hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) whom I certainly very much admire ; see him in the end landed not in the position he naturally expected, but stranded and relegated to a position which he did not covet. He has told more than one audience in this coun-

try exactly what he thinks of his present portfolio of Trade and Commerce. He has told them that it is a perfectly useless portfolio, that it should never have been created, that it is a department in which a man cannot earn one dollar of the salary which is paid him. See him occupying that position now, compelled, reluctantly, I hope to draw the emolument which is attached to that office, and no matter what our political opinions may be, it must be a pathetic picture to us to see him as he is. It is pathetic to see him obliged to stand up and state that the expenditure of this government is right, that the policy of this government is a free trade policy, in a word swallowing all that he has said, feeding as he does on husks ; feeding on the light literature he has spread broadcast through this country in his various speeches, and swallowing his record whole. I sincerely sympathize with the hon. gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I must apologize to the House—but the apology will only extend to a small portion of it in view of the emptiness of the Liberal benches. I do feel as a new member that though I have had a splendid subject and a magnificent opportunity, I have not availed myself of it, not from want or will, but because of want of ability to deal with these questions as efficiently as I would desire. In conclusion let me point to what I think is a fortunate thing in the midst of that which to some extent is a misfortune. I recognize that it is a very serious misfortune for this country that by a side issue, and by nothing else, that by a side issue and by a fluke this government came into power. But, while it is a great misfortune, a misfortune which I believe the people of this country recognize to-day, there is one thing upon which we should congratulate ourselves, and this is that we have just come to that stage in our political history when the people of Canada know exactly where we stand. For eighteen years, while the Conservatives were in power, and while the Conservative policy was calculated to work great good for Canada, there was still the great disadvantage that the members of the Liberal party, great and small, went up and down the country decrying our policy and thereby preventing it from having that full beneficial effect that it otherwise would. But that is not all. They not only did that, but by telling the people —and there were some people foolish enough to believe them sincere—that they were coming into power, and that when they came into power they would remove every vestige of protection and revert to the old free trade, which had ruined this country before. By doing so they retarded the prosperity of the country and prevented the building up of its industries to the extent to which they would otherwise have been built up under the Conservative policy. They told the people that they were coming into power, and would put into force one or other of the five or six policies which they had propounded, and that protection would be set aside. As the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) said so eloquently on many occasions—referring to the Conservative policy of protection—this accursed system, a system accursed by God and man, and it was going to be wiped out.' So that people stood hesitating and doubting, and doubt means distrust, and distrust in commercial matters means ultimate bankruptcy. While a great many people did not believe them, yet it did, to a certain extent, retard the onward march of the national policy during those eighteen years. But, when they came into power, it was found that they had not the courage to inaugurate any of the policies they had been preaching. I ask the hon. members of the government, will they tell me which of the policies they advocated they have adopted ? Is it continental free trade ? I know they will say it is not. Is it commercial union with the United States ? I know they will say it is not. Is it unrestricted reciprocity ? I know they will say it is not. Is it free trade? That is the only one they can escape on. They will not say that it is. Is it a tariff for revenue only ? The Minister of Finance came down here the other day and said this : A year ago I told the people of this country that we would reach the fifty-million mark in revenue. The revenue required is for an expenditure of $42,000,000. On a tariff for revenue only the hon. gentleman takes from the pockets of the people of this country $8,000,000 in excess of what he says is required for the expenditure of the country. How can he say, under these circumstances, that it is a tariff for revenue only ? Is it free trade as they have it in England ? No. And so it comes to this, that take it whatever way you will, these hon. gentlemen were never able, during the eighteen years that they were out of power, to devise a policy which was workable in the interest of this Dominion ; and when they came into power they were in this position, that they had to send a commission out to try by questions, such as they fling across the House to try to draw our hands, to devise a policy which they were not able to devise for themselves. The result was that when they got the report of that commission, they had to adopt in effect the old policy of the Conservative party, and they have attached to it a clause with reference to preferential trade, which has had no effect except to make it more difficult for the industries of this country to prosper. In the cotton industry alone we find that the stock has dropped to-day seventeen points. So that the result which is going to follow from this preferential tariff is making its appearance already.

I feel that I have already spoken longer than probably I ought as a new member ; but you will recognize that it is much more

difficult for us new members to speak than the old and hardened gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House, yes and some of whom sit on this side, but to our left. I would not for a moment say anything disrespectful of the members of the government. I think the time has come when we have it, as a firmly established idea, that protection shall be the main policy of this country. Good men are wanted now, and this is about all we want to have assured prosperity in this country. I say nothing disrespectful of the administration of this country, only I think they could be improved upon, some of them perhaps a great deal. I was walking the other day along Sparks street, when I saw an advertisement in a window. There was in the window a lot of fabrics of different colours, some of them gaudy in their appearance, and this legend was on them : 'They'll all stand washing,' and I may add, and watching.

Mr. SCOTT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Finance Minister, House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 25, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INLAND WATERS SEAMEN'S ACT.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 91) to amend the Inland Waters Seamen's Act. He said : The existing Act defining the inland waters of Canada is very uncertain, and doubts have arisen as to what it really means. It says : 'All the waters of Canada above the city of Quebec.' The question was whether that was confined to the River St. Lawrence or whether it embraced the lakes, or whether it could embrace the waters of the great North-west Territories. I have brought in a Bill to define that the inland waters of Canada shall embrace all the rivers and lakes whose waters are navigable, excepting the sea-coasts, bays and harbours, from a line above Point des Monts and Cape Chat on the shores of the St. Lawrence ; and conferring upon the judge of the Supreme Court in the Yukon territory, and upon the judge of the territorial court in the North-west Territories, the same jurisdiction for the punishment of offences as is given to the judges of the Superior Court of Lower Canada, and to the judges of the sessions of the peace in the lower provinces, with regard to offences committed upon the high seas, within Canadian jurisdiction.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE SAFETY OF SHIPS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 92) to amend the Act respecting the safety of ships. He said: When the Dominion Act was originally passed, many years ago, it then conformed to the British law. Since then the British mercantile law has been amended in very slight particulars, and owing to the construction of modern ships the spaces that are covered in and are not counted in the tonnage are not allowed by our law to be filled up with a cargo except by deals to the height of three feet, and I propose to amend our law so as to make it conform exactly with the Imperial statute in that respect.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is that in respect to deck loads ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say to my hon. friend that the Bill does not provide for any compulsory inspection of deck loads. It simply amends our existing law so as to provide that the vacant space, which is now compelled by law to be vacant, the spaces covered in in steamers above the three feet of deals, may be filled up with such articles as hay or other light material. It does not otherwise touch the question of deck loads at all.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INVESTIGATIONS INTO SHIPPING CASUALTIES.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 93) respecting inquiries and investigations into shipping casualties. He said : The Bill is the result of many communications which have passed between the Board of Trade in England and the Marine Department in Canada. Under the law as it now stands, we have power to investigate into the causes of any casualty which occurs in Canadian waters, even if the ship is commanded by an officer holding a British certificate, a British officer. The officers holding British certificates complained that the manner in which our investigations were held did not ensure to them that perfect fair-play which is ensured to them by investigations held under the British system.

The Board of Trade, after several cases had taken place, and the evidence been

sent to them, intimated as their opinion that the investigation should partake more of a judicial character, and that the judge who heard the case and decided whether the officer should lose his certificate for carelessness, should have the advantage in all cases of competent nautical assessors to sit with him, and that the presiding judge should be a legal gentleman. The Bill has been drafted in accordance with the suggestions of the British Board of Trade. Inasmuch as grave doubts exist, and there is a difference of opinion between the law officers of the Crown on this side of the water and the law officers of the Crown in Great Britain, as to whether the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had appellate jurisdiction to amend, or alter, or modify the findings of the court, the present law removes that doubt, and declares that he shall not have that jurisdiction ; so that, if a judicial court, under this statute, finds that an officer has been guilty of neglect of duty, the finding and the evidence are forwarded to Great Britain, to the authority from which he receives the certificate, to be dealt with by them, and cannot be altered or amended by us.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is to British certificates that it relates ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Entirely to British certificates. These are the two main amendments to enable me to appoint county court judges at Halifax, St. John and some other places and to associate with them nautical officers so as to bring our law into unison and harmony with the spirit of the British law and to make it uniform.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand the hon. gentleman proposes this change only in regard to certificates issued under the British Board of Trade in England ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Precisely.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Our law as to men holding certificates issued by the Department of Marine here, remains as it is.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries retains the same power as he had before.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but in regard to the court of first instance, are the general legal requirements necessary to the hearing of this case the same ; for instance, supposing the hon. gentleman were to take Capt. Smith, or some other officer, and appoint him to hold a preliminary inquiry ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not necessarily to hold the preliminary inquiry, but to hold an inquiry dealing with the certificate. We follow the same procedure as in England. The Bill provides for the appointment of a county judge, or a judge of some kind to act. An assessor would proceed with the court and Capt. Smith could act as the assessor to the judge.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 94) to amend the Railway Act. He said : Mr. Speaker, for the last two or three years the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and myself have been endeavouring to get a clause inserted into charters in the Railway Committee, conferring upon His Majesty, or upon the government, power to expropriate a railway at any time that it is deemed in the public interest that such railway should be expropriated, and also providing that any bonuses which may be given to the railway may properly be deducted from the price agreed upon in regard to the expropriation of the road. Upon every occasion upon which we have endeavoured to get that clause inserted in a charter in the Railway Committee, we were met by the proposition that it is singling a particular railway out for special treatment, and that there would be no objection if a clause of this kind were made to apply generally. I thought it would be in the interest of the House and the country that a Bill of that nature should be brought before the House. I have brought it in as an amendment to the Railway Act, and it contains only three provisions. One of the provisions, as I have explained, is that when you take over the road, any subsidies which have been voted to it shall be deducted. I have added to that provision that this clause shall apply to charters granted from the date of the existence of the present parliament. I may say that I looked up the question of the expropriation of railways, and I find that in 1884, Mr. Gladstone introduced a Bill into the Imperial House of Commons which became law, providing conditions under which railways might be expropriated by the government. After thinking the matter over, to some extent, I decided that it would not be well to insert in the Bill any provision of that nature, but that I should simply ask the House to make a general declaration in favour of expropriation. I regret that I was not in possession of certain information when we last had the matter before the Railway Committee, because, I find that we are not establishing a precedent at all. The first Canadian railway charter that was ever granted to a company, the proprietors of the Champlain and St. Lawrence Railroad, provided that the government should have the

right to expropriate the road at any time upon paying to the proprietors the amounts paid on their shares, plus 20 per cent. The Act incorporating the Grand Trunk Railway Company provided that the government might purchase the railway at the end of twenty-one years from January 1, 1853, upon certain conditions. The Act incorporating the London and Gore Railway Company, which in 1845 became the Great Western, provided for expropriation by the government at any time after forty years after completion of the work, upon repayment of the amounts paid on shares, plus 20 per cent. In many other charters there is an expropriation clause, so that I am not asking the House to establish any precedent whatever. I think it is desirable that this power should be made general. I am quite prepared for the argument that parliament has control of the railways now, but I think it is as well that we should serve formal notice upon all railway companies from this time forth, that their property may be expropriated by the Dominion, if necessary. Then, there will be no obtaining money from capitalists in the old land under false pretenses. They will clearly understand that a provision exists under which parliament may take these roads over. I think, in view of the trend of public opinion in favour of government control, or government ownership of railways, that it is particularly desirable that the Bill of which I have given notice shall be adopted. I move for leave to introduce the Bill, seconded by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson).

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That the names of Mr. Wade and Mr. Pringle be added to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY COMMITTEE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That the name of Mr. Tobin be substituted for that of Mr. Godbout as a member of the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the government if they would cause to be laid on the Table the order in council under which the reference of the claim of Nova Scotia in connection with the Eastern Extension Railway was made at an early day, without waiting until all the other papers are prepared.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is a mere oversight that I have not it with me now. I will have it to-morrow.

QUARANTINE REGULATIONS WITH UNITED STATES.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). In compliance with the request of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), I beg to move that an Order of the House do issue for a return containing the changes in the quarantine regulations between the United States and Canada.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I beg to present the return.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). I beg to call attention to the urgent necessity there is for holding a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee. I repeat the reasons which I gave the other day. There are two or three matters which it will be impossible to audit properly unless we have at least two meetings of that committee each week. We have only had about one meeting a week, and I was in hopes that there would be a meeting to-morrow. It is the desire of every one, I assume, that we should get through the business here as quickly as possible, but take the telegraph service in which some half million dollars is concerned, and even if we have two meetings a week, we will barely have sufficient time to make anything like a fair examination of these vouchers which are exceedingly voluminous. I have examined some of them and they certainly require explanation in the public interest. I am not at the moment familiar with the rights of members of the committee, but whatever they be, we have been deferring to the convenience of the members of the government, several of whom are on that committee. It is no doubt in the public interest that they should be present, and considering the government majority and all that we had to bow to their convenience. Possibly it is the right of a member of the committee to have the committee called together and to take his chances on a quorum being present. I wish to know if it is not possible to meet to-morrow.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). The week before last there were two meetings.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. One.

Mr. FRASER. Excuse me, two. Arrangements were made and we met on Wednesday, and the clerk called a meeting for Friday, but we only sat a few minutes. I was

away on the last day, but it is not absolutely necessary that the chairman should be there. I find that Wednesday is the most convenient day for that committee to meet, and when we meet on Wednesday, then we can decide as to whether Thursday or Friday would be the most convenient for another meeting. I have no desire but to have two meetings a week, but as there are two other committees meeting to-morrow the Public Accounts will be called for Wednesday.

CANADA NATIONAL RAILWAY AND TRANSPORT COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 13) to incorporate the Canada National Railway and Transport Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Mr. MACLEAN. On section 2 I object to the name which it is proposed to call this company. In the committee I objected to the use of the word 'National' in connection with a private corporation like this on the ground that we should retain the word 'National' for the railways owned by Canada. The word 'National' is a very good name and instead of calling the Intercolonial Railway the government railway system of Canada, we should call it the National Railway System of Canada. I ask the government that they should in defence of their own road withdraw the word 'National' from the name of this company and use it hereafter as a distinctive name for the government railways of this country. I do not wish to cause the promoters of this Bill any trouble at this stage, but I would suggest to them that they should change the name. I would ask the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) to request the promoters of the Bill to use some other name.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I do not imagine there would be any objection to striking out the word 'National' if you like. I did not think it is a matter of quite as much importance as my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) thinks it is, but if it is agreeable to the House it could be called the Canada Railway and Transport Company.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That makes it all the stronger.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think it ought to be called the Georgian Bay and Toronto Railway Company, or some name like that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Make a proposal.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would prefer the name should be given by the promoters of the Bill, but if they do not do so we can christen it ourselves.

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). Mr. Cowan, who has charge of the Bill, is unfortunately ill, but I understood from the solicitor and from Mr. Campbell who was promoting the Bill that they did not object to a change in the name. We can amend it on third reading.

Mr. SPROULE. This is the proper place to amend it. I move that it be named the Toronto and Georgian Bay Railway.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. There will be no necessity for such a motion if the promoters will agree to a change in the name. I think myself it is just as well not to have the word 'National' in, but those interested should have the privilege of naming the company, and that can be done on the third reading.

Mr. SPROULE. That was discussed in the committee, and I understood that the promoter was not averse to the name proposed. It was not carried, but it was not seriously objected to.

The PRIME MINISTER. That may be taken up on the third reading.

On the question that the Bill be reported,

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I desire to move the addition of another clause to the Bill, in accordance with the terms of the notice which I gave a few days ago. I move that the following be added as clause 14:

> His Majesty shall have the right at any time to take over the undertaking, property, rights and franchises of the company, and for that purpose the provisions of the Expropriation Act shall apply.
>
> From any valuation placed upon such property so taken there shall be deducted on payment the amount of any bonus or subsidy paid by the government of Canada to the company towards the construction of such line of railway or any part thereof.

This resolution is somewhat similar in terms to a resolution which was presented to the committee and the House when a Bill similar to this was under our consideration some twelve months ago. If this were a Bill asking for an ordinary local charter, for the construction of a road seventy-five miles long for the purpose of serving the municipalities through which it passed, there might be some valid objection taken to the insertion of this provision. But the charter asked for is not for the purpose of constructing a local road; that has never been sought for, and it is not required. Between the town of Collingwood, one of the termini mentioned in the Bill, and Lake Ontario we have already two roads—one running to the city of Toronto, ninety-four miles in length, and the other running to the city of Hamilton, about 112 miles in length. So that the two chief ports on Lake Ontario are connected with that important port on the Georgian Bay by two lines of railway whose greatest distance apart is not more than twenty-five miles. It cannot be said, therefore, that this third road is required for any purposes of a local character. That, I think,

has been made abundantly clear again and again in debates which have taken place in this House on the transportation question, and by representations which have been made by the leading business men and organizations of the province of Ontario ; and if the committee and the House had not been impressed with the view that the road which we propose to charter was to form a link in a transportation route the most direct between the head of inland navigation and the sea-board, I think great difficulty would have been experienced in procuring a charter for the construction of this road. It is proposed that this shall be made an air line. The distance from Collingwood to Toronto by the present rail route is ninety-four miles. By constructing this line in the most direct way, it is expected that the distance will be shortened to seventy or seventy-four miles. Large bonding powers have been given in the Bill, because it is proposed that the road shall be constructed in the most substantial manner possible, with the heaviest rails, the most substantial road-bed, the latest and most improved freight cars, and the heaviest and best locomotives, for the purpose of carrying on the large business which we all hope and expect will be developed between the west and north-west and the sea-board in years to come. The board of trade of the city of Toronto for some years past, being impressed with the importance of this route as a competitive route against the railways, has been drawing public attention to the matter, and has been invoking the aid of the government for the purpose of securing the construction of a line similar to that which is proposed under this Bill ; and I have in my hand a copy of a resolution which was adopted unanimously at a general meeting of that board, held on the 2nd of February, 1899, and which declared :

> That, in the opinion of this board, the Dominion government should take into consideration the question of opening up this most important avenue of communication with the seaboard, and that, in connection with the canal system of this country, they should complete the shortest and most speedy route to the upper lakes by building an independent railway to operate in connection with vessels from Toronto, which is the most suitable harbour on Lake Ontario, and the nearest and most suitable harbour or harbours for the purpose upon the Georgian Bay, as a complement to the St. Lawrence canal system.

On June 1, 1899, the Toronto Board of Trade adopted unanimously the recommendation respecting the means to be adopted to create more Canadian bottoms on our lakes. Among the means which could best accomplish this object was the construction of

> A line of railway to be owned and controlled by the government, built across the portage to Georgian Bay, which is the natural receptacle of the grain of the United States as well as of western Canada, the ports of which are able to accommodate the largest vessels which traverse the upper lakes, but which cannot get in to Lake Ontario, thus making a short and speedy route to Chicago, Duluth and Fort William, with opportunities for return cargo, especially of manufactured products for the Canadian North-west. By this project centres of population, including points as far east as the maritime provinces, Quebec, Montreal and Toronto, become interested in a common aim to build up our lake marine and create an interprovincial marine trade.

I draw attention to these conclusions of the Toronto Board of Trade to emphasize the point, that in all the discussions which have taken place so far, this line of railway was not considered as a local enterprise but as merely a link, and a comparatively short link in the chain of communication between the head of Lake Superior and the city of Quebec.

When the matter was up for consideration twelve months ago, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who was deeply interested in this subject, made some remarks on the transportation question, introduced by the resolution of my hon. friend the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), and in the course of remarks made on the 28th March last, the hon. member for North Simcoe said :

> If this railway were built, the chain would be complete, and thus the natural channel through which this trade should go would be perfected, and the lower lakes, rivers and canals would be successfully joined with the upper lakes and canals.

The hon. member then went on to give statements showing the distances by the various routes now adopted between the head of Lake Superior and the ports of Montreal and Quebec, but I need not weary the committee by giving these tables of distances, as they can be found in the 'Hansard' of March 28th last. He concluded by making the statement that ' there seems to be no room for doubt that the route via Collingwood and Toronto is of all the cheapest and best.' But this route of course cannot be made available except by the construction of this air line for the purpose of joining together the ports of Collingwood and Toronto.

Now, the hon. member who represented Kent in the last parliament (Mr. Campbell), who is one of the promoters of this Bill, joined in that discussion twelve months ago and had something to say as to the advantages which he thought would result, not only to the producers of the west and the North-west, but also to the people of the province of Ontario, if this railway were constructed and this route established. Speaking on the same day as the hon. member for North Simcoe, the 28th March last, Mr. Campbell said :

> I am strongly of opinion that the great highway from the west should be by way of the

Georgian Bay and Toronto. It is over 300 miles shorter than the route by the Welland canal. It is the shortest possible route to the seaboard, and it can be constructed at reasonable expense, as compared with the other routes. . . . . I say that if this route were adopted and a highway made from the city of Toronto to Georgian Bay, you would at once afford a competing line which would compel all the railways to reduce their freights, and thus you would add enormously to the value of the produce of the rest of Ontario.

I am sure that in view of the last statement which I have read, and which gives the opinion of the hon. member who represented the county of Kent in the last parliament, and which is the opinion generally entertained by those who have given this matter any serious consideration—in view of the fact that this route would become a successful competitor with the railway lines now in existence and result in the diminution of freight charges between the west and the sea board, it is surely not unreasonable to ask, lest any of these railways might become possessed of this route or charter, that a provision, such as I have suggested, should be embodied in this Bill. It is surely not unreasonable that the government should have the right at any time to take this road, if they should find that it was not serving the purposes for which the charter was given, so that the advantage of active competition with the railways might be afforded, not only to those exporting the produce of Canada, but also to those bringing goods into Canada.

The then hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) made this further statement:

I contend that the government should carefully look into this matter before they finally decide. I believe that the route from Toronto to Georgian Bay, which is over 300 miles shorter than via the Welland canal, will confer upon the people of this country enormous advantages that will greatly enhance the value of all the produce raised in the province of Ontario.

I need not take up the time of the committee at greater length on the importance of this link being retained by the government in the public interest. It is a matter of the most vital importance—if the hopes and expectations we all have as to the enormous development which will take place in the traffic of this country are to be realized—that this most important link in the most direct route of transportation between the North-west and the seaboard should be in the hands of the people of Canada for all time to come. If this clause is not inserted and if bonuses are given to this road, we may find that practically little or nothing will be done. Indeed, the charter may be acquired by one of the roads already in existence, with which this new road would compete, and thus the advantages of the establishment of this further line of transportation would be entirely lost.

Speaking for myself, I think that the clause, as amended, is one which ought to meet with the approval of the committee. It differs from the clause submitted last year in this respect, that it proposes to take over the entire enterprise, not the railway and appurtenances alone, but the railway and whatever vessels are connected with it in the navigation of the great lakes. It is surely not unreasonable to ask that if the government of the day gives a substantial bonus to assist in the construction of this railway, the amount of the bonus should be deducted from the amount payable by the government, should it decide to take over the road.

I therefore beg to move that the following clause be added to the Bill:

His Majesty shall have the right at any time to take over the undertaking, property rights and franchises of the company, and for that purpose the provisions of the Expropriation Act shall apply.

From any valuation placed upon such property so taken there shall be deducted on payment the amount of any bonus or subsidy paid by the government of Canada to the company towards the construction of such line of railway or any part thereof.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The question involved in the motion of the hon. gentleman was thoroughly threshed out before the Railway Committee, and I need not say that there was considerable diversity of opinion, first, as to whether the clause of this character at all should be introduced, and next, as to what its nature should be.

In the course of that discussion I expressed a certain view and framed an amendment embodying that view, and that amendment, which I proposed to the committee, is identical with that which the hon. gentleman has just moved. But it did not meet with the approval of the committee, and hence the hon. gentleman has felt it necessary to move it here. The question that is before the committee, it seems to me, is not a very large question, viewed from the standpoint of the promoters, nor is it one which, so far as I am capable of forming an opinion on the subject, ought in the slightest degree to militate against the promotion of the undertaking. I cannot conceive why any one who is satisfied that this enterprise had merit in it which would justify him in investing his means in it should hesitate to do so because this clause, if adopted by the committee, was found in the Bill. The first portion of the clause is little more than a declaration or notice that parliament may do, in respect of this particular undertaking what, unquestionably, it can do, without incorporating the clause in the incorporating Bill, in respect of any undertaking that may be set on foot through our legislation. Parliament, undoubtedly, as I view the law and the powers of parliament, can declare in favour of the expropriation of any property that it is deemed necessary in the public interest to possess, even though the company

which may have constructed that work and may have received its charter from this parliament did not take its charter with any express provision to that effect contained in it. The committee thought, or a number of the members of the committee thought, it would be desirable to give the notice, and I could see no objection to such notice being given, because it would simply convey to the promoters and to those investors who might connect themselves with the enterprise that this parliament has this power, which, otherwise, they might not be aware of. I do not consider that portion of the clause the important portion, but rather the second portion of it. This second part, as hon. members will see, provides that, in the event of parliament expropriating, the amount paid shall be subject to reduction by the amount of any subsidy or aid which may be given by this parliament to assist the enterprise. Now, it seems to me that practically the sole question for this committee to consider is whether or not it would be a reasonable or appropriate clause to insert in the Bill or a proper condition to impose. Will any person hesitate to say that it would be a proper condition ? I question if there is a doubt in the mind of any one in this House that, if we grant a subsidy to this road, and if the enterprise is of the importance which hon. gentleman, on both sides apparently, declare it to be—though I have not seen much evidence to convince me of that, but assuming that to be the case—and for that reason it was decided to acquire it, it would be proper to deduct from the value paid for the undertaking the amount of any subsidy granted by this parliament. I am prepared, for one, and so declared myself in this committee, to vote for this amendment. I think it can do no harm to anybody. I cannot see why any one should think it ought to militate at all against the succeseful promotion of the enterprise. What reason could any person have for refusing to go into this enterprise under such conditions ? If they were going in merely for the purpose of getting the bonus as a benefit to be retained by them even though the property were expropriated, I can imagine they would hesitate. But we will not assume that that motive would inspire anybody who would put his money into the undertaking. These are my views as expressed in the committee and as still entertained, and I am prepared to vote for the amendment the hon. gentleman has moved.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (North Victoria). I take the liberty of asking the attention of the Minister of Railways to an amendment to the amendment which I shall move. It is not necessary that we should here enter into a discussion of the merits or demerits of this road. But, if the government purposes taking over this road or any road to the Georgian Bay, I would respectfully submit that a road leading to the harbour of Midland, which is a much better harbour than that of Collingwood, and which would not require the expenditure of any public money upon it in order to fit it to receive the largest vessels, would be much preferable to one to Collingwood. More than that, the route to Midland could be extended to connect with the magnificent harbour of Parry Sound ; and as a grain route for the city of Toronto, I am satisfied it would be infinitely better than one from Collingwood—not that I would wish to draw these issues in here, but they have already been introduced and that is my reason for mentioning the matter. Still further, if the government is ever going to take over this road, by running to Midland and on to Parry Sound, there would be the beginning of a great national system of railways to the North-west which has been mentioned by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). The government would have at its disposal, from Toronto to Parry Sound, a road in full running order, which would save the construction of another road in case the one to Collingwood was built. However, I mention this in passing. The amendment I propose, seconded by Mr. McCormick, is as follows :

> That after the word ' thereof ' in the amendment there be inserted the following : 'And there shall be further deducted on payment the amount of any bonus or subsidy paid by any municipality to the said company, which amount shall be refunded to the municipality.'

Mr. DAVIS. What have we to do with the bonuses voted by municipalities.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis), that a former Liberal leader was not above endeavouring to influence the voters, on one occasion, by holding out the inducement to them, that, if they returned his party to power, not only would a bonus so voted on roads taken over by the government be refunded, but the question of repaying to the municipalities all the subsidies paid by them whether the government took over the roads or not would be taken up. If a municipality has voted a large sum of money—as many of them have done—in order that they might have competition, and subsequently, by amalgamation, the competition for which the money was voted has been denied or done away with, that municipality is certainly entitled to a redress of the grievance under which it labours. It is not necessary that anything further should be said on this subject.

Mr. MACLEAN. As regards these two amendments, I am glad to hear the Minister of Railways and Canals say he will accept that one proposed by the member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). It was discussed in committee, and I believe that while it was voted down there, if we had had the support of the Minister of Railways

at the second reading we would have got it through. I hope under any case it will be put through to-day. In connection with the remarks made here to-day by the Minister of Railways, and already made before the committee, I wish to inform the House, and to inform his colleague, the Minister of Public Works, that somehow the minister does not think much of this proposition. Then, why is all this money being spent on Collingwood harbour ? Surely that harbour is to be improved at the public expense for a definite purpose, and if it is not in connection with a railway complementary of the canal system of this country, for what purpose is the money being spent ? I cannot see. Now, I suppose this road, or a similar road, is an important link in the railway and water transportation of this country. I am surprised to hear the minister say, as he has said on two occasions, that he does not think much of this proposition. While I will vote for the amendment, I must take the opportunity to say that I think the government is making a great mistake in allowing this charter to be taken up by a private corporation. As I argued in the Railway Committee, and as I will argue now, the government should expropriate the Grand Trunk Railway between Toronto and Collingwood, and nationalize a road between Toronto and some harbour on the Georgian Bay—Midland, probably, or Collingwood. But, certainly they could find a harbour, and then they could take over the better portion of the Grand Trunk Railway, double track it, and extend it on to Parry Sound and Sudbury, by North Bay on to Hudson Bay, in connection with the system of the Ontario government. But here is a proposition to get this road, which is the best paying road in Canada, and it could be acquired for what will be given in the way of bonuses to this country. If the government would pursue the policy they have declared of doing great things in connection with the canals of this country, they would not rest a moment until they did have a national railway from the Georgian Bay to Lake Ontario, and connecting with the railway and river system of this country. I am surprised that this opportunity is to be let pass, as many others have been, without the government getting a substantial advantage to the country. As regards the proposal of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes), I think it is objectionable to interfere on behalf of municipalities. I think municipalities ought to make their own contracts when they vote their own money to railways.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. Why not this parliament as well ?

Mr. MACLEAN. This parliament is doing it now. I know the hon. gentleman will say : Why not make a provision in the Subsidy Bill ? We have not made sufficient provision in the past in these subsidy contracts. These subsidy contracts are not stringent enough. If there are to be any more subsidies in this country, I hope the contracts will be much more stringent than they are at the present time

Mr. CALVERT. I am sorry my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Cowan) is not here to discuss this Bill, as he is in charge of it; but, unfortunately, he is not able to do so to-day. I am a little surprised at the attitude of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) and the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), representing the interests of the city of Toronto, who have endeavoured to place an amendment in this Bill with a view of killing it. Now, the city council of Toronto passed a resolution last year when this Bill was under discussion, offering their assistance if the government of Canada would grant a charter to a line connecting Collingwood with Toronto. They wished to have an independent railway from Collingwood to Toronto, a railway that would bring grain from the west through by the city of Toronto. Now this company proposes to put a large number of vessels on the lakes, they propose to put eight large vessels drawing some 20 feet of water on the upper lakes. These vessels will cost $1,540,000. Then, they propose to put thirty-two vessels on the St. Lawrence with 14 feet draught, that will cost $3,000,000, or $80,000 each. Now, I always like to follow my leader, the Minister of Railways and Canals, and I would like to ask this question of my hon. friend : Providing this government grants bonuses at all, gives any money to the construction of this railway, and they retain the power of taking it back, what is going to become of the large expenditure in connection with these vessels? As I understand it, this parliament has never granted any money towards the construction of vessels, you simply pay a certain amount of money to vessels that do a certain work for the country, but nothing for the construction of vessels, and these vessels, which are estimated to cost nearly $5,000,000, will simply be in the hands of the promoters.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). No, the clauses provides that they shall be taken over with the railway.

Mr. CALVERT. The clause provides you shall take over these vessels at what they cost. It simply provides that if the road is taken over, the amount of money granted by the government shall be deducted. But, you do not grant any money towards building the vessels, and are you going to take the vessels over for what they cost ?

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). They will be taken over at what the arbitrators decide.

Mr. CALVERT. If you propose to take them over for what they cost, these men will be placed in the position that they will have the vessels on their hands, providing that clause is put in. Can these people go to the money markets of the world and place their bonds and secure money for the construction of that road? We must also remember that under the policy of this government, on any money that is paid over to the railway companies, they pay 3 per cent interest; so that, we are not actually giving away money, they have not asked for any money yet, but if they do, the policy of the government is that they shall pay 3 per cent on that money. Now, the government can borrow money at less than 3 per cent, and they charge the railway company 3 per cent on all the money they receive from the government; so that is not a very bad investment.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). How is the government going to get 3 per cent from the railway companies? Your proposition is, that if the government subsidized this railway, the government will get 3 per cent in return on the subsidy. Who from, and under what clause?

Mr. CALVERT. Under the Railway Act, as I understand it. In the Subsidy Act, where the money is paid over to the company, they have got to agree before they get the money to pay 3 per cent; the 3 per per cent is taken out of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Calvert) is quite correct, because the subsidy regulations as now framed calls for 3 per cent.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Will the hon. member for South Norfolk tell this House whether the country has received 3 per cent on all bonuses?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I did not say that, I was only supporting the hon. gentleman's contention that 3 per cent is charged. If you look at the Subsidy Act you will find that it has been changed.

Mr. CALVERT. Such being the case, why should we single out this railway when you are making a general Act? I am in favour of making a general Act dealing with all railways alike, and I think it is unfair to the promoters of this Bill. This Bill passed this House last year, it has passed the committee this year, we have already voted down a resolution proposed by the minister to-day, and I think it will be most unfair to the promoters of this Bill to have anything of that kind placed in it. As I said, this is a strong company, they have a good directorate, men of means, and they propose to build a railway double-tracked, and to place a large number of vessels at both ends, so the enterprise will be one of immense importance to the people of this country. In the interest of the promoters, I would hope that the House would not vote for the amendment, but would vote to pass the Bill as it passed the committee the other day.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). Mr. Chairman, I want to define my position upon this Bill and I will do it as briefly as possible. I do not propose to commence voting for legislation not according to my understanding of the lines we have been pursuing in the Railway Committee and in the House in times past. I believe that either one of these amendments will be a departure from the well-understood principles that we have hitherto followed. This is simply, as I understand it, a private Bill for a private railway.

Mr. CLARKE. Not at all.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. According to my understanding it is. It has been introduced and passed so far entirely as a private Bill. I think I am quite right and I propose to try to be logical. If, at any future time the government see fit, whichever party may be in power, and it becomes a public matter to adopt the policy which has been proposed, they must stand or fall upon that policy. In the general Railway Act last year, or the year before, we had quite extensive alterations when the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) revised it and put in a number of new clauses that were in line with the policy of the government. If the government at the commencement of the session had made the announcement that they proposed to amend the Railway Act in this direction and apply the amendment to all the Bills that should be passed, there would be more logic in the proposition. I have always endeavoured, and I do not propose to change now, to legislate on legislative principles without departing from those in any special case. I say that the Railway Committee, having passed this Bill, which was introduced as a private Bill, I propose to vote against both of these amendments. I propose to vote against the amendment of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) because municipalities, if they give bonuses to this road, ought to be allowed to give them on such conditions as they please, as we have no jurisdiction over them. We are asked to say that a municipality cannot give a bonus in spite of this. If we pass the amendment to the amendment, it will be equivalent to our saying that we will take it out of the power of the municipality to give a bonus without any reference to getting it back at all. I think the municipal councils are quite competent to take care

of themselves, and that they will not thank us for trying to tie their hands before the event or before they come to consider the question of the bonus. As to the amendment, if it is proposed to change the general Railway Act and apply expropriation, we can then consider the question, but I do not propose, as far as I am concerned, to vote to put this condition in any one particular Bill. I will say, in passing, now, though perhaps it might be more properly said afterwards, that I do not think this railway is entitled to a subsidy from the government, but that is a matter that we must deal with at the proper time. We neither should assume that it will get a bonus, or not get one, because that is a matter upon which the government will take the responsibility at the proper time. Assuming that something is going to happen that we do not know will happen is something that we have no right to do in considering legislation of this kind. I have never legislated nor agreed to legislate in that way, and I do not propose to commence to-day. We can consider the question of the application of the expropriation power to Bills of this kind at the proper time. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) has introduced a Bill under which this question may be discussed. This Bill is nothing more nor less than a private Bill. Objections may be taken to the charter if any hon. gentleman wants to object to it, such as that the road is not necessary because it is paralleling an existing road, but, so far, we have never applied that principle and there is no objection to this Bill on that score.

Mr. CLARKE. If this had been an ordinary private Bill granting permission to construct a road 70 miles long from one point to another in a territory already served by two railways, would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale) vote for the charter ?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. As a rule, I will vote for a railway charter where the promoters ask for no public aid, but where they will undertake to construct the road as a commercial undertaking, unless it is interfering with some road under construction.

Mr. CLARKE. There are two lines under construction.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Suppose there are three. The only circumstances upon which we object to a charter are when there is one road authorized already that is under construction and the time is not up. My view is that we should legislate on legislative principles. If we do not we become personal. If we become personal, or party, in regard to private legislation, then, God help this House. The only logical and consistent way is to treat all individuals under similar circumstances alike. That I have endeavoured to do in the past and I propose to do in the future.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). Mr. Speaker, I suppose that ordinarily I ought to oppose the Bill altogether, because it seems to me that there is only one point where grain ought to be transhipped to be sent down the St. Lawrence. However, I do not take so narrow a view as that in discussing the Bill which is now before the House. I am not opposing the Bill, but I am opposed to both of these amendments that have been presented to the House. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) has said that the first part of the amendment is not at all necessary, because parliament has at all times the right to expropriate undertakings of this kind. Then, there only remains the question of the latter part of the amendment. I am speaking of the amendment of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), and that is providing that upon expropriation the amount of the subsidy is to be deducted. This amendment provides for the expropriation by the government of the whole undertaking. I do not want to put it in the power of the government to make an expropriation such as this amendement contemplates. If parliament has such power, or ever should choose to exercise that power, it will be a matter which should receive the most careful consideration of the House . If any one should propose the expropriation of the vessels, such as the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Calvert) spoke of, as being the intention of this company to build for service on the upper lakes and to carry grain to Montreal, I think that will be a new departure, so far as government works are concerned, that will hardly meet the approbation of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). At least I hardly think so. It will be going a great deal farther than mere nationalizing the railway system of this country. I hope the government will not enter into competition with the private owners of vessel property by seeking to carry grain from the west to the east. I think this can be better done by private enterprise than by the government. Whatever may be said in reference to railways, telegraph lines, the telephone system, and similar enterprises, I do not think the argument applies to the government ownership of vessel property. Then, there is another thing. It strikes me as one of the strongest possible arguments that it is unfair discrimination against this company that such a clause should be put into their Bill. This is unquestionably a private Bill in reference to a company just such as we are incorporating all the time, and the logic of such an argument is irresistible. In view of the legislation which has heretofore been adopted by this House, I do not see what good reason can be given for incorporating in this Bill a clause which has not been incorporated in any other Bill in the past, and which it is not proposed to incorporate in any Bill in the future.

Mr. COCHRANE. Did not the company agree to accept this clause last year if we would pass the Bill ?

Mr. COWAN. No.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes.

Mr. BRITTON. The company which was seeking incorporation certainly agreed to accept the clause at that time. They were forced into a corner and they wanted to get their Bill through, but notwithstanding their willingness to make the concession the Railway Committee would not allow the Bill to pass. I have no quarrel with the promoters for accepting that clause last year, but I agree with the hon. member for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale), that we should not force such a clause into this charter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). This railway is declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, and I am inclined to agree with the view of the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) that in respect to such works it would be desirable to pass a general law enabling the government of Canada to expropriate them.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. That is a different question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think it is a different question, and for this reason. You must begin at some time or other with a provision of this kind and there would be exactly the same reason against a general law that there is against this. If we are to start with the assumption that from henceforth the amendment which is proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) shall be applied to all railways, then we must adopt that principle if we insert the clause in this Bill. I do not see any injustice in beginning with this company any more than beginning with any other company. I do not see any more injustice in doing this (provided we make it a principle which shall guide us in the future) than there would be injustice in passing a general Act; because any company coming after the general Act had been passed would be in the same position as this company and as all future companies under the principle I have indicated. I do not however agree with the terms of the amendment, and I do not agree with the views of the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) with regard to the justice of this amendment. The latter part of the amendment is expressed in this way :

> From any valuation placed upon the said property so taken shall be deducted in payment the amount of any bonus or subsidy by the government of Canada to the company towards the construction of any such line of railway or any part thereof.

The objection I have to the amendment, and the objection I have to the argument of the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) is this : that while it might be in some cases perfectly proper to deduct the subsidy, it does not seem to me that in all cases it would be proper to do so. This amendment refers to the Expropriation Act. We all know the basis on which you work out the value of an undertaking under the Expropriation Act. You do not work it out on the basis of what it cost the persons who have constructed the undertaking; you work it out upon the basis of what the property is worth at the time of its expropriation. The rule in England, and I think in this country, is to add about 10 per cent to that for the reason that the property is taken against the will of the owner. Suppose this property at the time it is to be expropriated should be worth only half of what it had cost to the persons who had constructed it ; it does not seem to me that it would be a just thing to deduct the amount of the subsidy in a case of that kind. On the other hand if the property should be worth immensely more than it cost to construct it, it might be a very proper thing indeed, that the government in taking this road back should deduct the amount of the subsidy. The question came up incidentally in the discussion in respect to the value of the Drummond County Railway. That was not a case of expropriation, but it was a case in which the government were taking over a railway at a fixed price. The view I expressed then and to which I still adhere, is that if you take into consideration as a basis of your purchase the actual cost to the owner, then it is a most proper thing that you should deduct the subsidy after allowing interest or a reasonable advance to the person whose property you are taking. I took the view then, and I take it now that if you are dealing simply with the value of the property it does not seem to me that it would be in all cases a proper thing to deduct the amount of the subsidy, and indeed in some cases if you do so it might work a very great injustice to the owners of the road. For that reason I would not feel inclined to agree with the latter portion of the amendment, while I am in accord with the views expressed by the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair), and by the hon. member (Mr. Clarke) with regard to the first part of it. It may be there is some fallacy in the view I have expressed with regard to expropriation proceedings, and I should be glad if my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) would point out any error in that respect.

Mr. T. S. SPOULE (East Grey). The hon. gentleman from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) objects to this clause because this is a private Bill, and because we have not done this heretofore. His reasons do not hold good in my opinion. We can never commence too soon to do a right thing and it is never too late to mend a bad principle. If we believe that this is a proper thing to do,

then the fact that we have no precedent for it should not deter us. England has been carrying out the same principle for years. It is provided in England that every large vessel which is built according to the Admiralty requirements and which gets governmental subsidies shall be available to be taken over by the government at a certain valuation to be agreed upon in case of war. In this case we provided that this railway shall be taken over in the event of some important national necessity, and as we propose to give a subsidy in this case——

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). No, we do not.

Mr. SPROULE. If there is no subsidy given to this road, then the clause does not apply at all.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). It does not have to apply. No harm is done.

Mr. SPROULE. This proposed amendment certainly presumes that we will give a subsidy.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Not necessarily.

Mr. SPROULE. It certainly does or else there is no sense in the amendment. Of course the first part of the clause declares our right to expropriate, and the Minister of Railways tells us that we have that right already, but the second part says we shall deduct the subsidy if we take over the road, and how can we deduct the subsidy if none is given. I repeat that the principle embodied in this amendment has been in force in England for half a century or more, in connection with the taking over of merchant vessels in case of war. These vessels are owned and built by private corporations and there is no difference between attacking a private corporation for the national need in England and attacking private corporation in case of national necessity here. The argument of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) consequently does not hold good. I am not in favour of the amendment to the amendment which proposes to deduct municipal bonuses. A municipality in giving a bonus gives it for the purpose of securing a railway for carrying trade to and from the locality, and when the railway is built the local need for which it pays the subsidy is satisfied and is never taken away. It is only given by the people in the locality, who can always use this local convenience, and the cost of which is partly supplied by themselves. In that event I do not think there are just grounds why the municipality should ask for the money to be paid back. In addition to that, when a municipality gives a bonus, it costs nearly half of it to get the bonus carried; and thus a large part of it is practically lost and does not inure to the advantage of the railway. But in this case, every person in the country contributes a portion of the cost of the railway, both those who use the railway and those who do not. Therefore, when there is a national need that the railway should be taken under the control of the government, I can see no reason why the amount of the purchase price should not be reduced by the amount of the bonus given. The only reason is that stated by the leader of the opposition, which I confess has always been to my mind an argument against this principle. It was this. Suppose we give a subsidy to a private corporation, which goes on and builds the railway, and afterwards transfers it to innocent purchasers. The road runs down in the meantime until it becomes worth less than the original subsidy; so that if the government took it at a valuation, and deducted the amount of the subsidy, the innocent holder would have nothing. It seems to me that the proposal of the hon. leader of the opposition is a very good one for safeguarding the interests of the innocent holders—that the subsidy should be deducted only when the value of the property exceeds the actual cost. That could only be when it would become a matter of national importance that the government should take the railway under its control. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) says this is only a private corporation. There is no doubt that it is, and yet nobody would have given a charter to a private corporation to compete with others occupying the same ground, but for the national need. There are two private corporations occupying the same ground to-day; and yet we are giving this company this charter because this road is believed to be a part of a great highway of commerce that will be of national importance, not only to Canada but to the United States as well; because it is hoped it will attract a large part of the commerce of the United States. This road will serve not only the port of Collingwood, but any other ports on the Georgian Bay. At the present time there is a very important harbour being constructed at Meaford, and it has a sufficient depth of water to admit the largest vessels. Then, they have built a large elevator there for the purpose of securing a share of the trade of the upper lakes. Collingwood is only twenty-two miles from Meaford, and the road between the two places is almost as level as a floor. If this road becomes the national highway which we think it is destined to become, Meaford will be able to take advantage of it as well as Collingwood. It becomes the more important on that account, because it will be fed not simply by one good harbour, but by two. I think we should provide that when it becomes necessary in the interest of the country to take the road over, the government should not be obliged to pay the money which the country has put in to help to build it. That would be paying the money twice. For these reasons I am in favour of the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret that I cannot agree with the last speaker in favouring this amendment. I opposed it in the Railway Committee, and I intend to oppose it here, for two reasons : first of all, for the reason which has been very lucidly stated by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), that this is exceptional legislation, and if it is a sound principle to adopt, it should be adopted in a general way. I do not think it is a sufficient answer to say that we must make a beginning, and that we might as well begin here as anywhere else. We might begin to-day by applying the principle to this Bill, and to-morrow we might discuss the matter more thoroughly and come to the conclusion that it is, as I hold it to be, an unsound principle. So that one day we would have a Bill with this provision, and the next day we would have one in which it was not contained.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not a fact that the hon. gentleman supported this principle in the Bill of last year ?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no recollection of having supported any such proposition, and if I did, that is no reason why I should support it now. On the contrary, I am always open to conviction. Supposing the proposition to deduct subsidies were proposed in a general Bill, there would be a great deal to be said on both sides of the question; the argument does not all lie on the one side. The point is this. When the government conclude to give a bonus for the construction of a railway, why do they do so? They do it in general, I believe, because they know that the dividends likely to arise from operation of the railway will not be sufficient to induce private capital to invest in the enterprise. In other words, the capital put in, together with the bonus, does not create a property as valuable as the bonus and the capital combined, and perhaps only creates one worth as much as the private capital put into it. I have in my mind a railway in the province of Nova Scotia into which the Dominion and provincial governments put subsidies amounting to about $500,000, and private capitalists put nearly $1,000,000, and they created a property which, if the government desired to take it over, would probably have been valued at less than $1,000,000—perhaps at $600,000 or $700,000. The result of such a provision in that case would be that private individuals would be asked to construct a property for the benefit of the whole country, and lose $400,000 or $500,000 of their own money in the effort to do so. I do not believe that is a right or equitable result, and I do not believe that the proposition applied as a general principle would be likely to operate as the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) supposes that it would. Instead of being any relief to the poor people who are sweating and groaning under the fardels which they have to bear in this matter of railway construction, it might increase their burdens, by making it more difficult to construct railways in this country. It is perhaps not necessary to go into the discussion of that subject at present; but I say it is not a sound principle, capable of application in every case, to deduct the bonus from the value of the property. It would be confiscating the property, and compelling private individuals to construct railways for the benefit of the country at large. In this particular case, it is absolutely indefensible, because it is proposed to make it an exception, instead of introducing the principle as a general one applicable to every one alike.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not the hon. gentleman at the present time advocating the taking over by the government of a provincial railway in Nova Scotia, and giving back to the province the bonuses given to it by the provincial government ? It is the same principle.

Mr. RUSSELL. When did I advocate that?

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). If we could get from the right hon. leader of the House a declaration as to whether he would be willing to accept, as a government measure, the Bill which I introduced this afternoon, and which, I gather from the remarks of the Minister of Railways, would have that hon. gentleman's support, this discussion might end here. The Bill I have introduced merely provides for the expropriation of any railway, when parliament decides that its expropriation is in the interests of the country, and provides further for the deduction of the government bonuses from the expropriation price, as proposed by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke).

I want to say a word with reference to the contention of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) and the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell), that we would, if we should adopt this amendment, be creating a precedent. Hon. gentlemen will remember how frequently that argument was used in the last two or three sessions.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not use the argument that you would be using any precedent. I am of the opinion that we would not and that it would not be observed as a precedent.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not use that argument, but the argument was generally used that it would be unfair——

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I have no desire to misrepresent any one, but it was generally contended that it would be unfair to single out any particular company for the application of this provision, and that the proper way was to bring this up in the House of Commons as a general Act. I

have a good deal of sympathy with that view, and it was in order to get a declaration from the House on the general principle that I introduced the Bill I did this afternoon. There may be some provisions in that Bill which the House may not think desirable, and I would be prepared to accept any amendment that would render it more workable.

With regard to the establishment of a precedent, this would not have the effect, because a precedent has already been established. In 1844, in the parliament of Great Britain, Mr. Gladstone introduced an Act, which is now in the statutes, containing just such a provision as the one proposed, namely, that at any time parliament may expropriate any railway.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I did not argue for one moment that we could not pass a general law, and the hon. gentleman is misrepresenting me.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I am not making the slightest reference to the hon. gentleman at all. My observations are purely of a general character. I am saying that in 1844 a precedent was established in the British parliament. Also in the first railway charter which ever passed the parliament of Canada the Act incorporating the proprietors of the Champlain and St. Lawrence Railway, there is a provision for government expropriation at any time, on paying to the proprietors the amount paid on their shares, plus 20 per cent. In the charter of the Grand Trunk Railway there is also a clause providing for expropriation, so that if the government desired to take over the Grand Trunk Railway, from Collingwood down, we have the power to do so under the charter of that company itself. Then, in the Act incorporating the Great Western Company, originally known as the London and Gore Railway Company, there is just such a clause providing for expropriation. And if hon. gentlemen choose to look through the statutes, they will find many railway charters giving this power of expropriation.

We are asked, why single out this company to begin with ? Well, there is no desire on the part of any one to single out this particular company. It is promoted by a gentleman who has always been deservedly popular in this House and generally respected, and it is particularly painful to me to have to offer any opposition at all, because of my desire to agree with and assist that hon. gentleman. But we have to begin somewhere, and is not the present just as good a time as any other ?

I agree with the Minister of Railways that if this parliament, or any municipality or province, contributes to a railway enterprise, and the people desire to take that road over for its own benefit, the subsidy paid should be deducted from the price awarded. Why should we hand over the subsidy itself ? In giving a company the privilege to build a railway, we confer a valuable franchise, and if in addition we give a bonus, why should the people not be returned that bonus when taking over the railway.

Mr. COWAN. The government have not given bonuses to this road, and have ample power to expropriate any time they think fit. The hon. gentleman wants to expropriate before any bonuses are granted.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). The Minister of Railways explained that point fully in the committee. He showed that there was no power in the general Railway Act, or even in the Expropriation Act, to deduct the government bonus. Parliament, of course, can exercise the right of eminent domain and expropriate anything, but we want to serve notice on all companies from this time out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say that.

Mr RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Well, some one used that argument. I repeat that it would be desirable we should serve notice that from this time forth parliament may expropriate any railway it may deem in the interests of Canada to take over. Then the men who put money into these enterprises will know that such a provision exists. They may not stop to think that parliament is supreme, and may exercise its right of eminent domain, but when put in a general Bill, such as the one I propose, they cannot plead ignorance. Unless, however, we have the promise that the Bill I propose will pass this session, we ought to insist on the clause suggested being put into this particular measure.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have not heard any reason advanced why this should be made an exceptional case. Of course, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) said that this was not an ordinary road, but I do not think that any member of this House will admit that there is anything in that statement. During the past few years we have granted a great many charters very much more extraordinary, and they met with no particular opposition. What I want to point out is that some years ago, in order that we might have unanimity with regard to Bills of this kind, a committee was appointed, and a model Bill was adopted, and this measure is strictly along the lines of that model Bill. We have given charters in the past with very much wider and more extraordinary powers. But, for the sake of having uniformity, the most experienceed men in these matters got together and framed a model Bill ; and that model Bill has been pretty closely stuck to, except in cases where some good reason was shown for variation. In this case, I am safe in saying, no reason at all has

been given. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) says that this is an important railway, and that the Toronto Board of Trade has had the subject before it. I will admit that the members of the board of trade have been squabbling about this road for a great many years. But, we have not found these members of the board of trade, nor the citizens of Toronto, coming forward to put a dollar into this enterprise. If it is such an important and extraordinary enterprise, if it is going to do such a tremendous trade, it is strange that these men who are investing money and raising money in other countries for railway enterprises, have not found it of advantage to themselves or the country to make or promote investment in it. The fact is, we had a little local squabble in Toronto. But we have had before the committee, Bill after Bill of a hundred times as much importance as this, we have had such Bills go through every session, and not a word along the lines of the proposed amendment. I can only come to one conclusion—that there is thought to be a special effort now to move a seductive looking amendment. I am prepared to say that there may not be something in the principle or policy involved in the amendment; but, I think that no one who seriously desired the future prosperity of the country would be able to announce off-hand whether he favoured the principle of that amendment or not. As has been ably pointed out by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell), it is a question whether this, instead of being a movement in the public interest, if seriously and closely examined, may not be found to involve a most mistaken policy. I believe that what we want in this country is the development of our resources; we want people with capital, whether Canadians or outsiders, to invest in railway enterprises under proper conditions. We have had a great deal of experience in these matters, and, as a result of that experience, we adopted a model Bill. Subject to the conditions that our experience has shown to be necessary, we should give every encouragement we can to railway enterprises. If the time ever comes, after we have granted a charter in the ordinary manner, when the parties who have the charter appeal for a subsidy, or bonus or assistance, then is the time for any hon. member to declare on what conditions it is thought wise to give that assistance. It has been pointed out that charters have been granted in the past containing conditions of expropriation. But, when the model Bill was framed, such a condition was left out, because it was well known that it was unnecessary, as parliament has the power to expropriate these enterprises at any time desired; and, by putting in such clauses, you only handicap parliament, and, perhaps, injure the public interest. I think it is about time that the members of this House should recognize that the people of the country want the development of this country's resources, and that they feel the need of railways for that purpose. Let us remove, in any proper way we can, any burden under which the people unjustly suffer, but, for the mere advancement of a seductive idea which, it may be, may work up to our practical disadvantage, let us not impose conditions which are different from those we have had, or which are to be found in other countries. I gather from the remarks of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), that if he were asked by a capitalist for his advice as a lawyer as to investing in an enterprise of this kind, he would say that this charter seemed to contain some unusual legislation, which might, as some members say, be harmless, but, on the whole, it would be better for the capitalist to have nothing to do with the matter. That is in accordance with the experience of every one who has tried to raise money upon the debentures or stock of any company such as this, whether chartered by the provincial or Dominion parliament. So, I do not see that any reasonable argument has been advanced why this Bill should be treated differently from any other Bill considered in this House. I am not prepared to say that the principle involved in the amendment is not a good thing, but it is one that should be most carefully considered before we adopt it, and, if it is deemed a wise policy, it should be adopted as a general policy and one applying to all roads. As to the enterprise itself, I do not think it is necessary to say anything. There are differences of opinion. If the parties interested in the district affected, and in the enterprise, can raise the money to develop that trade, it would be a great advantage to the city of Toronto, and, perhaps, a great advantage to the western country in giving a competing route for grain. If it is possible that this enterprise could be carried out, I say, in the name of all common sense, let us give these people the best possible Bill, and thus place them in a favourable position for floating the enterprise.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to say, for the sake of clearness, that if I thought a stipulation of this kind would handicap any railway, I would have a different opinion from that which I entertain. I do not see how it could, from any possible standpoint, handicap this railway or any other, because the valuation which is to be placed upon the road must be the full valuation of the road, including and taking into consideration its prospects in the future. Further than that, the valuation which would be placed upon the road for expropriation would be about 10 per cent more than its actual value if the ordinary rules of expropriation were carried out.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) a question?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). I would like to ask whether his opinion as a lawyer, is that the amendment would apply to the railway only or to the whole scheme, including the steamboats ?

Mr. GOURLEY. In the committee, we agreed that it should apply to both.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). I say, on the face of it, that it does not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Speaking offhand, I should say all the property was included, because it uses the words 'undertaking and property.'

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). The hon. gentleman will see that that is one of the difficulties. I am sure that no two lawyers in the House would agree upon the subject.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not responsible for the opinion of any one else ; I am giving my own opinion. My own opinion is that the words 'undertaking and property' mean exactly what they say. But, I would like to make myself clear with regard to this matter. I say that a provision of this kind is proper in the case of every railway declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. I limited my remarks to that. I think it is quite proper that this should be contained in a general Bill—I speak for myself in saying that. I say further, that the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland, Oxford) who has just sat down, seem to me to be destructive of his own argument. He tells us that a model Bill was agreed upon. Was it not as unfair to the companies first subjected to that Bill to be so treated as it is for this company to be made subject to this provision now ? The idea I suggested in the remarks I made was, that we should act upon this principle henceforth ; in other words, that we should insert a provision of this kind in a model Bill, a Bill which shall apply to all undertakings of this kind which are declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. The hon. gentleman will bear in mind that in making that statement I am not referring to the latter part of the amendment, because I do not concur with the principle of the second part of the amendment. I think that the second part of this amendment is not proper, and I will vote against the amendment as a whole unless that part is eliminated or modified. I would suggest that some such modification as this be made, and I will then be prepared to vote for it :

> But such subsidy shall not be deducted except to the extent by which such valuation is in excess of the cost of such property, together with a reasonable allowance for interest upon such cost.

If we have a provision of that kind I think the interests of the company would be perfectly safeguarded. As it stands at present I do not agree with it. I can see that great injustice might be done to the gentlemen who put thier money into this enterprise, if the amendment were adopted in the form in which it stands.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We have spent some two hours upon this Bill, and I think the time has come that we should arrive at some conclusion upon it. The policy which I have always endeavoured to follow in matters of this kind has been that when legislation comes back from the standing committees of this House, and especially from the Railway Committee, which is one of the most, if not the most, important, is invariably to support the report of the committee, unless it be shown that some error has been committed. When there is a divergence of opinion, as there is in the present instance, as to what is the best policy to be followed by the House, I have always thought it was best to support the committee and adopt their report. If we undertook to reopen a question that had been settled in the committee, we should have a great divergence of opinion, and it is doubtful whether this House or the committee are the best places for settling questions of this kind. We are accustomed to put a great deal of trust in the Railway Committee, and I think on this occasion we can safely adopt their report as the best judgment that can be placed upon the question. For this reason I am disposed to accept the report of the committee, especially in view of the fact that this very question has been debated at great length and threshed out by the committee. The argument which has impressed me most is that advanced by the hon. leader of the opposition. The hon. gentleman says : If you are to introduce this legislation why not do so by a model Bill ? I may answer that some years ago, after a good deal of deliberation, we adopted a model Bill, this model Bill has been given to the committee to follow, and if we are to depart from the standing clauses which are to be found in this model Bill, it should be done only after due consideration. It should not be done in this Bill alone, but the new clauses to be introduced in the model Bill should be adopted by the Railway Committee itself and then be taken up by this House and adopted as the legislation of this country. I take much the same view as the leader of the opposition. He is not satisfied with the amendment which has been proposed, he would accept it in part but not in whole, and has proposed an amendment to the amendment. His amendment, I would suggest, would be at considerable variance with the policy we have hitherto followed. I am not prepared to say that it would not be in the right direction, but he will agree with me that before we adopt this amendment it should receive considerable attention from the Railway Committee. If it be thought proper to introduce new legislation of this character, for my part I would rather favour it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not proposing this as an amendment, but as simply voicing my own opinion.

The PRIME MINISTER. I understand that, but it simply supports my contention that if amendments of that character are to be introduced at all they should be considered as part of a standard Bill. Coming now to the amendment itself, it is in these words :

His Majesty shall have the right at any time to take over the undertaking and the property rights and franchises of the company——

And for that purpose the Expropriation Act shall apply. We do not require to put that in any Bill. This parliament has the right at any time to expropriate railway property, the Canadian Pacific Railway, for instance. I think my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) will agree with me that we have an undoubted right to do so, and we can do so to-morrow. I do not know but the time may come which my hon. friend from East York is sighing for, when we shall have all the railways of this country under our jurisdiction, when we shall have the ownership of them. I am not prepared to adopt his principle to-day, but some time we may come to his conclusion, we may do what has been done in other countries. But if that time ever came this parliament would have to consider the clauses of expropriation, what rule of expropriation should be followed. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition stated a moment ago that at the present time we have a certain rule of expropriation, that is to say, that we take the value of the property as it is at the time we make the expropriation. We may expropriate a house which may have cost the owner $100,000, and we may only give for it $40,000 or even $20,000, as the marketable value of it at the time of expropriation. Whether we should have such a rule of expropriation as that to apply to railways is another matter. We should have to consider the question in all its details. I think on the whole the balance of opinion and of argument is that that rule should not apply in exceptional legislation under this Bill. But if there is to be exceptional legislation it ought to be carefully considered in a model Bill and not in a particular Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN. I wish to point out that we should never have had the confession that we have just listened to from the premier if this amendment had not been introduced to this Bill. He is coming to the government ownership of railways. I totally disagree with the right hon. gentleman, however, in the doctrine that those things should be settled in the committees, and that parliament should not have a voice. We only delegate our rights to that committee, and we can review their action at any time ; if we see fit to supplement their action we have the right to do so. Another thing I wish to point out is that there are no general principles underlying our legislation in this House. Our legislation in the past has been as erratic as a grasshopper's jumps. It jumps in every direction, and there are no general principles to be found. But we must begin some time. There is only one way to play upon the hornpipe and that is to play upon it, and you must begin by playing upon it, and we propose to begin some time the policy of taking over these railways, and the sooner we begin the better. I hope the amendment as proposed here to-day will be adopted ; and I desire again to take this opportunity to compliment the right hon. gentleman on the slight confession he has made of his views in regard to government ownership of railways.

Mr. S. E. GOURLEY (Colchester). I think the Prime Minister underestimates the importance of this discussion. We have discussed questions this session, hour after hour, not nearly so important as this one. I have heard the subject of transportation discussed here time after time, and I take this opportunity of explaining that while I have seconded this amendment, I am strongly in favour of bonuses to railways. I want bonuses for railways, and I will vote for railways through Ontario or through British Columbia and canals, too, if I am treated equally generously when I ask for railway subsidies in the county I have the honour to represent. I will vote for a dozen railways and canals, if they will enable us to take our share of the trade of this continent. Unless the Canadian people show more energy in the future than we have done in the past, we will never reach the position that God and nature intended us to fill. The people of Canada have been very slow during the last fifty years. If we had equalled the energy of our friends on the other side of the line, instead of having to-day a population of 6,000,000, we might have divided the population of the continent with them. While they have been building 200,000 miles of railway, equal to the railways of the whole world, we, little Canadians, sitting here, have built only 17,000 miles. There is the whole difference between the United States and Canada. They have built 200,000 miles of railway, equivalent to the railways of the whole globe, with the Canadian railways thrown in. They have conquered in their railway enterprises the sources of success, a success which is in direct ratio to the miles of railway they have built. We, little Canadians, sitting here——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. GOURLEY—not fully comprehending our destiny, have missed great opportunities. I have heard gentlemen say in this House that we are at the end of our railway enterprises. If I believed that, I would lift my hat to Canada to-morrow and emigrate to

some more progressive country. We are only at the beginning of our railway building, and I hope in a few years to see the Georgian Bay canal built as well. We cannot allow the commerce of our country to go to the United States. I think if we doubled our national debt to-morrow, borrowed money at 2½ per cent, expended it to build railways, not giving it to boodlers or contractors, but expended it honestly, it would be the greatest achievement Canada ever accomplished. Now, I just wanted to say this, in order to explain my position, in regard to my seconding this amendment, which otherwise might be misunderstood. Let me say one word more in reference to the principle which I think is involved in the amendment. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) said that the principle ought to be made general. I agree with him, and I may say this, that in the Railway Committee I became alarmed at the trend of affairs; because I thought a most vicious principle was about to be introduced into the legislation of this country. Coming from the maritime provinces, I am not concerned about the rivalries of Ontario. I was only interested in seeing that the legislation of this parliament should not reflect upon the honour of the people. What I thought was going to happen in the Railway Committee was this: I saw a large element in the Railway Committee propounding the idea of requiring the subsidies to be paid back if we expropriated the railway. It is admitted that Canada has the power to expropriate, but, if we expropriated any railway, under any charter granted by this parliament, no lawyer, or honest man, would contend that we should take a dollar of the subsidies back unless notice to that effect was given in the charter. We have given no notice to the brokers, the bankers and the capitalists, who have taken our charter and given us their money, of our intentions in this respect.

The hon. member for Hants and other hon. gentlemen said: Do not put any notice in this charter; we will fix it in the general Act. But, what would be the result? This Act would be passed and the men who procured it would go to the brokers and bankers of London and get their money. No man would propose that any provision of the general Act should apply to that charter unless he were a criminal, or dishonest, unless that provision was already in the general Act, or passed concurrently with this. The difficulty is this: If you are going to propose that the general Act shall apply to this company you are going to make the provision retroactive, and if you make it retroactive in reference to this company, you make it retroactive in reference to all companies, and the result would be that the reputation of Canada would suffer. I want to build 50,000 miles of railway in this country in the near future, and this is not the way to achieve such a result. While I agree with the hon. member for Hants, I agree with him only in so far as that the principle should be general. If it is to apply to this Bill, notice to the public should be given now. I do not agree with my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) that this is a private Bill. I have heard frequent discussion here about the transportation question, and it is a vital question, which must be settled ultimately, if the political power of this continent is to remain in Ottawa and not remain at Washington. When I looked at the map and saw that the route proposed by this Bill was going to cut off 300 miles and save us going round the peninsula of Ontario; knowing what Canada's sentiments are in regard to the transportation of the products of the west, I concluded that this proposal was worth trying, because we want to try every solution for the settlement of this question. We have tried one system, but, if necessary, let us try another; and, if the St. Lawrence canal system fails, let us build the Georgian Bay canal to-morrow. Let us build railways, until we do succeed in controlling the trade of this northern half of the continent. I hope the hon. gentlemen from Ontario and Quebec, when they talk about the transportation problem of this continent, will not hereafter think that everything begins at Collingwood on the one hand and ends at Quebec on the other. I would ask them to recollect, that when God made the ports of this country, that he made the ports of Halifax and St. John as well as the ports of Ontario and Quebec, and you people must try to recognize that we are legislating for the whole of Canada. I will vote money as readily for British Columbia or Ontario enterprises as I will for the construction of railways in the county in which I live. If I would not do that, I would be unworthy to occupy a seat in this parliament. When I hear hon. gentlemen talk about ending the transportation system at Collingwood on the one hand, or Quebec on the other, it strikes me as something that is not worthy of the discussions in this parliament. I propose, with the co-operation of my hon. friends from the maritime provinces, to introduce a discussion here, during the session, that will show some hon. gentlemen that the real transportation system of this continent will end at Halifax, and it is useless to talk about these little fresh water ports of Ontario and Quebec. You fresh water sailors up here appear to know very little about the ultimate possibilities of the transportation system of this young commercial giant of the north. If any hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, can show me that this amendment will interfere with the bringing of capital into this country, then, I am out of it. If this amendment will prevent this company financing this road, then, again, I am out of it. I want this road to be built. I do not care if there are fifty lines parallel to it. Let us try the experiment.

Amendment to amendment (Mr. Hughes, North Victoria) negatived.

Amendment (Mr. Clarke) negatived.

Bill reported.

GUELPH JUNCTION RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the order :

House in committee on Bill (No. 23) respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. Mr. A. G. Blair). There was an understanding the other evening that this Bill should be referred back to committee. I beg to move :

That the order be discharged and that Bill (No. 23) respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Railways and Canals for further consideration.

Motion agreed to.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the United Empire Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Birkett.

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Century Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Monk.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—Mr. Vrooman.

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the St. Mary River Bridge Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Rathbun Company.—Mr. Britton.

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Oliver.

QUESTIONS.

ALBERTON HARBOUR, P.E.I.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Who authorized the removal of stones placed at great expense in the breastwork at Sandy Island, Alberton Harbour ?
2. To whom were the stones sold?
3. What price, if any, was paid for them?
4. To whom was the money paid?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) :

1. No such authorization was given, and no such stones were removed.

2. No stones out of the breastwork at Sandy Island, in Alberton Harbour, were sold.

That answers the third and fourth questions. I may say to my hon. friend, that I think he is confounding the breastwork at Sandy Island with the foundation of the lighthouse.

PRINTING OF THE FRENCH VERSION OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. ETHIER (by Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure) asked : (translation)

1. Is the government aware that, since the beginning of the present session, the translators of the Debates have each day translated into English all the French, and into French all the English by them received for that purpose from the Government Printing Bureau, notwithstanding that the amount of matter for translation is equivalent at times to as much as 128 columns of Hansard, in a single day ?

2. Is the government aware that since the opening of the present session, the translators of the Dabates have also corrected and returned to the Printing Bureau each day, all the proofs sent to them therefrom for that purpose, notwithstanding that such proofs amount at times to as much as 125 columns of Hansard, in a single day ?

3. Is the government aware that, up to this date (March 18), the Bureau has sent to the translators of the Debates, matter for translation up to the 12th only, and proofs for correction up to the 11th only ; and that of the French version it has paged and published the Debates up to the beginning of the sitting of March 4th only, notwithstanding that the amount of matter for translation in the hands of the printer is sufficient to bring the work up to the 14th at least, and the paging and publishing up to the 11th ?

4. Is the government aware that the delay in the printing and distributing of the French Hansard is due to the management of the Printing Bureau and not to the translators of the Debates, who labour day by day and even Sundays and holidays, if necessary, in order to translate forthwith as it is received, all matter furnished to them ?

5. Is the government aware that the delay and tardiness of the Government Printing Office in printing the French edition of the Hansard, is the means of depriving the representatives of the people, the press and the public in general of the advantages they should derive from the steady labour of the translators ?

6. Is it the intention of the government to put a stop to the delay caused by the Printing Bureau and to secure the paging and publishing, in due time, of the French edition of the House of Commons Debates ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). (Translation.) The government has no information in regard to the matter referred to by the hon. gentleman. I would advise my hon. friend to apply for information to the committee itself, as they have jurisdiction in the matter.

CONSTRUCTION OF LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

When the contract was made with the Locomotive Works Company, at Kingston, Ont., for the construction of twenty locomotives, was there a clause inserted in it stipulating that the union rate of wages should be paid to the men employed in the works?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

No labour clause inserted in this contract. In contracts for the furnishing of mater-

ials, cement, timber, fuel, oils, rolling stock, plant, and the like, where the filling of the government order forms a part, merely, of the contractor's general business, and is performed upon the contractor's own premises, the department does not attempt to assume any control over the works, or over the portion of the contractor's working staff that may happen to be handling parts of the departmental contract.

All other contracts contain a labour clause.

TORONTO POST OFFICE—STATION B.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. When was the building leased which is now occupied and used as station 'B' of the Post Office Department in Toronto.

2. What is the name and address of the person from whom the building was leased, and the length of time for which lease runs?

3. What rent per annum is being paid for the building?

4. What rent was paid by the department for the use of the building occupied as a branch post office in the Rossin House block, Toronto?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND :

1. August 14th, 1900.

2. A. L. Bender, Toronto : five years.

3. Seven hundred and fifty dollars per annum—which includes heating.

4. There was no rent paid directly to the late postmaster at the York street branch office, recently closed, but a salary of $900 per annum and commissions was allowed him, which would total nearly $1,000, for the use of a portion of his store and attendance. The department supplied all fittings.

HORSES FOR THE BRITISH ARMY.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

1. Has the following communication been received by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture from C. W. Peterson, secretary of the Territorial Horse Breeders' Association :—

'I am directed by the executive committee of the Territorial Horse Breeders' Association to call your attention to the fact that, although over 100,000 head of horses and mules have been purchased in the United States, and a considerable number in eastern Canada, for use in the South African campaign, for which satisfactory prices were paid, no attempt has apparently been made by the War Office authorities to secure any portion of this enormous number of remounts in the Territories, in spite of the fact that both the western contingents which left Canada for service in South Africa were mounted entirely on western horses, and that it has not been satisfactorily established that any difficulty was experienced in obtaining a sufficient number of a satisfactory type, although the notices given the rancher in both instances were entirely inadequate, owing to the hurried preparations.

It is well known to western breeders, and the fact is deeply deplored, that the impression evidently prevails in eastern Canada, that there are not enough horses raised in the Territories as yet for any practical purposes. This impression, however, is entirely erroneous. It is true that during the years of low values, breeding operations were largely discontinued, but it is also a fact that the absolute want of a remunerative and stable market for horses of certain standard types, is not alone working a distinct hardship upon a vast number of small breeders, but it is also exerting a most baneful influence upon the development of the horse industry here, as it effectually discourages breeding operations. No person will for any length of time expend money and labour upon high class breeding stock without a reasonable assurance of ultimate satisfactory financial returns from his efforts.

Vast portions of the North-west Territories present such topographical, meteorological and soil conditions that general farming or cattle-raising can never be successfully prosecuted therein. Such being the case, it necessarily follows that these enormous areas must eventually be devoted, if utilized at all, to the raising of horses, or, in the more favourable localities, to sheep-raising. It is, therefore, clear that the business of horse-raising must perforce ultimately develop into one of the most important branches of agriculture in the west. But even if these circumstances were not in themselves sufficient to bring horse-breeding operations prominently to the front in the Territories, the local conditions are such that no horse-producing country in the world could successfully compete against our cheap pastures rich in lime, and favourable climate, enabling horses to range out winter and summer, at little or no expense to the owner.

The present position of affairs is simply unbearable, and I am directed by my committee to urge you, as emphatically as lies in my power, to come to the rescue of our breeders in some way. The market for heavy draught horses is all that could be desired at present, but the conditions here are not nearly so favourable to the production of this class of horses as to the raising of light horses, and it is particularly in connection with the latter that government assistance is needed.

After devoting considerable thought to the matter, I am directed by my committee to suggest, as a feasible means of putting this industry on a proper footing, that your department should deal with it somewhat on the same basis as has been adopted in respect to the dairy industry in the Territories. An amount of money might be appropriated at the forthcoming session of parliament, sufficient to enable you to purchase, as an experiment, a limited number of horses in the west, conforming to the cavalry, artillery and mounted infantry standards, at a fair minimum price. At least two months' notice should be given to breeders here of the dates and places where your agent would purchase, and also full information respecting the types of horses required, and to what extent they would be handled. The association would undertake to look after the local organization, advertising, &c., and would otherwise render your department every assistance possible. Ample notice is absolutely essential, as horses are usually ranging out, and it takes considerable time to get them in and properly handled. This will not, under ordinary circumstances, be done until there is a sale in sight. Three months' notice would be better than two. In the meantime, negotiations could be opened up with the remount department of the British War Office, with a view to having a purchasing officer sent out, as soon as your department had gathered a sufficient number of horses, to inspect them and select all those coming up to the army standards.

There would doubtless be a certain number of culls no matter how carefully the horses had

been purchased; but those would, in centres like Toronto, Montreal or Ottawa, in most cases, be worth nearly as much as your department paid for them, and if the prices offered territorial breeders for their animals were fixed at their approximate value for army purposes, less the cost of transportation and other expenses (which would still leave a very satisfactory figure), it is unlikely that any considerable loss would be sustained by your department in the whole transaction. Any trifling debit balance would, of course, be amply justified by the impetus which would be given horse-breeding operations in the Territories.

Even granting that the necessary financial arrangements could be made to enable this association to successfully handle such a scheme itself, it could not hope to do so as economically and efficiently as could be done by the federal government. You have in the person of the live stock commissioner an official well fitted to do the organization work required. At every considerable point in the Territories there is a mounted police divisional headquarters where assistance could be obtained in purchasing, holding and shipping these animals, and where an experienced veterinarian in the employ of the department would be available. In fact, the cost of handling the scheme in the hands of your department could be reduced to a mere minimum.

It is anticipated that if an arrangement such as outlined could be continued for five or six years under a government guarantee, the production of military remounts in the Territories would easily double, and if proper representations were made to the Imperial government, based upon actual knowledge of the number of suitable horses available annually and the record for endurance and constitution which western horses would, by that time, undoubtedly have made for themselves in the service, it should prove a feasible proposition to induce the War Office authorities to establish regular remount depots at various points throughout the west, such as are now maintained in the Argentine Republic by the British government in connection with the Indian army.

In conclusion, I am to express, in behalf of my committee, that its representations may meet with favourable consideration at your hands.'

2. Also a copy of the following resolution in support of the above, from George Harcourt, secretary of the Horse Breeders' Association of Manitoba and the North-west Territories :—

'That this association strongly endorses the proposal made to the Department of Agriculture by the Territorial Horse Breeders' Association, by which the department is asked to secure an appropriation for the purpose of purchasing annually in the west a number of horses coming up to the type of the standard required by the various branches of the army, to be resold to the British government.'

3. What action, if any, has been taken on these communications?

4. If no action has been taken, does the government intend adopting any line of action to the furtherance of the views of those associations?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). Yes, the communications mentioned have been received. These communications are under consideration, and the government are discussing and considering what can be done to induce the Imperial government to purchase horses in Canada for army purposes.

I.C.R—GRAIN EXPORTS.

Mr. WILSON asked :

Referring to the return brought down re St. John and Halifax elevators :—How much of the grain passing through said elevators, for export, was brought from points west of Montreal over the Intercolonial Railway? What were the quantities for each elevator, separately?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). All the grain passing through the St. John and Halifax elevators, for export, came from points west of Montreal. The number of bushels of grain passing through the St. John elevator, for export, was 507,576. The number of bushels of grain passing through the Halifax elevator, for export, was 763,425.

THE DOUKHOBORS.

Mr. WILSON asked :

1. What were the dates on which the several detachments of Doukhobors arrived in this country?

2. What amount was paid them by way of bonus?

3. What amount has been loaned them ?

4. What was the expense in conducting them to their several locations?

5. How much was paid for their medical and other attendance?

6. What has been the total amount expended in connection with the immigration of the Doukhobors up to date?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. In the absence of the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Clifford Sifton), I beg to say :

1. First party, 20th January, 1899 ; second party, 27th January, 1899 ; third party, 9th May, 1899 ; fourth party, 5th June, 1899 ; fifth party, 21st July, 1899.

2. The sum of $35,817.78 was paid them by way of bonus—$32,008.18 of which was handed over to the Doukhobors' Committee in Winnipeg, to be expended on their behalf—the balance, $3,809.60 was expended by the government for provisions and charged to the bonus account. The allowance for bonus was at the rate of £1 per head. No bonuses were paid on these immigrants to the steamship companies.

3. Nothing has been loaned to the Doukhobors. Payments amounting to about $20,000 were made by the government for supplies, teaming and equipment, which will be refunded, and to secure payment of which liens will be taken on their lands.

4. The expense incurred in locating the Doukhobors was similar to the expenditure for this service connected with other immigrants. No distinct account is kept of the expense of locating different nationalities. It would be impossible to do so. A guide might have in his charge several immigrants all from different countries, and the cost has not been separated so as to show the proportionate sum chargeable to each nationality.

5. The accounts rendered for medical attendance do not give particulars, except in very few cases, as to the nationality of the

immigrants treated ; it is therefore impossible to state how much has been paid for medical attendance on the Doukhobors as distinct from other immigrants.

6. Bonuses, $35,817.78 ; supplies, &c., $20,000 ; total, $55,817.78. In addition to this amount, there were ordinary disbursements incident to the transportation, locating and care of Doukhobors, which sums are included in the ordinary general immigration expenses, and are similar to the expenses incurred in connection with all immigrants, and no separate account is kept to show the proportionate cost of English, Irish, Scotch, Galician, Doukhobors or other immigrants.

MR. WM. STUBBS.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

Has William Stubbs, of Caledon, Ont., formerly representing the riding of Cardwell in this House, been appointed to any position under this government? If so, what are his duties and the salary attached to the office?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

Mr. William Stubbs, of Caledon, Ont., has been appointed an official veterinarian of the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of testing cattle for export to the United States, and any other veterinary work required, at a salary of $1,200 per annum.

MR. W. E. O'BRIEN.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

Has W. E. O'Brien, of Shanty Bay, Ont., been appointed to any position under the government? If so, what position, and what salary attaches thereto?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

Mr. W. E. O'Brien, of Shanty Bay, Ont., has been appointed a commissioner to represent the Dominion of Canada at the Glasgow exhibition, at a salary at the rate of $2,500 per annum, with $5 a day for living expenses, together with transportation expenses.

I. C. R.—DIVISION EXTENSION.

Mr. DECHENE asked :

Whether it is the intention of the Minister of Railways to extend the first division of the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to Campbellton? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

No decision has yet been arrived at to extend the first division of the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to Campbellton.

MR. DUNCAN C. ANDERSON.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

Has Duncan C. Anderson, of the township of Oro, in the riding of East Simcoe, been appointed to a position in the Department of Agriculture as a lecturer in British Columbia? If so, what is his position and what salary attaches to the position? What is term of service?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

Mr. D. C. Anderson has been engaged by the Department of Agriculture to give a series of lectures at Farmers' Institute meetings arranged for in British Columbia by the Department of Agriculture of that province.

His remuneration is at the rate of $3 per day.

His term of service is from March 4 to the end of the series of meetings on May 3.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is Mr. Anderson in the employ of the local government of British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

RICE IMPORTS.

Mr. CLANCY asked :

What quantity of uncleaned or unhulled rice was imported from Great Britain for consumption for the year ending 30th June, 1900, and the value thereof? Was 25 per cent of the value of such rice of British production? If so, in what way?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) :

The quantity of rice, uncleaned, unhulled or paddy, imported from Great Britain and entered for consumption in Canada during the fiscal year 1900 amounted to 10,647,075 pounds, valued at $132,221, of which amounts 10,609,779 pounds, valued at $131,450, were entered at preferential tariff rates.

Unhulled or uncleaned rice is treated as a natural product, unmanufactured. The certificate as to the proportion of labour entering into the production of manufactured articles is therefore not applicable to unhulled or uncleaned rice ; and such rice being the growth or produce of a British country entitled to the preference (as British India, Straits Settlements, &c.,) would be allowed entry under the preferential tariff when imported into Canada direct from Great Britain.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Fielding :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, when a vote is challenged on the motion to go into Committee of Ways and means, the question that faces a

member of this House is not alone whether the policy of the government of the day is satisfactory, but also whether the member prefers the policy of the government or the policy propounded by hon. gentlemen on the opposition benches. And, on this occasion, the duty devolving upon a member of the House is made simpler by the fact that the leader of the opposition has condensed the policy of himself and his following in the shape of the amendment which is now before the House. As a further means of ascertaining exactly and entirely what is the policy of the opposition, we also have before us the speeches of members of the opposition, and, Sir, I think that any one who has followed the reports of the debate up to this stage must have been astonished at the impossible positions which our friends on the opposition benches endeavour to maintain—or would be astonished but for the fact that our friends have been endeavouring to maintain these positions for the last four or five years, and our astonishment now merges into a feeling of amusement. At once they tell us that the policy of the government involves too high protection, involves excessive duties, at least they complain that too much money is taken from the pockets of the people by the tariff that is in force, and at the same time they complain that the tariff is not high enough, and they think it necessary to place that view in the form that is now before us. In one breath they complain that the government of the day has been and is guilty of dreadful extravagance, but I notice that they entirely fail now, as they have failed in the last five years to take any practical exception to any material portion of the expenditures proposed by the government. As I say, in one breath they tell us that the Liberal party as represented by the government in this House is keeping in force the obsolete protective system which was inaugurated in 1878 and maintained until 1896. They tell us that the protective system is still in force, but at the same time they deem it necessary to frame and present an amendment, which, I think at all events, nails them to the position that the present tariff is not high enough. They bring in an amendment which, I suppose, they will support, and they will then feel free to to go out into the country and appeal to the manufacturers on the ground that the tariff in force is not sufficiently protective, and they will make the promise to the manufacturers that if the country will give them the opportunity they will put in force a tariff that will be properly protective. In one breath they tell us that the policy of the present administration is not a proper, a judicious policy; and, in the same breath, they tell us that the administration is simply applying the old policy which the Conservative party maintained in this country for something like eighteen years. In other words, they complain that the Liberal party has stolen the Conservatives clothes. They seem to wish to complain that the members of the Liberal party have become converted to Conservative doctrine. Admitting, for the moment, that that is true, is there any good reason for any patriotic Conservative to complain on that score? If a Conservative really believes that the principle of protection is a proper principle and that it should be applied in this country, is there any real reason why he should complain because a member of the Liberal party, or an Independent or any other citizen becomes a convert to what he himself, at all events, believes to be the true political gospel? Liberals, I think, have never urged such a complaint as this. In years past in this country there were contests over questions of principle. Something like sixty or seventy years ago there was a contest in this country on the question of responsible government. The Whigs contended for the principle of responsible government, and the Tories contended against that principle. Time went on and by-and-by the Tories became converted to the principle of responsible government. And, so far as I have been able to learn there never was a Liberal who complained of any Tory who became a convert.

The last hon. gentleman who occupied the floor in this debate, speaking last Friday evening, it seemed to me tried to include in his speech nearly all the impossible positions which the opposition attempts to maintain on the fiscal question. There have been hon. gentlemen on the other side who have taken one line of argument, and gentlemen who have taken a different line. But the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) himself managed to take both lines of argument. He proved, I suppose to his own satisfaction at all events, that the claim that is made by the government that there was a surplus in the last fiscal year of some $8,000,000 was an entirely mistaken claim. He proved to his own satisfaction that, instead of there being a surplus, there was a deficit, that the people of the country at the end of the last fiscal year were in a worse position than at the commencement of the year. And this, notwithstanding the fact, that, as I understand it, the public debt was reduced by $779,000 in the fiscal year. A short time after, he proved—also, I suppose to his own satisfaction—that the government took out of the pockets of the people $8,000,000 in excess of what was required to meet the expenses of the country. He also presented a considerable array of figures to prove that the system of protection was still in force and to prove that considerable duties were still in force in regard to agricultural products. He was, at that time, endeavouring to give an answer to a question, that had been asked from this side of the House. Some hon. gentleman on this side had invited any member of the opposition or any one else who believed in the principle of protection to show how the

agriculturist and how the labour of this country might be protected. The hon. member for South Simcoe took up the tariff and showed that on a number of agricultural products, a considerable tariff was still in force. But that did not prove to me that these articles are protected or that the farmers reap any benefit from the protection of the tariff which is in force on those articles. For instance, there is a duty of 12 cents a bushel on wheat—I think that is the rate. But I feel certain that there is not one farmer in a hundred in this country who gets any advantage through that duty upon wheat. The mere fact that there is a duty upon wheat does not at all prove that the farmer who grows wheat receives any advantage from the tariff. But the hon. member had satisfied himself that the agricultural produce of the country was protected, and in the next breath he told us that after the Liberal government came into power they almost entirely wiped out the duties that had been previously levied upon the imported products of the United States, and had then gone down to Washington and asked for some reciprocity arrangements.

But there were some hon. gentlemen opposite who made a fair argument, and observed some logic in their reasoning. It appeared to me that one of the most logical speeches that I heard coming from the opposition benches was that of the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), who declared himself a protectionist and against the present tariff, because it does not afford sufficient protection. He told the House, what is a fact, that of the $189,000,000 worth of imports brought into this country last year, $76,000,000 of that total represented free goods. As to that fact, the hon. member for East Toronto and myself are in entire agreement, but our conclusions from the same fact differ pretty widely. That hon. gentleman declared that the tariff was bad so far as it involved this free trade principle; while I believe the tariff is good so far as it contains that principle. He stated that the people of Canada, by a very large majority, were opposed to the introduction of free trade principles into our tariff, and on that point also I cannot agree with him. I think, and certainly hon. gentlemen of the opposition are of this opinion, because they constantly charge the government with failure to obey the mandate,—that in the year 1896 the people of Canada gave a mandate against the principle of protection in our tariff; it is my opinion, but possibly there is room for a little disagreement, that in the year 1900 the people of Canada again gave a mandate against the application of the principle of protection in our tariff. At all events, the opposition, in complaining against the height of our tariff and then complaining that it is too low, must be considered as holding an untenable position.

One complaint I have to make against the amendment submitted by the leader of the opposition is, that it is not definite enough. It is framed in terms vague enough, I fear, to permit gentlemen representing that party to go through the country later on and make divers appeals to the people, similar to those divers appeals that they made last fall, when the people of Canada were asked to decide as between the Liberal and Conservative parties. We know that members of the opposition, and even leaders of the party, went through different parts of the country making entirely different pleas and entirely different promises. In one province, for instance, they promised to have a duty put on lumber, while, on the other hand, in other parts of the country, they were complaining against the small duty at present existing upon some classes of lumber. In the province of Manitoba, so prominent a leader as Hugh John Macdonald, for instance, promised that if the Conservative party was returned to power the farmers would be given the advantage of free agricultural implements; while, in other provinces, other Conservative leaders, among them Sir Charles Tupper and the Hon. Mr. Foster, made definite promises that if the Conservative party was returned to power the duty on agricultural implements would be increased. I give these instances as an illustration of the various tactics that were resorted to, and the various promises that were made by the different Conservative leaders last fall in various parts of the country. In the part of the country from which I come, the government was assailed because its leader was a Frenchman and a Roman Catholic. I state this without fear of successful contradiction, although I notice that since this session opened and since this debate began, certain prominent gentlemen on the other side have questioned whether it were true that racial and religious cries were resorted to by members of the opposition. I say that in the part of the country from which I come the electors were appealed to on the ground that the leader of the Liberal party, and some of his lieutenants, were Frenchmen and Roman Catholics. I believe it is a fact also, that in the province of Quebec, the Liberal party were attacked because one of the leaders was 'too British for me.'

Now, I say that I take issue with this amendment partly because it is not definite enough, and I take issue with it because it means, if it means anything, that the principle of protection in the present tariff ought to be increased. I take issue with the amendment because it means, if it means anything, that duties should be increased on agricultural implements, and that duties should be reimposed on such articles as binder twine, barbed wire and cream separators, many of which are used by the farmers in our part of the country. I take issue with it because it means, if it means anything, that the duties at present in force should be increased in respect to the whole line of articles which may be imported into

this country. As I said at the commencement, the question that faces me is not entirely whether I deem the policy at present in force as satisfactory, for if I were obliged to give a candid opinion, I would have to say that I am not entirely satisfied with the tariff of the government as it stands, and any dissatisfaction I may have with regard to it is on account of the height of the duties imposed under that tariff. I notice that the Finance Minister, in his statement, partly foreshadowed a lessening of the revenues reaped under the tariff at present in force.

I have a specific to recommend if there is danger of a lessening of the revenue and the specific that I would recommend is to make a further cut in the tariff. I believe that in regard to some articles the tariff at present is to a certain extent protective, and I believe, too, that a protective tariff cannot be called a revenue tariff. If the tariff protects a certain line of manufactures it is a tariff which is not calculated to bring in a revenue. So, I would say that if there is to be feared a lessening of revenue under the present tariff, the proper way to obviate the danger is to make further cuts in that tariff. I will give an illustration from the tariff history of the country. Up to 1894 a protective tariff, a tariff of 35 per cent was levied against agricultural implements coming into this country, and in 1894 a reduction was made to 20 per cent on mowers and binders, a reduction equal to 43 per cent. Since that time the revenue has not lessened notwithstanding that the duty was cut almost in two. The revenue has not lessened, but, on the contrary, it has increased to an extent equal to nearly 500 per cent. In 1894, before the reduction and while there was a duty of 35 per cent, the revenue reaped from binders was $24,478.50. Last year, under a 20 per cent tariff, the revenue that was reaped was $160.860.40. Upon mowers, in 1894, when a 35 per cent duty was levied, the revenue reaped was $9.935.65. In 1900 under a 20 per cent tariff, the revenue was $71,111.40. The revenue reaped from the whole line of agricultural implements in 1894 was $77.921.86. Since 1894 the duties not only upon binders and mowers have been cut, but on other agricultural implements they have been cut from, I think, 35 to 25 per cent, and in 1900, under these lower duties, there was a revenue reaped, not of $77,921.86, but of no less than $357,-200.22. Carrying this argument a little further we find that there has been a general cut in the taxation on all articles brought in since 1897 of from 10 to 12½ per cent and that this cut was followed, not by a reduction of revenue, but, by an increase of customs duties of about 40 per cent or an increase from $20,000,000 to $28.-000,000. So the argument that is advanced by the opposition is fallacious; the mere fact that there has been an increase in the revenue, in the amount of money that the people have paid in customs duties, is not proof positive that any greater taxation has been levied, because, in regard to binders and mowers, while the amount of revenue which reached the coffers of the country was vastly larger this last year than in 1894, the fact must be plain that no additional taxation was imposed upon the people, or upon the farmers who purchased these agricultural implements, but, that on the contrary, there has been a marked lessening of taxation. While the rate of taxation was 35 per cent and while it did not yield money to the general revenues of the country, it was still levied upon the people; it did not come into the treasury of Canada, but it went into the pockets of the manufacturers. I take issue with the amendment when it strikes at the preferential arrangement that is now in force between this country and the mother country. I may say that personally I do not feel so much interest in whether the preferential arrangement is of advantage to the people of Great Britain as in whether it is of advantage to the people of Canada. It is because I believe that the preferential arrangement has been of great advantage to the people of Canada in lessening the taxation imposed upon our people that I stand by the preferential arrangement as it is at present upon the statute-book.

Before I sit down I wish to refer briefly to another question that is not allied with the trade or tariff issue, but which is a financial question, and which, I think, may be properly mentioned and discussed in this debate. It is not now, and I trust may not become, a matter at issue between the political parties. I allude to that coming change in relations between the North-west Territories of Canada and this parliament, and as I say that is a question largely financial, and so I think it is not out of place in this discussion. I shall preface the remarks that I have to make by the statement that I take it as a tribute to the far-sightedness and the statesmanship of the gentlemen who, in 1865, met in the city of Quebec and framed the arrangement which resulted in the confederation of the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, that, in the portion of the country which they then contemplated should become a part of Canada—I allude to the North-west Territories which at that time were known as Rupert's Land—there has never since the North-west became a part of Canada, and not up to this time, been a thought, or a suggestion, in the mind of any person in that country, so far as their future was concerned other than of becoming a province of the Dominion of Canada and a permanent part of confederation. Notwithstanding the fact that, in some respects some people there may believe that it would be to their immediate material advantage to be associated in a different way with the country immediately to the south so that they might

trade with the cities of St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Chicago, which are much nearer than the cities of Toronto and Montreal, where they chiefly trade, notwithstanding that materially and immediately it might be, in a way, to their advantage to look to a different destiny, there is not at the present time, never has been, and I do not think ever will be any thought in the mind of any resident, or any citizen of the North-west, but to remain as a part of confederation and a part of the Dominion of Canada. The people in that country have for some years been looking forward to the time when a change should be made and when the part of the country in which they live should become in all respects equal to the other provinces of the Dominion.

Occasionally, in this House—even since this session has opened—there have been remarks dropped which might lead a western member to believe that the opinion is held down here that the western people are very impatient; that they are looking for their wrongs to be righted immediately; that they want things to move a little too fast; but, Sir, in regard to this question the people of the North-west cannot be accused of any undue haste. They have been heretofore working under such a constitution as the Federal parliament thought well to grant. They have now come to a stage when they feel that some additional powers are required and when some different arrangement ought be made so as to enable them to better carry on the work of local government. The difficulty they labour under is not so much constitutional as it is financial. So far as their constitutional powers are concerned the people feel that they might possibly get along for some time yet without any marked change. But they have come to a point in their history when they feel hampered as regards their finances. The members of the House all know the difference which exists between the financial relations of the provinces to the Dominion and the financial relations of the North-west Territories to the Dominion. Each of the provinces has a fixed financial status and the provincial subsidies are not voted by this parliament year after year, but are paid under statute, whereas with regard to the North-west Territories the grant which corresponds in a sense to the provincial subsidies, has to be voted each session by this House. To better explain some of the difficulties which arise under the present system, I will quote the words of the chief spokesman of the North-west Territories, the Hon. Mr. Haultain, from a speech he made in the legislature last session. He said:

> We might well go on developing under the territorial system for a long time to come if our revenue would only keep pace with our requirements. But the present financial condition is an impossible one—I mean the condition of being dependent upon the annual vote of parliament for the larger part of our income. We have already exhausted every means of obtaining any very large increase to that parliamentary vote. Even were any government so well disposed towards the Territories—and I think all governments are in a way—the conditions surrounding a parliamentary vote, the conditions which exist at Ottawa, prevent any adequate amount being given to us under our present institutions. I make that statement believing such to be the case. So long as the Territories remain in a dependent condition and receive their financial assistance as a matter of grace rather than of right; so long as the Territories remain in the position of having a large amount of money voted as a grant in addition to a number of other things which the provinces do for themselves, provided for them every year in the Dominion Supply, just for so long will it be impossible for the Territories to secure that suitable financial recognition without which even the present institutions cannot be successfully carried on. We have pretty well passed through the preliminary stages, and we have pretty well come to an end of our usefulness so far as our present condition will permit us. We have to a certain extent fairly well exhausted, in the broader sense of the word, the powers given to us under the legislative jurisdiction which we now possess. I believe the time has come for beginning the superstructure for which we have been laying the foundations. I believe we have laid these foundations well; and that so far as the institutions we have created; so far as the main body of our laws—which deal not only with the primary but even with many of the secondary wants and interests of this country—are concerned, I believe we have a good body of laws, and that very largely we have exhausted the more obvious uses and powers of the constitution which we have and of the powers which we possess under it. I do not say that further progress is impossible, but I do say that any very large amount of progress, or any very large amount of development, is not possible under the existing institutions.

I will not take up time arguing that the North-west Territories have pretty nearly arrived at a period in their history when a change must be made in their existing relations to the Federal parliament. The people up there, at least if they are properly represented in the legislature and if their chief spokesman the Prime Minister of the Territories, is to be relied upon; the people there have come to the conclusion that very shortly some change will have to be looked for. Before the local elections in 1898, the Hon. Mr. Haultain spoke at various points throughout the Territories on this subject, and I shall quote from the language he used at one place to show that even three years ago this change was looked forward to and that the present legislature of the Territories was in reality given a mandate to open up negotiations with respect to the subject. Speaking at Yorkton, the Hon. Mr. Haultain said:

> If the financial question is capable of other solution, I will be satisfied to remain as at present. The only thing there seems to be to do is to think at least of negotiating for provincial establishment. I feel convinced that it will be the principal work of the new legislature before the end of its four years' term to enter into such negotiations. With the

greater development that now seems assured, the needs in respect of schools and improvement will certainly develop. Outside of direct taxation, there seems no possibility of a solution except by provincial establishment—not perhaps to-day or next year, but in the reasonably near future.

Last session in the legislature the following address was voted upon by all the local representatives of the people and unanimously adopted :

1. Whereas by the British North America Act, 1867, it was (amongst other things) enacted that it should be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's most honourable Privy Council, on address from the Houses of the parliament of Canada, to admit Rupert's Land and the North-west Territory, or either of them, into the union on such terms and conditions in each case as should be in the addresses expressed and as the Queen should think fit to approve, subject to the provisions of the said Act ;

2. And whereas, by an address from the Houses of the parliament of Canada Her Majesty was prayed to unite Rupert's Land and the North-west Territory with the Dominion of Canada ;

3. And whereas, in order to further the petition of the parliament of Canada, Her Majesty, under the authority of the Rupert's Land Act, 1868, accepted a surrender from the governor and company of adventurers of England trading into Hudson's bay, of all the lands, territories, rights, privileges, liberties, franchises, powers and authorities whatsoever granted or purported to be granted by certain letters patent therein recited to the said company in Rupert's Land ;

4. And whereas, in the said address it was represented to Her Majesty, as a reason for the extension of the Dominion of Canada westward, that the welfare of the population of these territories would be materially enhanced by the formation therein of political institutions, bearing analogy, as far as circumstances will admit, to those which existed in the several provinces then forming the Dominion ;

5. And whereas, the Houses of the parliament of Canada by their said address expressed to Her Majesty their willingness to assume the duties and obligations of government and legislation as regards these territories ;

6. And whereas, in pursuance and exercise of the powers invested in the Queen by the aforesaid Acts, Her Majesty, by and with the advice of her most honourable Privy Council, ordered and declared that from and after the 15th day of July, 1870, Rupert's Land and the North-western Territory should be admitted into and become part of the Dominion of Canada, and granted power and authority to the parliament of Canada to legislate for the future welfare and good government of these territories ;

7. And whereas, by the British North America Act, 1871, the parliament of Canada was further given power from time to time to make provision for the administration, peace, order and good government of any territory not for the time being included in any province;

8. And whereas, under the several authorities so given, the parliament of Canada has created political institutions in these territories bearing a close analogy to those which exist in the several provinces of the Dominion ;

9. And whereas, by the confederation compact the provinces which formed the Dominion, on the 15th day of July, 1870, were furnished with the means of carrying on local self-government upon certain well-defined bases ;

10. And whereas, the territories, being an integral part of the Dominion, and having had imposed upon them the duties and obligations incidental to the political institutions which have been given to them, and which said duties and obligations the parliament of Canada has declared its willingness to assume, are entitled to such Federal assistance for their maintenance as will bear due proportion and analogy to that given to other portions of the Dominion for similar purposes;

11. And whereas, repeated representations have been made in various ways to the government of Canada with the view of obtaining just and equitable financial assistance towards providing for the proper and efficient administration of local affairs in the Territories and for the public necessities of their rapidly increasing population ;

12. And whereas, such representations have been met by intermittent and insufficient additions to the annual grant, the provision so made by the parliament of Canada never bearing any adequate proportion to the financial obligations imposed by the enlargement and development of the political institutions created by itself;

13. And whereas, it is desirable that a basis should be established upon which the claims of the Territories to suitable financial recognition may be settled and agreed upon :

14. Therefore be it resolved, that an humble address to His Excellency the Governor General be adopted by this House praying him that he will be pleased to cause the fullest enquiry to be made into the position of the Territories, financial and otherwise, and to cause such action to be taken as will provide for their present and immediate welfare and good government, as well as the due fulfilment of the duties and obligations of government and legislation assumed, with respect to these Territories, by the parliament of Canada ;

15. And be it further resolved that, whereas, by the British North America Act, 1871, it was (amongst other things) enacted that the parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any province thereof, and may, at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and administration of . . . . such province, His Excellency be also prayed to order inquiries to be made and accounts taken with a view to the settlement of the terms and conditions upon which the territories or any part thereof shall be established as a province, and that before any such province is established, opportunity should be given to the people of the territories, through their accredited representatives, of considering and discussing such terms and conditions.

That, Sir, is the succinct record of the history and the present claims of the legislature of the North-west Territories. And that the government here have been fairly seized of the fact that a change in the near future will be necessary. I infer from a statement that has been made in this House by one of the ministers of the Crown since the commencement of the present session, in answer to a question that was put by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). The hon. member for East

York asked if any new provinces were likely to be formed in the North-west Territories after the census was taken, and this answer was given by the Minister of the Interior :

A deputation, consisting of two members of the North-west government, Mr. Haultain and Mr. Ross, were in Ottawa some time ago on other business, and took the opportunity of discussing this question. I may say that while during the last three or four years they have not addressed any official communication to the government, yet from time to time they have discussed with myself and my colleagues the question of giving the Territories provincial status, and lately they handed us a memorandum on that subject. We have not officially replied to that memorandum as yet, but expect to do so shortly. This is a matter, of course, requiring serious consideration. I may say, in a general way, that I am of the opinion that it will have to be dealt with in the very near future. The people of the Territories are as capable of self-government as any other people in Canada, and have shown their fitness by the admirable manner in which they have carried on their present administration. Of course, the financial question is a serious one. The subsidy required for the Territories in the course of a few years would have to be greatly increased, and there is the question of the control of public lands and matters of that kind which would have to be settled.

These various statements will obviate any necessity of my going into the question as to whether the time has come for this change. The representatives of the Territories think the time is approaching, and we may conclude from this statement of the Minister of the Interior that the government here are seized of the fact that the time is rapidly approaching when a change must be made in the relations of the North-west legislature to this parliament ; and as the census is to be taken this year, the data thus obtained will make it possible to intelligently negotiate, and will bring a favourable time for commencing negotiations.

I may refer briefly to the causes which make this change necessary. A country so large as the North-west Territories, with a sparse population, is always an expensive country to govern locally. During the last few years very material additions have been made to the population. Immigrants have been coming into the country in large numbers, making necessary further expenditures on education and public works. I believe that in one year as many as one hundred new school districts have been formed in the North-west Territories, and have had to be provided for by the local government. No argument is necessary to show that with such a condition of affairs the financial requirements of the local government are increasing very rapidly. As to the way in which the local authorities expend their money, statistics show that a very large proportion of their revenues is devoted to education and public works. The total amount at the disposal of the local legislature last year was $470,000. Of this, no less than $182,000 was voted for education and

$178,000 for public works, including the construction of roads and bridges, sinking public wells, providing ferries and similar services, leaving only $110,000 for civil government, legislation, administration of civil justice, and so forth. In these figures I think we find full justification for the commendatory remarks made by the Minister of the Interior with reference to the territorial government.

I wish to refer for a moment to a question that has been raised with respect to some of the foreign settlers. The hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) asked a question in the House as to the provision being made for the education of the Doukhobors, a considerable number of whom are settled in the Territories, I assume from the manner of his question that he thought the government should devote a certain amount of money and take certain steps to see that the education of the Doukhobors was not neglected. I have not any very intimate knowledge of that subject, but I am aware that the members of the local government have had conferences with representatives of those people ; and while I believe that there is and will be a considerable amount of difficulty with regard to the education of the Doukhobors, owing to their peculiar customs and beliefs, still I think that the past history of the local government gives us warrant to believe that that government is perfectly competent to deal with whatever difficulty may exist.

Hon. members will readily understand that in a part of the country to which many foreign immigrants are coming year after year—and since the opening up of the North-west Territories, every year there has been an influx of a large number of people who may be classed as foreigners, people from the continent of Europe,—there must be problems of more or less difficulty to be solved by the local authorities. In the past, the local government has been found competent to cope with the difficulties which have arisen, and while a certain amount of patience may be required in dealing with peculiar people like the Doukhobors, we may take it for granted that the local government will be competent to grapple with any difficulties that may arise. I fear that the local authorities would take exception, and properly, to this parliament stepping into the domain of education, the power of dealing with which was many years ago conferred upon the local government. The difficulty of dealing with people like the Doukhobors, owing to their peculiarities, this House, of course, has a right to consider, and the consideration will further impress on hon. members the necessity of providing financial means to the local government to enable it to deal effectively and efficiently with these people.

I propose, Sir, with the permission of the House, to glance very briefly at the political history of the North-west Territories. The

acquisition of these territories was contemplated by the statesmen who met in Quebec in 1865—the fathers of confederation ; and from one of the resolutions then passed, I extract the following sentence :

Provision being made for the admission, on equitable terms, of Newfoundland, the North-west Territories, British Columbia and Vancouver, on such terms as the parliament of the federated provinces shall deem equitable and as shall receive the assent of Her Majesty.

Respecting the contention that the expenditures incurred with regard to the North-west Territories, including the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, should be wholly charged against the North-west Territories, let me quote another portion of the resolution as showing the view on this point held by the fathers of confederation :

The communication with the North-west Territories and the improvements required for the development of the trade of the great west with the seaboard, are regarded by this conference as subjects of the highest importance to the federated provinces.

Thus, the view held by the fathers of confederation respecting the expenditures which would have to be made in the North-west Territories, was that these expenditures would not be incurred so much for the North-west Territories as for the provinces which originally formed confederation. The territory was acquired following an address from the Canadian parliament to Her Majesty, praying that Rupert's Land and the North-west Territories might be united to the Dominion of Canada. The address recited that :

It would promote the prosperity of the Canadian people and conduce to the advantage of the whole empire, if the Dominion of Canada constituted under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, were extended westward to the shores of the Pacific ocean. That the colonization of the fertile lands of the Saskatchewan, the Assiniboine and the Red river districts; the development of the mineral wealth which abounds in the region of the North-west, and the extension of commercial intercourse through the British possessions in America from the Atlantic to the Pacific, are alike dependent on the establishment of a stable government for the maintenance of law and order in the North-western Territory; and that the welfare of a sparse and widely scattered population of British subjects of European origin, already inhabiting these remote and unorganized territories, would be materially enhanced by the formation therein of political institutions bearing analogy, as far as circumstances will admit, to those which exist in the several provinces of this Dominion.

The foregoing quotations show distinctly, first, that the North-west Territories were acquired for the benefit primarily of the confederated provinces ; second, that it was the intention of Canada to extend to the Territories a system of government bearing analogy to those of the provinces; and third, they include a guarantee that the Territories would be placed on an equitable basis compared with the other provinces. That I take to mean that we would eventually be given a constitutional and financial position, which would bear strict analogy to the positions occupied by each one of the other provinces. On the 15th July, 1870, the North-west Territories were admitted into confederation and became part and parcel of the Dominion. The history of the local government in that country since then I shall not take up the time of the House by going over, I may say briefly, that from time to time additional powers were conferred on the local authorities until now there is very little difference—practically none constitutionally—between the position of the Territories and that of any province. The Territories lack a few of the powers possessed by the provinces, as, for instance, the power to borrow money on the public credit, the power to charter railways, the power to erect and maintain such institutions as insane asylums. But they have authority over education and other matters; and so far as any power has been conferred upon them, they exercise it in exactly the same manner as similar powers are exercised out by the local legislatures and governments in provinces.

I do not wish to go into any of the details at present. My intention is merely to draw the attention of parliament to a subject with which this parliament will almost certainly have to deal in the very near future—almost certainly before the end of this term. But there are one or two details to which I wish to refer briefly. The question will arise whether one or more provinces should be created out of the present territories, namely, the two Assiniboias, Saskatchewan and Alberta. On that point I do not care to offer any decided opinion, and I do not know that there exists in the minds of the people any very decided opinion. My personal opinion is in favour of the erection of only one province, as I think it would be a mistake to create too many governments in that country, and I believe that one system—one lieutenant governor and one executive—would be sufficient to attend to the interests of local government in that country. The point is sometimes raised that the area is very large, which no one will dispute, but it is not larger than that of at least one existing province. The area of the four districts in the North-west Territories is about 302,000 miles, and that of the province of British Columbia comprises 383,000 square miles. The area is not very much larger than the area of Ontario, which is 222,000 square miles, and of Quebec, which is 228,000 square miles.

It is interesting in this connection, to remember that, prior to confederation the late Sir John Macdonald held strongly to the opinion that a legislative union for all Canada would be preferable to a federal union. If a man so far-sighted as Sir John Macdonald believed that the legislative interests of all Canada might be most satisfactorily

dealt with by one legislature sitting at Ottawa, and if that proposition was possible, the proposition that the area comprised in these four districts could be governed in a local sense by one legislature is not at all an absurdity. Another suggestion has been mooted, one on which I have no hesitation in expressing a very decided opinion—a suggestion that a portion of the territory should be annexed to the province of Manitoba. The people of the Territories generally, would very strongly oppose the carrying out of such a proposition; and the people who, if it were carried out would find themselves in the province of Manitoba, would and do most strongly oppose the proposition. As I have explained, the relations at present existing between the legislature of the Territories and this parliament, and the whole constitutional and financial position of the Territories limit the resources of local government practically to the annual grants voted by this parliament, apart from the powers of direct taxation which have been conferred upon it. I do not imagine that this House would look with equanimity upon the powers of direct taxation being applied to any severe extent in that country. This House looks to a speedy settlement of that country, looks for a large immigration to that country, looks for progress in that country, and certainly the application of the power of direct taxation to a severe extent would not conduce to that progress or that early settlement or any very large immigration. Apart from the power of direct taxation, really the only resource of the local government of the territory is the annual grant voted by this parliament. I do not wish to complain that the annual grants have not been fairly generous, although in no year have they sufficed to fully and adequately meet the requirements. Looked at from all points of view, however, I think the yearly grants have been fairly generous. But a position has been reached where the need is growing so fast year by year that it is found almost impossible or entirely impossible to get the income from this parliament which is necessary. I will not weary the House with a statement of what the annual grant has been—that may be found in the estimates for the various years, which are on record. I will not go any further into the matters of detail, but shall draw the attention of the House to what I think should be a broad, general principle upon which the arrangements which will be made should be negotiated and arrived at. On the constitutional side, I imagine, the proposition is very simple. I have no doubt that this House will very readily confer upon the legislature of the Territories all the powers which have been conferred upon the legislatures of the provinces. But financially the case may be more complex. On the financial side there may be room for argument. Financially, the various provinces have been dealt with in this way—a yearly grant is made to the local legislature for purposes of government, varying from $80,000 in the case of Ontario to $30,000 to Prince Edward Island, also a per capita allowance of eighty cents per head. In addition, to some of the provinces, an allowance is made on account of debt, which, I expect, every member of the House understands and which I will not go into at present. And another source of income of the originally confederated provinces is that they are in possession of the public resources, public lands, timber and minerals within their borders. I do not wish to enter into a contentious discussion of the matter at the present time. As I said, it is a subject upon which there may be differences of opinion. The opinion has been sometimes expressed that the originally confederated provinces, by paying to the Hudson's Bay Company £300,000, purchased all the land and all the right in the land in the North-west Territories. That is a position in which the people of the North-west Territories will not readily acquiesce. Their idea and my idea is not that by paying £300,000 to the Hudson's Bay Company, the land or the right in the land was absolutely purchased. The people of the Territories believe that in that transaction Canada merely extinguished a questionable right claimed by the Hudson's Bay Company. The people of the Territories also claim this, that, even if that money is regarded as purchase money they are bearing a portion of the burden by paying their fair share of the interest of the money which was borrowed to pay that amount. I will not allude either to the question of the lands given away to railway corporations. That is a matter which may make the negotiation a little more difficult than it otherwise would be; but I may say that what the people will expect and what I think they have a right to expect—and this is really the point to which I wish to call the attention of parliament—is that they will be dealt with on exactly the same basis as the originally confederated provinces dealt with themselves, they will be put in exactly the same position as that occupied by the originally confederated provinces. If the proper principle is adhered to, if the principle of absolute equality is observed, if parliament places the new province upon an equitable basis, the local government will be given a proper grant for government, also the per capita grant, and be given anything that may be shown to be due as the debt allowance. And they will be put in the possession of the public resources, lands, timber and minerals, in the same way as the other provinces were put in possession of those resources. I believe that that portion of the confederation arrangement by which the original provinces retained control over their public resources, was looked upon by the fathers of confederation as the keystone of the whole

scheme. On that point I will read a couple of extracts from speeches made by leading statesmen, either at the Quebec conference or in the parliament of Lower Canada at the time the Quebec resolutions were being considered. The late Sir John A. Macdonald said :

It will be seen that the local legislatures have the control of all local works; and it is a matter of great importance, and one of the chief advantages of the federal union and of local legislatures, that each province will have the power and means of developing its own resources and aiding its own progress after its own fashion and its own way.

The late Sir. A. T. Galt said :

It will be observed that in the plan proposed here are certain sources of local revenue reserved to the local governments arising from territorial domain, lands, mines, &c. In the case of Canada a large sum will be received from these resources, but it may be that some of them, such as the municipal loan fund, will become exhausted in course of time. We may, however, place just confidence in the development of our resources, and repose in the belief that we shall find in our territorial domain, our valuable mines and our fertile lands, additional sources of revenues far beyond the requirements of the public service. If, nevertheless, the local revenues become inadequate, it will be necessary for the local governments to have resort to direct taxation; and I do not hesitate to say that one of the wisest provisions in the proposed constitution, and that which affords the surest guarantee that the people will take a healthy interest in their own affairs and see that no extravagance is committed by those placed in power by them, is to be found in the fact that those who are called upon to administer public affairs will feel, when they resort to direct taxation, that a solemn responsibility will be exacted by the people in the most peremptory manner.

Since 1867, other provinces have come in. When Prince Edward Island was taken into confederation a grant was voted her for the very reason that she did not have any public lands. When British Columbia came in, the public resources were left to the ownership of the province and beyond that a strip of her territory, required by Canada for purposes connected with the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, was taken over, and a purchase price to the amount of $100,000 annually is being paid to the province on account of this strip of land which the Dominion took over for Federal purposes. The people of the Territories contend that the public lands of that country are now simply held in trust by parliament until such time as provinces may be created in that area. They firmly believe that their contention is good. But even if a strict legal or moral right cannot be established by the people of the Territories to be given possession of their local resources. I appeal to this House whether it would not be unwise and impolitic to create provinces out there on any different basis from that on which other provinces stand. Entire equality is the only sure guarantee of the permanency of the Confederation structure. Is it not a fair proposition that the citizen of the Northwest Territories should be looked upon in all respects as equal to the citizen of any other province ? The proper policy for this parliament to pursue is to make the citizen of that country in all respects equal to the citizen of any other province of Canada. The subjects that come under the purview of the local government affect the people more closely than those dealt with by this parliament, and the best way to promote the progress of that country will be to give as much financial ability as possible to the local legislature to deal with their local affairs, so that education, public works and all local services may be dealt with efficiently and adequately. My opinion is that by no other means can parliament do as much at one stroke to promote progress and the true welfare, not of the Territories alone but of Canada as a whole, as by placing the main portion of Western Canada in a strong, efficient, capable position as concerns its local government. I think I have fairly established that the time is approaching for a change, that the present position of the local government in the Territories is not satisfactory financially, and even constitutionally is not entirely satisfactory. I will read one other extract from a speech by Mr. Haultain, the Prime Minister, delivered in the local assembly a little less than a year ago :

As I have already said, we must develop, whether we have provincial institutions in a year or two years, or even if we do not have them in ten years hence. There are certain things necessary for the proper carrying out of the work of this House; there are certain necessary extensions of our jurisdiction which must receive attention. Extensions have been made from year to year, but as the conditions of the country change and become more complex and as our population increases, so will the necessity for larger power become more pressing, and whatever postponement of the provincial question there may be, it is our duty, and it is an absolute necessity to the proper working out of the functions of this House, to ask for an extension of our powers not two years hence, but immediately.

Mr. Bennett : An extension of what power in particular?

Mr. Haultain : There is no reason why we should not have the regulation—possibly not completely, but to a greater extent—of our constitution. There is no reason why we should not have that because there are several points which are involved which make it difficult for us to deal with our election laws. For instance, we have no power to disqualify a man for membership to this House, and there are a number of other instances without going into details. We should, too, have the administration of criminal justice. There is no reason why we should not; there are many reasons, financial as well as others, why we should. We have already a certain amount of civil jurisdiction given us, and the position at present simply means that two sets of officials have to

be kept in this country instead of one. There is no practical reason why the same work should not be done by us as is done by the Attorney General's Department in the provinces. We should also have control of the registry offices. The important power to legislate with regard to property and civil rights given to us in one section of the North-west Territories Act is largely curtailed by the Dominion parliament having undertaken to deal with the question of land titles under the Land Titles Act, and I need not remind the House how often we run up against the Land Titles Act in attempting to legislate on many questions. In much of our important legislation we have to deal with land and land titles, and it is a practical argument that if we had the power—as they have in the provinces—to deal exclusively with property and civil rights we should be able to make a great many improvements in much of our general legislation as well as improvements in the land titles system itself. I believe the land titles system under local administration can be made to be not only a self-supporting service, but can also be so conducted as to very largely reduce the number and amount of fees which are at present charged for the various services performed. There are other matters, but I need hardly dwell on them. I believe that—no matter at what time, remote or near, the larger question of provincial institutions is settled—we require an extension of the powers of this House immediately. Many of them we should have had some time ago. We have been asking for them ever since 1892—asking for them every year.

I have kept the House a great deal longer than I intended and I fear that I have, to some extent, wearied the House. I regret exceedingly that it was not some other hon. gentleman with more ability and more fluency who would have better presented the case and have performed the duty of placing it for the first time before parliament, but, I feel, at all events, that the question is large enough and that the country to which it refers is great enough to create pride in the mind of any one who has the privilege, however poorly, of studying and dealing with it. I trust that when the time comes, whether it comes next year, or the succeeding year, and I feel assured that it will come before the end of the term of this parliament, that parliament may deal with the question on broad principles and endeavour to place the citizens of the North-west Territories in a position entirely equal, in no way inferior, to the position which is occupied by the citizens of any other province of Canada.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). It is not my intention to enter into a discussion of the budget as the ground has been pretty well covered——

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). Mr. Speaker——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara has the floor.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I thought I was next on the list, Mr. Speaker. I put my name down a week ago.

Mr. SCOTT.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara has the floor.

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, for a long while, or at least, since the 7th November last, I have wondered a good deal how it was that the hon. gentleman who so well represented West Assiniboia in this House for several parliaments was not able to be with us during this parliament, and I am very glad to be able to say that I have discovered the reason. I think I have found it out. Evidently the hon. member who used to be in this House and whom the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott), who has just spoken, succeeded in ousting from that position by obtaining enough votes to enable him to represent that constituency here, must have been defeated at the polls because he was not able to promise to do so many impossible things for the North-west Territories as the hon. gentleman who has succeeded him. I cannot think of anything else that had anything to do with the reversal in the allegiance of that constituency. I have listened to-night with a great deal of attention for an hour and twenty-five minutes to the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, to find out what he had to say about the fiscal policies, about the fiscal policy, if any, of the government, and about the fiscal policy of the opposition. I have listened for over an hour of that time to his discourse on entirely different matters and I give the hon. gentleman a great deal of credit and a great deal of thanks too, because it will serve as an example, as an illustration for me when I shall say a word in regard to the government fiscal policy, which I shall do in a few minutes in the course of my speech. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has also assisted me by saying that nobody knows to-day, in spite of over a week's debate on the fiscal questions of this country, what is the fiscal policy of the government outside of the members of the cabinet themselves. We have been trying to find that out for four years and we did think, that, although they would not tell the people what their policy was, they would tell the members of parliament when we got into a new parliament after the elections. But, we have not discovered it yet from the members of the cabinet and we find that of those behind the cabinet no two of them agree for one minute as to what that policy is. We have the hon. gentleman who has just sat down discoursing to us; he wants free trade, and he illustrates his position by saying that he does not want a duty on wheat. But he does not say that he would remove the duty on wheat, and he votes for a government that keeps that duty on wheat and votes for a government that does not put a duty on corn. The people of Ontario are more concerned in having a duty on corn than the people of the North-west Territories are in having a

duty on wheat. I know that it is denied that throughout the Dominion there are sectional feelings, I know it is denied that the province of Quebec votes in one way for certain reasons that it ought not to take into consideration, but, while on the floor of this House we find that all the members of the Conservative party stand together as one man on matters of policy, we cannot find hon. gentlemen opposite able to debate the question without bringing in sectional matters that particularly affect their own constituencies. So, if we want an excuse or a justification, for putting on the records of the House a declaration distinctly saying what our policy is, hon. gentlemen opposite have not only given us that excuse, but our regard for the honour of the country forces us to do so because we want to have a policy declared in such a way as to be understood by the ordinary every-day man in this country, so that he can tell his neighbour in Buffalo, or his cousin in Ireland, or England, or Scotland, what kind of laws he is going up against if he emigrates to this country. If we cannot have a policy that every one can understand in that way from the government, the next best thing to do is to have a policy from the opposition, so that if the people will be willing to bide a wee they will know what is going to be the policy of the country when the opposition become the government. If we wanted any reason for putting a declaration, or a resolution, upon records of the House such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax), whom I have the honour to follow in this House, has placed upon the records, we have it from the very proceedings, the very arguments which are made by hon. gentlemen opposite in their endeavour to support the government willingly in everything that is done, and everything that the government may do. In 1896—I do not wish to repeat, but it is necessary to make the argument consecutive—it is well known that the government got into power by making certain pledges and it is well known and never disputed that it did not carry out these pledges. In 1900 it was argued upon the hustings of every province—I will not speak specially for the provinces of Quebec, or Manitoba, or for the North-west Territories, because I was not there, and I cannot say what they did there, but it is fair to assume that the same arguments were made there as were made in Ontario, that there was more than one reason why the government should be turned out of office. It was argued that in public matters you could not trust them, and that was given as the reason why they should be turned out. The province of Ontario, which I think, I may say, without wishing to wound the feelings of hon. gentlemen representing other parts of the Dominion, leads the other provinces in civilization and progress, undertook to say by a very large majority that such things as were shown to have been done could not be done in public life any more than they could be done in private life, that the business of Canada could not be done on that basis, that the affairs of the country must be carried on in a proper and business like way. I have heard many reasons given by hon. gentlemen as to why the government is not better represented on the floor of this House from the province of Ontario ; but, if you look at it in any constituency you like, comparing it with another constituency and applying fair and proper reasoning to it, you will find that the reason which generally actuated the mind of the people, was whether they would or would not employ persons to carry on their business whom they had employed before and who had not carried out what they said they would do. I am not debating now whether free trade or protection is the best policy for the province. I believe protection is the best policy. I have always believed it, I believe it now, and I am caused more than ever to believe it by the fact that some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House admit that it is while all hon. gentlemen on this side of the House say it is. That does not carry a doubt according to the expressions of the cabinet, but it does carry a doubt according to expressions of hon. gentlemen behind and supporting that cabinet. For all these reasons we must conclude that protection is the best policy for this country. But, Sir, the question of whether protection or free trade is the better policy in our interests is not the question that most concerns us as a people. Sir, it is a question of the national honour of Canada ; it is a question as to whether we are to do business in public matters upon the same moral plane as we do business in private matters. I stand here to say that if my hon. leader were to-day to treat the public issues so lightly from a moral standpoint, as have the leaders of the Liberal party I would not come to this parliament to sit behind him and to vote with him on party questions. The hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who spoke in favour of protection the other night, was forced before the last elections to issue a special address to his electors in order to make himself safe and for fear the government would go down, and that he would go down with it if he did not show to the people that he was not going to be guided by that sort of political morality—if the word is permissible—which seems to find favour with the Liberals of this country. I say that we are here to-night, Sir, to decide whether the government of this fair Dominion will be obliged to do what it says it will do, or whether it is to be allowed to get into power promising that it will do certain things when in power, and then not only not do them, but come back four years afterwards and not pay the ordinary compliment to the people of telling them what they are going to do or what

they are not going to do. This government in effect says to the people of Canada : We told you we would do such and such a thing in order to get to power, but now that we have power for the second time we will not pay you the compliment to say whether we are free traders or protectionists ; we will let you find that out for yourselves, and we will go as we please on this question so long as we have men behind us to vote to retain us in power. That is the position which the government places the people of Canada in to-day. I say that if we had no better reason to vote for protection and for a business policy such as that propounded by the leader of the opposition there would be sufficient to entitle this amendment to the support of the ordinary individual in the fact that the leader of the opposition has plainly laid down what policy he wants ; has nailed his colours to the mast, and will steer his course towards a plain business policy which every one can understand and rely upon. The gentleman from Annapolis (Mr. Wade) was frank enough to tell us the other night—and these confessions will fall unawares from the lips of gentlemen opposite—that when the Liberals were wandering around in the wilderness of opposition they did this and that and the other thing. Well, Sir, I can tell that hon. gentleman that although the Conservative party to-day is in the wilderness of opposition, we will never wander around ; we will always be able to blaze the trees as we go along, so that we can always be found and always find our way back. To-day in opposition we place upon record what our policy is, and even if it is not a policy that commends itself to every man who may be an utter free trader, it will at least commend itself to every man who has the interests of his people at heart, for he knows where we are going to take him, he knows our record is good, and he knows we never said we would do a thing and refuse to do it afterwards, even though we had made a mistake. Now, Sir, it has been asked me a great many times how it happened that the chief whip of the Liberal party in the last parliament was not returned to this House from a constituency that was supposed to be safe for the Liberals, and how it is that I came here in his stead. I have always thought it better to reserve the explanation as to that until the time arrived when I could state it publicly in the House of Commons. It is due to no qualification of mine, and it is due to no disqualification on the part of Mr. Gibson. The people of the banner electoral district of Lincoln and Niagara, the oldest settled part of Ontario, a place that first had a parliament building in the whole of this Dominion ; a place that first had a lieutenant-governor residing there—and were it not that I see some hon. gentlemen opposite smiling, I would say, a place that is in the forefront of civilization—a district ahead of the rest of the Dominion in age, if age counts for anything ; that electoral district has returned a supporter of the Conservative party to oppose the acts of the Liberal government simply and solely because the electors did not know what that government would do if it were returned to power on the 7th of November, for they knew that during its four years of power it had done nothing that it promised to do in the years prior to 1896. That and nothing else caused the constituency of Lincoln and Niagara to send me to this House. And, Sir, although perhaps I should not say so, I trust that my constituents will not find me wanting in representing their interests ; at all events, when I return to them they will never have to accuse me of making false pledges and of promising them something which I did not endeavour to have carried out.

The resolution before us, Sir, has been thoroughly discussed by gentlemen on both sides of the House. It has been explained over and over again by gentlemen on this side of the House, while the gentlemen on the other side do not appear to be able or willing to understand what it means. It is pretty well written, it is pretty plain English ; it is protection and it is a preference with Great Britain, that is to say, a mutual preference. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), who last spoke, made an able and eloquent argument in favour of the North-west Territories, and I will take the liberty of pointing out to the government what this follower of theirs thinks a man should do in carrying out his duty. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) evidently came here determined to see that the North-west Territories, and his district of West Assiniboia especially, should get full and ample justice at the hands of this parliament. Now, Sir, the rule that ought to guide us in business, be it great or small, should be the same rule in principle in small affairs as well as in great. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) devoted the largest part of his speech to trying to prove to the government that they should give a preference to the North-west Territories in return for something which the Territories have done for us, as he says. Now, would not the same rule apply in the relations between Canada and the British Empire, and is it not the duty of the Prime Minister to go to England and get something else than Cobden medals for us in return for what we are doing for the mother land ? If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) will apply to the government the same rule which he wishes the government to apply to the constituency which he so ably represents, then he should vote for this amendment moved by the leader of the opposition, because it asks in the interests of the Dominion of Canada just exactly what he wants in the interests of the Territories. As far as that goes we have got a very good example if we need it. I admit that we have not been in the habit of going across the floor to get ex-

amples. I grant you that we have never been quite so hard up as to have to go around looking to gentlemen opposite for examples for what we ought to do ; but I do say that we could go for an example to the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) who asks from this parliament for his constituents, what this resolution, in principle, asks from the mother country for the Dominion of Canada. We are told by gentlemen opposite that it was disloyal to ask England, disloyal to ask Her late lamented Majesty Queen Victoria, or our present noble King Edward VII., to give anything in return for the preference we give them. But, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) does not say that it is disloyal to this parliament to ask us to give to the North-west Territories something in return for what he alleges they gave us. I believe, Sir, that the reasoning which I have endeavoured to follow in this respect will be the reasoning which will be followed by the people of Canada when next they get the chance, and that they will expect the Canadian government to do business with the mother land upon terms which are just and fair to the people of the Dominion. I have heard it argued in this debate that Mr. Chamberlain, representing the English people, will not allow us to do a certain thing, and therefore it is out of the question for us to try and do it. Well, does any gentleman in this House believe that Mr. Chamberlain will desist from trying to get the treaties he wants with Germany or Russia because some man who is interested in trying to dissuade him simply tells Mr. Chamberlain that he cannot get these treaties. He is on the other side of the contract. Where is the astuteness and the business ability of this cabinet ? When they go to England to make a deal with Mr. Chamberlain, they can only come back and tell us : It is true, we went there to get something in return for this advantage which we are giving to the mother country, and they gave us a Cobden medal, which we will lay on the Table, if necessary, and let you see it. Even if Mr. Chamberlain did regard that as a fair return, that is no reason why we should not go on and try to get just compensation for this country for the great advantages which we are giving to the mother land.

I want to deal for one minute with one or two things which have been said in the course of this debate, because they do not strike me as being correct, and my constituents would blame me if I sat silent and allowed such things to be said without rising to contradict them. It was said by the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) the other night, that the charge of inconsistency against this government might well be laid by some people. I suppose he says that in politeness, instead of using the stronger word which we might apply, and say they might be charged with bad faith. But he censured the hon. member for Pictou for laying the charge of inconsistency against them. That is the way hon. gentlemen oposite try to get rid of the main question in this debate. They take the ground that some one now supporting the opposition did wrong, and, therefore, no accusation of wrong-doing should be laid against the government. I submit that it is the government who are on their trial, and not the opposition. The opposition are not to be blamed for the sins of the government ; and because the government are fairly chargeable with inconsistency, it is no answer to say to the individual making the charge : Six or eight or ten years ago you made a different statement, when, perhaps, the individual was not in the House at all. That is not the kind of argument which I think ought to prevail in this House.

Of course, I am influenced a good deal by the learned lecture which the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) gave us, being a new member like himself, and not very much older than he is. He gave us a long discourse of twenty-five minutes or half an hour about our duty in conducting this debate. I have no doubt that if we could all do, as he said, stick to the question strictly, we would be able to get along better than we do. But, the hon. gentleman made some remarks about the farmers of this country and the preference to England which I cannot allow to go unchallenged, as I represent a good many farmers, some 4,000 or 5,000 having voted in my constituency in the last election. He said the farmers did not mind the loss of a few paltry hundreds of thousands of dollars. I suppose he believes that the possession of the Cobden medal is worth that much to them, and was a full compensation for their loss on account of this so-called preference to England. Well, he must be speaking for the farmers of South Wellington alone. I wish it to be understood that his remarks do not apply to the farmers of the constituency I represent. Although they are not stingy men, who insist on the last dollar in a business transaction, still they believe in doing business on business principles ; and if the government undertakes to do business for them, they expect them to bring back something better than a paltry medal. I do not doubt that the farmers of South Wellington are just as intelligent and as able to elect representatives as the farmers of my constituency. I am not insinuating for a moment that they are not. But, I do say, that when the hon. member for South Wellington made that remark, I believe he had not consulted the farmers of his own county, and when he goes home and explains it to them, if he can, he will get their orders not to make a remark like that again.

The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) told us the other day that there was no life in this opposition. The opposition do not mind any little jokes being made at their

expense, but these things get into 'Hansard,' and into the public press, and are read seriously, and for that reason we do not like them to be said. The hon. gentleman said also that this opposition had no practical head on its shoulders. Well, it seems to me the hon. member had better ask himself again, who has been doing the practical business in this parliament since February 6? He had better look through 'Hansard' and see who has initiated the legislation, and he will find that on nearly every question of public importance the opposition has taken the initiative, and the government has opposed, and has afterwards given in, as they did on the binder twine question. When hon. members opposite make assertions of this kind, which are not based on the facts, but are mere bluff, I warn them, be they young members or old ones, there will always be a member on this side ready to get up and point out what the actual facts are.

Now I wish to speak for a moment in regard to the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). The other night that hon. gentleman declared that he was a protectionist in theory and in practice, if he could get the practice. Well, the practice is on this side of the House, and when the vote is taken on this question, I should think he would stand up and vote with us, and get the benefit of the practice of protection as well as the theory. He sits behind this government, and he declared at the end of his speech that he was going to vote with the government; yet, he is a protectionist. and he thinks this government is a revenue tariff government. The hon. gentleman declared himself to be a protectionist, and he knows that we on this side of the House have been consistent protectionists; he knows we are protectionists to-day, as we always have been, and he knows that our record has been to carry out, when in power, the pledges and promises we have made when out of power.

The hon. gentleman said that although he is a protectionist he will vote against this resolution. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not the way to convince new members—if I may be allowed to speak for the new members—upon this side as to what their duty is. We would prefer to take the advice of the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, and state in clean cut language what we mean, and if what we mean is the same as what is expressed in this resolution, then vote for it. I have no faith in the man who says: I do not believe in a free trade or a revenue tariff, and I do believe in protection, but as this resolution, which meets my views in favour of protection, does not come from my side of the House I cannot support it. I will vote for a thing I do not believe in and against that which I do believe in, in order to be upon the same side as the government. If this is the sort of argument used in the hopes of convincing this House—and I see no reason why we should debate in this House at all, unless in the hope of convincing some of those who differ from us that we are right and they are wrong—if that is the sort of argument to which the hon. gentleman from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) resorts, let me tell him that he will have to adopt an altogether different style of tactics, if he expects to convince us that when we want protection we must not vote for the resolution which proposes that policy.

Let me now, Mr. Speaker, discuss for a moment the question of British preference as explained by the government. In his budget speech, the hon. the Finance Minister said that we could not obtain from Great Britain the preference we wanted now, but that when we could get such a preference we will have it. It is no doubt not very difficult to understand that when we can get a thing we will have it. Any school boy would know that when we can get a thing which is good for us, we will very likely take it. Yet that was the summing up of this great policy of the government, as I understood the Finance Minister. We cannot obtain a preference because Mr. Chamberlain will not give it to us, but we are in hopes that by saying to him, we do not want it and are not going to make any row, if we do not get it, he will end by giving it to us, and as soon as he will give it to us, we will have it. That is the sum and substance of the Finance Minister's programme.

Well, what is the other side of the question? We, on this side, say: We can have it if we show the British government that we are entitled to get it and are resolved to get it. We contend that we can get it if we argue our case fairly, and that we could have got it, instead of the Cobden medal, had the right hon. gentleman asked for it. But the right hon. gentleman, not only did not ask for it, but declared that he would not. The people of this Dominion to-day, however, are asking for it; and in reply to this demand, hon. gentlemen opposite say it would be a good thing to get, but we will make no effort to get it. I suppose we ought to give them some credit for not saying that such a preference would be a curse and for not imagining that the people are so gullible as to suppose that it would be a serious injury to get something so evidently to our advantage. If there is an independent man on the government benches, if there is a man not hide-bound in his politics, if any gentlemen on the other side are still susceptible to reason, why not, in the name of common sense, vote for the resolution of the leader of the opposition? What matter whether the resolution comes from a Grit or a Tory, if it be in the interests of the country? Surely, in this parliament, the highest deliberative body in the country, we should do business on business principles just as it would be done in some school section or some little factory employ-

ing not more than ten men. We might then expect to have Canada obtain the same justice as any other country would, for I do not believe there is any other country which deals with Great Britain in this way—getting nothing in return for something substantial given. There is no country in the world dealing with Great Britain or with Canada which does not insist on a quid pro quo for what it gives. In fact the argument of the government simply amounts to this: We do not know how to do this thing, you think you can do it, but we will not even ask you to assist us. On the contrary, we will declare that it is not in the interests of the country to do it because we do not know how. That is the whole sum and substance of their position. I would appeal to these hon. gentlemen opposite to take a more patriotic course, a more loyal course to Canada, and support this resolution. Let them do as they did with regard to binder twine, in which they admitted we had got the best of them. Let them hedge before it is too late and support this resolution, and we will have a unanimous vote. The position taken by the government is simply a declaration of incompetence, and inability to do the first piece of business they ought to have applied themselves to, one which they have been professing to deal with for some years, and which they claim to have at their finger ends. Yet they have accomplished nothing and will not even try to accomplish anything. Because forsooth public men on the other side of the Atlantic say we cannot get what we desire, they say we will not worry them with trying to get it, and lay ourselves open to the charge of not being loyal. But has England ever accused her subjects of being disloyal because they did their duty to those who put their trust in them? Does King Edward expect us to deceive the people who have entrusted us with the administration of their affairs in order that we may show him that we are loyal? Would he not, on the contrary, prefer that the government should show its loyalty by carrying out the trust reposed in it? Would the most loyal man in England blame the parliament of the Dominion for asserting its right in a legitimate and proper way? The argument that it would not be loyal to ask from England anything more than we are getting is childish in the extreme.

The right hon. the First Minister drew a very pathetic picture. He depicted the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) going to England and talking to the workingmen and asking them for a preference, and he depicted their replying to the hon. the leader of the opposition: If we do this thing for you, what are you going to give us in return? And the leader of the opposition would reply: Oh, as we are protectionists people, you must not expect us to give you anything. But did not the right hon. gentleman, by this very illustration, convict himself of wrong-doing. Because what did he say when he went to the workingmen in England and gave them this preference in our market? Did he ask them for anything in return? He points out that the English workingmen would want something in return for what he gave us. But did the right hon. gentleman ask Mr. Chamberlain what he was going to give in return for this preference? No, he came away with the Cobden medal and that satisfied him.

But if this matter were put before Great Britain as it should be, if the right and justice of our case were made out, we would accomplish one of two things. We would either get a preference in return for that which we give, or we would be perfectly within our rights in withdrawing the preference we have given, and thus show that we are not children and fools. I do not wish to detain the House longer, as I know there are a great many hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who wish to speak. But as I have said at the beginning, I could not allow some of the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite to pass unchallenged. I could not sit in silence—my constituents would blame me if I had, I say, sat here in silence—while things were said which they no more than I could give assent to.

Before sitting down, I must touch upon one matter referred to by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil)—touched upon by that hon. gentleman very improperly and indiscreetly, it seems to me, touched upon in order to make the most capital he could for the premier of the government which he follows in this House. In a speech devoted to questions of race and religion, brought in under the excuse of being allowed to wander far afield and not stick to the question of the budget, which is before the House, he appealed to every one on the floor of the House to witness that all here were proud of the Prime Minister. If he means to speak of the Prime Minister in his individual capacity, I have nothing to say against the hon. gentleman's remarks. But if he meant, as I understood him to mean, that every one was proud of the Prime Minister in his official capacity, then I feel it my duty to my constituents to say that I am not proud of the Prime Minister nor are my constituents proud of him. And why are we not proud of him? Because, Mr. Speaker, he had it in his power, occupying the position he does, at a most prosperous time and at a time when Canada filled a large place in the eyes of the people of the empire—not because of anything that he had done, but because he was fortunate enough to be the premier of the country at the time when the fruit was ripe which had been sowed long before he knew how to reap it—to do honour to his country and to secure great benefit to his country, yet he showed that he was not fit to be trusted with the affairs of the country. Because, when he was in England he did not try

to secure the bargain for a preference with Great Britain, as he might have done, but he has shown that, since 1896, he has led a government that care not a whit for the carrying out of their promises, but are ready to appeal to the people to put them into power, promising that they will effect certain changes, and, when they attain power, care nothing about fulfilling their promises. When we go to the country, to sweep the country as we did in 1878, these hon. gentlemen hope to be able to tell the people that no objection was made to the things they have done—like this old story about the expenditure to which they say no one has objected. They would be very glad to be able to say that the hon. member for Bonaventure had called the whole House to witness that all were proud of the Prime Minister as a public man, and nobody in the House contradicted him. It is for this reason that I am obliged, unpleasant as it may be, to speak out for the grand old county of Lincoln and Niagara, and to declare that we are not all proud of the premier in his official capacity. We are not proud of a premier who promised to reduce the expenditure, who promised to reduce the public debt, who promised to reduce the number of cabinet ministers, but increased them all, who promised to do everything he could think of to catch a few votes, thinking that the people who had begun to say : 'We might as well have a change anyhow,' could be won by these promises to give him their votes, and that if he got into power he would not be obliged to redeem them. And, worst of all, being trusted a second time with power—for the people of Canada are a good-natured people, and they said : Well, the government slipped by the way-side once, but we will give them another chance—he has not even respect enough for the people to tell the people what their policy is going to be. It must be either because they know that the people will not believe them, or because they have no policy, and have been only waiting until the leader of the opposition should give them one that they can do business with. I think the Minister of Finance has given us a good hint. He does not give the opposition credit for pointing the way. But, in a couple of years he will say : Lo, and behold—as the premier said—we now have the same old policy as we had in 1878 ; the leader of the opposition has approved, and so have all his followers, and we will give it to you; now, gentlemen of the Dominion of Canada, voters and electors why not return us again to power ?—the combined wisdom of the opposition could not suggest any better policy than this we offer you, for here is the resolution that they proposed in 1901 ; we have acted upon that policy, we have got a preference with Great Britain, and you ought to return us to power, because we have given you the policy that the opposition wanted to give you in 1901 and which we then opposed.

Mr. JAMES J. HUGHES (King's P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, not being accustomed to public speaking either in or out of parliament, I rise with more than ordinary diffidence, perhaps more than ordinary nervousness, to address this House for the first time, but I presume that the House will give to me that measure of generosity and kindness and forebearance that, I believe, it always extends to members who speak under similar circumstances. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) who has just taken his seat, seems to have some grievance against the government, because he says he does not know what the policy of the government is. The government has been in power four or five years, and surely the hon. gentleman has intelligence enough to know what the policy of the government was in that time —and the Finance Minister, in his budget speech the other day, said there would be no change in the policy of the government, and I presume that the hon. gentleman, if he was present on that occasion, must have heard the Finance Minister making that statement. The hon. gentleman seems also to have a grievance against the people of Canada because they returned this government to power on November 7 last. That is unfortunate for the hon. gentleman, but the people generally have their way in these things. I understand that the hon. gentleman is the representative of Niagara. I presume he has lived for many years near the great falls, and, perhaps, the roar and rush of those mighty waters may have influenced his style of public speaking. It did not strike me that the hon. gentleman said anything new upon the question, or anything specific that I am obliged to answer specifically. In the few remarks I am to make, in a general way, I presume, an answer will be found to anything he has said. Now, during the progress of this debate I have obtained some information. I have found, amongst other things, that the opposition do not agree with the government on a great many points. I also found that the opposition do not agree among themselves on a great many points. And I think I have also learned that, generally speaking, or at least, on a good many occasions, each member of the opposition managed to disagree with himself. But, while there was this great divergence of opinion, there were some points upon which we all agreed—Liberal and Conservative, government and opposition—namely, that the country was eminetly prosperous, and that in the last few years the development of the trade of the country was something really wonderful, and far greater than at any previous time in the country's history. And I noticed that the government was under the impression that they deserved some little credit for some share of this pros-

perity, but the opposition were not inclined to give them credit for anything at all; on the contrary, they seemed to think that if it were not that this government was in power the prosperity might be greater. It seems to be a cardinal doctrine of the opposition that governments have much to do with the development or retardation of the country. These hon. gentlemen admit that the country has been progressing, and that the trade of the country has been greatly developed; but, they say: It has been due to Providence and the Canadian people. They seem to think that when the Conservatives are in power Providence and the people can take a rest, because the Conservatives will attend to all things terrestrial.

The opposition say that the present administration have increased the taxation and expenditure of the country, and have increased the public debt. In regard to the increase of taxation, the Finance Minister clearly showed in his budget speech that the reduction of taxation on importations of last year alone was upwards of $3,000,000. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), I think it was said that that amount was too high, and he went into a long and somewhat elaborate calculation, comparing the tariff of the present administration for a series of years with the tariff of the late administration for another series of years. He made, I think, a somewhat unfair comparison in that way; but at all events he was compelled to admit that the reduction in the taxation was about $2,000,000. The hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Smith), also speaking from the side of the opposition, figured out that in the Post Office Department the reduction in taxation last year was $1,000,000; so that, according to two hon. gentlemen opposite, the reduction in taxation last year was at least $3,000,000. That was a reduction which perhaps was not quite as large as we would wish to see on this side of the House, but at all events it was a pretty good reduction in the taxation of this country.

Now, in regard to the public debt, hon. gentlemen have figured it out that the increase during the present administration has been $7,000,000. But if you compare that increase in four years with the increase in the public debt of $6,500,000 a year during the time the Conservative party were in power, the increase of $7,000,000 in four years would only be half a million dollars more than for each year of the previous administration. The Minister of Trade and Commerce speaking the other evening upon this question, showed that for this increase in the debt Canada had received valuable consideration. For the $3,500,000 that was given in the subsidy to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, Canada had received ample returns in the coal lands, which alone more than equalled the whole amount of the subsidy, while the trade that the building of that road has developed had already yielded in customs and excise duties an amount nearly or quite sufficient to recoup the treasury for that sum, not to speak at all of the advantage secured to the people of the North-west by a reduction in the freight rates, which is said to be worth $700,000 or $800,000 a year. In addition Canada has secured running rights over that road for any railways it may build. Now, there was another $1,500,000 well expended in sending troops from this country to South Africa, another $1,000,000 was the discount on the 2½ per cent loan which the Finance Minister floated in London, and which was purely money well expended, because it established for ever the 2½ per cent rate. The hon. Minister could easily have floated a 3 per cent loan at a premium, and thus have added nothing to the public debt, but the transaction would not have been nearly so good a one for Canada, so that altogether we have $6,000,000 of expenditure for which Canada has received ample return. Now with regard to the public expenditure, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), replying to the Finance Minister on the budget speech, complained that this government had enormously increased the rate of expenditure. In order that there may be no doubt about what he said, I will read his words:

> It is, of course, only natural that our expenditure should increase as our trade increases, but this increase in expenditure is far outrunning any increase in revenue, and there is not the slightest attempt on the part of the government or any member of it to keep our expenditure within our means.

Now, I take exception to that statement, although I do so with some degree of hesitation, in view of the great reputation of that hon. gentleman as a financier, but I think that statement is entirely contrary to facts. The increase in the rate of expenditure under the present administration is practically the same as it was under the previous administration, and under any government that is in power in this country, no matter whether Liberals or Conservatives, the expenditure is bound to increase as the country develops. I think it was the hon. senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who, speaking some years ago, stated that the expenditure of this country must necessarily increase. I say that while the trade of the country is developing, the rate of increase in expenditure under the present administration is practically what it was under the previous administration, while the net revenue under the present administration increased about three and a half times faster than under the previous administration. I understand that the hon. gentleman from Toronto is director in a large railway corporation. Suppose that he could go before his shareholders at an annual meeting and show that while the business of the company had largely increased, while the net revenue of the company had

largely increased, still the expenses of management had been practically what they were under the previous board of directors; that the expenditure had been practically what it was before while the increase in revenue had been three and a half times greater, I want to know if that hon. gentleman would not expect a vote of thanks from the shareholders of the company. The present government, I think, have received from the people of Canada a vote of thanks at the last general elections for the way they had administered the finances of this country during the previous four years.

Some members from the great province of Ontario have asked what this government have done for the farmers, what they have done to find better markets for the produce of this country. Now, Sir, allow me to read some figures which will show what has been done under the present administration for the farmers of this country:

EXPORTS.

	1896.	1900.
Butter	$ 1,052,089	$ 5,122,156
Cheese	13,956,871	19,856,324
Eggs	807,086	1,457,902
Bacon and hams	4,381,968	12,758,025
Animals and their produce (total)	36,507,641	56,148,807
Apples	1,416,470	2,578,233
Fruits	1,716,278	3,305,662
Wheat	5,771,521	11,995,488
Flour	718,433	2,791,885
Total grain	8,096,808	18,057,233
Agricultural products	14,083,361	27,516,609
Total provisions	21,200,808	40,063,218
Manufactures	9,365,384	14,224,287
Exports the produce of Canada	109,915,337	170,642,369

In regard to apples, the hon. member for Wentworth said that for ten or fifteen years past the apple growers of Ontario had been trying to get the government to do something for the apple export trade, and they could get nothing until they applied to the present Minister of Agriculture, who was the first to try to do anything for the apple exporters of Ontario. The statement which I have given is my answer to the hon. gentlemen who have asked on some former occasions what the present government have done for the manufacturers and producers of Canada in order to obtain and develop markets for them.

Now, in regard to preferential trade matters about which we have heard a great deal and about which a great deal was said during the last election, it appears, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, that it is a very easy matter to get the British government to put a duty on corn, meat and other products of large importation into that country. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) in speaking upon this question the other evening, pretended to think that it was an easy matter to have this thing settled. In a very short space of time he fixed up a tariff, that, to his mind, would not only suit Canada but Great Britain and the other parts of the British Empire. He fixed this matter up, settled it to his own satisfaction and he then, in fancy, took a trip to the commonwealth of Australia. He arranged matters there for the commonwealth of Australia and then, having some more work to do he transported himself, in fancy, to the old country and showed the effete statesmen of that country what they needed for the mother land. He told them that it was a very easy matter to put a duty on corn and other foodstuffs going into that country, because, as he said, this duty would not increase the price to the consumer in Great Britain, but that at the same time it would increase the price of these articles to the producers in Canada. I have heard that the magicians of old were men that could do wonderful things, but I do not believe they could do anything so wonderful as that which the hon. member for West York proposes when he says that Great Britain could put a duty on articles from Canada going into that country that would not increase the price, but which at the same time would give the producers in Canada an increased price. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), not to be outdone in anything that was going on, rose in his place and showed that he had a goat of his own that he was going to ride or die in the attempt. He became severe with some of the bad men who were preventing him from buying the railway systems and steamship lines for $2, and he was going to show the people how they could be made rich by taxing themselves. In order to show how easy he could explain all these matters he threw off a few ideas of abstract wisdom, and in winding up the matter he said that the United States, a highly protective country, are driving free trade England out of the markets of the world in the manufacture of iron and steel. He drew from that the conclusion that it was because of protection that the United States were enabled to manufacture iron and steel cheaper than free trade England. Did it not strike that hon. gentleman that if the United States were able to manufacture these metals cheaper than England it was because of their great natural advantages? Canada is not a highy protective country as compared with the United States, and we have heard upon the highest authority that Canada can manufacture iron and steel for $6 a ton less than the United States. It would appear to me that if the hon. member for East York had taken the trouble to examine this question he would not have said that it was because of the protection that the United States have given these industries that they have achieved such great results but that it is because of the great natural advantages that they can manufacture cheaper. For the very same reason Canada can manufacture these articles cheaper. But, the hon. member for East York was going to make another arrangement. He is

strongly in favour of repealing the preferential tariff altogether, or of making it as he says, more equitable, and I include with him in this position on this question the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). These hon. gentlemen say that because of a preferential tariff, as it at present exists, and because of the reduction of 33⅓ per cent on textile fabrics and woollen goods the woollen mills of the country are to be closed up. The hon. member for East York said that for a preferential trade arrangement with Great Britain he was willing to increase the preference to 50 per cent. If the woollen mills cannot stand the present competition, what would become of them it it were increased to 50 per cent? And I dare say the hon. gentleman would even be willing to add, say 10 or 15 per cent more, in order to strike a bargain? If the woollen mills are going to be closed up because of the present preference, I suppose they would flourish if it were to be increased to 50 or 60 per cent? This is the kind of argument that hon. gentlemen opposite address to the House. I was nearly forgetting the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). He appeared to have made a discovery in the remarks that he addressed to the House. He said that the government were taking credit to themselves, because, as a result of giving the preferential tariff to Great Britain, exporters of goods to this country, similar to those manufactured in Great Britain, were obliged to bring the price down to the amount of the preference and he entirely controverted that position. He said that it would never operate in that way at all. Am I right in making that statement?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman asks if he is right in making the statement that I entirely controverted it. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.). Then, I am stating the case correctly as far as he is concerned. A little later on he said that if we had a preference with England and England would put a duty on corn, meat and other products coming from Canada it would not increase the price of these articles because all other countries exporting similar articles to Britain would have to come down in the price equal to the preference to Canada. It would appear, therefore, that the laws of trade and commerce would work one way in Canada, and in directly an opposite way in Great Britain.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman quite misunderstood me. It has been pointed out that we send a mere fraction, and must always send a mere fraction of the breadstuffs to England, and therefore the greater must bear the burden instead of the smaller. That is the distinction.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is very strong in fractions. He has figured it out to his own satisfaction that the preference to Great Britain only amounts to thirty-five one hundredths of one per cent, but he and his friends say in the same breath that the Prime Minister went to England and gave away valuable concessions and got absolutely nothing in return. I leave it to gentlemen opposite to settle these inconsistencies and contradictions among themselves. I again come back to the statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) that the preference the present government gives Great Britain does not reduce the price of similar articles coming into this country from other countries, while on the other hand he tells us that if Great Britain put a duty upon corn and wool and meat and other products going into her markets and gave Canada a preference, then every other country sending similar articles into Great Britain would have to come down to the extent of the preference.

Mr. CLANCY. That was not it.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.) Oh, yes, that was it.

Mr. CLANCY. I endeavoured to point out that the class of goods imported from other countries to this country were of a different kind, although they may be classified the same, and therefore could not come into competition; and that other countries had separate fields from Great Britain. There are two distinct fields, as the hon. gentleman knows, and therefore they cannot come into competition.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.) The remarks of the hon. gentleman are on record and any person can read them. He may wish to make an explanation now, but we all know what he said the other evening. Some hon. gentlemen opposite have asked what the present administration have done.

Mr. CLANCY. I never asked that.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.) Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman that this government since it came into power have made very great improvements and developments in the Post Office Department; they have reorganized and rejuvenated the militia of this country; they have extended the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal, and, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) said the other day, they have turned a dead railway into a live one; they have provided cold storage and transportation facilities so that the immense exports of products from this country have become possible; they have provided such facilities that the fruit and other perishable products of Canada at the Paris exposition were able to carry off the lion's share of the prizes in competition with the whole world. This government have done a great many other things since they have been in power, and I believe they have fully satisfied the

people of Canada. I suppose they do not claim that they possess all the wisdom of the earth. They are not infallible or impeccable, but they are at least an earnest, honest, patriotic, progressive body of men who are giving their time and the best of what is in them for the true development of our country, and the people of Canada appreciate it. Well, Sir, some of these gentlemen opposite have been rehearsing their campaign speeches, and we were told by the hon. member from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) and the hon. member from West York (Mr. Wallace) and others, that the miserable and disreputable race cry that was started in the province of Quebec last year, had some considerable influence upon the elections. I do not know what influence the race cry may have had, but I want to say that that miserable and disreputable race cry was started in a very small corner of the province of Quebec, namely in the Star newspaper office in Montreal. Perhaps it had no influence in the province of Ontario, I hope it had none, but hon. gentlemen opposite are the best judges of the effect which the race and religious cry was expressly intended to have there. Now, Sir, as to the amendment before the House. In the words of an eminent authority, the language is delightfully vague. It says :

That, in the opinion of this House, the welfare of this country requires a pronounced policy of adequate protection and encouragement at all times to the labour, agricultural, manufacturing, mining and other industrial interests of Canada.

That, in the opinion of this House, the adoption of a policy of mutual trade preference within the empire would prove of great benefit to the mother country and to the colonies, and would greatly promote the prosperity, unity and progress of the empire as a whole, and that the present time, when the Commonwealth of Australia is laying the foundation of its fiscal system, is particularly opportune for taking prompt and energetic steps towards the furtherance of this object.

So there is to be high protection for the manufacturers, free trade for the farmers; riches for everybody, everything you want and if there is anything you want and do not see all you have to do is to ask for it.

This House is further of opinion that equivalent or adequate duties should be imposed by Canada upon the products and manufactures of countries not within the empire in all cases where such countries fail to admit Canadian products and manufactures upon fair terms, and that the government should take for this purpose all such available measures as may be found necessary.

When the leader of the opposition was speaking to this part of the resolution, he declared that he would not approve of bringing it into effect against the United States and, of course, it does not apply to Great Britain, or any part of the empire. Therefore, as 87 per cent of our whole trade is with Great Britain and the United States, this part of the resolution would be practically a dead letter. It would appear as if the resolution has been so worded that hon. gentlemen opposite can go throughout the country and take whatever meaning they like out of it. It is the hope of these hon. gentlemen that all those who are in distress and oppressed with difficulty, and under any affliction of mind may gather around the leader of the opposition and that he may become their prince in the cave of Adullam, and in this way he may perhaps gather around him a party sufficiently strong to some time in the distant future return him to power. For the reasons I have given, Mr. Speaker, and for many many others, I am a supporter of the present administration. I am both an old Liberal and a new Liberal, because I do not think there is any difference between the two. The hon. member from Toronto (Mr. Brock) told us that the Conservatives were not ashamed of anything in their past history. He is a very fortunate man indeed who has no skeleton in the family cupboard. I do not think that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) has been a close reader of political events in the years 1891 and 1873 and 1849, or else he would know, that if all the skeletons in the political cupboards of the Conservative party were revealed, they would astonish even the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). For the reasons I have given I am a supporter of the Liberal party, and I shall be obliged to vote against the amendment. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members for their patient hearing.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose, at this stage of the debate, to go into the figures connected with the budget. They have been elaborately dealt with by members on both sides of the House. I wish merely to confine myself to a few observations which have occurred to me as I listened to the debate, which I followed most patiently and carefully. The most striking feature of the debate, so far as I have been able to see, has been the declaration on the part of a number of Liberals, that while they are free traders in theory, they are still willing to support protection in practice. I must say that I have listened with regret to many declarations on the part of Liberals that they are willing to accept a protective tariff.

Now, it seems to me that if there is one thing which is desirable in this country at the present time, it is that we should get down to clear definitions. I think it is particularly desirable that we should have a distinct and authoritative statement as to whether the tariff which we have is a protective tariff or a tariff for revenue only. I think, Sir—and I am sure that you and hon. members will agree with me—that it is not a good thing, either in the interest of the country or in our own interest, that we should either practice any deception on the

country or allow any deception to be practised on ourselves. Either this tariff is a protective tariff or it is a tariff for revenue only. My own conviction is that the tariff has not been scaled down to the point of a revenue tariff. I may say that this tariff question was discussed very elaborately in my constituency during an exciting campaign which was waged there previous to the election. Some speakers contended that the tariff had been scaled down to a revenue basis, and that the government, in revising the tariff in 1897, had wiped out entirely the element of protection. The position I took at that time was this. I gave to my audiences three statements with regard to the tariff. I quoted the statement which was frequently made by the Hon. Geo. E. Foster, who, as you know, was the financial critic of the opposition during the last parliament, that the total reduction in the tariff made by this government amounted to 71-100ths of 1 per cent. I merely gave his statement for what it was worth. Mr. Joseph Martin, a Liberal of rugged independence, a very prominent figure in this country, and one who occupied a prominent position in this House, made the statement at a public meeting in Winnipeg some years ago, that the reductions in the tariff amounted to less than 1 per cent. I gave that statement for what it was worth. Then, I remember listening to a speech which my hon. friend the present Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) made in the city of Winnipeg a little over a year ago, in which he made the claim, if my memory serves me correctly—and he will correct me if I do not present the actual fact—that the reduction had been 2½ per cent on the tariff, or 10 per cent if you bring it to cash. Therefore, I said there were three statements with regard to the tariff—the first by a Conservative, the second by a Liberal, and the third by a member of this government. Now, I put the matter in this way—and I think hon. members will agree that it was perfectly fair ; I think the country at least expected, from the ante-election pledges of the Liberal party, and from the Ottawa platform, that if we did not get free trade as they have it in England, which my right hon. friend the leader of the government declared to be his own ideal, we would, at any rate, get a tariff for revenue only. The question then arose, what is a tariff for revenue only ? Under the administration of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, we had what I think the country regarded as a tariff for revenue only. That tariff, as you know, was a 17½ per cent tariff. In 1878 when the Liberal government of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was defeated and the Conservatives came into power, they inaugurated what was known as the national policy, and imposed a tariff which has generally been regarded as averaging 35 per cent. If we were to get a purely revenue tariff, I think the popular expectation was that we should get a 17½ per cent tariff. Instead of that, if you accept the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs —and we will take his statement, and disregard those of Mr. Foster and Mr. Martin —we have a tariff of 32½ per cent.

Therefore, what the country and this House have to consider is this : Is a reduction of 2½ per cent a wiping out of the element of protection from the tariff ? Now, I may frankly say that I do not consider that it is ; and, as I said at the outset, I believe if there is one thing desirable in the country at the present time, it is perfect frankness in regard to this matter. Either we have a revenue tariff or we have a protective tariff. I have never been disposed to be hypercritical of the government with regard to the reduction of the tariff. We had conditions established in the country extending over a priod of twenty years; we had industries in full operation, which had grown up under the protective tariff, and it was not reasonable to expect the government to wipe out the tariff, or even to cut it down at one swoop to 17½ per cent which was Mackenzie's revenue tariff. Therefore, I was never disposed to be hypercritical of the policy the government adopted ; and when the Finance Minister, in 1897, at the time the revision was made, warned the manufacturers that eternal vigilance would be the price of protection, and when he gave the country clearly to understand that there would be a general scaling down of the customs duties from time to time, I may say that as a western man I was disposed to accept that. I was disappointed, however, when the tariff was announced, for we had reason to expect that the duties would have been taken off agricultural implements and coal oil, and other necessities of the farmers. But, the country was in a very kindly mood, and was very generously disposed towards the government, and, as the people felt that there would be a scaling down of the duties from time to time, as intimated by the Minister of Finance, they were disposed to be satisfied. Even in the west, where the disappointment with regard to the tariff was very severe, the people were disposed to treat the government with the utmost generosity.

But what is the position now ? I remember very well my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, in that speech to which I have referred, turning to the vast audience in the city of Winnipeg and drawing their attention to the reduction of 2½ per cent and asking them if they were not now satisfied. Let me recall also the statement made by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in his speech at Perth, in which he said, that the tariff was a settled question and had been taken out of the list of issues in this country. And, during my campaign, I was able to quote a statement

made by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) at a banquet in Valleyfield, where he assured the cotton kings that the tariff would not be interfered with. Therefore we may reasonably conclude that the settled policy of this government seems to be stability of tariff.

This session we hoped to have the duty on coal oil wiped out. That was one of the great issues during the last four or five years when the Liberal party was in opposition. That duty was made to do service on every Liberal platform from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the people of the North-west had reason to expect that this very high duty would be removed.

From what I could learn, I feared that this session the former duty on lumber would have been reimposed, and I listened with great regret to the remarks of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on that point. If there is one thing in the North-west which we need it is lumber. There are no pine forests in that country, and we have to get our lumber from Ontario or Minnesota, and if the duty were reimposed it would inflict great hardship on our people, who require a great deal of lumber in building granaries and stables and sheds to protect their cattle and horses in the very severe weather.

As far as I can judge, we are more likely to have the tariff raised than lowered, and if such be the case, I would like to sound a warning note to the Liberals of this country. I think it is fair to assume that, owing to the educative campaign which was conducted for twenty years prior to 1896, at least one-half of our people have been converted to the idea of free trade or at least a tariff for revenue only. But, we have to-day the spectacle of the Liberal party being gradually led along the path of high duties with a prospect of being ultimately delivered right into the fold of protection, body and boots. If that be the case, a warning note ought to be sounded. I believe that the great mass of the Liberal party in this country is sound on this tariff question. I do not believe that the people want protection, and it seems to me that official Liberalism stands in this position: The voice is the voice of free trade Jacob, but the hands are the hands of protective Esau.

I like to be perfectly frank. I think it is desirable that we should call a spade a spade, and if our present policy tariff be a protective tariff—and I believe it is—and if a protective tariff was bad for twenty years before 1896, it is equally bad at present. So far as I am concerned, representing a large constituency in the west, I hope that I will be given grace to raise my voice from time to time against the protective tariff. Exotic industries not indigenous to the country at all are protected by huge bounties. But the farmer is protected in no way whatever. The question of the duty on wheat was brought up to-night. One hon. member wanted to know if the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) was willing to agree to the abrogation of the duty on wheat. Well, as far as I am concerned, I would be perfectly satisfied to have the duty taken off wheat altogether, and I believe so would the farmers of the west. The Ministers of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and Customs (Mr. Paterson) will recall that when they conducted an inquiry with regard to the operation of the tariff, in the council chamber at Winnipeg, a large deputation of farmers from all over the province appeared before them and declared in favour of taking off the duty on wheat. The people of the west do not desire protection, but if you are going to protect these industries in the east—the iron and coal industries—by giving them bounties, I would like to put in a plea for a bounty to the farmers of the North-west on growing their wheat.

The future of Canada lies in its vast plains to the west, and unless you make the conditions of that country such that the settlers will be able to procure their necessaries cheaply, you are not going to promote the success of that country as you should. I am no prophet, but I think those hon. gentlemen who have traversed our western plains, will agree with me that in probably a decade, the balance of power in Canada will be vested in that country. I remember well when the right hon. leader of the government was wont to make strong pleas in behalf of that country. I am disposed to believe that his heart still beats in sympathy with the people of the North-west, and I would appeal to him to-night not to allow the protective idea to prevail in our tariff.

Something is due to the North-west, if we desire that country to succeed as it should. And in that connection I would urge a plea against the introduction of too many European immigrants into that country. We have on the plains sufficient now of these foreign immigrants. Land is becoming scarce, such as we have in Manitoba, and we can well afford to hold these fertile plains for our own sons. Let us put there the best classes of people we can procure, people with broad ideas, people with good blood, people in whom we have confidence. Let us settle these people on the plains, and then we will have a population that will assist instead of retard us in our progress, a population which will be able to exercise intelligence in the politics of this country and work along the right lines when the time comes for them to receive the franchise.

Now, although not strictly germane to this question in view of the great latitude that has been allowed in this debate, I would like to say this—that I think it would be desirable to have the government enunciate a clear policy with regard to railway bonusing, the construction of railways and the ex-

tension of our canals. Take, for instance, the Trent Valley canal, into which, I think, some seven or eight millions of the country's money has been poured in past years. Let me remind my Liberal friends in this House that for all these years they contended against that expenditure as one utterly useless, and now we are going on pouring further millions into that enterprise. I think that is a mistake. We have now expended on our canal system some eighty millions of dollars; and thoughtful men who have studied the question of transportation in this country, I think, will agree that that money has, to a very large extent, been wasted. I do not think that our canal system has been satisfactory; I do not think there are any set of men in this country today who have a clear and intelligent view as to what the aim should be with regard to the canal system. I would appeal to the House, that, before spending more money, a definite scheme should be formulated so that at least we may cease to expend millions uselessly on the canals. As to the question of railway bonusing, I think that public opinion in this country is growing so strong, that in recent months if not in recent years feeling against this system has so increased that the people will not justify the giving of one dollar further of bonuses to any railway company, more especially in the settled districts of Canada. I think we should allow it to be understood that Canada has reached the stage when a franchise to construct a road is valuable even without a bonus. I do not think we should go further in paying for the railroads of this country and handing them over to exploiters to tax us heavily under the head of freight rates.

I would like to say one word with regard to the public expenditures of Canada. I may be accused of being a cheeseparer, but I am quite willing to be so classed. There was not a declaration of the Liberal party in which I more heartily acquiesced than that made by the Hon. Mr. Mills and endorsed by the hon. premier and also by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). If you put us in power, said these hon. gentlemen prior to 1896, we will be able to reduce the amount charged for running the machine by two or three—and I think they went as far as to say four or five—millions of dollars. I think they were perfectly sincere in that. In discussing this question with a Liberal friend the other day, he said: 'Mr. Richardson, I do not think this country wants any reform, I do not think the people desire it; what they want is a liberal expenditure of money, and, for my part I have come to the conclusion that it is scarcely worth while trying to advocate any reform in this country.' If that proposition is true, it is an appaling one, and one that every member should take into serious consideration. It may be that our friends who sit on the treasury benches have come to the conclusion that they would not make the mistakes that Mackenzie made—if they were mistakes—and that the country desires a lavish expenditure of money. If they have conscientiously reached that conclusion, I think it is most unfortunate. I believe that we can save not merely three or four or five millions in the public expenditure, but possibly seven or eight millions. I believe that the departments are loaded up far beyond the necessities of the public service, and I believe that all along the line great savings could be effected. I believe, further, that in this time of prosperity, when Providence has smiled upon us—(I do not attribute good times to the action of the government, though I would not like to deprive the government of any credit due to them in facilitating the matter so far as in them lies)—now that we are having these years of plenty, we ought to take serious stock of our affairs and endeavour, as far as possible, to curtail the public expenditure and reduce the public debt. I believe the time will come, and come soon, when we shall not have as good times as we have now, and instead of large surpluses—on the possession of which I congratuate the country—we will have to face deficits. And it is well, in view of these possibilities, that we should exercise great economy in running our affairs. I believe with ex-President Cleveland that public office is a public trust. To my mind no statesman or philosopher ever made a better declaration than that. Without lecturing the House, I think we should get our minds fairly seized of that idea. And if the members of the government were fairly seized of that idea, I believe greater care would be exercised with regard to the distribution of bonuses and with regard to expenditures generally. I believe that the distribution of these bonuses is one of the causes, perhaps the principal cause, of the corruption that prevails throughout the country at the present day. I am not prepared to say that corruption is especially due to the operations of the Liberals or operations of the Conservatives; both parties are to my mind equally blameworthy. All men who are fair-minded know that corruption exists to a very large extent at the present time. I think it would be the duty of public men to put an effective veto on corruption. I do not see anything higher they could do in the interest of humanity than that corruption should be wiped out as far as possible.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Where is it?

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). If the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Ross) does not know that there is corruption in this country, it would be quite useless for me to attempt to enlighten him. I say that, inasmuch as

these bonuses are the greatest sources, in my estimation, of corruption, I believe that the sooner we stop them and the sooner the government secures control of the railways and of transportation, the better it will be in the best interests of the country. For, after all, the loss of a few hundreds of thousands of dollars, in my opinion, is nothing compared with the demoralization of the people.

Now, I am sure hon. gentlemen will realize, in view of the statements that I have made, that it will be impossible for me to support the amendment. The amendment calls for adequate protection to our industries. I think our so-called industries have been protected entirely too much, and the period of protection has been already too long. I believe the time has come not merely for lopping away the mouldering branches, but for stripping the tree comparatively bare. I believe that most of these industries should stand upon their own feet without protection, and, believing so, I find it impossible to support the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition. I am not here to say that I think free trade is possible in Canada at the present. I believe, that for a long time to come at least, it will be necessary to raise our revenue by tariff duties.

My hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) made to-night what I think was a very convincing argument, when he quoted the figures of the revenue received under the 35 per cent protective tariff on agricultural implements which prevailed prior to 1894, and the figures of the revenue received under the tariff revised by the Conservative party in 1894, that is, when the duties were reduced on agricultural implements from 35 per cent to 20 per cent. My hon. friend was able to show that the revenue increased five or ten times, I think; anyway, to an enormous extent. I was going to suggest to him that he would have made his argument even stronger had he taken the year 1899 instead of 1900. He shakes his head, probably he knows, having gone over the figures. The reason why I think the argument would have been stronger if taken from 1899 is, that last year, as hon. gentlemen know, we had a very serious crop failure in Manitoba, and there was a much smaller purchase of agricultural implements for that reason. I believe that had he taken 1899 he would have been able to make a better comparison. However, his comparison was sufficient to satisfy me and to satisfy all hon. members in this House that you can gather more revenue out of a lower tariff than from a high one; that you make nothing out of a protective tariff, you simply put money into the pockets of the manufacturers instead of into the public exchequer. This argument reminded me of the language I used to hear from the leader of the House in the old days, and which appealed to me especially as a young man, who was sitting at the feet of Gamaliel and receiving lessons with regard to protection and free trade. I may say that so far as my own view goes, I stand by the position which I have held for the last fifteen or twenty years with regard to the tariff. As a western man I do not see how I could take any other position, because if there is one thing that the country requires, it is to have the duties lowered or wiped out altogether from the necessaries of the settlers.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I shall have to speak this evening to a very thin House, as I see that a good many members are absent. Now, Sir, I think it would be well, if we really are the servants of the people, that our masters should send spotters to this House to see how their servants are attending to their duties, because I notice many seats on both sides of the House are empty. I think that is not what we get our indemnity for. I do not wish to be critical, I do not wish to be hard on the members that are absent, because they cannot hear me. I have sat here since this House opened, and I have noticed a great many times that the ministerial benches were occupied either by the Prime Minister or the Finance Minister; one of them is always in his seat, more often the Prime Minister. Now, if I have said anything that will induce a member to be in his seat regularly, I think I have accomplished something. As regards the question before the House, I do not suppose I can throw much light upon it. I must say, however, after listening to the discussion from both sides of the House, that it has turned more often on something else than either the budget or the amendment. The question has been discussed at great length from the political standpoint, and I think the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) is the only member that has spoken this evening from the Independent standpoint. I think it is my duty to take the same line. I was, as you know, elected an independent, and I intend to pursue that course as long as I sit in this House. I will support any government as long as they bring down good measures; as long as they are truthful, faithful and honest to this country I will support them.

Now, this question of the budget is a very difficult thing, perhaps, for a farmer to undertake to criticise. But if I criticise it at all it will be from the farmer's standpoint. You know that politics run very high in this country, they say there is more politics in Canada to the square inch than in any other country in the world, and I believe it. I was at a threshing bee some years ago, and I am going to tell you what I heard. I see it is in order to tell stories in this House, to talk religion, to do almost anything, so I will tell you a story showing

the condition of politics in the section of country in which I live. Two farmers, both of them intelligent men, were discussing politics—there were over a dozen of us present. The two men grew quite warm over it, very warm indeed, and one of them broke out in language something like this : 'The Tories may all go to ——' he meant Hades, but he said another place—into the place where his Satanic majesty resides, I believe. The other gentleman replied : 'There is one thing certain, there will be no Grits in heaven.' I came to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I would remain an Independent, because heaven was not made in vain, and the Independents will be there sure.

Now, there are a number of things in the budget that I think are all right. There are some things, perhaps, in the amendment that may be all right ; but I have been a free trader for over fifty years, and I cannot swallow the high protective duty in that amendment. I say this much, as I admire many of the actions of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, for I believe they are in earnest, I believe they are trying to do as their constituents told them to do ; but when they advocate a high protective tariff, which means that the farmers of this country will have to pay higher for everything that they require, and probably get less for everything they raise, then I am sure I cannot possibly follow them. Then, they say that they are opposed to the preferential tariff with Great Britain. On that question I have my ideas. I stop and think of what happened in years gone by. I always thought that the Conservative party were the most loyal party we had. I thought they were true, and especially true to the mother country, but when I find that they stand out so strongly against the preferential tariff, I exclaim : 'Oh, how my idol is shattered.'

I am sorry for one reason that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) is not in his seat. He is getting old now like myself and it requires an active, smart, able, young man to fill that position because he has to look out markets for us. I am sorry, and I think he is sorry too, that he made a speech five years ago when he said that the office which he now holds, and to which he was about to be promoted, was of no use whatever, in fact, that it was like the fifth wheel to the coach. Further, he said, that if we raised more than $38,000,000 it would be a disgrace and a shame. I am reminded that the Psalmist said : 'Oh, that mine enemy would write a book.' The hon. gentleman's political foes say, 'Oh, that mine enemy would make a speech,' because it comes back on him and tells with great force against him. As far as the budget is concerned, it is a very difficult matter. If the Independents of this House were in power we would find it perhaps very difficult to arrange so that we could make both ends meet or come out within half a million of dollars of doing so. We would perhaps have as much difficulty as the members of the government have. However, we would be in hopes that we would have the balance on the right side of the ledger and have something more instead of having a deficit. We would rather have a favourable balance, but, we believe that it is the duty of the government to raise as much as they require to meet the expenditure of the country and that when they raise more money which is not required it seems to me that they should do what every good farmer would do, who had a mortgage on his farm. He would not go and spend the money on finery or on furniture. He would pay off the mortgage, but, instead of that we find that the government, in the last four or five years have added about $7,000,000 to the public debt. It seems to me that the government should at least live within their income and pay off something of the national debt. That is what I believe should be done with the surplus. However, they have thought otherwise. As far as this question of trade is concerned, I may say that those hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who are asking for increased protection, who advocate high duties on everything that is manufactured in this country, and who propose to prevent British goods coming in here in order to protect people who are engaged in business, take a position with which I do not agree. Of course, we do not blame hon. members who represent urban constituencies and are endeavouring to please their constituents, but, on the other hand, those of us who represent rural constituencies will not be justified in going back to their constituents and telling them that they have advocated a high protective tariff. I do not see how they can square themselves with their constituents. What does a high protective tariff mean ? It means that some few men are going to become immensely rich while the rest of us are immensely poor. If you cannot get a sufficient number of specimens of this class of people in our own country you only have to cross the border and you will find millionaires and multi-millionaires whose wealth is the result of protection. Carnegie does not know what to do with his money. He is bringing some of it to Ottawa. He does not know what to do with the money he has made out of the farmers and out of the fools in the United States. There are hundreds of men like him and it is all brought about by high protection in that country. We have been following here in the same footsteps. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House want to continue in his footsteps.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). An hon. gentleman says 'hear, hear.' Well, he is not a farmer ; he does not have to pay for it. Now, we are told that this government had

the largest surplus that was ever produced in Canada. According to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), this is not the largest, and I have not heard his statement contradicted. I was expecting to hear it contradicted on the other side of the House. The hon. member for Pictou most emphatically says that there have been greater surpluses under some other governments than under the present government. However, I will leave that for you to settle amongst yourselves. I am quite content that the government should have a deficit in the post office. If the government have acted in any one way that is beneficial to this country it is the way in which the post office has been conducted. They have reduced the postage in Canada, and we all know how cheap postage encourages trade. I am satisfied the government are justified in doing it. As far as sending soldiers to South Africa is concerned, I am sure the country will endorse the expenditure of public money for that service. It has given us an advertisement and has shown to Great Britain where the hearts of Canadians lie. In regard to the tariff it was expected, and I was expecting it myself, that when this government came into power they would surely carry out the pledges they had given to us, and I would tell hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that if you were tomorrow to change places, it is quite possible that you may not be able to carry out all the things you are saying in opposition. I notice that I have the attention of the House and I thank hon. gentlemen very much for it. I am afraid I am wearying you.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I was in hopes that the government would carry out their free trade policy, but it seems that they found it almost impossible to do so. I have no doubt that they did the very best they could. But, if they do not carry out their policy and if they continue in the course of extravagance in expenditure and in the appointing of unnecessary officials, they will be sure to hear from somebody on this side of the House. Why, Sir, I have heard, and it is more than hearsay, that when the Conservatives were on the Treasury benches for eighteen years they appointed seventeen supporters of theirs from this House to offices of emolument.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). You gentlemen over there laugh about that, but I find from the record that the present government have only been five years in power and they have appointed twelve of their friends from the House of Commons to office, so they went the Tories one better. It is a shame for any honourable man who is elected to serve for five years in this parliament to go begging and sneaking around the ministers to ask an office. It is a worse disgrace for the members than for the government which appoints them. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope that will not occur again.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I do not pose as a critic generally, but I say what I think and I am not ashamed of it, and I am not afraid to meet any man, and you need not be if you do what is right. I just thought that this government when they promised so many things would have at least given to the farmers free coal oil. Coal oil is the farmers' electric light and the farmers' gas. He takes it in the morning to the barn to do his chores, and at night he burns it in his household. The mechanic, the labouring man, and the farmer use it, but the people of the cities care little about the price of coal oil, because they do not burn it. Now, five cents a gallon makes quite a big item to the farmer and we thought that this government would leave Mr. Rockefeller on one side and that we 'fellers' would get some help, but instead of that Rockefeller got it. I suppose there was some influence brought to bear upon the government, and that the monopolists were taken care of while the farmers got left. We thought that agricultural implements would be allowed in free, and although they were reduced to 20 per cent, still 20 per cent is quite a good deal from the farmers' point of view.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who reduced that duty ?

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Not you. I hope you gentlemen will not catechise me because you put me out, and when I get done you can speak as long and as fast as you like, but let me have a chance now. The average life of a binder is ten years. The first binder I purchased cost me $200, and the next $120. Capitalize the interest and see how much it costs a farmer for his binders. Now if this money went into the treasury of the country it would not be so bad, but it goes into the pockets of men who form trusts and put up the price of binders on the farmers, and the government gets no revenue. Consequently the government should take some action in this matter especially for the benefit of these poor people who live on the prairies.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). You think I am making a point in your favour, but just wait a little until I get at you. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is nearly twelve o'clock and I must conclude.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I am the only man in this House except the Prime

Minister that you gentlemen tell to go on and speak. When I came down here one gentleman said to me : You will have a very short session this time because all the long-winded fellows are left at home, but I find that we have got some long-winded men left, and all you have to do is to wind them up and they will go on as long as you like, and say very little when they have done. Now, Sir, I do not intend to give the government much advice. I am not going to wield the patronage in my county, and I would not if I had the privilege of doing it. Anyway, the government would not listen to me if I did give them advice, but if they expect to get the votes of the farmers of this country they have got to do as they promised to do. Let them carry out their pledges. The government, of course, are only men like the rest of us and they are subject to influence if the right influence is brought to bear upon them. When a man says he is above temptation I begin to think that he has not had sufficient offered to him. Perhaps the reason that I am honest is that I have not been tempted, and I do not expect that the government is going to tempt me. Now, Sir, while I have been sitting here for the last eight or nine days listening to this debate I have taken enough notes to fill half a bushel measure, but I cannot use them to-night, and as the budget will not be discussed again I think I had better keep them until next year's budget. There are several things here I would like to speak about. I am strongly opposed to the members of the government taking part in the elections, and you know that in the old country they do not allow a man who has a title to go on the stump and advise the people as to how they should vote. I should like to see the titled gentlemen in this country adopt that system, and if they did the people would have a great deal more respect for them. I noticed that all last week two of the ministers were missing, and it was quite a while before I found out where they were. I discovered at last that there were some public works to be erected away up in North Bruce, and of course they had to be looked after. Again, I found that the hon. member for West Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Hackett) had a grievance, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries Hon. Sir Louis Davies) went down to look after that. I do not think that kind of thing is right. Just before the election in East Elgin the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was up there, and I am sorry he is not in his place because I do not like to say a word behind a man's back that I would not say before his face. The Minister of Public Works came up into our county with his jaunting car or some other car, and what for ? Well, to build a drill shed. Along about the 5th November he set to dig a hole in the ground and turned the sod with a silver shovel, and that kind of thing and the people became disgusted. Gentlemen, if you want to know why you lost East Elgin do not ask any more questions. It is too thin ; a great deal too thin ; it does not do. In the constituency I represent we have not got a five-cent piece of government money invested except it be a railway which last year you built parallel to another line and to which you gave $3,200 a mile. Unless you count that, I do not think my constituency has got a five-cent piece which the government have put into it. So we do not owe them anything ; and my constituents did not send them a supporter on that account, but they sent a man.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House any further; it is within ten minutes of midnight. I know that the rules of the House do not permit me to move an adjournment ; but I will give you my sentiments on this question :

That in the opinion of this House close trade relations between all the British colonies and the mother country would be the means of strengthening the empire, and that some system of fair trade, leading to freer trade, should be inaugurated ; that, in the meantime, all the infant industries of this country should be assisted until they are able to stand alone, but not after ; that all raw material used in manufactures shall be admitted free, as far as practicable—and I mean to include in that binders, which are part of the farmer's raw material ; that the revenue required for the expenditure of the country shall be raised on the luxuries of life as far as possible ; that 50 per cent instead of 33⅓ per cent be taken off the duties on all kinds of British goods ; and that a reciprocal duty be placed against all other countries whenever it is not prejudicial to the best interests of this country.

Now, this is something of my own getting up ; I did not consult anybody as to this. But if I had an opportunity of moving an amendment, that is what I would move.

I do not know that I should say any more, except to give you an illustration of what I mean by infant industries. There was a great big strapping boy, who had grown to be quite a big lad, and who had learned to swear before he was weaned. His mother had not weaned him for several reasons—I will not give them. His mother had company call one day. It was tony company, and she took them into the parlor. The boy was out playing in the mud and dirt, and he ran into the house where the mother was, and cried : 'Mother, I want some tit.' Mother said : 'Go away, you naughty boy ; what do you mean ?' He had learned to say bad words ; I suppose he had been playing with some Grit boys ; and he went in again more ferocious than before, and shouted : 'Mother, I must have some tit.' She said : 'You little dog, go away.' He persisted, and went in again and cried out to the mother ; and that night he got such a spanking that he was weaned, and

never wanted any more 'tit.' So these infant industries are strong in comparison, but still they want 'tit.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is time to close these remarks.

Mr. HACKETT. May I ask the right hon. leader of the government if he will agree to the adjournment of the debate? If so, I move that the debate be adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There has been, I understand, a private agreement for the closing of the debate. For my part, I am quite willing to agree to the motion of my hon. friend, but, I suppose, considering the number of gentlemen who want to speak, that it will not be possible to close the debate to-morrow.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would have preferred, as far as I am personally concerned, that the debate should be closed to-morrow. If, however, it is the sense of the House that that cannot be done, of course I shall only have to submit. But, I think it is very desirable that it should be closed to-morrow, if it is at all possible.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think it will be possible. It would be better to understand that it will close on Thursday.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 26, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 95) respecting the Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 96) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900. He said: Mr. Speaker, in the election law as it stands, clause 108, provision is made for the punishment of any person who secures a seat by inducing a candidate to withdraw from the nomination already offered by the promise of an office or employment of any kind. Whether by an oversight, or otherwise, there is no provision in the Act as it stands to prevent the purchase of a seat by inducing a candidate who has already accepted a nomination to withdraw in consideration of a promise of money. The object of the Bill is to make the provision in regard to bribery the same touching the securing of a seat by inducing a candidate to withdraw as it is defined in regard to other cases. This Bill is merely to amend the law to that effect.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPORT PRESENTED.

List of shareholders of the chartered banks of the Dominion of Canada, to the 31st December, 1900.—Hon. W. S. Fielding.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the House to what seems to be the non-compliance with an order of the House, made on the 18th February, respecting the bringing down of all papers, telegrams, &c., respecting the pay of the men of 'C' Battery Canadian Artillery, which served in South Africa. On pages 5 and 6 of the return which has been brought down is to be found a report from Col. J. A. G. Hudon, commanding 'C' Battery, dated 25th January, 1901. The commanding officer in this report goes on to say, that:

> General Sir F. Carrington, commanding the Rhodesian field force, was of the opinion that all corps under his command should receive equal rates of pay, and recommended to the War Office that 'C' Battery should receive the Rhodesian rates. Early in October I received official information from the paymaster of the Rhodesian force that War Office authority had been received for 'C' Battery to be paid from the date of their departure from Beira on the 14th of April to the date of disembarkation in Canada. . . . The correspondence on the subject is in the battery store wagon, which has not yet arrived from Halifax.

It is of the utmost importance, Mr. Speaker, that this return should include the correspondence to which the commanding officer refers. It is important for us to ascertain the nature of the correspondence which took place between the officer commanding the battery and the general officer in command of the force. My motion was wide enough to cover this correspondence, and I ask if it is the intention of the government to have it brought down. The commanding officer wrote on January 25 that the wagon containing the official archives of the battery had not yet arrived from Halifax, and as two months have elapsed since that time, we may reasonably assume that the wagon with the correspondence has reached headquarters. The correspondence referred to by the commanding officer should be laid before the House at the earliest possible moment.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry the hon. the

Minister of Militia is not in his seat at this moment, but I will call his attention to the matter as soon as he comes in.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Fielding :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. EDWARD HACKETT (West Prince, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few observations on the question now being discussed by the House, I desire to say that it is not my intention to speak at any length. I am thankful indeed that the right hon. the leader of the government so kindly consented to the adjournment of the House last night. I think his intention was to go on for some time longer, but he courteously consented to the adjournment, and instead of forcing me to speak last night, gave me an opportunity of addressing the House this afternoon. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the question under discussion now is chiefly : Protection to the industries of Canada. I had the honour of being a member of this House in 1879, when Sir Leonard Tilley introduced into the parliament of Canada the national policy. That policy was for the purpose of giving protection to all the industries in Canada ; protection to the farmers, to the fishermen, to the manufacturers, to the miners, to the lumbermen, and to all classes of our population. I need scarcely say that that policy met strong opposition from the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches, but who were then sitting on this side of the House. We have on record that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) made very strong speeches against the national policy at that date. He said it was blue ruin to the country, and he called it legalized robbery. We find also that his colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies), who comes from the province of Prince Edward Island, said that the system of protection to Canadian industries was accursed of God and man.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh !

Mr. HACKETT. Yet, Sir, we find that that fiscal system has been supported by the people of Canada from that date to the present, that under that system Canada has gone on and prospered, that her industries have flourished, and that to-day the government of the country, although they pretend to be a free trade or revenue tariff government, are bound to sustain that underlying principle in their tariff of protection to Canadian industries. Sir, if this government had fulfilled their pledges ; if they had repealed the protective tariff of the Conservatives, they would not be in a position to-day to tell us that Canada was flourishing and prosperous. But, because they retained the principle of protection to the industries of Canada, the Minister of Finance was able to bring down a budget speech congratulating the country on its splendid financial position. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing we want in this country, and that is, honest government. I care not what party be in power, whether it be Liberal or Conservative or Independent, we want that party to be honest, and to carry out, as far as possible, the pledges they made to the people. There are two gentlemen who sit on this side of the House, but who are classed as Independents, and we heard them last night rebuke the government for not carrying out their pledges to the people of the country to reduce the expenditure by several million dollars a year, and to reduce the tariff ; but, still these gentlemen told us that they were going to vote against the amendment of the leader of the opposition. How can we have honest government in this country unless the Independent members, and indeed the supporters of the government themselves, demonstrate that they are opposed to conduct which tends to lower the standard of honesty and integrity in the government of this country. I listened to the hon. gentleman from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) with a great deal of pleasure, because he made a very pleasing address, but he told us that while he was opposed to protection, while he believed that this government had not carried out its pledges; while he knew that the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), especially in addressing a meeting in Manitoba, had gone back on his promises and pledges, yet, in face of all that, he announced that he would vote with the government on this occasion. Sir, it is lowering the tone of public opinion in this country for gentlemen such as the hon. member to announce their support of a government who have not fulfilled their pledges, and who are masquerading in the stolen clothes of the late Conservative government.

Now, Sir, I want to say a word in reference to the hon. gentleman from King's, P.E.I., (Mr. Hughes), who spoke last night. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) made his debut in parliament, and he acquitted himself in a creditable manner, and coming from the same province as I do, although we are opposed in politics, I must give my hon. friend credit for delivering a very fair speech. But, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) was not correct in his facts. His speech sounded all right, but when you came to sift it, you found that he was quite astray in his conclusions. He said :

Some members from the great province of Ontario have asked us what this government have done for the farmers; what they have done to find better markets for the products of this

country. Now, Sir, allow me to read some figures which will show what was done for the farmers of this country under the present administration.

Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) went on to show that our exports of butter, cheese, eggs, bacon, ham, animals and their products, apples, fruit, wheat, flour, &c., had increased from $109,915,000 in 1896, to $170,000,000 in 1900. He said that this government have increased those exports. Will the hon. gentleman pretend to say that it was this government that caused this great increase in the exports of the country ? Does he pretend to say that because we had fine weather, because the rain fell and the sun shone and the crops were abundant, this government did it ? Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that anything that was done by this government in any way assisted the industrious, intelligent people of Canada thus to increase their products ? Sir, it was due to the energy, the enterprise, the industry of the people themselves, and not to this government.

I want to refer briefly to the cheese industry of the province of Prince Edward Island, which has grown largely within the last few years. Who established that industry there ? The late Conservative government. They sent Prof. Robertson down there, when there was only one small cheese factory on the island, and encouraged the farmers to start more factories ; but he was very coolly received by gentlemen who are now sitting on the Treasury benches. That industry is now prospering and flourishing to such an extent that in the year 1900 the farmers of Prince Edward Island were able to export $600,000 worth of dairy products, owing to what was done by the Conservative government, while nothing has been done by this government.

We in Prince Edward Island desire to have the means of transporting our products to the markets of the old world. We have been insisting on having cold storage provided ; but this government has done nothing for us in that direction. A day or two ago I asked the hon. Minister of Agriculture what he was doing in that connection, and he said the matter was now being negotiated. We have had this government in power now four or five years. When these gentlemen were in opposition they promised us cold storage. The system was introduced into this country by Dr. Montague, a late member of this House. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when canvassing the votes of the people for his candidates in Prince Edward Island, said, Return me to power, and you will have cold storage for the shipment of your products to the markets of the old world. But we have no cold storage. One year a steamer called at Charlottetown. Another year an old hulk called the Gaspesia, which had no cold storage accommodation, called there. For the last two years none have called. We have been told that in 1899 this was due to the American-Spanish war, which caused a great demand for steamships, and it was impossible to provide one to carry the products of Prince Edward Island to the markets of Great Britain. We were told last year that it was owing to the great demand for steamships on account of the South African war. This year up to this time the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) says the matter is being negotiated. Sir, I would ask the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes), to insist that the minister whom he follows so slavishly shall provide some accommodation for the farmers of Prince Edward Island.

Now, if there is one thing more than another for which the farmers of Prince Edward Island feel aggrieved, it is because this government has allowed American corn to come into the country free of duty. The growers of coarse grains, who have a large quantity for sale each year, find American corn coming in to compete with their products, which they have, in consequence, to sell at reduced prices. This is what this government have done for the people of Canada, especially for the farmers of Prince Edward Island.

Now, having said so much with regard to my hon. friend from King's, I want for one moment to refer to what was said a few nights ago by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). He made a very pleasing address. He discredited Ontario and the eastern provinces. He said, we in the west are the people—it is to the great west we must look for the future of Canada. He said that the exports of this country were largely made up from he products of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. This was a sectional cry. It was only intended for the hon. gentleman's constituents, and was not what ought to have been said in this House. We know that there is in that western country an area of the most fertile and valuable lands in the world ; and we know that its immense possibilities remained closed to the people of Canada until the Conservative party built a railway and opened up that great country. If that country has such advantages that it is able to compete with and discount Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces, it is because of the action of the late Conservative government led by Sir John Macdonald and having as his Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper.

Another hon. gentleman who delivered a very pleasing address the other evening was the hon. member (Mr. Wade) who comes from the far-famed valley of Annapolis and represents that district. He spoke at great length, and he spoke principally of apples. We know that in the Province of Nova Scotia from the far-famed valley of Annapolis and the home of Evangeline, are produced the finest apples to be found in the world. We know that the people there are not afraid

to compete with any other people, not only in Canada, but in any part of the United States. But what did the hon. gentleman say? Not satisfied with the advantages of his beautiful valley, which will be blossoming in a few weeks, spreading its fragrance around, he attacked the leader of the opposition, saying: These gentlemen fear Ontario, as they have a right to fear it, because the intelligent people of Ontario are rising in their might against them. The hon. member said to the hon. leader of the opposition that the only way you could protect the farmers of Nova Scotia was to prevent the farmers of Ontario slaughtering their products in the markets of Nova Scotia. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he is now in his seat, what product of Ontario has been slaughtered in the markets of Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman is not present.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Butter, for one thing, pork for another.

Mr. HACKETT. With the best grazing lands in the maritime provinces in the district which my hon. friend comes from, need the farmers there be afraid of competition from the farmers of Ontario in the making of butter or beef? Is that the only article?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) No.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. member for Victoria says that Ontario butter is forced on the market of Nova Scotia. Well, if so, they get a good article. Such a cry is a sectional one, unworthy of any member of this parliament. We are one people in Canada. From the Atlantic to the Pacific we form one people of Canadians, the products of one province are sold in another, and it is a very small and antiquated cry to pretend that the goods of one province are being slaughtered in the markets of another.

I want to say another word with respect to this fruit question. I do not know if the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is in his seat, but let me tell the House that we are able to produce good fruit in Prince Edward Island. We have in that province facilities for growing good apples, pears and small fruits of all kinds. Some years ago an association was formed, composed of men holding different views on politics, called the Fruit Growers' Association of Prince Edward Island. This association was formed particularly to promote the apple industry, and those gentlemen were enabled to send to the markets of Great Britain apples that not only commanded the highest price, but were recommended by the English fruit dealers as very choice fruit. It was supposed that this government, in which the Island is represented by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), would do something for the promotion of that great industry in that province. It was asked to send down there some one who thoroughly understood the industry of horticulture, and who would instruct the people in pruning and grafting. It did send a man, concerning whom I asked a question the other day. I asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Who recommended a Mr. Kinsman as a scientific horticulturist to work in Prince Edward Island during the summer of 1899?
2. What amount did his mission cost?
3. Was the minister satisfied with the result of his work?

The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) replied:

1. Mr. Kinsman was recommended by gentlemen whose acquaintance with him was sufficient to justify their recommendation and in whose judgment I have confidence.
2. His work cost $563.43 for expenses and $304 for salary.
3. The report which he gave of his work was satisfactory.

You will notice, Sir, that the expenses are very large in proportion to the salary, and you will notice also that this was a very evasive reply. The minister did not say that he was pleased with the work done by Mr. Kinsman, but that Mr. Kinsman's report was satisfactory. Evidently any report Mr. Kinsman might write out would be satisfactory to the hon. gentleman. But in the annual report of the Fruit Growers' Association of Prince Edward Island for 1899, what do we find? This Mr. Kinsman, who was a camp follower of the Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Mr. Borden), for whom that hon. minister wanted to get a job at the expense of the people, was sent by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to his friend the leader of the government in Prince Edward Island; instead of sending him to the president and the directors of the Fruit Growers' Association, the hon. minister sent him down to Mr. Farquharson, the leader of the government, intending thereby to advance not only his own political interests but those of Mr. Farquharson. Well, what did the Fruit Growers' Association say. They said:

Mr. Kinsman went over the stations several times, without eliciting any interest anywhere. And this was not remarkable; for, on his own admission, he knew little or nothing about grafting and very little about pruning. As might be expected, no enthusiasm at all was aroused in the work, the most important needs, those of pruning and grafting, being entirely abandoned; and the mission which should have benefited the province so considerably, was thus quickly turned into absolute failure by political contact.

I want the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to mark this:

Representing all shades of politics in private life we deprecate as strongly as words can express the mixing up of politics with horticulture in even the remotest degree. As an association the F. G. A. knows no party, its aims being wholly and solely to advance the interests of horticulture for this whole province, without regard to any outside concern.

The failure of Mr. Kinsman's mission can therefore in no wise be put upon this association. The F. G. A. could, without doubt, had it been permitted, have turned it to some good account for horticulture, and thus have saved the large amount of money thrown away—money so very much needed for the fostering of horticultural interests in the province.

We feel, however, that at least one good end has been served by this complete failure;—politics and politicians can make no capital out of an invasion of the proper rights of agricultural associations.

A large amount of money was thus thrown away which might well have been spent to some good purpose. We can grow fruit in Prince Edward Island just as well as they can in the far-famed Annapolis Valley. All our people require is some instruction with regard to grafting and pruning, but instead of sending a competent man, the government send down a camp follower of the Minister of Militia to assist in promoting the political interests of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and those of his friend Mr. Farquharson.

I desire to turn for a moment to the budget speech made a few days ago. The hon. the Minister of Finance found his lines cast in very pleasant places, and as he was reading over the yearly surpluses, I could see the Minister of Trade and Commerce turning green with envy. For that hon. gentleman could not but remember that when he was Finance Minister he had no surplus to boast of, although he had increased the taxes, and was obliged to tell the people that he saw no means of increasing the revenue except by direct taxation. The prosperous condition of the country can, however, be easily accounted for. It is due no doubt to the fact that this government have retained the national policy. But the hon. gentleman made—I do not know whether wittingly or not—this statement:

When I remind this House that the increase in the whole eighteen years of the national policy was only $66,000,000, and when I show that in one year only of the present administration the increase was over $59,000,000, and nearly $60,000,000, hon. gentlemen will be able to measure the vast progress that has been made in the trade of the country.

That is an unfair comparison. As my hon. friend from South Ontario (Mr. Ross) said the other evening, we have cycles of depression and cycles of prosperity. If hon. gentlemen opposite had looked up the public accounts during the last fifteen years, they would have seen that there have been as great increases in the trade of the country as during the last few years. I find that the total trade of the country in 1873 amounted to $217,104,516. In 1879, it had declined, under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, the Finance Minister of that administration being at present hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), from $217,000,000 to $151,000,000. Would hon. gentlemen opposite say that the Minister of Trade and Commerce was responsible for that, because he was Finance Minister at the time? Then it was that the people of the country, feeling that something should be done to restore confidence and to place the business of the country on a sound footing decided, in 1878, to inaugurate the national policy as proposed by Sir John A. Macdonald. Under the national policy, we find that from 1879 to 1882, the trade of the country increased to $224,000,000, an increase of over $70,000,000 during those years. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that this was owing to the great prosperity of the country, but it was owing also to the national policy stimulating the interests of the country, restoring confidence and re-establishing in the minds of our people the belief that we could build up a great nation on this northern half of the North American continent. After that, we had a period of depression. From 1882 to 1886, trade fell from $221,000,000 to $189,000,000. About 1893, we had a period of prosperity, and our trade rose to $241,000,000. All this shows that we have these cycles, these periods of prosperity and periods of depression. The hon. gentleman who says that under this government the trade increased by $60,000,000 owing to the action of this government is speaking in a manner which is far from justifiable for one addressing an intelligent body of gentlemen such as we have in this House. Why do we have this prosperity? We have here a great heritage won by the energy of our fathers, and, through the statesmanship of Sir John A. Macdonald, assisted by able lieutenants, means have been afforded for the development of our resources. These men built the Canadian Pacific Railway, they built the Intercolonial Railway, they built the Sault Ste. Marie canal, they improved the St. Lawrence canals, and thus and in other ways afforded the people of this great country means to transact their business and enabled us to stand on a par with our neighbours to the south of us. And hon. gentlemen opposite, coming into power, found these great public works completed and all this accommodation provided; and now they find it an easy thing to claim credit for the prosperity which has come to us. I challenge any hon. gentleman on the other side to show where they ever obtained a market for the people for the sale of a pound of bacon, a pound of butter, or a bushel of wheat, oats or peas. The prosperity of the country is not due to the government but is due to the policy and administration of their predecessors, coupled with the energy and industry of the Canadian people.

Turning from that for a moment, we find that this government, like some other people, use prosperity as an excuse for extravagance. Last year this government collected $51,029,994 of revenue, against

$36,618,590 in 1896, an increase of $14,411,-404. And they boast a surplus of $8,000,-000. Having this great amount of money at their disposal, what are they doing to reduce the burdens of the people ? The hon. member from King's (Mr. Hughes) last night echoed the Finance Minister, who said that they had reduced the taxes of the people by $2,000,000. The Minister of Finance philosophizing on that subject, but speaking without facts and figures, said that if you apply the old tariff to the present imports, the people would have paid $2,000,-000 more than they did. But there are no facts to substantiate this statement, nor is there any fair comparison. But we find, looking at the blue-book compiled under the supervision of the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson)—that is where you find the plain statement of the taxes per head paid by the people. According to that table, we find it plainly stated that the amount of customs duties per head of population in 1896 was $3.94, while the amount collected in 1900 was $5.37—an increase of $1.43. Assuming that each family contains five people—and that is only a moderate family in this country—you will find that the taxes of the average family has increased between $7 and $8 under the present government. No hon. gentleman can deny it, for there are the figures plainly set forth in the book compiled by themselves. They boast of their surplus, but that surplus they have taken from the pockets of the people. They are taking money from the man who toils from morning till night for his family, in order that they may spend it in extravagance. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) will remember that, in the province of Prince Edward Island before this government came into power he used to talk to the people a great deal about the taxes on cottons and to declare that we were building up monopolies and enriching great cotton lords, and that out of the pockets of the people of that province came much of the money for these wealthy men. But when the hon. gentleman came into power did he reduce the taxation ? I find that the duties paid last year on cotton goods amounted to $1,665,293.38. The people whom the hon. gentleman represents, mostly farmers and fishermen, had to pay a large proportion of those duties. There are no manufacturers of those goods they have to be imported from Great Britain and the United States, or from the older provinces of Canada where those manufactures are established. But, the hon. gentleman has done nothing to relieve the people of that tax. He has increased the tax on brown cotton used mostly by workingmen from 30 per cent to 35 per cent; he has increased the tax on printed cotton from 30 per cent to 35 per cent; he has increased the tax on other grades of those goods by 2½ per cent. He has done this for the purpose, as the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) said, of keeping alive the cotton mills of Valleyfield, to protect them to such an extent that they will not have to shut up. Hon. gentlemen opposite speak of a revenue tariff. Where does a revenue tariff come in in respect of these goods ? Have they any desire, as they pretend, to reduce the taxes ? We remember that when Sir Leonard Tilley and the Hon. Geo. E. Foster had surpluses, as these gentlemen now boast of, they commenced to reduce the taxes of the people; they did not take from them millions of money that were not required for carrying on the public service. We were told in those days that a surplus was a very bad thing, that it was wrong, that it showed inefficiency, incompetence, inability on the part of the Finance Minister when he took from the people more money than was required to carry on the affairs of the country. Yet the hon. gentleman boasts of a surplus of $8,000,000.

Not one thing has been done to reduce the taxation of the people in connection with cotton goods. I do not know whether my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) is in his seat or not, I believe he is. He spoke to us the other evening about what a great thing it was to have a preferential tariff in favour of silks coming into this country. I presume that hon. gentleman is not a benedict, I take it for granted that he is a married man, because he says there is no greater present you can take home to your wife than a silk dress; therefore, you should be able to buy it cheaply. The hon. gentleman is a man of wealth, I believe he is possessed of considerable means, and there is no doubt that his wife is the possessor of many fine silk dresses. While I approve of his sentiment, while it is quite right for him to buy a silk dress for his wife if he can afford it, what will the poor workingman do who has to pay an increased tax of 5 per cent on the printed cotton that is required to clothe his wife and daughters ? Sir, the hon. gentleman may be right, let him buy silk dresses for his wife; but let me remind him that the labouring man, the farmer, when he wants to buy a piece of cotton to make a dress for his wife, has to pay an increased tax of 5 per cent; and if he wants to buy a piece of shirting for his sons he is unable to do so without paying this increased tax; and very often these men have all or more than they can do to provide their families with food and fuel.

Then the hon. gentleman went on to talk about coal oil. When hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side of the House they dwelt at great length on the enormity of the tax on coal oil. They said : Coal oil is used by the workingmen, and you have taxed it 5 cents a gallon for purely protective purposes. Put us in power and we will repeal that tax. Now, Mr. Speaker,

what have they done ? The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), speaking on this subject the other evening, said that the duty on coal oil in 1896 was 7 cents a gallon, and they reduced it to 5 cents. Now that hon. gentleman, with his means of information, ought to have known that he was making a mistake; it was 6 cents a gallon instead of 7 cents. This reminds me of a story that I heard told about two men who went out shooting. When they came back they were giving an account of their afternoon's sport, and one man said he had shot ninety-nine snipe. The other man said : 'Why didn't you say one hundred and make it an even number ?' 'Why,' replied the other, 'I did not want to tell a lie for one snipe.' But the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is not so conscientious. He was willing to do the trick for one cent. He said the duty in 1896 was 7 cents a gallon, when the fact is that it was only 6 cents a gallon. The present government reduced that duty 1 cent a gallon, and in doing so, they allowed privileges to the Standard Oil Company, that octopus that is not only bleeding the people of Canada, but has its fangs in the throat of the people of the United States, and is sucking their blood. The government allowed that company the privilege of bringing their oil into this country in tank ships, and as a consequence the Canadian industry became of no importance, and it passed into the hands of Rockefeller and his associates. Whether the duty is 5 cents a gallon or 10 cents, the government have put the Canadian people into the clutches of that monopoly, and the Rockefellers are taking out of this country, through the connivance of the present government, over $2,000,000 a year of the hard earned money of our people.

Now, I want to turn to another question, one that seriously affects the people of Canada. What I am about to say I shall say in all sincerity, because I represent a people who are not a manufacturing people, who have to depend on their farms and on the products of the waters for their living. Those people are great consumers of tobacco. We know that when the workingman comes home at night there is nothing gives him so much pleasure as to take down his pipe and sit with his family at the fireside and have a smoke. But what have these gentlemen done ? I find that the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) put this question to the government :

1. What was the total amount of duty collected on tobacco for the year ended June 30, 1900?

2. How much of this amount was due to the additional duty imposed in the session of 1897?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier) :

1. The total duty collected on tobacco, including license fees, $3,281,639.48.

2. Of this amount $971,977.60 is owing to duty placed on raw leaf in April, 1897.

Mr. HACKETT.

Here we have this government, who are posing as friends of the poor man, and who are taxing that poor man's pipe to the extent of a million dollars a year. They may boast of their surplus, but we have here the undoubted testimony of their Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) that last year the consumers of tobacco in Canada paid $1,000,000 extra on account of the tax imposed by these gentlemen. But why have they done it ? Have they done it for the purposes of revenue ? They pretend to be free traders, and yet I believe that they imposed this tax for the purposes of protection. It was not done for revenue. These gentlemen have got to get back into their boots, they have got to show that this taxation imposed on the country is either for a revenue or for protective purposes; and I am willing to stake my reputation here on the statement that this $1,000,000 is taken out of the consumers of tobacco in this country to protect the tobacco growers in the province of Quebec and up in the Ontario peninsula; and these hon. gentlemen cannot deny it.

Another question I want to refer to, and I wish the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) were here to hear me. But it seems the air was getting too hot for him, and he had to leave the Chamber. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries used to dwell on the iniquitous tax on flour. Down in the province of Prince Edward Island we do not produce sufficient flour for our population, we have to import. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) used to tell the people : When we come to power you are going to be relieved of this tax on flour, it is a duty that is going into the pockets of the farmers of Ontario and of the North-west. Now, what do we find in regard to flour ? Last year the amount of duty paid on flour was $145,707.18. Now that the hon. gentleman is on the Treasury benches, he is quite satisfied that the consumers in the maritime provinces should pay this duty on flour. But, there was another article, including breadstuffs, with which hon. gentlemen opposite used to find great fault in connection with the late tariff and that was the article of rice. We collected in duties, last, year, on rice $180,000, I regret that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) is not here because I want to refer to an extract from a speech he delivered in this House in connection with this very article of rices. He said :

Rice is one of a class of articles which should be first removed from the taxable list. Further, this is an article not raised in the country, the duty is not required for protection purposes, and therefore the tax is highly indefensible.

It was an indefensible tax in 1890, but the hon. gentleman sits there and defends it in 1900, because he is drawing his salary as Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Now, having said so much in connection with this matter, I will turn to the question of the debt. The debt of Canada is a very important question. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson), who represents, as he says, the largest body of farmers in Canada, will remember that any increase in the debt of the country will have to be paid by the farmers of the country, because they are the people who have their homes here, who are not birds of passage, but who intend to remain here. The hon. gentleman will agree with me in that respect. It is their contributions that must go to decrease the public debt. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) also referred to that. We find fault with the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) because, in bringing down to this House a statement he did not state the facts fairly, justly and honestly. We find that he said here that the total increase in four years was $6,996,373, that the average increase per year for four years was $1,749,993, and that the average increase for eighteen years, under the Conservatives, was $6,563,075. That is not a fair comparison to make. You cannot take the last four years and compare them with the preceding eighteen years and make a fair comparison. During these eighteen years hon. gentlemen will remember that the Conservative party took up the great public works of Canada, and that they had to go to the markets of the world and borrow money to pay for these great public works. What have hon. gentlemen opposite done? The Crow's Nest Railway and the Drummond County line are all that they have added to the assets of the country, while they have for these services increased the debt nearly $2,000,000 a year during their term of office. A fair way of putting the case would be to take the increase in the public debt of the last four years of Conservative rule and compare it with the four years of Liberal rule. When I do that I find that during the last four years of Conservative rule the public debt was increased between $3,500,000 and $3,750,000. It should be remembered that during this time Mr. Foster had no surpluses. It was a period of depression, one of those cycles of hard times to which the hon. gentleman has referred. During that period he had no surpluses to apply to the redemption of the debt, but we find that he so economically managed the affairs of the country that he was enabled to show that the public debt had increased only about $3,500,000 a year. On the other hand these hon. gentlemen opposite, with their large surpluses, and having no large public works to construct, have increased the public debt by nearly $2,000,000 a year. That is the comparison, and it is unworthy of the hon. Minister of Finance to compare the four years of his administration with the eighteen years of the late administration.

I want to say a word about the expenditure. We find, as I said at the outset, that when you have money at your disposal coming in easily you are likely to have extravagance. Now is the time for the hon. Minister of Finance to husband the resources of the country to save the taxes of the people, because, as he says, we are on the crest of the wave, for the future we will go downward, and he should have something put by for a rainy day and to meet emergencies. He is not doing that. We find that under his management he has allowed the expenditure of the country, in four years, to increase by $6,000,000. This is reckless extravagance. If he had conducted the affairs of the country in an economical way and husbanded the taxes of the people, he would be able to make a better showing than he is doing to-day. He has added to the public debt, he has increased the public expenditure, and no one could make a worse showing before the people than that of the present administration. We were asked: Where has the money gone? Why do you not vote against it? What is the use of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House opposing votes brought down by hon. gentlemen opposite? They will carry them through with their majority, large as it is. What do we find in the Department of Justice? I will again appeal to the hon. member for West Elgin, because, if there was any one plank in the platform of the body that he represents that was emphasized, it was against the increase of judicial expenditure in this country. They believe that they have been taxed too heavily for the maintenance of judges and high-salaried officials. We find that during the last four years this government have increased the expenditure on the judiciary nearly $100,000 a year. Why was that done? It was done to find places for hon. gentlemen who occupied seats in this House, and who, like rats deserting a sinking ship, got away before the storm came on. These men have been provided with soft seats, and it has cost the people of the country $100,000 more than in 1896. Then, we find an increase in the controllable expenditure in connection with immigration. We find that the expenditure has increased from 1896 to 1900, four years, by $314,363.61. Here is an increase beyond all proportion, an increase that cannot be approved by the people of Canada. These hon. gentlemen may say: We have brought in immigrants, we have sent our agents to the confines of civilization, and a certain Mr. Preston, that I read about a day or two ago said that he had gone to some unknown people and was going to bring them to Canada. We have had enough of these people brought to Canada. The hon. member for Lisgar, who is fresh from that country, and knows the conditions there, rebuked the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) for bringing in this class

of immigration. We do not want any more Doukhobors, Galicians, Bohemians, and other people of the class that have been discovered by Mr. Preston. We want in this country the blood and sinew of the old land, the men of England, of Scotland, of Ireland, and of France. We should go to the men, who, next to our own people, are the best pioneers, the men who have opened up the country. We want these men in this country, and if the government are going to spend our money in bringing in immigrants, for God's sake leave out these Doukhobors and other people like that. We have been asked, on this side of the House, to challenge any amount in connection with immigration, and accepting that challenge, I say that this increase of $314,363.61 in the immigration estimates is far beyond all consideration, and that certainly the people cannot approve of it. I find also in the department so ably presided over by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), that there has been a tremendous increase in the expenditure. I do not know what the hon. gentleman is doing to increase the trade and commerce of the country, but I do know that when the late Conservative government established a commissioner of trade and commerce, not a minister, the hon. gentleman opposite exclaimed in the loudest tones of which he is capable against the creation of that office. But, the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) has dropped into it very nicely, and he fills it very well. Now, these expenditures are under the direct control of the government, and they must be held responsible for them. We find that the Department of Trade and Commerce, in 1895, cost $11,022, and in 1900, the cost was $55,501.06, an increase of $44,476. I want to know what value the Minister of Trade and Commerce has given to the country for that large increase? The Minister of Marine (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) told us the other night that he was sworn to do a certain duty, and that he would do it; but when I called his attention to the fact that the administration of the fisheries department in Prince Edward Island was costing two dollars now for the one dollar it cost in 1896, the hon. minister could make no reply. I know the demands made upon him. I know his camp followers, who have wandered around in the wilderness for eighteen years, are pressing him, and the minister (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) had to provide for these, and so he increased the expenditure of his department in Prince Edward Island by 100 per cent since he has been in office.

I wish now to refer to a great proposed industry in this country, namely, the manufacture of beet-root sugar. We had, in Prince Edward Island, last year, a gentleman representing one of the great beet sugar factories of the United States, who addressed the farmers in various localities, and told them if they would provide three thousand acres of land, the company he represented would provide that much more, and if the government gave a bonus of one cent per pound for three years, he would establish a beet root factory in the island. The same conditions exist in the province of Ontario in regard to this matter, and the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), in his budget speech, said:

> We have been asked to consider the question of establishing the beet-root sugar industry in this country. We have been asked to grant bounties to that industry, and we have not been able to comply with that request. We found that the bounty system, adopted some years ago and put in operation, was not successful, and we are not quite satisfied yet that we would be justified in granting bounties to revive that business.

He ignored the application of the farmers of Canada for a bounty on beet-root sugar, and later on he says in his speech:

> We think, if the industry is to be put on a basis of business, if the industry is as promising a one for the Dominion as it should be, with the bounty which is allowed by the legislature of Ontario, and with this valuable concession, for it is a valuable concession, in respect to the machinery, an opportunity will be allowed for giving that business a fair trial in the province of Ontario.

If the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) does not want to give a bounty to the farmers of Ontario, I suppose I cannot help it, but I do say that it is the duty of the minister, and of the government, to come to the support of that industry and grant a bonus for a few years. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) told us that the provincial government of Ontario gave a bonus, and that was sufficient, but does he not know that the province of Ontario is paying a bounty on the manufacture of iron, and that this Federal government is also paying a bounty on iron in addition to that. Sir, the farmers of this country are asked to contribute towards that iron bounty. The hon. member for Vancouver has told us that $15,000,000 will be added to the public debt of Canada in the next five years, to pay the bounties on iron and steel, and we know that the farmers of Canada will have to pay a great part of that bounty. Is the Finance Minister going to turn his back on the farmers? While they have to pay for the bounty on iron and steel, is he not going to assist them with a bounty for this great beet-root sugar industry? I ask the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) to reconsider his position, and if he weighs it carefully, he will see that it is his duty to come to the assistance of the farmers of Canada in this matter. If he taxes the farmers to pay $15,000,000 in bounties on iron and steel, he should at least give them a small bounty on their beet sugar. In order to show the feeling that prevails in Prince Edward Island in connection with

this matter, I shall read a resolution passed by the Charlottetown Board of Trade on March 7, 1900. This resolution was passed by a body of active, up-to-date business men, second to none in Canada. They know what they are talking about, and when they pass a resolution of this kind, I would impress upon the government that it is worthy of their consideration. The resolution is as follows :

And whereas, it is the unanimous opinion of the council of the board of trade of this city that the establishment of a beet sugar factory would be productive of enormous benefits to our farmers, labourers and business men by the investment and circulation of a large amount of capital, and would probably, from the great expansion of trade and the increase in transportation on our Island Railway (estimated to amount to 8,000 or 10,000 cars in each year), render it in a short time self-sustaining and a valuable asset to our Federal government.

Therefore resolved, that in view of securing to the island the establishment of a beet sugar factory, we urge upon the Dominion government the necessity of a bounty of 1 cent per pound for a term of three years on the beet sugar manufactured within this province, in order to foster and sustain this contemplated industry during the preliminary stage.

I trust that the government will pay some attention to that resolution.

One word with regard to preferential trade, and I have done. The resolution moved by the hon. leader of the opposition covers the whole ground. We are not, on this side of the House, opposed to giving a preference to Great Britain. On the contrary, while it may be a matter of sentiment to a great extent, we view it from a business standpoint also. Britain has done well by us, and we should do something in return, and we are not opposed to the preference ; but, I say here, that when that preference extends to goods that are in greater part manufactured in Belgium and Germany, and into which enter only 25 per cent of English labour and of English manufacture ; when these goods come in contact with goods manufactured in Montreal, Halifax or St. John, or any city in Canada, then, Sir, I stand by the people of Canada against any preference to Great Britain. A few days ago I received a circular from the woollen manufacturers of Canada, stating that their trade was injured through the importation of these cheap goods which are three-quarters manufactured in Belgium and Germany, and only one-quarter in Great Britain, and that these foreign goods were likely to drive our own manufacturers out of the market, and thus deprive Canadian workmen of the means of earning their livelihood. I say, Sir, that we, as part of the British Empire, while we are willing that the manufacturer in Lancashire and Yorkshire shall hold his position, we want the manufacturer in Canada to be above any and all of them. I believe that these woollen manufacturers would not have sent around this circular unless they believed there was danger ahead for their industry, and that being the case it is the duty of the government to at once take some action.

The hon. gentleman is on the crest of the wave, and he knows what it is to have breakers ahead ; he may find himself in the rought waters next year. I hope the government will take such measures as may be necessary to protect our Canadian manufacturers against the manufacturers of Belgium and Germany. In this connection, I am going to read another resolution which was passed by the Charlottetown Board of Trade. In that city there is no manufacturing to any extent ; and yet this board of trade, composed of commercial gentlemen, feeling that perhaps their fellow-countrymen in the different provinces might be oppressed, and seeing that, owing to the conduct of this government in connection with the railways, the trade of Canada was being diverted from St. John and Halifax to Portland and Boston, passed this resolution on the 7th of March, 1901 :

Resolved, that this council heartily endorses the suggestion of a member of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association which provides, ' that a customs rebate of 33⅓ per cent on goods manufactured in Great Britain be allowed only when said goods are landed at Canadian ports,' and pledges itself to use every means in its power to urge the adoption of the measure by the government.

Now, I want to say a word or two in regard to my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), whom I do not see in his place at the moment. I was much pleased at the manner in which that hon. gentleman addressed the House, not only on the last occasion, but on the occasion on which he seconded the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. In his first speech the hon. gentleman said that we did not want in this country any cries of race and religion, and yet the other day he brought up that subject again. Why did he bring it up a second time, if he comes here as a peacemaker ? I am not of the same origin as the hon. gentleman, though I am of the same creed. I am descended from a race of men who had to leave Ireland many years ago on account of persecution ; I belong to the Catholic faith ; but I see no reason why I should parade before this House my race or religion. Why did the hon. gentleman bring that subject up if he came here as a peacemaker ? We find it raised on every possible occasion on that side of the House. It is the stock-in-trade of these gentlemen ; it is what they build their hopes on—this cry of race and creed. I repudiate these attempts to stir up racial and religious feeling. When I had the honour of being a member of this House in 1879, the seat you so honourably fill, Mr. Speaker, was occupied by a man from the province of Quebec, of the same origin as yourself. Hon. Mr. Blanchet, and there was no talk then of

race and religion. To-day you are filling the same place with dignity and honour, and why should these gentlemen at this time raise this question of race and creed? I will tell you why; because the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) in his paper, La Patrie, is fomenting it and stirring it up. What did we find in the province of Prince Edward Island? We found one of his satellites going among the intelligent French voters of my district, stirring them up, and saying to them: You must vote for Laurier and Tarte because they are Frenchmen. This man remained there more than two months, going around and holding meetings in out-of-the-way places, and circulating his stories amongst the intelligent Frenchmen of West Prince; but I am glad to say that they were too honest and intelligent to be seduced by him. Although they were Frenchmen, and proud of their compatriot, the leader of the government, and proud of the stand the French Canadians were taking in the province of Quebec, yet they stood true to their political principles. As I said, this emissary remained there from July to November, and when a ballot box containing a majority of votes for me at a certain polling district was stolen from a train and never turned up at Summerside, this man was on the train. I do not believe we have a man in Prince Edward Island base enough to steal that ballot box. I attribute it to the work of this man who was sent down by the Minister of Public Works.

Sir, I have occupied more time than I intended at the outset——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. HACKETT. I am flattered. My hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Robinson), the premier and myself are the only members who have been asked to go on. We in Canada own a noble heritage left to us by our fathers. Whether we are of French, English, Scotch, Irish or German origin, let us unite and work shoulder to shoulder to develop our country and maintain it, what it is at present, the brightest jewel in the crown of the empire.

Hon. R. R. DOBELL (Quebec West). Mr. Speaker, I need hardly say that it is not with any very great desire that I rise to prolong this debate, nor is it that I expect, as my hon. colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) said, to have the last word. But I am very pleased to have the opportunity of expressing to this House what I believe to be the universal feeling with regard to the speech made by my hon. colleague the Minister of Finance. I believe it will be hailed throughout the country with the greatest satisfaction. For myself, I regard that speech as unique. As I think the hon. leader of the opposition said, it had the characteristic of being short, and I wish all the members on both sides of the House had tried to follow my hon. friend's example in that respect. I shall do my best, however I fail in other respects, to earn the thanks of the House for making a short speech; also do my best to lay a few facts before the House. We have all listened with great patience to the various statistics that have been given us during the last two or three days, and for my part I do not intend to add one figure to those given. I do not believe in this method of piling up figures and then using them to arrive at wrong conclusions, nor do I believe in compiling vast quantities of words and delivering them without wisdom. I think, on the contrary, that when one rises to speak in this House he should weigh very carefully what he has to say.

The speech delivered by my colleague the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), I look upon as exceedingly exhilarating. Its keynote might be epitomized under these three headings: That never was Canada so prosperous; that never were her people so contented; and that never was her future so promising. With that speech I would be content to face the country, confident that it would be endorsed by the vast majority of the people.

My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), claimed that while the Minister of Finance was warning us that we had reached the full springtide of prosperity, he used the simile of a skater who continued at a rapid pace while the ice was marked dangerous. The Finance Minister, he said, admitted he was skating on very thin ice and yet kept on at full speed. But the hon. gentleman forgot that our Finance Minister was careful to look ahead and had provided for another twelve months with a surplus of $6,000,000. I do not think that many of us would desire that provision should be made for a longer period than twelve months, nor would it be wise to prognosticate what might happen in years to come. If the hon. minister gave reasons—and in my opinion he gave sound reasons—for calculating on another surplus during the next year, it seems to me it would be unreasonable to expect any prediction further.

The first criticism on the budget speech from the opposition side came from the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler). The remarks that hon. gentleman made at the outset, namely:

> I must congratulate the Finance Minister and the government, as I congratulate the country, upon the statement of prosperity which the hon. gentleman has been enabled to show to Canada—a prosperity which we one and all delight in.

Is one we can all cordially endorse, and if some one had then whispered to the hon. gentleman: 'Least said soonest mended; go no further,' and the hon. gentleman had followed the old maxim and stopped there, he would have given a lead to that side of

the House which would have been very creditable to him. But he did not stop there. He went on further to remark that we were only trustees for the development of this country, in which remark I entirely agree. And what a country, what a heritage of boundless wealth, Mr. Speaker, we have in our trust. We admit, Mr. Speaker, that we are only trustees, having full responsibility for the development of an estate with its boundless possibilities of future wealth, which really is beyond the dream of avarice.

But, my hon. friend unfortunately just then ran off the track and came to grief, and I am sure his remarks will disappoint his friends, north, south, east and west. He claimed that the time had come when it is no longer necessary to bonus railways.

Well, I ask, is there an hon. gentleman in this House who can support that contention. The hon. gentleman tried to support his view by drawing a comparison between this country and the states of New York, Minnesota and Illinois. But is the comparison at all a fair one ? I find that the population of those three states amounts to 14,000,000, covering an area of 198,000 square miles. Surely there can be no comparison between these three thickly inhabited states, the greater part of which is under close cultivation, and such a country as Canada, the population of which is about five and a half millions, and the area 3,318,000 square miles. In the three states mentioned by the hon. gentleman there are seventy inhabitants to every mile, whereas in Canada there is but 1·6 to every mile.

I think it would have been wise if the hon. gentleman had gone a little more into detail before making such a sweeping statement. I would like to ask him why he did not particularize some other of our extravagances. I would like to know whether he would take exception to the bonusing of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, which, I believe, has repaid this country fifty-fold by the opening up of coal lands and the development of the Kootenay country. I would like to know whether he thinks we are wrong in carrying out the pledges which were made by the Conservative government many years ago and repeated every time when they were asking for the support of the people of Canada. For instance, would he repudiate the pledge by the late government to build the Quebec bridge ? Would he also condemn the opening up of the Rainy River district, and what is known as New Ontario, and which is likely to repay us for our expenditure a hundred-fold. It would be interesting also to learn whether the hon. gentleman approves of the loss of revenue we sustained by reducing the rate of postage to one-penny. Also whether he approves of the deepening of the St. Lawrence canals. Would he also begrudge the contribution required for the Pacific cable and for sending the contingents to South Africa. These are the chief items which have swelled the expenditure during the past twelve months.

Then take the iron industry, which is looming up, and which will possibly grow to be the largest iron and steel enterprise in the world. Evidently already hon. gentlemen opposite are greatly exercised over the extent to which the bounty given this industry may draw upon the resources of Canada. But the larger the call may be the greater will be the prosperity of that industry. Once established, that industry will be permanent, and who can tell what the result will be. The fact that the calls will be heavy the next two or three years will ensure the success of the enterprise. If they do not go to work and produce a large quantity, we will have a very small bonus to pay, but on the other hand, we will not have so flourishing an industry as we anticipated.

It would be like the other industry at Londonderry—it would survive for a few years, as long as it was drinking the pap, and would then die. But we hope for different results in this case. The expenditure that is being made there will ensure for us the future development of that iron industry ; and it does not much matter what it costs for a year or two, for our Minister of Finance has wisely provided that the bonusing should gradualy die out. I believe that that industry will be firmly established and will remain, and not only that, but that it will lead to ship-building and bridge-building, and will give us the iron for our railways and all the girders and other parts for structural work. All these works I have referred to are completed or are being completed, the future will lead to new calls upon us. Shall we shirk those new calls ? Shall we, as trustees, put the property that is entrusted to us in a napkin and bury it in the ground in order that we may have it for future generations ? No, I speak my own mind when I say that the only complaint that I feel can be justly made against us, is that we have not done nearly enough, that there are calls upon us throughout the length and breadth of this land to which we have not replied as promptly as we should have done. I believe that the navigation from Belle Isle to Montreal ought to have a great deal spent upon it, and I believe it should be so placed that no one could point a finger and say : This ought to be done, or that ought to be done. It would be money well expended. It would net us a very high return before long. Don't you think we have been supine in not opening that immense inland lake, Hudson Bay, with its 4,000 miles of coast line, with its inlets, like Chesterfield Inlet running into it, and also such harbours as the mouth of the Churchill river, which would give us easy access to the extreme North-west ? Another complaint, that if I were in opposition, I would make against the

government is because of the little effort we have made to win the trade from South Africa and Australia. I maintain that it is the duty of the government, as trustees, to open up every avenue of trade that we can and make us independent of other countries. That is the very first principle of free trade. What protection does for us is to give us pampered industries, industries that cannot live by themselves, industries that will want a fresh bonus or fresh protection every year—you never quite reach the point where they have enough. But, if our manufacturers are treated like men, they soon learn that they must look around them and find fresh markets for their products; and they will be able to do it if they only try. I remember that some years ago the locomotive builders of England were crying out for some kind of protection. But the government did not listen to them. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) say that he found in England a great desire to introduce protection. I have not seen it in any single paper of any reliability. I find, on the contrary, that a certain member of parliament did bring up something of that kind, but he did not secure a following. The close of the hon. gentleman's speech redeemed the middle portion and he finished with this proposition. That it would be desirable to see if Quebec would not give far greater advantages to the country at much less cost than the very expensive work of deepening the river from Quebec to Montreal; and this should be taken up and fully considered before any more expensive work is done. If Montreal is considered the best place to make a national port why we must all cordially join in carrying it out; but I do not think the enterprise should be gone on with, without due consideration whether Quebec should be the best port for transporting the produce not only of our own Northwest, but for the produce of the larger portion of the grain and corn producing states of the American union. Now, I would like to say a word or two about the amendment which has been presented to this House by the leader of the opposition. I would like to read it, and, with permission, I will read the second clause first:

That, in the opinion of this House, the adoption of a policy of mutual trade preference within the empire would prove of great benefit to the mother country and to the colonies, and would greatly promote the prosperity, unity and progress of the empire as a whole, and that the present time, when the Commonwealth of Australia is laying the foundation of its fiscal system, is particularly opportune for taking prompt and energetic steps towards the furtherance of this object.

I would follow that anywhere, and I am sure that any hon. member would do the same. But let me read to you what this is preceded by. These two clauses remind me very much of the action of a twin-screw steamer under certain circumstances. If the captain wishes to turn the steamer, he orders one screw full speed ahead and the other screw full speed astern. What I have read you was the full speed ahead. I am sure that there is not a member of this government or this parliament who would not support that loyally and do everything possible to carry it out. But, here comes the full speed astern:

That, in the opinion of this House, the welfare of this country requires a pronounced policy of adequate protection and encouragement at all times to the labour, agricultural, manufacturing, mining and other industrial interests of Canada.

Now, I contend that that is the very way to destroy the energy and enterprise of this country. As I have said, with one screw full speed ahead, and one full speed astern, the steamer turns around and makes no progress, and that is exactly what would come to this country if we listened to that resolution. And that is quite reason enough for us to oppose it to the utmost of our power.

Now, reference has been made by several members of the House to what our premier said in England almost directly he arrived. If ever I listened to words almost prophetic and inspiring they are those words of our premier. I will read them because they are well worthy of being repeated. He said:

I claim for the present government of Canada that they have passed a resolution by which the products of Great Britain are admitted in the rate of their tariff at 12½ per cent, and next year at 25 per cent reduction. This we have done, not asking any compensation. There is a class of our fellow-citizens who ask that all such concessions should be made for a quid pro quo. The Canadian government has ignored such sentiments. We have done it because we owe a debt of gratitude to Great Britain. We have done it because it is no intention of ours to disturb in any way the system of free trade which has done so much for England.

Now that, I think, should be the aim and object of every member of this House. I heard one of my hon. friends on this side tell what England had done for Canada, and he told of some of the very important advantages which England had given to us and we now enjoy—the advantages of her power of defence, the advantage of her consular service, the advantage of the mother country as a great market for our products. But these are all minor things to the great benefit we have derived from Great Britain. Is there any example in history of any country doing what Great Britain did for Canada, and since then has done for others of her dependencies? A few years ago, she gave to the people of Western Australia—and I believe that at that time they numbered something less than 250,000 souls—that whole territory of Western Australia, and the means of establishing a government in it, without exacting one shilling for the transfer of the property. Recently, as we all know, Western Australia, Victoria, New

South Wales and Queensland have been welded together in one great commonwealth.

For Canada, she gave us her counsel and her help to form a Dominion which would rival the mother country in the freedom of her constitution and in independence. And what did she exact from us in return? She has not exacted from us one iota in return for all the mineral wealth of this country, for all the forests, for all the public works which had been built at her expense. She did not charge us even the cost of the parchment by which she transferred this great territory to us; she handed it over to us with her blessing and the prayer that we would become prosperous and strong. Search through the history of 2,000 years and you will not find anything to compare with that. And yet we hear some hon. gentlemen talking of the duty of England to give us a quid pro quo amounting to a few thousand pounds, probably, a year, or we will say a few thousands of pounds. But nothing in the world that Canada can give to Great Britain would recompense in the slightest degree the debt that we owe her for the freedom and blessings which she has established for us and has ever helped us to maintain. Now, let us go on and see how much further we can reduce our preferential tariff on British goods next year. I see my colleague the Minister of Finance is watching me closely, he is afraid I am going to develop what may happen at the next session of parliament, but I will not do so.

Mr. WALLACE. Go on, don't let anybody shut you off like that.

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. There is one other point——

Mr. WALLACE. We were getting quite interested.

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. I am pleased to hear that from such an expert. Now, there is one difficulty in carrying out that part of the amendment calling for closer trade with Great Britain and her dependencies. Great Britain has told us distinctly and clearly that she cannot entertain any proposition for inter-Imperial preferential trade that is not based on free trade. I think that is perfectly reasonable. I think our premier was perfectly right in saying that he had no wish to interfere with the fiscal policy of Great Britain. How can we desire to interfere when Great Britain has placed us here and said to us: Adopt your own policy, we give you full leave to do as you like. We have done as we liked, and Great Britain has never shown the slightest feeling or irritation because we tax her goods while she lets ours in free. In closing I would like to read to the House a statement of my own views made fifteen years ago as to the best policy for this country. I do not place those views before you as voicing the views of my colleagues. I think this cabinet is very happily constituted in that, while we hold different views, we adopt the same policy of hastening slowly and working towards the goal that we hope to reach eventually. It may take a long time, but I think in twenty-five years more we will have a good chance of getting there. If the country will only be patient and give us twenty-five years more of power, you will see, I think, that we will reach a free trade level. Now, this is what I said:

> Incidental protection is all that this country requires. I mean by incidental protection the collection of such an amount of revenue at the ports of the Dominion as will enable the government to pay the ordinary expenses of administration, but not duties levied as a pure and simple protection. I believe the best, the simplest and most economical way of collecting our revenue, if it were practicable, would be by 'per capita,' and not import duty at all; that the country would thrive better, that it would be a cheaper land to live in, and that people would throng to it from all countries where distress prevailed.

I know perfectly well when I enunciate this view that free trade is not practicable. We have got to protect vested interests, and we know how largely those interests are wrapped up in the welfare of the country. I see the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is smiling, but I say in perfect candour and frankness that we cannot make any sudden change. I think, Mr. Speaker, I have said all that is necessary for me to say on this occasion, and I will close with an expression of the hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will help us in working out the fullest possible measure of inter-Imperial trade.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). It seems to me as this debate proceeds that it becomes more and more difficult to express any view which is absolutely novel on the question under discussion. But certainly there is one feature of the debate which deserves to be noticed, and that is the extraordinary divergence of views which the debate has revealed on the part of hon. gentlemen who sit on the government side of this House. We have on the one hand many strong supporters of the government who openly complain of the present fiscal policy, and declare that the duties are a great deal too high. We have my hon. friend the member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), who only a few days ago, though he sits at the present moment side by side with a protectionist Prime Minister, declared that this tariff was one he did not approve of, and that it should be reduced. Then there are other hon. members coming from the west who have expressed the same view very strongly, and the hope that before long a reduction will be made in the present rate of duty. That is one school that exists on the other side of the House. On the other hand we have heard hon. members contending that the tariff which we have is in reality a protective tariff, that in its

essence, in its main features, it is the same tariff policy that held force in this country previous to the advent of the present administration. I listened with the greatest of attention to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), and I was considerably surprised at his arguments. He says that we are living under a revenue tariff, and that that is really the character of the present tariff. Well, Sir, believing as I do with the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) and with all eminent writers on political economy, that any tariff which exceeds 17 per cent, and which brings into the public exchequer a larger amount than is absolutely necessary to carry on the public affairs of the country, must be a protective tariff, I was surprised to hear the Minister of Trade and Commerce maintain that opinion. I had expected that in presence of these three schools and with such divergent views, the hon. minister without portfolio (Hon. Mr. Dobell) was going to elucidate and explain these differences.

Far from it. I find that, for my part, I totally fail to apprehend the distinction he made, although he is, as we all know, a practical steamship man. He has shown it in the way in which he has managed this fast Atlantic business. This idea, which he expressed, of a twin-screw steamer, with one screw propelling forward and the other backwards, I do not understand at all. He, himself, has grave doubts as to the adaptability of that simile, and as evidence of that, he said that the only way to levy money for the administration of public affairs was by a per capita tax. Under these circumstances, I say that it is not surprising that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, when he delivered his speech upon the budget, asked us, implored us, as an opposition, to formulate some policy, and to express, as a united party, what our policy was. I take exception to that demand, and I say that in the mouth of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce that demand sounds like something strange and pathetic. I deem it that an opposition, fresh from the polls, a party recently defeated by the vote of the people, have some other duty extended to them than to bob up in parliament and formulate a policy. We have had a policy; that policy, I take it, has not met with the approval of the people, and under these circumstances, I think our duty is rather to ask these hon. gentlemen to unite upon a policy, to express a policy in order that we shall be in a position to criticise its application to the wants of the country, instead of asking us to formulate a policy at the present moment. I question very much, if, in the whole annals of British parliamentary history, in a country which has some knowledge, I take it, of the administration of popular institutions, whether we will find in any one single instance the spectacle of a party recently defeated at the polls presenting itself in parliament and formulating a policy. Is it in order that we should choose a policy for hon. gentlemen opposite to take from us and administer in a way in which we do not want it to be administered? No, Sir. I deem that it is our duty to sit here as critics, to see in what manner the government propose to apply the policy which they have, and in what manner that policy is going to benefit the country. But, there is something more. There is a lesson in this demand made of the opposition by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, in this sighing which he seems to have for the expression of a policy on our behalf. I would be reluctant, after the example he himself presents to us, to formulate a policy. Why? What benefit has it been to that hon. gentleman himself to formulate a policy in the past? Has it received any execution, has it brought him to any other place than to the place he occupies, to-day, himself, than this, to see a man of his known ability and experience occupying a position in this cabinet which he, himself, on many previous occasions, declared to be a useless one, and one that should be done away with? He had a policy; he preached strongly the policy of free trade. Have we got free trade? He is obliged to admit that the policy of which he was such an ardent pursuer, such a devoted defender, has been replaced by the policy of a revenue tariff. If hon. members will take the trouble to read the speech made by the right hon. Prime Minister, they will find that he is completely contradicted, that the right hon. Prime Minister maintains that our policy at the present moment is a protective policy that has as its ultimate object free trade. Did not the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce advocate strongly, in many different forms, closer commercial relations with the United States? What has become of that? Did not he advocate that point at one time, and in strong language, in language which, I am told, was most forcible, but which I never had the occasion myself to hear in this House, because I was not here when the hon. gentleman sat in the place which we occupy to-day? Did not he strongly advocate and declare necessary, because it had become a source of danger, a reduction in the public debt? Was not that one of his strongest policies at one time? Where are we to-day in that regard? We have increased the public debt by many millions since the hon. gentleman has had it in his power to control the policy of the country. The hon. gentleman had a policy also, and he expressed it freely, and that was a policy in which, as has been stated on this side of the House, many Conservatives throughout the country coincided. That policy was, that our yearly expenditure was too great. The hon. gentleman, and some of his colleagues, declared that the expenditure might be reduced by

many millions. Has that declaration been of any use to him ? Has the party of which he is a member been guided by it since they came into power ? We know that it is absolutely the opposite of that policy that has prevailed, and we heard how the hon. gentleman has endeavoured to explain away the increase of $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 in the yearly expenditure of the government. My hon. friend who was so anxious and who thinks it so very necessary and indispensible that we should go forward and formulate a policy, was in favour of a reduction in the number of cabinet ministers. One might really say that the expenditure of the country in that regard has increased instead of diminished. My hon. friend subscribed at one time, in a solemn conclave of his party, to the proposition that the time had come to totally abolish railway subsidies. That was his policy, not only in this House, but, I think, he addressed public meetings throughout the country upon this point during the period when he sat on these benches. He also formulated that policy known as the policy of the Patrons of Industry. He formulated that policy in so many words, over his own signature. What has come of it ? We never have had such immense expenditures under that head as since the hon. gentleman has been in control of the administration of this country. My hon. friend will recognize, I am sure, that at one time his policy was the total and complete independence of parliament. Has that policy been carried out ? We all know that these hon. gentlemen have violated their professions in that regard, that they have placed a larger number of their supporters in office during the few years that they have been in power than was ever placed before they assumed the reins of office during the same period of time. But, I would proceed with an endless enumeration. Was not my hon. friend a strong supporter of the principle that public works should be executed by public tender ? What has he to say to the words which fell from the mouth of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries the other day, who, in his own dulcet tones, said to us : You cannot expect us to depart from the principle that we must help our friends when we are in office ? What has he to say of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), who has made it a principle to depart entirely from the rule that public contracts ought to be given by tender ? On the contrary, I maintain, and we had proof of it the other day, that public contracts are reserved for party friends. Under these circumstances, I think that the claim of my hon. friend, that we should formulate a policy, ought to be accepted with a great deal of diffidence on this side of the House, and with a great deal of doubt. Why, my hon. friend even went so far as to subscribe to the principle, that the important question of prohibition should be submitted to the vote of the whole electors of Canada, and that the government, who had an affirmative vote on that point, should accede to the will of the people. He believed that we should do as they do in Switzerland, and some other states, and proceed on these important points by a regular submission of the question to the votes of the individual electors, and be governed thereby. What has come of that policy ? It has been thrown to the winds, like every other principle or policy declared by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Under these circumstances, for my part, I feel great confidence in the principle of lying low, of waiting, and not of enunciating great theories and principles which I never intend carrying into practice ; but, taking my true position as a member of the opposition, waiting and seeing how these gentlemen intend carrying out the policy which they set forth, in such magnificent language, when they sat on this side of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the amendment which is now under discussion, I wish to be as brief as possible, and I lay before you this proposition : That by the preference which we are granting to Great Britain we lose in this country a sum stated in round figures to be $2,000,000 a year. I say we are losing that sum, because I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to prove to us that upon the articles exported from England and which reach here under the British preference, the consumer really gets the benefit of that preference. It goes as we all know —and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot establish the contrary—it goes to enrich the British manufacturer. It goes practically as a bounty to the manufacturers of Sheffield and Manchester and Bradford, as against our own Canadian manufacturers, and we consumers in Canada do not derive the benefit which we ought to derive from that preference. Under these circumstances the question arises : Whether this lavishness, this immense degree of favour extended to a class of people who extend no favour to us is justified in the present state of this young country. Is our financial position such that we can afford to make this distribution of wealth in England where it is not required, to the detriment of our own people ? Sir, we were told by the Finance Minister that we have a great surplus, and I would ask this House how it is that the announcement of such a large surplus as the sum of $8,000,000 should have left the people so entirely unaffected. The reason is that the people take very little stock in surpluses. They have very little belief in the reality of the existence of such a thing as a surplus, and I believe that the common sense of the people which considers rather what is the state of the public debt ; what is the amount which we expend annually ; I believe that is a sounder theory than the theory of book-keeping by which the Minister of Finance arrives at the

conclusion which he was so proud to announce to the House. That is the reason that when the announcement was made by the Finance Minister, the people were found indifferent to it. Why, Sir, the day after the Minister of Finance had made his speech I found myself in Montreal. I met a number of people, and nobody, either Liberal or Conservative, seemed to attach any importance to the fact that the Minister of Finance had made that announcement. In fact, the only joyful people I saw were the little boys selling the Montreal Herald at the street corners, who were announcing in loud tones : We give away with each copy of the Herald a picture of the Hon. Mr. Fielding. And when I recall the fact that that newspaper received some $20,000 or $25,000 from the government last year, and when I saw that each one of these boys had received instructions to give away a picture of the Minister of Finance, I asked myself : Is this a pure unalloyed case of gratitude, or else is it, as the cynic says, a keen appreciation of favours to come.

Now, Sir, I said a moment ago that I believe the people of this country are not led astray by this announcement of a surplus ; that what they consider is the increase of the public debt and the amount of the annual expenditure, and the per capita increase of the rate of taxation upon the people. Taking these two points into consideration we have as a result incontrovertible, that during the administration of this government the public debt has been increased by over $7,000,000, and that in face of the fact that during the years which preceded their advent to power they declared that the increase of the public debt had become a great danger and that the first thing they would do would be to reduce it. We have had also, as a matter of fact, during the past fiscal year an increase in the per capita taxation (the amount of burden which weighs upon the people of Canada) of over $1.63 per head. That is what the people consider. And why is it that they pay so little attention to the announcement that we have a surplus ? It is because they know perfectly well, as we all know, that these surpluses are in reality not in the public chest, not as a rule invested in real capital—that is to say, in capital which directly or indirectly produces some revenue to the state—but that that surplus, to a very large extent, has been devoted to special expenditure from which under no circumstances whatever can the country expect any return. If you take the statement of the Finance Minister himself, we find that he gives the total revenue received during the past year at about $51,000,000, and if we add what he calls the ordinary expenditure of $44,002,323.56 to the special expenditure which he states we have to meet before the end of the year, and as these special expenditures amount to $9,742,187.33, then we find that we have spent during the year a sum of no less than $53,844,510.39. And the best proof of that expenditure is that in order to complete the amount required for the financial year of 1900, we will have to pass an additional money vote in this House. We cannot take that sum out of the surplus indicated by the Finance Minister ; we will require a special vote of the House for it, because we have more than exhausted the total revenue of the country. I will not go so far as to say that out of that capital expenditure there are not some amounts from which we can expect a return, but I say that if hon. members will take the trouble to carefully scan each item of capital expenditure in the Auditor General's Report they will find a vast amount of expenditure which properly ought to fall under the annual expenditure of the country, and not be charged to capital account. I believe, Sir, that until we have some authoritative definition by parliament or by some officer independent of parliament, or by some commission which will settle in a permanent manner what is strictly to be called capital expenditure, this confusion of the account will always exist, and the people will never be absolutely certain as to the exact state of the finances of this country.

Now, Sir, without taking up too much of the time of the House or going into too many details, if hon. members will take the trouble to turn to these items which the hon. Minister of Finance indicated to us as being capital expenditure—if they will look at the expenditure of some $200,000 in connection with Dominioin lands, they will see numberless items which ought properly be entered under the annual expenditure ; if they will turn to the militia expenditure, they will find that ammunition itself is classed as capital expenditure ; if they will look at the extraordinary transaction called the Yukon telegraph extension, which has been perpetrated by the Minister of Public Works, and examine one by one the items connected with the execution of that work—a work which was undertaken without tender, without any fixing of the prices beforehand, to my mind a scandalous transaction—they will find under the head of capital expenditure, drinking cups, pistols, ammunition, eiderdown quilts, tobacco. In fact, if I did not fear to trespass on the attention of the House, I would quote some of those items, and it would become evident that to call that capital expenditure is not only contrary to every sound business principle and principle of book-keeping, but contrary to every tenet of common sense. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) made the statement with the utmost complacency that it was very strange that people on this side of the House should find fault, because the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) had expended some $4,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway, and had succeeded in deriving from

that enterprise a revenue of $4,000,000 also. We all know that the Intercolonial Railway is in pretty much the same position to-day in which it has always been, and in which it will ever be, until the management of that road is taken completely out of the control of political influences. If members of this House will take the trouble to examine the capital expenditure incurred on the Intercolonial Railway last year, a work which has already cost us something like $60,000,000, they will find that in some $1,700,000 there are a number of items which no railway man of experience would class under the head of capital expenditure. Take, for instance, the construction of the elevators at St. John and Halifax, if you wish to apply the principle of capital expenditure producing some revenue. Are these works, which have cost something over $200,000, to be placed in the category of works producing a revenue for this country ? I venture to say that if we had the total amount spent on maintenance of these elevators and the total amount of grain handled by them, you would find that it has cost about as much to move the grain that has come to these elevators as it would cost to move it with a teaspoon. Under these circumstances, I venture to say that the placing under the head of capital expenditure of at least two-thirds of the amounts mentioned by the Minister of Finance is an error, according to the principles of sound book-keeping.

It is a mistake, I think, to say that the public, or even the press, which under ordinary circumstances is favourable to my hon. friends, has been totally gratified at their administration of the finances of the country. On the day after the day on which the hon. Minister of Finance delivered his budget speech, an article appeared in the Montreal Witness, a paper by no means unfavourable to the present government, which expressed, to my mind, the views of a very large number of people on the financial administration of the present government. I have not the quotation here, but the sense of it is that there is great dissatisfaction throughout the country at the failure of the Liberal party to carry out the pledges which they made so formally to the country before they assumed the reins of office, and that that dissatisfaction will go on increasing until practical measures are taken to reduce the public debt and the annual expenditure. The same view is expressed by the Huntingdon Gleaner, a paper of wide circulation published in the eastern townships, favourable to the present government, and one which on more than one occasion has expressed its dissatisfaction at the failure of the government to carry out its pledges. There is no doubt that this government has been above all things a fortunate government. We have had a run of extraordinary prosperity, for which the Minister of Finance takes credit. But if we look at what has been actually carried out in the way of improvement during that period of prosperity, what do we find ?

If you will take the extreme western limit of the country, the Yukon territory, where, according to a report which was laid before parliament several years ago, we had the authoritative declaration of Mr. Ogilvie that there were $100,000,000 of gold in sight, has the government actually derived every possible benefit which we had a right to expect from the discovery of that rich gold-bearing country ? The Minister of Trade and Commerce seems to be superabundantly satisfied from the fact that we have been able to derive from that country sufficient revenue to meet its expenses. But is that all we had a right to expect ?

In 1897, when that impossible scheme, which the Minister of Railways then submitted to this parliament, was under discussion, when we had submitted to us the project of important concessions to certain railway contractors who were to build a line of communication with the Yukon, the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) threatened the members who sat to your left, Mr. Speaker, with dire regrets in the future for venturing to oppose that scheme. Upon that occasion, I remember quoting from an English paper to the effect that we were pursuing in Canada a policy which had brought untold misfortune to other gold-bearing countries, namely, the policy of opening up that country to all strangers, of delivering over the richest gold finds in newly discovered regions to manipulators and speculators, and I ventured to prophesy then that the people of Canada as a whole, and the individual members of this community, would derive very little benefit from the Yukon. It seems to me that that prediction has to a very large extent been verified. The Dominion itself, under the showing of the Minister of Finance, has not realized anything like a sufficient amount to meet the expenditure of that section, and where do we meet individual Canadians who have derived great benefit from the Yukon ? They are very few in number. Speaking for my own province, I venture to say that you can count on the fingers of one hand the individuals who have enriched themselves in that land which, it was claimed at that time, belonged to us and to us alone.

Then with respect to agriculture, have we made any great reforms ? With the immense revenues at the disposal of this government, has the Minister of Agriculture succeeded in making any great innovations? Has he done anything in the province of Quebec to advance the cause of agriculture? The agricultural classes of that province, Mr. Speaker, have by their own individual efforts made immense strides of late years, and since this government has come into power they have appealed for the establishment of model farming schools in that province. One at least would be of some use

to the people, but I venture to say that the Minister of Agriculture is not able to point out, in spite of the great revenue which this country has enjoyed since he has occupied his position, any one thing of consequence which he has done to promote that interest which he ought to have so much at heart.

As regards immigration, I venture to say that the system which has been followed is one which ought not to prevail. I think there is a great deal of truth in the observation made by my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), and the same opinion prevails in my own province, that we should now begin to consider the necessity of reserving the lands of the North-west for our own people or else select for those lands the very best class of immigrants that can be found on the other side of the Atlantic. Those who are familiar with the system of immigration in my own province maintain that it is better to spend $3,000 in bringing out five or six or eight or ten good immigrants to the country and in looking after them from the time they leave Europe until they are well settled, than in spending one-half the money in bringing out a horde of people whose habits and education are alien to our institutions. And in bringing out good settlers, we must not forget that they will not only themselves become a valuable addition to our population, but will be the most profitable immigration agents you could possibly have. Is that the policy followed out by this government? No, Sir, we are spending over half a million dollars a year on immigration, and that expenditure has become an immense engine of patronage. We have a number of agents scouring European countries to bring out immigrants whom it would be better to leave at home. Have we the splendid results pointed out by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), when he said it was surprising to hear any expressions of discontent on this side, in view of the fact that 30,000 or 40,000 farms had been settled during the past year by the proper kind of immigrants. I say, Mr. Speaker, that that statement is not correct. I say that the policy of importing Doukhobors, people from eastern Europe, about whom we know little and of whom what little we do know is unfavourable, is a mistaken policy, and I think that the sooner Mr. Preston is called down from the position he occupies, the better it will be for the country. At present this gentleman is travelling through Europe at a salary of $4,000 a year and expenses. The other day he gave an interview to a Montreal paper in which he stated he was about to travel in eastern Asia and to visit the Moloccan race and expected to secure there a very large number of immigrants for this country. But who knows whether this race, which Mr. Preston intends bringing out, is more or less acceptable than the Doukhobors. We have already some idea of what that kind of importation means, and of what kind of ideas such people entertain. We had the other day a manifesto in which these Doukhobors complained of the laws of this country and declared that they believed in free love and other things of that kind. We all know that these men have most extraordinary ideas about the organization of society, and I consider them a great danger for this country. That is the opinion which prevails in the province of Quebec with regard to bringing out such a large number of these immigrants when we do not know, from our own experience, what kind of settlers they will make. The other day, in answer to a question from this side of the House, we had the Minister of the Interior repudiating the profession of faith made on behalf of the Doukhobor population and declaring that it was made by one whom he termed a Russian and not a Doukhobor. Well, I find in last Saturday's Witness an address to the Doukhobor population of Canada by one of their own race, one who signs himself their loving brother, and one who evidently is a leader among them—Mr. Leo Tolstoi. And if hon. members will take the trouble to look through that address they will find there an absolute confession of communism as an article of faith among that population. Mr. Tolstoi, after addressing these people as dear brethren and sisters, says to them:

> We do not fail against the teachings of Jesus, but confirm ourselves in it; to our own we provide food and a life without care, and we can assist the poorest when they are at the point of starvation. That is fundamentally wrong, my beloved. What one calls his property he will not only not let another have, but even defend it against him with all his might. And he who wishes to defend anything by force must be prepared to quarrel, and, in extreme cases, even to commit murder. Without force, without homicide, no property can be maintained. That we get along without violence and manslaughter, we thank those whose calling it is to guard and secure our property. Every proprietor needs soldiers and policemen; will you be proprietors, then your refusal was worthless to serve as soldiers and policemen; then you would have done better to perform such service instead of to covet only the enjoyment of the acquired goods.

And he goes on in this strain, but I will not read the whole quotation. As the Witness remarks in an editorial, this is neither more nor less than a profession of communism. Are we to be told that in the whole continent of Europe, with Great Britain, France, Belgium and Germany to select from, we cannot possibly find better settlers for this country than these men who profess communism and who declare, and who come here and are even imported, on the understanding that they will not bear arms for the defence of this country? I venture to say that the whole immigration system of this country ought to be remodelled, ought to be improved, and that we should bring to our shores only the very best that can be found in Europe, and

under the best supervision. On this point, as upon many others, I do not think that, with the vast resources at the command of the government, they have done what might properly be expected of them. I do not think that, considering the wants of this country, we are in a position to make the sacrifice we are making, and which I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, the sacrifice of about $2,000,000 a year under circumstances which seem to me totally unwarrantable.

Now, I do not think that, in the matter of bonusing railways, the government, having fallen from the high principles which they professed when they sat on the opposition benches, has proceeded with the greatest wisdom. We have at the present moment in Montreal a proof of my statement. We have there a railway which we purchased at a price which no man from Quebec will deny was a very exorbitant price. I speak of the Drummond County Railway. And we have gratified the Grand Trunk with an immense sum for the improvement of the bridge, and we are paying them an immense sum annually as rent. And what is the consequence ? We find that the Grand Trunk, after this immense sacrifice made by the country, is actually working to build up the port of Portland instead of maintaining the valuable port of Montreal. And what is the cause ? One of the principal causes is the failure of the government to insert in the agreement, at the time when these arrangements with the Grand Trunk were made, a clause which would protect the city of Montreal and protect that port upon which we have spent, are spending, and intend to spend, such large sums of money. With the resources which prosperity has brought to the government, have we really availed ourselves of every opportunity in the matter of expenditure ? We find every year in the estimates submitted to us large amounts for wharfs and public buildings. There does not seem to be a member on the other side who does not seem desirous of perpetuating his own memory by erecting within the limits of his constituency either a public building or a wharf. But, Sir, even with these immense resources, has this government solved, has it even attempted to solve in a manner beneficial to this country the great question of transportation ? I submit to this House that that problem, that difficult problem, which we are now called upon to deal with has been dealt with in a most inefficient manner by this government. We have to the south of us a people armed with immense resources. They are bent on securing the carrying trade of the west. They have money galore, they have brains and, so far, in that struggle to secure for our own country at least a fair proportion of the traffic of the west, I submit we have utterly failed. Divide, Mr. Speaker, into two parts the route which we must consider in dealing with this question of transportation. From Montreal to the west what have we ? We have not those improvements in the canal system which will become necessary if we are to rival to any successful degree our American neighbours. There is not at the present moment any possibility for a boat drawing fourteen feet of water to pass through the canals of Canada. In La Patrie, the day before yesterday, we find a letter from the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) admitting that it is impossible for a boat drawing fourteen feet of water to pass through the canals—and this in spite of the statement which was made here by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair). And, Sir, I venture to say, without claiming any special knowledge of that subject, that, until we have free canals in this country it will be very difficult for us to meet the Americans on the question of transportation. But, once you are in Montreal the errors committed by this government are still more flagrant. Very far from having made of the port of Montreal a national port, that port is a disgrace to that city. We have no elevator. That is the crying need of the city of Montreal. And how have these hon. gentlemen met the call, which, more than once, has been made by the city of Montreal for the erection of proper elevators in that place ? They have committed the greatest possible mistake. They made a contract for the erection of elevators with Mr. Conners. Anybody might have known that any contract having in view the erection of elevators in Montreal which depends for its success on American capital is bound to fail. It did fail. And we have no elevators at the present moment, in spite of the claims urged time and again by all the commercial bodies of that city. I tell hon. gentlemen opposite—and I believe they will come to the same conclusion before long—that the only way in which they can secure that portion of the trade of the west to which we are entitled is by making an arrangement with the carriers of the lakes to interest them in the port of Montreal. They are able, if they are interested in a proper way and without undue sacrifice of money by this government, to erect the elevators where required —not where Mr. Conner's elevator was erected, but at the place where the business men of Montreal required these elevators. What is required is an elevator situated in the middle of the port, available for the Intercolonial Railway, available for water-borne and railway-borne grain, and which can distribute to the ships about the centre of the port, without undue expense, the grain received there. Until we have these elevators, the system is incomplete. And unless the port of Montreal is provided, and provided very soon, with the wharfs which we require there, I venture

to say that every effort we may make to secure the commerce of the west will prove unavailing. And, what is the condition when you leave Montreal and proceed to the ocean? Have hon. gentlemen who sit in this House taken the trouble to read the report of the inquiry held by the business men of Montreal into the condition of the shipping between Montreal and the ocean? Why, Sir, the underwriters' rates we have to pay are absolutely prohibitive and must favour the American channels of commerce to the detriment of Montreal.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MONK. When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I was endeavouring to establish that with the immense resources which a period of great inflation and prosperity had placed at the disposal of the government, the government had failed to grapple successfully with some of the most vital problems that concern the future of this country. I gave as an instance the transportation question, showing that in my opinion the transportation question, so far as it is connected with the canal system, had not been dealt with vigorously, had not been dealt with by the government as it should have been, in view of the immense rivalry which we have to contend with from the other side of the line. I had spoken of Montreal. The condition of the port of Montreal at the present time, I said, was disgraceful; and that in the interest of a proper solution of that question the government should devote its energies, its attention, and perhaps some of its immense surplus, to placing that port in a position to compete successfully with the ports of the United States, which are drawing away the great commerce of the west. Well, Sir, I do believe that if the Minister of Public Works had had a free hand to place that port upon a proper footing, possibly things might be in a better condition than they are to-day.

But the trouble is that the transportation question interests too many authorities, there are too many who have to deal with the solution of that question to make a prompt and perfect solution of it. When you come to deal with the canal system, you have the policy, you have the ideas of the Minister of Railways and Canals; when you come to deal with the ports, the landing places on the upper lakes, you have to deal with the Minister of Public Works; when you come to the port of Montreal, things are still more complicated. You have the Minister of Public Works, you have the Minister of Customs, you have a body there called the Montreal Harbour Board; and when you leave Montreal, and even before leaving Montreal for the high seas, you have the authority, you have the policy, you have the ideas of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is my conviction that until that transportation question, so important to us, is confined either to the final decision of one man or of one body, there will be conflicts. Conflicts have arisen in the past, divergence of views, and the consequence will be that the trade and commerce of this country will greatly suffer. Once you leave the port of Montreal and go towards the ocean, members of this House who will take the trouble to scan the report of the shipping inquiry held in Montreal, the resolutions passed by the Board of Underwriters, the testimony of pilots, of disinterested men such as captains who come to our shores from Europe, you will find that from Montreal to the sea the system of lights is entirely inadequate. It is surprising to think that during these four years of plenty no improvement has been made in our signal service. The system of fog signals is condemned unanimously both by pilots and by the captains, and when you come to the channel there are defects at every step. So that between the port of Montreal and the ocean there is no reason for surprise whatever that the rates charged upon shipping, upon hulls as well as cargoes, are absolutely prohibitive, and militate naturally in favour of American enterprise.

As to the question of elevators, for my own part I do not believe that in Montreal the interests of our trade would be enhanced by the government building an elevator; neither do I believe, we have proof of it in the past, that the building of an elevator by an American capitalist depending upon American capital, upon the assistance which he may receive at Buffalo or elsewhere in the United States, can possibly have any but disastrous results. My own conviction is that we should interest in the shipping in Montreal the carriers on the great lakes. They could build a suitable elevator there with reasonable assistance from the government. They would be interested in supplying that elevator with grain and without the expense of too large a sum of money. By enlisting the interests of the carriers on our lakes, we would succeed in bringing to Montreal a very large proportion of the grain that finds its outlet through American ports. But even if we brought to Montreal the whole grain of the North-west, as things are in Montreal at present, we could not deal with that grain once it reached that port.

In connection with what might have been done during this era of prosperity, I think it is not improper to refer to the utter failure of the government to give us that service which, to my mind, is a necessary complement of the transportation question, which is its final solution, that is to say, the fast Atlantic service. It is a well known fact that when this government came into power in 1896, arrangements had been completed for a fast Atlantic service. There

remained merely the question of formality to fulfil. The arrangements were binding between the Allans and the government, and the only thing the government had to do was to put the contract into shape and to have it approved by the Governor in Council. Well, Sir, what spectacle have we had ? I do not see here the minister (Mr. Dobell) who more particularly was charged with carrying out the pledge given, I think, in the speech from the Throne in 1896, that we would have a fast Atlantic service ; but the results which have been obtained are absolutely nil. The minister without portfolio has made many voyages to Europe. he has crossed the Atlantic many times, he has lured us like a mermaid with bottle-necked ships and plans of all kinds, but as a matter of fact the results obtained are absolutely nil ; and if he were not such an amiable man one would be inclined to say that he deserved himself to be taken upon some desert island in the Pacific ocean and there marooned for his negligence to carry out the scheme for which the government gave us such high hopes. But, Sir, during this period of inflation, when the commerce of the whole world has received such a great impetus, these gentlemen who have had the government of this country in their hands for several years, have made no serious effort to extend our trade relations with other countries. They have done nothing whatever to extend our trade relations with the sister colonies, with the great dependencies of Britain throughout the world. In that respect, as in many others, we are forced to the conclusion that they have failed to fulfil the promises which they made to the people of Canada. Take the United States. You know, Mr. Speaker, perhaps better than many of us, that in the province of Quebec in 1896, and ever since then, it has been stated that very soon we would have commercial arrangements concluded with the United States. It was the great boast of our hon. friends opposite when they were in opposition that if they could have the reins of power for a short time, we would very soon see improved trade relations with the United States. We have spent a great deal of money in connection with that commission, and that commission has sat very often. Have our trade relations with the United States been improved in any manner, or is it not the case that we have sacrificed our own interests to those of the Americans without any return whatever ? What is the positon today ? We are discussing a question of very great importance. If the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is so anxious to know what our policy is he will find occasion in this resolution which is under discussion to discover what we think in regard to this feature of our trade relations. Italy shut us out practically from trade with that country when we had an incipient trade of great hope. We are shut out from the United States, and we are shut out from Germany. All the nations of the world, practically, are in a position of hostility in respect to ourselves. Hon. gentlemen opposite think that they have effaced all that by giving a preference to Great Britain, which has had for effect, to my mind, the placing of Canada in a position most unfavourable with other countries, and in not giving to our agricultural and other products a position of favour of any kind whatever on the British market. Let me point out that with that great reason and sense which are distinctive traits of the English race, such a concession has never been asked from us by them. But, we find that almost every session since this preference has existed, the hon. Minister of Finance looks to this side of the House, and seems to dare anybody to call in question the advisability of our giving a preference to England without receiving anything in return. We heard him the other day, when he looked to this side of the House and asked if there was any man who was unfavourably disposed towards that preference, and when he heard ' hear, hear ' from this side of the House, he seemed ready to brand this expression of view as traitorous. All I can say is, that my notions of loyalty and the notions which seem to prevail with the hon. Minister of Finance are greatly at variance. When England granted, as she so generously did, an absolute and entire measure of self government to her great dependencies, she gave us a mission, and that mission was to do all that in our power lay for the proper development of our own country. Taking that view, I deem it that when we are making a fiscal policy for this country, we ought to have regard in the very first instance to what is best and most suitable for our own country, irrespective of what the interests of England may be. That is my contention, because I believe that everything that will go to build up trade and develop this country, will go to the advancement and aggrandizement of the British Empire at large. In reality, Sir, the policy of these hon. gentlemen, in so far as preferential trade is concerned, seems to be a policy of despair and inaction. They say : We have taken a step, we have granted a preference to England, but, when we invoke the necessity of putting in force the other side of the question, the side which interests us as Canadians, they tell us that there is no hope or expectation. The hon. Minister of Finance told us, in Montreal, not long ago, that a hope of that kind must necessarily be ephemeral, and that those who advocated mutual inter-Imperial preferential trade could be nothing else than humbugs. This is a proposition from which I entirely dissent. I said a moment ago that the policy of hon. gentlemen was one of inaction. Surely no honourable man who has at heart the interests of the British Empire, and who lives under the flag which

waves over us, would be prepared to say that he is disposed to deal harshly with England, but are we not going to move public opinion in England in the direction of our own interests ? What, I say, have this government done in that direction ? Absolutely nothing. We have communicated with England in the past. Those who read the constitutional history of this country will find that time and again we have made representations to the home authorities. We have made representations, for instance, on the instructions that were given under letters patent to the Governors General sent out to this country, we have made representations in reference to home rule, we have passed a resolution in respect to the Transvaal war, and not long ago we adopted a resolution in respect to a matter concerning, if I may use the expression, the internal economy of the British government, in connection with the coronation oath. But, when it comes to making representations to the home government in respect to the necessity and the sheer justice of giving us a more advantageous position in the home market, this government have done absolutely nothing. They have never taken a single step. I defy these hon. gentlemen to show us one single communication they have made to the home government in respect to what I consider to be the just demands of Canadians in regard to our position upon the British market. They have never moved one step in that direction. Well, this is a strange position for these hon. gentlemen to occupy. A couple of days ago, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, I believe it was, told us that, perhaps, in thirty or forty years, we might expect the realization of our hopes, but, we all know, that in England there is no better way of awakening public opinion than by just such representations as I say this government have failed to make. What did Lord Salisbury say after the convention which took place in Ottawa in 1894 ? I believe the resolutions of that convention were conveyed to him. He stated that the idea of mutual preferential trade was a grand idea, that it was a just idea in so far as we were concerned, but, he said, we are living in a country where popular government prevails; public opinion has not yet moved in that direction, go out and preach the gospel of mutual preferential trade, and when the public of Great Britain will have become aware of the justness of your demands, of the fairness of your proposals, I have no doubt this idea will then be realized. What have these hon. gentlemen done to move public opinion in England ? Oh, we have commissions to sit upon poor civil servants and employees, commissions that cost thousands of dollars, most of which money has been uselessly spent ; but, why have we not a commission, which would cost very little in comparison with the results to be attained, to inquire into this question of vital importance to us, a commission that would sit and do just such a work as was done by that gentleman from Nova Scotia who obtained the thousand guinea prize for an essay on fair trade. I forget his name, but he is well known in public life. Why have we not a commission to study the question, and bring the results of its studies both before the British public and the public of our own country ? I say that this inaction is guilty, and that it indicates that the government are not alive to the importance of our demand in that regard. Have we found any of the members of the government taking an active interest, a live interest, in the congresses of the boards of trade which have taken place since they occupied the Treasury benches, and endeavouring, through these congresses, to move public opinion in the proper direction ? It has been a policy of absolute inaction. We have a High Commissioner in England, we pay a considerable salary to that gentleman, and it is proper that we should have near the home government, a man in that position. It is, I take it, his chief mission to represent to the home government what our interests are, particularly in commercial matters. Has he received any instructions? Has he been requested to make this a cardinal question during his mission in Great Britain, and to endeavour to move public opinion there in the right direction. I defy the government to give us any proof that they communicated with our High Commissioner, asking him to interest the government of England on our behalf and to move public opinion in so far as he could in a direction which is favourable to our interests. The government have not sent representatives to the chief centres of England to test public opinion and to suggest to us the best means of directing it in our favour. And when we come to the press which supports the present government, we find throughout its writings the same policy of despair, and of flippant contempt for every effort made to secure the inestimable boon of mutual preferential trade. We find the Liberal press stating that any person who moves in that direction does not know what he is talking about, and that there is no hope that the present condition of things will change. If we are to believe these gentlemen opposite we are to remain exactly as we are. We are to have no favoured consideration in any of the great markets of Europe in which we might trade, while upon the British market itself we are to be placed absolutely on a par with every foreign nation which raises up a high tariff wall against British goods. Well, Sir, to my mind that position is one that cannot last for a very long time. Have this government invited the consideration of the other colonies to this important question which interests every one of the great dependencies of Great Britain ? No, Sir, they have not sought the support of one of

the great colonies to help us towards the achievement of mutual preferential trade. Their policy is one of absolute inactivity. And as regards personal efforts of the ministers, I think the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) was perfectly right in saying that the government had absolutely stumbled into this policy. We who sat in the last parliament know that when the preference was first proposed the responsible representatives of the government stated that the preference was to be extended to every country in the world, and when they did restrict the preference to Great Britain they never endeavoured to attract the attention of the English government to what I consider a most legitimate demand on our part. When the right hon. the Prime Minister went to England he was the first to declare that we had no desire for mutual preferential trade, but that on the contrary we offered the preference as a free gift and we did not expect anything in return. Since then other ministers have crossed the ocean and what have they done in the way of obtaining this, to us admittedly inestimable advantage of mutual preferential trade. Last summer four of our ministers went to England, but they did nothing in this matter. Why, if we are to believe what the gossips tell us, three of those ministers went over on the war path. They went to France for the purpose of returning with the scalp of the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and they were busy with very different things than the securing of a proper market for Canadian products in England. And, Sir, they failed even in the object for which they crossed the ocean. The three ministers who are known in Quebec as 'the Three Musketeers' returned in one ship, and the Minister of Public Works apprised that there was some conspiracy directed against him returned in another ship. It reads almost like one of Marryat's novels or a chapter from Robert Louis Stevenson's Treasure Island, and what is strange, the Minister of Public Works got here before them, because while they were on the high seas shooting the sun and trying to find out where Labrador was, he had arrived in Quebec and had maintained the position which he thought —and probably properly thought—he was entitled to in this government.

When the British government concluded this modus vivendi with Germany, a modus vivendi under the terms of which we in Canada are sacrificed, did the Canadian government intervene to obtain for our products in Germany at least an equivalent position with that of British goods? No, Sir, they never moved. They never made any effort in that direction either before or since, and to-day we are in the unfortunate position in the German market, which was pointed out by my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) who replied to the Minister of Finance, and no steps have been taken to rectify that situation. I believe that the sentiment prevails through Canada as it prevails in my own province, that in giving a preference to England we are entitled in return to a preference in the British market. Last year when we discussed this question I communicated to the House a very able report adopted by the Chambre du Commerce, of Montreal, which is composed of men who belong to all political parties, businessmen and bankers, and they were unanimously of opinion that the present situation is one which can only be of a most transitory nature, and that we must have such a zollverein between the British dependencies and the mother country, as will secure for Canada a favoured position for her products in every portion of the British Empire. In supporting the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition, I am perfectly sure I am voicing the opinion of the people of the province of Quebec.

Before I resume my seat, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an allusion to some remarks which fell from my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcil) deemed it necessary to apologize for the vote of the province of Quebec in the last election, a proceeding which to my mind was absolutely uncalled for. I am not aware that any member of this House has made any reflection or any complaint as to the verdict given by the province of Quebec. I am pleased to say that even outside of this House I have not heard from any member of my own party any word of reproach. I have heard nothing but the kindest observations so far as the province of Quebec is concerned.

Mr. BOURASSA. What about the letter of the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper)?

Mr. MONK. Well, what about it?

Mr. BOURASSA. Did you read it?

Mr. MONK. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) read it?

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Well, what is his opinion?

Mr. BOURASSA. He says the vote in Quebec was entirely due to racial feeling.

Mr. MONK. I did not read that; but I must confess that if that is what the hon. member for Pictou stated, he is not a resident of the province of Quebec, and in that regard I think he is mistaken.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. The fact is, Sir, we on this side of the House are in favour of freedom of elections, and we consider that the province of Quebec was free to vote as it liked. That great province during a long time supported the Conservative party—gave a most generous support to that party. Upon the question of the national policy, which is so derided by hon. gentlemen op-

posite, I do not think the province of Quebec has any reason to be ashamed of its record, because it supported that policy for many years. Speaking as a member of the Conservative party, I do not consider the province of Quebec as estranged entirely from us and our policy—by no means. In fact, I must state frankly that I believe elections in the province of Quebec are carried on pretty much as they are anywhere else. Public questions are studied and examined and judged by our people with great accuracy. That is my own personal opinion. In fact, I would go the length of saying very frankly that I do not believe there is any province in this Dominion where such a keen interest is taken in the great public questions, such as the one now under discussion, as in the province of Quebec ; and the great issues before the country were certainly amply discussed in that province during the last election. Of course, any man who would say boldly that considerations of race, so far, at any rate, as the right hon. Prime Minister being of the nationality of the majority of that province was concerned, were absolutely not considered by the electorate, would, I think be considerably mistaken. But in that, as hon. gentlemen will admit, there are limits, which it is easy for any man of judgment to establish in his own mind. But other questions were discussed, and to my mind it would certainly be unfair to that great province to say that in the verdict which it gave in the last election it was led purely and simply by racial considerations. The fact is there were other causes affecting the result of the elections in that province and it would be most unfair to say that that cause alone operated. Of course, hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House know that not only in the province of Quebec, but everywhere else, in the heat and struggle which accompanies an electoral contest, parties who are not very responsible sometimes give utterance to sentiments which savour of violence and perhaps appeals to prejudice. But I say truthfully that I am not aware that in that respect the province of Quebec is any worse than any other province. I will give you an instance. Any one who would calmly and coolly sit down and group together and print in a pamphlet, opinions which might hurt the members from the province of Ontario—any one who would cull articles taken from the Quebec press, supposing such articles existed, and group them in a pamphlet, and coolly circulate that pamphlet through the province of Ontario, would be considered as acting unpatriotically and without judgment. Hon. members know that in the heat of the last election there was issued a pamphlet which did us on this side of the House a great deal of harm. That pamphlet purported to contain —I never myself had time to verify it—articles from certain newspapers, purported to give chapter and verse for those articles; and it was circulated just before the election. I speak of it with some knowledge, because when I saw that pamphlet, I confess to you frankly, I thought I was a goner.

Mr. BOURASSA. When you had your friends' literature ?

Mr. MONK. We had our press literature, but we had not a red pamphlet. We know that in England, where elections are properly carried on, as far as they can be, things of that kind are sometimes resorted to. But that red pamphlet, I tell you frankly, I believe accounted for the defeat of some of us.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Does the hon. gentleman allude to pamphlet No. 6 ?

Mr. MONK. Oh, no ; it was a far more deadly pamphlet than that. At that moment, when I deemed that everything was lost, the man who came to my rescue was a gentleman who sits on the front row of government benches ; I speak of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) ; and I for one felt like crossing the floor of the House and giving him my thanks for the service he had rendered me. I do not know how he would take it, so I prefer giving him my thanks from this distance. When we got the manifesto of the hon. member for North Norfolk, in which he proposed over his own signature that a British corps should be sent to garrison Quebec, I thought he had rendered me a great service ; and I must confess to you, if it was raising the race cry, that I made good use of that manifesto. After I had used it several times, I thought the red pamphlet had lost a good deal of its virtue.

Mr. BOURASSA. Will the hon. gentleman add that in consequence of that manifesto the hon. member for North Norfolk was chosen by the Conservative party as their candidate in Ontario ?

Mr. MONK. I did not know that, and I am not aware of it yet.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I can only say that the hon. member for North Norfolk is paired with a good Conservative this session on all party questions.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He was not opposed by them.

Mr. MONK. I would not like the House to suppose that the election in the province of Quebec turned on these questions. I mention them simply as incidents. After we got that manifesto, the people in my county at any rate thought things were pretty well squared up, and they came to the conclusion that if, as alleged, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) breakfasted off a Catholic every morning, then that the hon. member for North Norfolk dined off a Frenchman.

Mr. SPROULE. The diet seems to have agreed with them.

Mr. MONK. I could give numberless instances in which the population of that province was by no means governed by mere sentimentality. Hon. members from that province will bear me out when I say that there probably never was or will be a man who was a greater popular idol than the late Honoré Mercier. In 1890 he was in the zenith of his power, in 1892, as far as I could judge, the affection of the people for his person had not in any way changed, but on account of the acts of his government—acts for which probably he himself was not responsible—there was a vote which swept him and his friends from power. That with other incidents which I could quote prove that the people of the province of Quebec, when it comes to an election, exercise their better judgment and are not, as is believed in some quarters, entirely governed by feelings or prejudice of race and religion.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). Are we to infer that there is a sweep coming soon now ?

Mr. MONK. I believe there is, but if I entertained the idea that that population was governed solely by feelings of that kind, I would despair almost of the advancement of this country. I would despair of an element which allowed itself to be governed entirely by such feelings ; and if I remain in public life, and give, such as they may be worth, my services to that province, it is because I entertain the conviction that such is not the case. I entertain a firm abiding hope in that population. Hon. members who are perhaps strangers to that province will believe me when I say that it is almost incredible the progress which the French Canadian population of Quebec have made within the last quarter of a century. Within the time I have attained the years of manhood, their progress in elementary education, in the higher education, in science, arts and literature, and in agriculture, has not been excelled, if equalled, by any other population in this Dominion. Their progress in agriculture alone is something which does them infinite honour. In every calling of life, banking, business, there has been progress ; they are a population gifted in an extraordinary degree by Providence—a population that has realized that there is no bar to their progress, and that is the greatest hope I have in them. They desire to go forward, they have no other home but this country, no other desire but to build up this country in common with other nationalities. Some people would perhaps say that they entertain the expectation of establishing here a dependency of France, but those who know the people of Quebec know that that idea never had any existence in their minds. The people of Quebec know as well as I do what the colonial rule of continental nations is, and I venture to say that they would not for a moment think of accepting the colonial rule of France, though attached, as they are, to that country, by tradition. They could not stand it for six weeks. And the annexation sentiment, which has existed in some part or other of this country at times, does not exist in the province of Quebec today. Our people have only one desire—this is essentially their home, their country—and that desire is to build up this country and to act in that respect in conjunction with other nationalities. This is calculated to give every man who has the future of this country at heart great hope, because these people are an important element, an element that must be counted with, and I believe that when important crisises come upon this country, when we require to stand together, whatever may be the reason, when we require to put our shoulders to the wheel in order to make this great inheritance which Providence has given us a grand and powerful country, they will not be found behind any other nationality.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). The debate, Mr. Speaker, which has gone on for many days, has been interesting and brought out many subjects which I would like to discuss, but I recognize the fact that there are others who desire to address this House on the policy of the government and that proposed by the opposition, and that it is desirable a vote should soon be taken, and therefore I shall endeavour to make the few remarks I have to offer on this occasion as brief as possible. I may say at the outset that, in my opinion, the concluding remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken are of a character which meets with my approval, and which I think will tend to the benefit of the country. With the tone of the hon. gentleman's speech I have no fault to find, but when he endeavoured to point out that on this side of the House it was difficult to ascertain what particular views we held with regard to tariff matters, it seemed to me that the hon. gentleman's remarks would have been more apt if applied to his own side. After stating that we on this side did not all hold the same views, as might be expected from a party supposed to act together, he very frankly told us that he had his own views peculiar to himself, and that while the opposition held certain views, it was no part of their plan or policy to let the country know what these were. We all believe, the hon. gentleman said, in lying low. Our policy, I understood him to say, is to let the government go on and not interfere, and if we have any plan that we think would be better for governing the country, if we have any policy that would conduce more to its best interests, it is no part of our duty to give the country the benefit of it, but we will content ourselves with just playing the part of critics on any course pursued by the party

in power. Then I would ask the hon. gentleman, if that be the policy of his party—and he, as first lieutenant ought to be able to speak for it—how comes it that this amendment was brought in by his leader. The hon. gentleman is second only to his leader, he is the first lieutenant of his party, but did not happen to be in the House at time the resolution was introduced. That resolution was therefore seconded by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and by it we are given the declared policy of the Conservative party. These hon. gentlemen then did not follow my hon. friend's advice, they did not lie low. But the hon. gentleman happened to be absent at the time, and in his absence that policy which he advocates was lost sight of, and we have now a declaration of what the policy of the opposition is. If the hon. gentleman desired that the course he advocates should be followed, he should not have left his seat.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps the hon. minister will allow me to say that I was here all the time.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Then I have done the hon. gentleman unintentionally an injustice, for I did not suppose, judging by the policy of lying low which he had advocated, that he could have been present when the policy of his party was being crystallized into a resolution.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). Perhaps the hon. the Minister of Customs, as usual, was absent.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think that the Minister of Customs is generally found in his seat. If then there is a difference on the other side with regard to the policy to be followed by the opposition, how can these hon. gentlemen expect that on this side of the House we should be perfectly agreed concerning every individual item in the tariff. Surely, it is not to be expected that any political party can be one in opinion on every one of the three hundred or four hundred dutiable articles in the tariff. Nor can it be expected from hon. gentlemen on the other side. I have not the slightest doubt that some gentlemen on that side believe that the duty on kerosene should be removed, that others think it should only be reduced, and that still others are opposed to any reduction, but believe, being true protectionists at heart, in making the duty high enough to enable the article to be produced in this country. Mr. Speaker, we have to act on general principles, and when these gentlemen ask what is our policy they ought to know it. It is the same policy which has prevailed during the past three years—the same policy which was in operation when parliament last dissolved and we went to the country.

What is the policy they offer? We were told that the amendment declared it, and that thus declared it was to be accepted. When it was offered, it was interpreted by the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite to be the same old policy that was adopted in 1876—twenty-five years ago. Here is a party, in this progressive country, this country that is going forward by leaps and bounds, that finds the height of its ambition, finds its course for the future in a policy that was adopted twenty-five years ago, but was since discarded and cast out by the people. I am glad they brought it forward. During the last election contest, I was on many platforms. The ablest financial exponent on the opposition side, Hon. George E. Foster declared their policy to be what the hon. gentlemen have formulated in the first part of their resolution—a reversion to the old policy—the national policy, and the old condition of things that existed in 1878. He gloried in the position. To illustrate it he told a story—he told it on platform after platform—about how the Conservative wigwam stood where it had always stood; the same winds sighed around it, and the same tunes were played in it as long ago; and he declared in the fulness of his heart, that he had come out into the country to take the Liberals who, he said, had been deserted by those who formulated the Liberal policy, to take them by the hand and lead them into the old Tory wigwam that had never changed. For my part, I asked every Liberal in this country who, for any cause, felt dissatisfied with his party and its conduct in the past, if he wished to march back into the old Tory wigwam of 1878. No. The Liberal party have moved forward, and the country has moved forward with them. Let these gentlemen who wish to go into their old wigwam go back twenty-five years and dwell there. This country will not go with them, nor will this government or party. Our motto is 'Onward.' Progress is what is wanted in this country. The hon. gentleman taunts us because we on this side of the House do not agree. He longs to see his party in power, that there may be unanimity of sentiment in the government. We have had some indications of the harmony that prevails, so far as views of public questions are concerned, among hon. gentlemen opposite in their speeches. Their chief financial critic, whose task it was to reply to the Finance Minister, and whose words, therefore, are considered as carrying great weight, made part of his utterance on that occasion—and words spoken on such an occasion are likely to be spoken with care—to the effect that the policy of the party opposite was, that these bonuses to railway lines should cease. But, we have heard from one or two hon. gentlemen opposite—yes, and from more—a most excited declaration, that it was this government's bounden duty to go on bonusing railways—especially in the province of Nova Scotia, said one hon. gentleman from that province. Here is harmony. Where are they in re-

ference to this question ? Where are they in reference to the preferential tariff ? Are they not at sixes and sevens in this respect ?

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman cannot have heard the speech of the leader of the opposition, when he declared he was not prepared to declare for the repeal of the preference, that it was an ungracious thing to do, and Conservatives were not bound to do so. Yet the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) declared that he is in favour of repealing it. And I take it that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) who has just addressed the House, and whose policy is to lie low, comes sufficiently out of his cover to indicate, especially by the sentences in which he speaks of our losing $2,000,000 through the preference, that he is prepared to do away with the preferential tariff. But, they have not the courage to declare themselves. They do not take a stand which is worthy of a great Canadian party, that as a party they are in favour of the repeal of the preference. They ask what our policy is. Our policy is a revenue tariff policy, and coupled with that is a preference to Great Britain. And where do they stand in reference to these matters ? They dare not tell us. And, that being the case, they might well be excused from taunting members on this side of the House because on every little item of the tariff they do not happen to hold views absolutely alike. Let us contrast the two policies. We are happily in a position where we can institute comparisons. For eighteen years we had their policy, this policy they have laid down as a policy for the future. And we know its results. And you have had the policy of the Liberal party, as plainly declared, and as maintained in practice under this government, a policy of a revenue tariff, with a preference for Great Britain. You have had that policy for four years, and the people and parliament of Canada are in excellent position to say which policy they should choose. What have been the results of our policy ? The foreign trade of the country in four years increased $140,000,000. That is, our foreign trade increased in these four years by $30,000,000 more than it increased in all the years from confederation down to 1896. Last year alone, the increase in the foreign trade was within a few millions of being as great as in the whole eighteen years of their policy. In these whole eighteen years the trade only increased $66,000,000, while in one year, last year, it increased by $59,000,000. The exports of Canadian products, from 1896 to 1900, exceeded the exports for the previous four years by $155,000,000. The exports of the produce of the farm, from 1896 to 1900, exceeded the exports for the previous four years by $83,000,000. And these hon. gentlemen opposite wish to turn back the hand upon the dial of time, to go back to a policy that was tried for eighteen years, and the result of which was almost complete stagnation in this country, and ask the people of this country to approve that policy. One hon. gentleman asked me, what had the government to do with all this. I reply that the Liberal party have never claimed, nor have the government in any way claimed, that this government was entitled to the credit. These hon. gentlemen say : You may thank Providence for that, and not the government.

Humbly and reverently we recognize the hand of Providence in our national affairs and in blessing this country as it has blessed it among the nations of the earth, and we ask not that credit shall be given to us for the benefits conferred upon us by Providence. But I ask the gentleman who interrupted me by saying, What have you to do with that?—I ask if, during the eighteen years when they bore rule in this country, they were all years of stringency and of famine ? Was that the result of Tory rule in this country for eighteen years ? Will you take that position ? Did not Providence smile on this land ? You know it smiled upon it under Conservative rule as it does under Liberal rule. Did not the sun shine and the rain fall then just as it does under the present administration ? What, then, makes the difference ? Surely the conclusion is inevitable that the men and the party who are controlling affairs now know better how to use the blessings that Providence confers upon this country, and in a manner better fitted to the interests of this country. That is what we claim for the government, we claim nothing more. What means this great increase of exports of farm produce ? The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) gave us one of the reasons, namely, that under this progressive government steps have been taken for filling up the North-west Territories. During the four years the Liberals have been in power that country has been filling up to a greater extent than during the eighteen years the Conservatives were in power. And you are finding the benefits. Mining regulations, liberal in their nature, facilities given for developing that portion of the wealth of this country, the Minister of Agriculture coming to this House and boldly asking for hundreds of thousands of dollars to perfect a cold storage system by which the products of this country are carried to the old country and there marketed at higher prices than they were under hon. gentlemen—these things account in part for it, and all other measures that have been taken by a government and a party alive to the interests of this country have contributed to these results. The member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), in the course of his speech, said :

While a great deal of time is taken up both in the House and in the country discussing the

extent of our foreign trade, little or nothing is said with regard to our interprovincial trade, and I think the Minister of Finance might very well have dealt with that feature of our commerce in his budget speech. I speak of our interprovincial trade which moves from east to west and vice versa, which our railways and transportation companies are designed to accommodate, and which is the chief reason for the existence of our manufacturing industries. That interprovincial trade has been built up enormously within the last twenty-five years, and in connection with it I would quote to the House an extract from a speech delivered by the Hon. George Brown.

And he quoted from a speech of the Hon. George Brown, remarking upon the great increase in interprovincial trade after confederation, and laying down the rule that where you have a large interprovincial trade you have a large export trade. The hon. member for East Toronto, whom I recognize as an authority on commercial matters, commented upon it in this way :

The Hon. George Brown in these words refers to the importance of our interprovincial traffic, and he also indicates that when we have prosperous interprovincial traffic we have also large exports and imports. This much we may be sure of, namely, that if we are prosperous within ourselves, we will also be prosperous in our trade to and from foreign countries.

That is the sentiment of the hon. member for East Toronto. Now I am going to reason backwards, and by a parity of reasoning. He says when you have good trade at home, interprovincial trade and domestic trade flourishing, you will have large exports and imports, you will have a large foreign trade. We have not the means of measuring our home and domestic trade, the advances it has made. But I apply the test the member for East Toronto gave us himself to ascertain how we are in that respect, and when I say that there has been an increase in foreign trade of $140,000,000 in four years, the logical conclusion follows, according to that hon. gentleman's reasoning, that if an enormous increase took place in our foreign trade, how great must have been the increase that took place in our domestic trade. Now, I put this argument to that hon. gentleman, who is recognized as an authority on commercial matters. Reasoning backwards, I think every one will admit that what I have said bears out the conclusion that I have arrived at, that instead of the industries of this country being languishing and dying, while this foreign trade was going on by leaps and bounds as shown in the figures I have given you, the factories and machine shops throughout the towns and cities of this Dominion were working many of them long through the hours of the night, with double staffs in order to keep up with the orders that were lying upon their desks ; and I am gazing into the countenance of a member of the opposition who knows that what I am saying is true, as they do all.

The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), whom it is always a pleasure to hear, who lays down propositions with great force, said that he could not find out exactly where we stood on the tariff question, because, he said, some of the members declared that we had a protective tariff, others declared that it was a free trade tariff, and he was at a loss to describe what kind of a tariff it was. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side declare that we have kept their old national policy, and that it has given the prosperity we enjoy to-day. Others tell us that we have destroyed that tariff, and that we are ruining the industries of the country ; and so the hon. member for East York, listening to the utterances of those around him, became bewildered and unable to decide what our policy was. He told this House what statesmanship was :

Now, in what does statesmanship consist? I wish to direct the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this matter.

He was directing attention to this side of the House.

Statesmanship consists in compromising in some way antagonistic principles. There is a principle of free trade, and there is a principle of protection, and each is advocated by certain doctrinaires. But the statesman finds some way of compromising these principles and of doing something for his country by that compromise.

And I expected him to add : When some of my friends tell me that this is a protective tariff the Liberals have, and others tell me it is a free trade tariff, I am forced to the conclusion that it is one of those happy compromises that may be described as statesmanship. Our friends opposite say, when you quote the figures of the exports : Well, that is very true, there has been a great increase in the foreign commerce of Canada, but that is world-wide, it exists in the United States as well as in Canada. I admit that the United States is a mighty country, but when we institute comparisons between this land and the United States we institute a comparison with a country which, perhaps, taken all in all, has the greatest natural facilities and riches of any country in the world. But we do not shrink from the comparison. If you look up the figures you will find that the exports of domestic produce from the United States, exclusive of coin and bullion, increased last year over the previous year by 14 per cent. Similar exports from Canada increased at the rate of 23 per cent. That is comparing Canada with the United States greatly to the advantage of Canada. The grand aggregate trade of the United States for last year increased over the previous year by 13½ per cent. The same trade in Canada increased by 19 per cent. On the basis of a population of 76,000,000 the foreign trade of the United

States last year was $32 per head, while for Canada on the basis of a population of 6,000,000 it was $63 per head. The grand aggregate trade of Canada increased in 1900 over 1896 by 60 per cent, while that of the United States for the same period increased by only 28 per cent. So, I give that as an answer to hon. gentlemen opposite when they think that they can wipe away the effect and force of these figures by declaring that the United States have equally prospered. If the two countries were equal it would be a grand thing for us to be able to say, which we were not able to say, under hon. gentlemen opposite, but, when we have passed them as we have, then, I am glad that we have had pointed to us that country so that we might institute the comparison that we have done.

Now let us look at the preference tariff and ascertain whether it is any benefit to us. Mr. Clancy, or the hon. member for Bothwell—I beg his pardon, for I desire to speak with respect of him as he endeavours to discuss a question of this kind on its merits—in discussing this matter made a statement, which, unfortunately, in the way in which it is phrased in the 'Hansard,' leaves an impression that I am sure, the hon. gentleman does not wish it should leave at all. Speaking of the increased trade with Great Britain under the preference tariff, he proceeded by making a comparison of the increase of our foreign trade with different countries, testing it by percentages and making out that the percentage of increased trade with Great Britain was much less than the percentage of increase with other countries, showing, that, therefore, we had not done so very much in the way of increasing our trade with Great Britain. I might point out that percentages are valuable as means of comparison when circumstances are somewhat nearly similar, while at other times you may institute percentage comparisons that are absolutely misleading and are of no value at all. If the hon. gentleman will pardon me, I am forced to say that I consider this one of the cases in which the remark I last made will apply. He quotes the increase of our foreign trade with Belgium, Italy, Australia, Portugal, France, Germany, other countries not classified, Great Britain, United States, South America, Holland and Newfoundland. He says that our trade increased with these countries to the following extent:

	Per cent.
Belgium	1,121
Italy	359
Australia	214
Portugal	176
France	136
Germany	126
Other countries not classified	71
Great Britain	61
United States	54
South America	43
Holland	34
Newfoundland	20

He comments upon that in the following words:

> That shows conclusively that the sentiment in our favour, of which these hon. gentlemen are boasting——

That is the sentiment in our favour as a result of the preferential tariff granted by Canada to Great Britain.

> —has had such little effect that Great Britain, as a consumer of Canadian products, stands only eighth upon the list.

I am sure the hon. gentleman did not want the country to infer that in the consumption of goods exported by this country, Great Britain stood eighth on the list of all other countries. That would be too patent a mistake for any one to make. He says that the percentage—he does not say that, but I suppose that is what he means—is eighth on the list. What are the facts, and you cannot go into that question of percentages without seeing that they are utterly valueless.

Mr. CLANCY. Are they not quite as apt and valuable as the percentages the hon. gentleman states himself in regard to the United States? While the percentage is low in the United States, the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the quantity exported is vastly greater than the quantity exported from Canada.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I think the hon. gentleman's point is not well taken, when there is the enormous trade that there is between Canada and Great Britain and the United States and Great Britain. While the aggregate trade of Canada is more nearly double per head of what it is in the United States, then, the percentage being applied, is a fair test and in fact it would be against Canada if it were anything, but when you take a case like this in which the hon. gentleman says that we increased our trade with Belgium by 1,121 per cent, and with Great Britain only 61 per cent, the comparison is utterly valueless, because the fact is that the total increase of trade with Belgium of 1,121 per cent was $764,387, while the increase of trade with Great Britain, with this less percentage, was $33,843,000. So, these figures are not to be used to establish the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. Minister of Customs give us the figures of the increased imports from the United States and from Great Britain along with the percentages? Just give us the figures of the increased trade with each country.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not that with me, but the hon. gentleman will be able to get it.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it would be opportune just now.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think the hon. gentleman will find that when he

gets these figures that the increase has been most satisfactory as far as Canada is concerned, and that they will bear out what I have said in relation to it. I have pointed out that these figures which have been quoted by the hon. member for Bothwell do not give a correct idea of the facts. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem now to be getting a little bolder in their attacks upon this preference. They will not say that they are in favour of repealing it. They fear the force of public opinion against them, but they seek to minimize the benefits that flow to us from it. An hon. gentleman the other night, while making a long speech, enumerated a great many articles in regard to which he said the preference was of no use to us at all, that we got no benefit from it, that there was no advantage even on goods coming from Great Britain, because the duties in some cases were made higher than they had been before in the general tariff and that, therefore, any benefit there was had been neutralized. In illustrating that a personal allusion was made to the Minister of Customs. I do not allude to it for that reason, because an insinuation cast out against any hon. gentlemen in this House is something that can be accomplished by anybody whose tastes run in that direction, and who are not too careful as to whether the statements they make are accurate or not. I simply use it for the purposes of illustration. That hon. gentleman said :

> Let us take the item of biscuits, $19,781. The duty was raised by 2½ per cent. I do not know whether it was done in the interest of the Minister of Customs, who has a large biscuit manufactory in Brantford, but certainly in that respect we do not get any benefit from the preferential tariff.

I leave the personal matter alone, but I use this as an illustration of inaccurate statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite. He says that we raised the duty on biscuits—he apparently means sweetened biscuits—to 27½ per cent under the general tariff, adding 2½ per cent to the duty which he says was done in my interests. If he will get an hon. gentleman who sits near him to figure it out for him, and it is a very simple problem, if he will take the total amount of duty paid on sweetened biscuits last year and divide it by the value that was entered, he will find the duty actually paid on these sweetened biscuits was 25½ per cent, instead of 27½ per cent, as it was under the old tariff of the national policy. There was 2 per cent less actual duty paid than there would have been paid under the old tariff in force.

But the point I want to make is : that it was not only biscuits that came from Great Britain, but there was a large quantity coming from the United States and other places, as well, and the whole quantity coming in under the higher rate from countries not under the operation of a preferential tariff, was reduced 2 per cent. If that is a sample of how gentlemen opposite make statements that are absolutely devoid of fact, and if these are to be read by the people and not inquired into, no wonder that certain sections of the people may sometimes be misled. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart) made a speech in this debate, and we find that he does not take the same view as some of his political friends, who say that the preferential tariff has not reduced the cost of goods to the people of Canada. I may state here that when we introduced the preferential tariff it was not entirely out of love to Great Britain, and losing sight of every other consideration, because one of the main reasons why we proposed it was that it would lessen the taxation of the people. Now, while some of the gentlemen opposite say the preferential tariff has not reduced the cost of certain articles which you get from Great Britain, the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Haggart) told us that woollen goods were coming in from England to such an extent that there is danger that the large woollen industry of Canada will be wiped out of existence. I am bound to say that I have great sympathy with every legitimate industry in this country. I would be very sorry indeed if the effect of the preferential tariff would be the cause of gentlemen who have their money invested in the woollen industry having their fears realized in that respect ; but I hope and trust, and I have reason to believe, that with the energies of the people engaged in that industry, and with the capital at their command, they will rise to the occasion and fully maintain their position. I may say that one of the benefits that was derived by the reduction of the tariff by this government to a revenue basis in many lines of industry, was what it must inevitably always be, that it stimulated the energies of those who are engaged in different industries so that they brought their best brains to bear on their work ; bought the very best machinery to be obtained, and notably in this woollen industry they produced an article that is a credit to Canada. I know there is a feeling in the breast of some people that goods that come from a distant place must be better than those we get at home, but I hope the time will come that when Canadians go to purchase clothes they will ask to be shown Canadian manufactured goods, and I think they will admit with me that we have arrived at a point of perfection in this product which is a credit to the men who are engaged in the industry. In view of the energy and enterprise which the woollen manufacturers of Canada have displayed in their industry, I do not believe that it will be crushed out. It is certainly not the desire of any Liberal that a single one of the great industries of this country shall come to loss or suffer harm. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), I think, grossly exaggerated

the extent of the imports of woollens from the old country. There is no doubt that in this line Great Britain benefited by the preferential tariff, and perhaps to a greater extent than in many other lines, but while they have benefited in Great Britain, it, of course, has caused a reduction in the taxes paid by the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) said :

> What we contend is that the policy of the present government, by raising so large a revenue from customs duties, is having the effect of shutting up the factories of this country, notably the woollen factories. Look at the great increase in the importations of woollen goods, $13,000,000 worth, or more than double what was imported in 1897.

The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is wrong in these figures. I have the Trade and Commerce figures here, and the imports in 1897 of dutiable woollens—and that is all we are concerned with—amounted to $7,125,748, while last year the amount was $9,801,565. There is an increase since 1897, but in 1896, under the old policy, the dutiable woollens imported amounted to $8,670,691. I grant there has been an increase, but it is an increase not as great in proportion as the increase in the total imports of goods from foreign countries. If there are gentlemen present who are interested in the woollen industry by having invested in it, I would ask them not to be too hopeless in the matter, not to be discouraged, but to continue to display the energy they have shown in the past and I have no doubt that with the excellence of their goods they will find that the preferential tariff—which I grant presses more closely on them than on others—they will find that it is to the general benefit of the people of Canada, and that it has not been to their detriment either.

Mr. WALLACE. What did the minister say the woollen imports for last year were ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. According to the Trade and Commerce table, the value of dutiable goods for 1900 was $9,801,565.

Mr. WALLACE. It is more than that in your own report.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This is the table of the trade and commerce, in which it is more condensed, but it will agree, I think, with the Trade and Navigation Returns.

Mr. WALLACE. The Trade and Navigation Returns give more than that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken, but I will not speak positively on that point. They should agree, because the trade and commerce is a compilation of the trade and navigation returns, and although not made in my department, I have no doubt they are made correctly. Now, Mr. Speaker, allusion has been made to the iron bounties and we have been taunted by gentlemen opposite that we have carried out in this what they say is the very essence of protection. That was a policy adopted by the late government and maintained by the present government, the distinction being that while almost no progress was made under the old government, great strides have taken place under the system that was adopted by the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) when he brought in his bounty resolutions in 1897. In the course of his speech he (Hon. Mr. Fielding) alluded to the fact that in the payment of these bounties, after the 1st of July, he intended to make them a charge upon capital account or on a special account which will go to capital account, thus placing these bounties in the same category as subsidies to railways, and should not be charged against the revenue of any one particular year, for the reason that you should not charge a railway subsidy to ordinary expenditure, because that railway subsidy once paid you get the benefit of it for all time to come without further payment. So with the iron bounties. For five years, under a diminishing sliding scale, you are paying out moneys in order to develop an enterprise. At the end of five years you have the interest developed, and you have the resulting benefit for all time to come, without anything more being paid by the country. Therefore, it is not fair to charge against any one year the expenditure for a benefit which you are to have during all future years. I think, therefore, the proposition of the Finance Minister is one that will commend itself to the House. Under the system pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite—and it is a system we have followed in the department over which I have the honour to preside for the time being—these bounties have been paid out of customs revenue. That is, the customs revenue has been diminished by the amount of the bounty we paid to the iron manufacturers, which should never have come out of the customs revenue. We pay refunds out of the customs revenue ; that is, we have taken into the revenue moneys which we have afterwards discovered should not have been paid, and we have refunded them. That is right enough. But, these bounties are paid out of money that never came into the customs or consolidated revenue at all. They are absolutely grants out of the public treasury, and, therefore, should not form part of the current expenditure. What the Finance Minister proposes is, that these iron bounties shall appear in the open light of day ; that men shall not have to take up the Auditor General's Report and search through the revenue and refunds to find out what bounties have been paid ; but, that they will appear in one sum, so that, whether they amount to millions or hundreds of thousands, the people of this country will know what they have paid. This

government does not seek to hide any of its transactions, but wants them all to appear in the open light of day.

I want to speak briefly about the average rate of duty, and the percentage of reduction made by this tariff. I will not argue the question ; it is not necessary to argue with hon. gentlemen opposite ; the time is lost in doing so. You can take the Trade and Navigation Returns, and find out for yourself. It is figured out in one of the tables on one of the early pages of the report, by clerks who have no object in making it appear other than it should be. If you take the total imports of dutiable and free goods, and divide them by the total amount of duty paid, you will find that in 1900 the percentage of duty was less than 16 per cent on the average on all the goods, dutiable and free, which came into this country, while, under the old tariff, in 1896, the percentage was 18·28 per cent. That is a reduction of about 2¼ per cent, not from 100, but from 18¼, which is equal to 12½ per cent reduction in the tariff. I give this as a rough test. I do not mean to say that it is an exact test. You may import more of one class of goods in one year than in another ; and if these goods have a higher rate of duty, your calculation may be somewhat upset ; but, as a rough test, this is of value. But, hon. gentlemen opposite, in criticising the tariff, say : Now that you have made corn free, there are some millions of bushels of corn brought in, and they are in the consumption column, while they have gone out to foreign countries ; you should take out these. In some cases they say, you should also take out coin and bullion. Well, that is fairly to be argued ; but, I must tell these hon. gentlemen that when millions of bushels of corn come into this country, to pass through our highways of commerce, enriching our shippers and railways, giving employment to the men handling it, I hold that they are valuable to this country. What are we sinking canals and building railways for ? Not only to carry the goods of our own country, but in the expectation of carrying a great portion of the traffic of the north-western states. Then, my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) wanted to know why the Finance Minister did not take out coin and bullion. Well, if you take out coin and bullion, there is shown to be between three and four million dollars of reduced taxation after these have been taken out. The hon. member for Bothwell shakes his head ; he thinks that is not correct : but, I can assure him that if he looks into it, he will admit that it is correct. The hon. gentleman said, alluding to the Finance Minister:

> In making his comparison this year he includes coin and bullion for all the years covered by his comparison. And why does he do so? Because to do so tells in favour of his own position, for the quantity of coin and bullion imported into Canada in 1900 was larger than in any previous year, and the effect of including them is to show a reduced percentage of taxation.

The hon. gentleman had not the proper faith in the honesty and fairness of the Finance Minister, or he would not have made that statement. The hon. member fell into this mistake. He looked hurriedly at the statement, and he saw that there was more coin and bullion imported this year than usual, and the Finance Minister, not having taken that out, he jumped to the conclusion that it should be out ; but, if the hon. gentleman will work out the proposition for himself, he will find that if coin and bullion had been omitted by the Finance Minister, the reduction would have been greater by ·10 of 1 per cent. The hon. member for Bothwell lost sight of the fact that the other goods which were included increased far more in proportion than the coin and bullion, and if you put them together, and make the reduction, the reduction would have been greater with the coin and bullion out than it was with it in. The hon. gentleman still shakes his head. I want to prove it to him, and I am going to give himself as an authority ; he will not deny that. To prove the accuracy of his calculation, I will quote the hon. member for Bothwell. In the statement made by him on page 1562, unrevised 'Hansard,' he gives the rates for 1896 and 1900, exclusive of coin and bullion, and Indian corn not remaining in the country, as 19·19 for 1896, and 17·21 for 1900. The Minister of Finance took credit for a saving of duty amounting to $3,292,230, after making due allowance for Indian corn. If he had deducted coin and bullion in making his calculations, he could have shown a saving of $3,300,977. Now, I think I have convinced the hon. member for Bothwell, for I have given himself as an authority on this matter, and he can work it out for himself.

If the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) were here, I would just like to make one observation by way of answer to an argument which is unworthy of the intelligence of hon. gentlemen opposite. But, time and again it is used. They say : You took $28,000,000 in your custom-houses last year, whereas we took only $19,000,000 when we were in ; so, you have wrung nine or ten million dollars more taxation out of the people than we did.

Hon. gentlemen opposite know that governments do not make the prices of goods in foreign countries. If the opposition got into power they could not rule the prices of yarn in the United States, or woollen goods in England, or wines in France or Germany. The law of supply and demand is what governs this matter. Should these hon. gentlemen get into power, they could not compel any man or woman in this country to go into a store and buy a dollar's worth or $10 worth of goods. People go into stores to buy goods to satisfy them-

selves and not to carry out any government policy. Therefore, what blame can be attached to the government if $28,000,000 went into the treasury this last year as compared with $19,000,000 the previous year. There is only one thing for which the government can be held responsible and that is the imposing of customs duties. And according as the government lower or raise the duties, they may be blamed or praised by the people. And I have pointed out that we have lowered the duties, and that if we have received a revenue this year of $28,000,000 instead of $19,000,000, we have received it under a reduced rate of taxation.

On page 1520 of the 'Hansard,' I find that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) is reported as having said :

> Sir Leonard Tilley in 1882 reduced taxation by one and a quarter million dollars, and in 1883 by a like amount.

That is correct. But turn back to these years, and you will find that Sir Leonard Tilley also reduced the rate of taxation, but that while the average rate of duty was slightly decreased, the revenue increased. In 1882 the revenue exceeded that of 1881 by over $3,000,000. Will these hon. gentlemen opposite then say that Sir Leonard Tilley wrung $3,000,000 of taxation out of the people ?

The hon. member for Pictou says that Sir Leonard Tilley reduced the taxation. So he did, but none the less he collected $3,000,000 more revenue in 1882 as compared with 1881, and in 1883 there was an excess of revenue over 1882 of nearly one million and a half dollars. Will hon. gentlemen opposite argue that in those two years Sir Leonard Tilley wrung four and a half million dollars of taxes more out of the people because that much more went into the treasury, and that despite the fact that he had reduced the rate of taxation ? If they will not, then they have no right to bring a similar charge against this government. We have reduced the rate of taxation, but still the revenue has increased by millions of dollars, and that increase was not wrung out of the people, but was the free will gift of a prosperous community, augmenting in numbers as in wealth.

The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), of whom I desire to speak with the greatest respect, for I think it will be admitted on all hands that he has imparted added dignity into the conduct of public affairs—that hon. gentleman, in introducing his resolution, spoke of the duty upon tobacco and the duty on sugar. With reference to the duty on tobacco, I need only point to the speech made by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Cowan) last year, and also to that made by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) this session, in which are pointed out the great progress made by this industry under the present tariff.

With reference to sugar, I think the hon. the leader of the opposition fell into a mistake. Of course he cannot be expected, owing to the multiplicity of his duties, to make a very close study of all these matters, but he made the statement that we had greatly increased the duty on sugar. Let me point out the mistake into which he fell, and into which he was led to some extent by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who ought to have known better. The hon. the leader of the opposition made this remark :

> I desire, in passing, to mention to the Minister of Finance that his taxes on sugar were considerably increased in 1898. In that year he took from the people $1,324,329, and in 1900 $2,286,123.

That statement would lead one to believe that we had taken nearly a million dollars more out of the pockets of the people by the tax on sugar, and my hon. friend was rather led to that conclusion by the hon. member for West York. Now, there was in 1900 more duty to the extent of $961,724 paid on sugar, raw and refined, than in 1898. That is quite true. But we only imported 239,127,300 pounds in 1898, while in 1900 we imported 304,460,448 pounds, and you could not have an increase of 64,000,000 pounds of imports without getting more money into the treasury. But that does not mean that the increased revenue was due to any increase in the taxation.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that there is not a higher rate paid now than in 1896 ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will not hesitate to say that. If the hon. genteman had not asked the question and had waited a moment longer, he would have seen that, with my usual frankness, I would have done that without the question being asked. But I am leading up to this and am pointing out what was done in the matter of sugar. When the government came into power they found that the sugar duties stood in this position. They had previously varied in degree. They had been high. These hon. gentlemen talk of having put sugar on the free list in 1891-2. But all sugars were never put on the free list. What they did was to put all raw sugar under No. 14—sugars that are not fit to go on the table and be used in the family at all, but are only fit for the refiner and only bought by him—they put those absolutely on the free list, and on the refined sugar made out of these, they put 80 cents on the 100 pounds. In other words, while nothing went into the revenue at all from the raw sugar, of which hundred of millions of pounds were imported by the refiner, the refined sugar,

which is the only sugar used by the people, was taxed 80 cents per 100 pounds. And if the protection theory that the duty aids the manufacturer holds good, that meant that the 80 cents, less the loss in refining, went into the pockets of the men engaged in that industry. That went on for a time. It was then pointed out that the duty was too high and the late government reduced it, still leaving raw sugar on the free list, to 64 cents per 100 pounds. They took off 16 cents. Well, if the refiner could live with 16 cents less protection, he could have lived on that reduced rate from the beginning. And if you apply 16 cents per 100 pounds to 250,000,000 pounds of raw sugar, you will find it amounts to some hundreds of thousands of dollars, which the people paid, under the 80 cents duty, over and above what the Conservatives themselves thought was necessary in order to keep the sugar refiners in existence. Before they left office, these hon. gentlemen re-introduced a measure putting a duty on raw sugar. They put a duty of one-half cent per pound on raw sugar, such as the refiner uses, and made the duty on refined sugar $1.14, leaving the refiner a margin of 64 cents as before. As the refiner paid 50 cents on the raw sugar, they gave him 50 cents extra on the refined, making it $1.14. The present Finance Minister left the same duty of 50 cents on the raw sugar, but instead of imposing a duty of $1.14 on the refined, he reduced it to the even dollar, thus giving the refiner a net protection of 50 cents per 100 pounds instead of 64 cents. Take that 14 cents per 100 pounds and multiply it by 250,000,000 pounds and figure out the saving for yourself. That makes a matter of some hundreds of thousands of dollars less paid by the people.

Now I come to answer my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). A year or two ago the Finance Minister, desiring to help the West India trade, introduced what was in force under the late government for a time prior to 1895, the polariscopic test. That is the test you make by the polariscope as to the saccharine strength of the sugar, in which a low grade saccharine sugar does not pay as high a duty as a high grade, but pays in proportion to its saccharine strength. And the Finance Minister of that time, so far as he could forecast it, tried to maintain the same rates of duty prevail. By this polariscopic test some of the sugars went below 50 cents a hundred pounds, and some went above it, but the design was to have it run about as it had—50 cents on the raw sugar and $1 on the refined. In the operation of this polariscopic test it has turned out, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has asked me, that there was last year a difference in favour of the refined of 56 cents, instead of 50 cents per hundred pounds. But we are still 8 cents per hundred pounds lower than they were. The difference is accounted for in part by this—that the tariff was changed in an effort to secure better trade relations with other British colonies; sugar from British colonies being admitted under a preference; and one of the Australian colonies is sending large quantities of sugar into the British Columbia market, which the people there benefit by and, as these come in under the preferential rate, the average has gone down. But let me point this out to the hon. member for Bothwell—that, under the actual operation, coming as near to it as we can, there is still 8 cents per 100 pounds less protection to the refiner than there was ; and 8 cents per 100 pounds on 250,000,000 pounds, he will find, will amount to quite a snug sum.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the government get more or less revenue per 100 pounds under the new tariff than under the old ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Under the present tariff we get more.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Under the preference we get less.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. On the whole, we get more. That is what we want—we want money to go into the treasury, not into the pockets of individuals. Last year, the average rates were—refined, $1.24 per 100 pounds, and raw 68 cents per 100 pounds—that is, we are putting 18 cents per 100 pounds more into the treasury on raw sugars than they were.

But I pass on, for I did not intend to speak so long on this subject. I come now to consider the question whether the opposition are prepared to say whether they will remove this preferential tariff or not. We have different opinions expressed by different hon. members opposite. The leader of the opposition said :

> The hon. the Minister of Finance is very ready to fling across the floor of this House the question whether or not we are prepared to repudiate the policy of British preference. Well, it is very difficult sometimes, and might be regarded as very offensive, to ask or to take back that which has been given away.
>
> The Liberal-Conservative party have never said that they proposed to repeal that preference; but they have said that they would never rest satisfied until, in addition to that and as compensation for that, we had attained a preference in British markets.

The hon. gentleman will not say that they wish to do away with it. But the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), when I asked him across the floor of the House, said that he would do away with it. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) who has just addressed the House, indicated that he was about ready to go that length. But the leader of the opposition would not go so far. In fact, he was afraid that what he had said might be interpreted to mean that they were not so much in favour of the old land

and the old flag as they were. So he strengthened himself in this way :

Now, I do not want any misunderstanding so far as the opposition or the party I have the honour to lead in this House is concerned. I am prepared to stand for the unity of the empire as strongly as any member of this House. I am prepared, for that purpose, to advocate and support the claims of any government that will spend its last dollar and send its last man in support of the integrity of the empire against any foe that may threaten disruption.

But the hon. member for East York said in effect : Do not send any British goods here, because we do not want them; we will send our last man and our last dollar to preserve the integrity of the empire, but do not send your woollen goods here, for our loyalty won't stand that.

Mr. BROCK. Does the hon. minister mean to say that doing away with the preference would do away with the importation of British goods altogether ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I do not think it would. But I do think this —and I would say it in answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock)—that their policy, if carried out on the only basis on which Mr. Chamberlain said it could be carried out, and woollen goods were admitted free, that would close the woollen factories; and, for that reason, while we are prepared to accept a preference in the British market when Britain is able to give it to us, the distinction is that we say that this is a matter for the British parliament to consider—this parliament cannot legislate for the British people. And therefore we come to consider the question whether, until the British people adopt, if they ever do, this policy of preference for preference Canada shall continue to give them what we have given. So far as this party is concerned, we say we will continue to give it. That is plain. But what do hon. gentlemen opposite say ? That is what we want to know and what we have a right to know. What does the first lieutenant (Mr. Monk) of the leader of the opposition say ? I have made a fair statement, will he make one as fair ?

Mr. MONK. Well, I would drop it right off.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Now we have it. And the statement was applauded and cheered. Here is another illustration of the beautiful harmony that exists in that party. The hon. leader of the party says: No, it would be an ungracious thing, and the Liberal-Conservative party never said that it should be done. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) coming out from lying low, declared for dropping it. We do not find unanimity even in the applause that greeted the remark of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk). I am glad that we know where hon. gentlemen stand on the question. They are opposed to the preferential tariff, but afraid to present a resolution calling for its repeal. Sir, we are in favour of it.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) will understand me. I said I was opposed to it as it is now, but not opposed to a mutual preference.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I understand perfectly. But we say we are in favour of it as it is now. We take the ground that when we took that step and gave that preference, we benefited ourselves. We left the general tariff high, too high for some people, but we carried out our policy as announced by giving a preference to Great Britain. And, by doing that—hon. gentlemen opposite may smile—we believe that we touched the British heart. You cannot convince intelligent people who read the comments of the English press when that was done, nor can you convince those who have been to the old land and heard the expressions of opinion by people over there, that the preference did not touch a sympathetic chord in the British heart and so became a means of opening the doors of the march of commerce to our products. A large part of the increase of your exports and the extra price you have got for them are due to that feeling that was aroused in Canada's favour by the preferential tariff.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him in what respect does that tariff preference benefit us ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If he will ask the hon. member who sits beside him, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), he will get the answer that it has benefited the people of this country because they are buying their woollens cheaper than many of the mills could make them, and if it be considered an advantage to have a lower rate of duty, as the hon. gentleman has been blaming us for not having in view of the surplus, then it must be a benefit to us that we have this reduced rate of taxation. I say when you bring the question up as to whether Canadians will accept a preference in British markets, the Canadian people, the Canadian government, the Canadian parliament, will of course accept a preference if Britain sees fit to give it to us. But that is a question for the British people to decide, and we say that if ever the British people come to that determination, the strongest and most effectual step that ever could be taken to secure that preference will be found to have been the action of Canada in first giving a preference to the mother land and in maintaining it. I venture to say that if the time ever does come—and these gentlemen say it is coming fast, I shall not enter on the prophetic role, I know that things move fast in these days, I am not going to say the British people will never reverse their trade

policy, I will not say that when the colonies are able to produce more nearly the quantity of breadstuffs that the British people require than they do now, I am not prepared to say what they may do—but I do say that when the time comes, if it ever does come, be it sooner or later, that the British people put protective duties on grain and produce, then if Canada comes in and asks them not to apply these protective duties against Canada, the Liberal government and the Liberal party who gave unasked a preference to the British people will be the party and the government most likely to secure that preference in the markets of England. It was not a party, the leaders of which say : We will take away from Britain what has been given to her, who will be entrusted with power, when that time comes, to negotiate with the British government to have Canada excluded from that protective tariff. The people of this country will recognize that and they will say : If we ever hope to have mutual preference, if it be coming, as the Conservatives say, then it behooves us above every other consideration to maintain the Liberal party and the government in power, for the act they did will give them an influence with the British government to secure this favour for Canada in the markets of Great Britain. It is not likely that favour can be secured for us by a party whose members will give no preference to Britain if it hurts us in the slightest degree, it is not the party who says : Send your last man and your last dollar, but keep out the last yard of cloth that comes into Canada from Great Britain. Can you get that preference ? Hon. gentlemen opposite have taken up the cue and have repeated time and again, though it has been answered, answered, answered, that we could have got this mutual preference when the Prime Minister went to England, and that failing to get it he lost the opportunity of a lifetime. Though they have been answered scores of times, yet they continue to repeat parrot-like this statement. No use telling them that the Duke of Devonshire never said what they attributed to him, no use telling them that the Postmaster General had the letter in the House and tabled it, I think, a letter written by the Duke of Devonshire's own hand, saying that what was alleged about him was not correct : no use telling them these things, they still repeat the cry that the Prime Minister could have obtained a mutual preference. Now, I propose to submit to this House an authoritative statement that the Prime Minister could not have got it, that no one could have got it at the present time, that no one can get it until the minds of the British people are prepared for it, and until British statesmen are prepared to take hold of it. I propose to give an authority that I think ought to be sufficient, so that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will never repeat again that we can have this mutual preference for the asking. I shall give as my authority the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), the late president of the Toronto Board of Trade, who went to England last summer along with other representative men to a meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce, to consider questions of national importance, where the question of inter-Imperial trade was discussed, at which he was present, when he was one of the committee appointed to interview Lord Salisbury in reference to this matter, and one who, with two or three others, subsequently interviewed Mr. Chamberlain in an informal way, one who therefore may be regarded as an absolute authority, and the latest one who has heard from England what the minds of English statesmen are on this question, not years ago when the Prime Minister could have had it, as they say, but in the three years that have transpired since then, during which they say the feeling of England has been growing in strength. What did the hon. member for East Toronto tell us ? You will find his speech in the 'Hansard,' page 1693 and 1694. He is replying to the Finance Minister, who pointed out to him that Lord Salisbury would not agree to receive the deputation :

> The reply which the Chamber of Commerce received from the Prime Minister was, as stated in this House, that the time for receiving this deputation was not opportune. It was not opportune because at that time the South African campaign was at its height; the war in China was also at its height; there was a very important session of the Imperial parliament in progress, which took up the time and attention of the Prime Minister and his colleagues——

The Finance Minister pointed out, what was known to all in this country, that this deputaton appointed to wait upon Lord Salisbury to discuss this question were not granted an interview because the time was not opportune. It was considered rather an abrupt answer, and the member for East Toronto is explaining why it was inopportune—because the South African campaign was at its height, the war in China was also at its height, and there was an important session of the Imperial parliament in progress which took up the attention of the Prime Minister and his colleagues. Now, I do not think that those are very strong reasons for saying that the time was inopportune. There may have been a war in South Africa, but still the Prime Minister might have seen them. The Prime Minister of England was aware that Canada sent her sons to South Africa to fight with the sons of the mother land, he knew we took an interest in the success of the British arms in China, believing their quarrel was just. Though a session of parliament may be in progress, English statesmen always recognize it their duty to

meet important men and to discuss important subjects of mutual interest. I do not see why the time was inopportune. The hon. member for East Toronto proceeds to state why it was that Lord Salisbury refused to receive this deputation. I am giving you his words, not mine, the words of one who was there :

—and the country was on the verge of an election. I can quite easily understand, therefore, and I think hon. members will agree with me, that in these conditions it was inopportune for the Prime Minister to receive such a deputation, especially in view of the fact that the discussion on this question, being one that enters largely into the politics of Great Britain, his reception of the deputation might be interpreted to mean that the Imperial government were about to adopt a protective policy, and this might cause their defeat in the elections which were about to take place.

That is the hon. member for East Toronto. He was there. Lord Salisbury would not receive them. He said the time was not opportune. He mentions why it could not be. The hon. member for East Toronto says that the South African war was on. Of course it was, but the business of government had to go on. The China war was on. Of course it was, but they received other deputations, and disposed of other business. This mutuality of preference, this inter-Imperial trade that the mother country and its inhabitants are burning to have established, could not be discussed. Minor subjects to that must have been discussed. Ah, but it was on the eve of an election, and if he even received that deputation it might be interpreted as an indication that they were going to introduce a protective policy, and that might, in the estimation of the hon. member for East Toronto—jeopardize the election. No, he does not speak of any possible alternative. He says that the only alternative was that it would assure their defeat. What is the use of hon. gentlemen opposite standing up and arguing that you can get this thing when you have the Prime Minister of England saying : Keep away ; it might be interpreted to mean that I am in favour of a protective policy, and even the appearance of this would be enough to secure my defeat in the election. Keep away from me. They rather smarted under that, I fancy, and they thought they would look around so as to have an interview with somebody. Mr. Chamberlain had always been advertised and quoted as a friend of this policy, and these gentlemen determined that they should wait upon him, not in their capacity as a deputation, but in their private capacity as individuals. They went there, not as a deputation. There was the hon. member for East Toronto, Mr. Cockshutt, of Brantford, Dr. Parkin, and a gentleman from Ottawa, whose report of the interview with Mr. Chamberlain was denied. I have waited to hear from that gentleman, to see what he would say in regard to the statement of the hon. member for East Toronto, that his report was not correct, when he declared that Mr. Chamberlain talked in quite a conversational way, and said that if these relations which were desired ever were to come about, they would have to come about through Canada abandoning her protective duties and placing the country on a free trade basis. Let us see what the hon. member for East Toronto says in reference to that :

The deputation which went to Mr. Chamberlain was a deputation of three or four Canadian gentlemen who desired to pay their respects to him before leaving England; and they went to him a good many days, perhaps weeks, afterwards. They were not sent by the congress. What transpired there was not given correctly by the extract read by the Finance Minister from the report of the representative who went from this city.

He says it was not correct.

I might say, however, that I am not in a position to state to the House what was said on that occasion, because it was thoroughly understood by Lord Strathcona and Mr. Chamberlain and the three or four of us who discussed this matter, that nothing should be said about it, because of the stand Lord Salisbury had taken. In order to confirm my opinion in that respect, I asked the other members of the deputation what their view of it was, and I have here letters from Mr. Parkin and Mr. Cockshutt, stating that their view of the interview was that it was of a confidential character.

The delegate from the Ottawa Board of Trade has told us that Mr. Chamberlain, in a quiet, conversational way, gave them to understand that it could only come about on the basis of free trade, which would mean ruin to the industries of this country, if they cannot stand, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, a reduction of 33⅓ per cent. But, mark you, the hon. member for East Toronto says, that even though he took the ground that he would secure for the people of England an absolutely free market for the manufactures of Great Britain, that when they did discuss it with Mr. Chamberlain it had to be kept hidden, it could not be done in the open, it must be confidential. The hon. member for East Toronto has told us the reasons which were given by Lord Salisbury. Even to discuss it on the basis of getting absolute freedom in our markets was impossible. That must be done in secret ; anything else might be interpreted as meaning that they favoured a protective tariff which might result in a defeat in the election. Keep it quiet, says Mr. Chamberlain, and every one else. That is the position of public opinion in England upon this question, when hon. gentlemen opposite, with an amount of brazen assurance that is remarkable, say that we can get this preference by simply asking for it. I give them their answer. I give them the statement made by the hon.

member for East Toronto in this House. It is in 'Hansard.' The last man in a position of authority who ever tried to interview British statesmen in reference to the matter was that hon. gentleman.

I must not detain the House any longer. The question of expenditures have been dealt with, and charges of recklessness have been made. One hon. gentleman says that we have increased the expenditure by $33,000,000 in five years. These statements are so extreme that the people themselves would be prepared to discredit them upon investigation. But, let me just show how it was that instead of $33,000,000 of an increase in the expenditure, the increase has been much less. I have a statement of the four years from 1897 to 1900, as compared with the four years from 1893 to 1896, and it shows that on consolidated fund account we increased the expenditure a little over $12,500,000, and that on capital account there was an increased expenditure of $4,000,000, making a total increase in expenditure in the period of four years from 1897 to 1900 as compared with the previous four years, of something like $16,000,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite hide from you the fact that the revenue that is derived from some sources does not mean taxation out of the pockets of the people to the extent they are speaking of. They do not point out the fact that while you have an expenditure of a million and a half extra on the Intercolonial Railway, not a cent of it came out of the pockets of the people by way of taxation, but out of the increased earnings of that road, and that while you have had an expenditure during these years of some $4,000,000 in the Yukon, it did not come out of you in the way of taxation, but out of the receipts of the Yukon. Hon. gentlemen do not point these things out to you. It is the taxation that is taken out of the pockets of the people of the country that they are interested in, and the rate of taxation, as I pointed out before, has been materially lowered by this government since we came into power. I just want to say a word more, because we are charged with extravagance in our expenditures of public money. Allusion was made to-day by one of the speakers, or perhaps the other night, to the charge that we had multiplied public officials, and it was asserted that we had run up the cost of the collection of revenue. That is true, to a certain extent, as far as the Department of Customs is concerned. I am prepared to admit that there has been an increase in expenditure. But, you cannot collect $28,000,000 of the money for the goods that represents at the reduced rate of taxation without adding to the customs staff, to say nothing of the improvements we have made by way of statistics, the prevention of smuggling, &c. For every additional bill of goods that may come into the country you have additional work for clerks, landing waiters and appraisers. You cannot bring the Intercolonial Railway from Point Lévis to Montreal and operate it without having some extra train hands. You cannot enlarge your postal service, and give facilities to different parts of the country without paying for it. There has been an increase, but people such as dwell in Canada will endorse an increase in the public expenditure for the collection of revenue, provided the public revenue has so increaseed as to warrant it. Turn to the Public Accounts, where it gives the cost of collection of revenue in the excise, the customs, the railways, the canals, the weights and measures, the post office, and in 1894-5, which was the last fair year's expenditure of the Conservative party—— for their accounts in 1896, in my judgment, were not fair accounts—and you will find in the last year's fair expenditure of the Conservative government, that the charges under consolidated expenditure for the collection of revenue amounted to $9,129,416, while the total revenue collected that year was $33,978,129. The cost of collection was therefore 27 per cent. Now, in 1900 the total charge for collection of revenue amounted to $11,044,526, but the total revenue collected was $51,029,994, the cost of collection being 22 per cent, or 5 per cent less than it was under the Conservative government in 1894-5. If the cost of collecting revenue in 1900 had been at the same rate as in 1894-5, the expenditure would have been in round figures $2,750,000 more than it was, and I think that is an answer to the gentleman who charges us with having increased the expenditure.

Before concluding, Sir, I wish to allude to the subject with which the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) closed his remarks in which he entered into the question as to whether there had been in the province whence he comes questions of race and creed introduced at the last election. I was glad to hear the words he spoke. They were a rebuke to men—I will not say in this House—but at all events they were a rebuke to a portion of the press which supports the Conservative party in the province of Ontario, and to a portion of the people there. I am glad he uttered these words. I re-echo the sentiment of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) given utterance to in this House on more than one occasion, and I cannot forbear quoting those words of his, which ought to find an echo in the breast of every man who is a lover of his country :

> As has been well said by the right hon. gentleman, this is a matter into which party consideration should not enter. This is a matter which should be above all party considerations, and I, for one, as long as I have any voice in this House or in this country shall protest against any question of race or creed being introduced into the party politics of Canada.

Grand sentiments these. In this debate that hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) dealt

with this question again, and he used this language :

I think that to stand for the unity of the people of this country and to suppress any cry of race or creed that may be raised, is a matter of greater importance to any political party in Canada than is the effort to obtain or retain power.

Grand sentiments. He recognizes the fact that ought to be recognized by all : That you may hold to a high tariff or to a low tariff, but that you should strive for a united people ; a people animated with a common desire to advance the welfare of their country, and to promote its progress in every portion of it. Why should these race and religious cries be introduced in a grand country like this ? Why should an attempt be made to separate the people and to obliterate that united feeling which is absolutely necessary ; I will not say to the existence of confederation, but to the progress of Canada under confederation. I wish, Sir, it might be said that gentlemen on the other side, each in his place endeavoured to give effect to the noble sentiments uttered by the leader of their party. The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) said in his speech the other day :

In the debate in this House the other day it was stated that race issues were being raised in North Bruce. I do not know whether they have been or not; but North Bruce has evidently remained, according to last reports, true to its old policy. I hope the electors of North Bruce did not vote on racial lines. If they voted on party lines, they had a right to vote as they did, it is a free country.

And here the hon. gentleman from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) arose in his place and said :

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to tell the hon. gentleman, as one who was there, that the racial question was never mentioned, so far as I know, either on the platform or off the platform.

I am bound to take the word of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), but not long before he uttered that statement he had a copy of this paper which I hold in my hand in his possession, and he brought up in the House as a matter of privilege, a statement contained in that paper, and when the Speaker ruled him out on that point he brought up, on going into Supply, an article headed 'Shameful Tactics,' which alleged that two mail clerks who had been sent, it was alleged, out of Wiarton to Owen Sound, so that they would not be present at the election. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) therefore had this paper in his possession. It is the Wiarton Canadian and Liberal-Conservative Banner of North Bruce. He read this extract from the paper :

The Grit machine has commenced its work in connection with the North Bruce by-election, and the act which has been perpetrated this week by the Tarte-Laurier combination is one of the most shameful.

That alone ought be sufficient to indicate to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) that there was an attempt to raise the race and religious cry. We who went through the contest in Ontario know how a sneer accompanied the utterance of these words on more than one occasion. But, if the hon. member for East Grey did not detect it from that, he might have turned to the editorial page and read this :

Who raised the race and religious cry in reference to the coronation oath ? Who but John Costigan, a member of the present Reform government.

Mr. WALLACE. It is pretty near.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. member for West York says pretty near. He does not wholly repudiate that reference, you see, as a man with a proper sense ought to, when a deliberately penned lie is read to him.

Mr. WALLACE. I said a little premature. We are looking for his advent day by day.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Again, perhaps the hon. member for West York will say this is not so far out :

Look at the construction of the present Grit government. Is it not nearly all French? Its majority is made up of French members, elected on the race and religion cry, and the cabinet is composed of a majority of representatives of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame, shame.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I wanted the hon. leader of the opposition to be in his place to-night, because he said that so long as he had a voice left, he would protest against this kind of thing. I wanted him to be in this House to raise his voice in protest and to denounce the utterance of his banner sheet in this riding. As he truly said, it is important above any party consideration to preserve the unity of the people of this country; it is away above any party question as to whether you will have a 20 per cent tariff or a 25 per cent tariff. This paper goes on :

And yet they ask you to send a representative from North Bruce to assist this French majority in voting away Ontario's money for the benefit of Quebec, and have the effrontery to tell you that Conservatives raised the race and religion cry.

I am glad the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) never heard the thing mentioned on the platform or off it, when he had this paper in his hand at the time, and could read about shameful tactics; and I hope that when the hon. gentleman rises, as I believe he is to follow me, he will express himself as his leader did, for I take it that he is opposed to such utterances as this. When he rose to assure the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) that

he had never heard the race and religion question mentioned, he left the impression that if any one had dared to mention it in his presence, he would have stamped it out. Now, they have formed a company in Wiarton to start a beet sugar factory. The people are interested in it, and anxious that this government should give it a bonus; and this paper says :

> The beet sugar factory agitators support the Conservative candidate in North Bruce. In parliament the French members and government opposed the granting of the bounty, and secured a postponement of the discussion. We cannot have the bounty unless the Dominion assumes the provincial debt of French Quebec, which only amounts to $32,000,000, and with their majority they can succeed in that outrageous demand. Will the electors of North Bruce sanction this by sending to Ottawa a man to swell this French majority? We trow not.

I read this with pain. The general elections were over, and this election in North Bruce was not a matter of life or death to the Conservative party; but this is printed in this organ which was supporting hon. gentlemen who were battling in that contest. I hold with the hon. leader of the opposition that above any question of obtaining or regaining power it is important to frown down this sowing of the seeds of dissention among the people of Canada who, differ as they may in their origin, have equal rights and equal liberties. To seek to raise a prejudice against any portion of our people because of their origin or their faith, is something that should be frowned down by every man who is a lover of his country; and when it comes to the penning of deliberate lies, which gentlemen opposite know to be lies, to the effect that a majority of this government are French members, when hon. gentlemen know that of the sixteen members of the cabinet with portfolios, only three are of French origin, then the ungenerous nature of such statements is apparent.

Sir, if they would give honour where honour is due, as honour might be given to that element in this House which is accused of seeking domination or undue influence, they should know that when the cabinet of the right hon. leader of the government was formed, himself a leading French Canadian, he had, I think, one colleague of the same faith and religion as himself, with portfolio, and one without portfolio; and besides, from his province, which sent a large majority of its representatives to support him, he had an English-speaking Protestant without portfolio, and an English-speaking Protestant with portfolio, and a Protestant of French origin with another portfolio. That was the composition of it; and when unfortunately, and to the regret of the people of this country, that French representative in the cabinet without portfolio was taken away, instead of filling the vacancy, as he was entitled in justice and fair-play to his own province to do, if it were disposed to take a narrow view of the matter, with one of the same origin and faith as the gentleman who died, he gave it to the province of Ontario and to a Scotch Presbyterian. And yet papers will be found to publish what I have read in your hearing against men who have acted in that noble way; and they venture to sneer at the names of Laurier and Tarte, as if there was something wrong and wicked about them, trying to sneer away men's reputations. Men in public positions have feelings like other men; and if they have done wrong, accuse them of the wrong and prove it against them; but do not sneer away a man's reputation because he happens to differ from you. I am one of the few members left in this House who took part in the selection of the leader of the Liberal party who is now Prime Minister of this Dominion, and I can tell you that when Mr. Blake left this country and it became necessary for the Liberal party to select another leader, the minds of the party representatives turned instinctively towards one of their colleagues, and unanimously asked him to take the leadership. He declined; he asked us not to press it upon him; he fairly besought that we should give it to some one else. He even then intimated that it was possible that he might not be as strong as some others might be, because he was not of the origin or the faith of the majority of the people of this country. Instantly every Liberal replied: We are not asking you to take the leadership of the Liberal party because you are of French origin or because you are of the faith of the minority; we are not asking you from motives of policy; we are asking you because we believe you are the one amongst us all who is fitted to be the leader; and the Liberal party, when they find the man best fitted for the position, ask his services without caring what his race or religion may be, and that is why we want you to lead us. And he assented to it. It is possible that he may be stung by these insinuations thrown out at times. It is possible that a man of high feeling must feel once in a while the injustice of such appeals. But I can only tell the right hon. gentleman that the right-thinking people of this country, whether Liberals or Conservatives, recognize in him the foremost man in Canada. I tell him that he has entrenched himself in the affections not alone of the French people—I am not speaking of them—but of the people of my own province. I give it as my unhesitating belief that he has entrenched himself in the affections of the people of Ontario as securely as in those of his own province. When I think of the services he has rendered to this Dominion, when I picture the honour he reflected on his country among that galaxy of statesmen gathered in the streets of London from every centre of the world-encircling British Empire, when

I hear the shouts acclaiming him as he passed through the streets of that great metropolis, when I think of the standing which he gave Canada among the nations of the world such as she never had before, I cannot but feel humiliated that any paper in the province of Ontario should publish such an ungenerous attack, should use such unworthy language as I have read, should strive to stir up the most ignoble prejudices against the leader of this government, and all to gain a temporary party advantage in a by-election. I am glad that the hon. gentleman who leads the opposition took the manly stand he did. I was delighted to hear his first lieutenant (Mr. Monk) tell us that in the province of Quebec political questions are not decided on lines of race and creed, but on lines of public policy. That is the way these questions should be decided, and we on this side reciprocate and re-echo the opinion expressed by the leader of the opposition, that questions such as I have referred to should never be raised in this country. As far as it lies in our power, we will abstain from using them, and our best exertions will be made to show that appeals such as I have read are unworthy of any people who pretend to the privilege of Canadian citizenship in this fair Dominion.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The tragic display, Mr. Speaker, to which the hon. gentleman who has just spoken worked himself up in his beautiful peroration, and the righteous indignation which he introduced into that fulsome eulogy that he expended on his leader, suggested to me that there was a little something indelicate about it. What it had to do with the financial policy of the government or the great questions of the day, I am unable to see. All through the hon. gentleman's speech, or at different times through it, the conviction was forced on my mind that the hon. gentleman imagined that noise was strength of argument, or that his argument was strong in proportion to its noise. If it was, he certainly treated the House to a very strong argument. But a careful analysis, I am afraid, would lead to another conclusion. The hon. gentleman, in his peroration, selected a subject that he thought would be attractive from its sympathetic nature, and one admirably suited to the occasion, and that was the race and religious cry, and in so doing he referred to some remarks made by the hon. member for East Grey a few days ago when the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) referred to the race and religious cry raised in North Bruce. I replied then that although I had taken part in that campaign, I had never heard race and religion mentioned on the platform or off it, and I repeat that statement here to-night. The hon. member the Minister of Customs took that as his text, and took up the Wiarton Canadian, and read the heading of an article that I brought to the attention of the House—an article complaining that the mail carriers in North Bruce had been taken away from home to prevent their voting in the by-election then going on. I read that article from first to last, and the hon. gentleman, holding it up, exclaimed in his righteous indignation with that fervour so peculiar to himself, and asked in thundering tones : Was there any race and religion cry in that, when you talk about the Tarte-Laurier combine ? Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a very common form of expression. We speak of the Ross-Hardy combine and the Mowat-Hardy combine. And our Reform friends used to speak of the Macdonald-Langevin and the Macdonald-Cartier combine. Therefore, there was nothing in that, in my opinion, disrespectful or severe from the race or religion standpoint. Why then should the hon. gentleman have worked himself up to such a righteous indignation over something that had not a solitary word of race and religion in it from first to last. The hon. gentleman did not dare to read it all, because if he had the House would have seen that all his indignation went for nothing, because there was not a word about race or religion in the whole article.

He then selected another article treating of French domination. Well, I would like to ask him if he could not have taken up many French papers in the province of Quebec during the last campaign and read articles that savoured very much more of race and religious cries than were contained in the one he quoted ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I have seen many of them quoted and can assure you the language was much stronger and the spirit of the articles much more intensely imbued with the race and religious cry than any the hon. gentleman has read.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it is not so. I would like him to quote any such papers.

Mr. SPROULE. I have not the papers, but have seen them quoted over and over again in other papers, and never saw them repudiated. Speaking of the race and religious cry, I passed through that campaign in Ontario last September, and I say, and say it frankly and in justice, not only to our own party, but to the French people of this country, that although I spoke in various ridings and on many platforms, I never heard the word Frenchman or Catholic mentioned on any platform in that campaign. The conduct of the government was discussed, their management or mismanagement of our affairs, their carrying out or failure to carry out the promises they had made, their

extravagance, their unbusinesslike policy—but not a word about race or religious questions. And I should have considered myself beneath contempt if I had used such arguments or even allowed them to be used in my presence without rebuke. So far as I know, and I think I am in a position to know, such a cry was not raised in Ontario, no such argument influenced the election. I wish to say that in justice to the French-speaking people and to the English-speaking people. The English-speaking people would not want to win an election on such a cry. I am surprised that the memories of hon. gentlemen opposite are so short that they cannot remember how we were obliged to meet that same cry of French domination every year from 1878 to 1887. I have stood on platform after platform and have had to defend the Conservative party against the cry of French domination. I thought it an unworthy cry, and I met and fought it as best I could. The hon. Minister of Customs should not think that the memory of the people of Ontario is so short that they cannot remember when the cry of French domination was one of the most successful raised in the interest of the Liberal party.

Now, I wish to refer to some arguments that the hon. member used, before I speak on this question generally. The hon. Minister of Customs said that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says that it is no part of our duty to give parliament and the country the benefit of our views of policy, and he criticised him adversely, because he did not do it. Does he forget that he sat behind his own leader for years when that gentleman was intrenched, as he said, behind the lines of torres vedras, and declared on platform after platform that it was the duty of an opposition to criticise the government, not to furnish them with a policy. To-night he sings another song—as an hon. gentleman beside me remarks, he cannot sing the old song. The hon. gentleman tells us that there are three or four hundred items in the tariff and that we must not expect the supporters of the government to agree upon them. We have had ample proof that they do not agree. During this debate, member after member on that side has arisen and declared that he favoured protection, or incidental protection, or bounties on iron, or bonuses, or some other of the various plans embodied in a protective tariff, while all the time admitting that they were prepared to vote against these things in support of the government. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) was in favour of protection. We remember that in 1879 his father was in this House declaiming against protection. I could not help thinking, when the hon. gentleman was speaking, of the adage about the boy being the father of the man. I do not think you could find half a dozen men among the government supporters who are in exact agreement as to the proper tariff for this country or whether the present tariff is a proper one or not. The hon. minister refers to the fact that the government is taunted with the imperfections of the tariff, but he asks us if we forget that the country has endorsed them and their tariff. I would remind the hon. gentleman that the great province of Ontario before which he laid that tariff so eloquently, both he and his friends, declared against them by a majority of eighteen or nineteen. He went to the country with a majority of twelve from Ontario and, after doing his best to convince the people that the tariff was right, he comes back with a minority of eighteen from that province. As he is one of the leaders of that party in Ontario, the fact that his own province has declared against him, notwithstanding his efforts to win it over to favouring his argument, should cause him to be less vigorous in his claim that the country has supported him. The hon. minister went on to speak of the development of our trade and to say that this was a justification of our tariff. He noticed the fact that the government were reminded that the increase in our exports was due to the beneficence of Providence and not to anything the government had done. He says they acknowledge all that Providence has done, but, if there had not been a wiser, businesslike government in control of affairs, that development could not have taken place to the same extent. But I have figures here to show that that development in the export trade was no greater than that which has taken place in similar trade in the United States, and that country did not have this wise and beneficent government to direct its affairs. It had the advantages of Providence the same as the hon. gentlemen over there had. But I only give this as an evidence that the expansion of our trade was not due to any business management of the government of the day, but was rather due to the fact that we had good crops, we had bountiful harvests, we had comparatively good prices for what we had to sell, and there was a revival of trade all over the world after the stagnation that had prevailed for several years in manufactures and industrial pursuits. Good times prevailed all over the world, and as a result we enjoyed an expansion of trade during that time.

Then he goes on to say that it was largely due to the Minister of Agriculture's cold storage. Now, how much had it to do with it, it would be interesting to inquire. I heard a statement made in this House the other night that amused me. An hon. gentleman, speaking on the other side, said: Do you suppose that the development of the butter trade, of the cheese trade, of the fruit trade, would have been so great but for the admirable cold storage system introduced by the Minister of Agriculture?

I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture thinks he was responsible for that development by his cold storage. I have no doubt that he endeavours to make the people of the country believe it, and his friends behind him try to make us believe it, when they resort to arguments like that. Now, in view of this contention, let me refer to the report of the Minister of Agriculture himself, where he gives a comparison of the exports of the country in cold storage for the last three years :

Of butter, while there were 209,175 packages sent out in cold storage in 1898, and 429,734 in 1899, in 1900 there were only 227,863. Of cheese, while there were 5,000 packages sent out in 1898, there were only 1,000 sent out in 1899, and not a single package in 1900. Of fruit, there were sent out 25,564 packages in 1898, 16,381 in 1899 and only 8,785 in 1900.

The cold storage had been responsible, as the hon. gentleman behind him said, for the great development in the cheese trade when there was an export of $19,000,000 worth. What, then, about this cold storage now ? Would the hon. gentleman not like to take that argument back and revise it ? Will he not refrain from addressing such an argument to the House, when the Minister of Agriculture's own report is so readily at hand ? Now, take fruit. In 1898, they sent out 25,000 packages ; in 1899, only 16,000 packages ; in 1900, only 8,000, one-third as much as they sent out in 1898. I give that as an answer to the argument of the hon. Minister of Customs, who attributes the great development in the exports of these lines to the admirable cold storage arrangements of the Minister of Agriculture.

Then, the hon. gentleman went on to tell us what statesmanship was, and he referred to some definition of it from this side of the House. He gave his own definition, and said that statesmanship consisted in compromising and harmonizing what was otherwise antagonistic. He read from a carefully-made statement of what statemanship is. I suppose he went into the library and culled out from standard authors his argument.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I was reading an extract from the speech of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean).

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman went on to define what he regarded as statemanship. His explanation of it reminded me of the story of a professor who was demonstrating to his class what chemistry was. He said : You will take an effervescent, you will add a deliquescent, there will be a precipitation, that is a conglomeration, that is a demonstration, and that is chemistry. That is about as intelligible a definition of chemistry as the hon. gentleman's definition of statemanship, and about as convincing. Then, the hon. gentleman spoke about the preferential tariff. It is true, he said, that it struck one or two lines, it is true that it has struck the woollen trade of this country. He says: I sympathize with the woollen industry, I am sorry if they stand to lose by it; but, I believe that by applying themselves with energy to the situation, and employing all the resources of their enterprise and their intelligence, they will be able to overcome these difficulties after awhile. Does not that savour a little of the answer given by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to the manufacturers in 1878, when he told them that all they had to do was to work harder and eat less? It is practically the same answer. That is the solution he offers to the woollen trade.

Then, the hon. member went on to give us a dissertation with regard to book-keeping, why you should charge a certain item to capital account and another to current account. He selected the iron bounties as an example, and said the iron bounties was a permanent improvement in the country, because it developed the mines, and should, therefore, be charged to capital account. It was exactly the same, he said, as if you were to put money into a railway which would run on indefinitely in the future for the benefit of the country. Does he forget that when that bounty is paid on iron a large percentage of the article goes out of the country, and is of no further use to the country ? The only benefit it is to the country is the employment it affords to men in mining the raw material, and in manufacturing it, but after it goes out it is of no permanent benefit to Canada ; therefore, I say it should not be charged to capital account. There is no comparison between charging an item of that nature to capital account and an item that goes into the construction of a public building, or a railway, or something that must remain in perpetuity an asset of the country.

The hon. gentleman went on to tell us that the average rate of duty, from 1896, as compared with 1900, was much higher in the former period. He said it was 2¼ per cent higher in 1896 than in 1900. Now, I would not like to apply to the hon. gentleman what I once heard a speaker say on a public platform with regard to another, who had given a lot of figures to strengthen his case, and who had tried to clinch his argument by reminding his audience that figures will not lie. 'No,' replied his opponent, ' figures won't lie, but sometimes liars will figure.' I do not wish to apply that saying to the hon. gentleman, because I would be sorry to believe that he deliberately tried to misrepresent figures. But, I want to say that if he had wished to be fair, he would not have taken those periods. He took the very best year for showing a low percentage of duty in imports during the whole time his party was in power, in 1900. Does he not know that the larger importations of free goods would

have reduced the rate of duty ? Does he not know that the larger importations of certain lines would do it ? He took the very worst year of the Conservative government to make that comparison. If he had desired to be fair he would have taken the four years of the Conservative administration and the subsequent four years of the Liberal administration. Had he done so, it would have shown him that during the four years his party was in power, the average rate of duty was 17·125 for the whole four years. Now, take the previous four years, and we find it was 17·445, or a difference of exactly 32-100ths of 1 per cent. Now, does not the Minister of Customs think he would have been much fairer if he had used the argument in that way, and given these figures to the House ? To take the very best year under their regime and the very worst under his, misleads the people and the country.

Then the hon. gentleman went on to speak of the efforts made by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) and some of his associates in England to discuss the question of mutual preferential trade with Lord Salisbury, and he very properly said that Lord Salisbury said that it was not an opportune time to discuss that question. He gave his reasons. In the first place, the Australian colonies are endeavouring to confederate, and therefore they cannot join in the request made by Canada. In the second place, we have the South African war on our hands and this is monopolizing the attention of the British Empire as of the rest of the world. We have an election coming on in the near future, we desire to appeal to the country, and therefore it is not an opportune time. Was that not a reasonable and correct reply ? Certainly it was a correct reply. Lord Salisbury's aim was to appeal to the people of England upon the policy that was carried out in South Africa and he did not want to have it mixed up with anything else. He said that it was not an opportune time because he did not want to mix up these other questions which were comparatively irrelevant to the situation as it then existed. The vital question was whether the government were carrying out a proper policy in South Africa or not. That is the reason he gave, and a proper one it was, why he did not wish to grant an interview to the deputation. I wish to touch upon that afterwards, and I will say no more about it at the present time.

The hon. gentleman went on and gave us another evidence of the way in which they are conducting the affairs of the country. He said : We are told that the management of the affairs of this country is extravagant because we have appointed dozens and dozens of officers more than are needed, and the argument he adopts to prove this is by showing that it cost 5 per cent less to collect the revenue last year than in 1896. On its face it would appear prima facie to be a good argument along that line, but the hon. gentleman would be the last man not to see where the fallacy of that argument comes in. Does he not know that the larger the revenue is, the lower is the cost of collecting it ? A hundred customs officers could collect a revenue of $10,000,000, but if you require to collect a revenue of $20,000,000 it would not necessarily follow that you would have to employ 200 officers. The same men will do the same duty and collect the double amount just as easily as the smaller amount. So, the argument of the hon. gentleman is very unfair. Then, he took a year when the collections were very large, when the importations were large and when there was comparatively no increased cost in the collection of the revenue, compared it with the year in which a smaller amount of revenue was collected, divided it by the number of collectors, or struck the percentage, and in that way made a favourable showing. I will give the hon. gentleman another illustration: Go down to the station and you will find a conductor, an engineer and a brakeman, who are to have charge of a train carrying one hundred passengers. You will have the same number of men if that train carries two hundred passengers, and it will not cost a cent more to do it. If the hon. gentleman's argument is correct, it would cost twice as much to carry two hundred passengers as it would cost to carry one hundred. I do not propose to touch any more upon the hon. gentleman's arguments at the present. I may refer to some other portions of his remarks later on.

I wish to say a few words in regard to the speech that we were pleased to hear from the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), who said that the country as a whole was in a prosperous condition, and that the people were amply employed at remunerative wages. This affords us quite as much pleasure as it does hon. gentlemen opposite, but, it was unnecessary to tell us that, because we all knew it. The people of the country knew it quite as well as the hon. Minister of Finance did. But we differ from the hon. Minister of Finance and his friends in their contention that this prosperity is brought about by their wise management of public affairs. We claim that it is not brought about by their wise management of public affairs, and it is proper to analyse and ascertain how far, if in any degree, they were responsible for bringing about these good times. The good times which we enjoy is the result of the cycle of good times coming after hard times. The whole world is enjoying better times. The surplus productions of the looms and factories had been used up after many years during which there was a larger output, leaving us with increased demands for these lines, and when the good times started the looms started again, the factories extended their business, the workmen were employed

at larger wages, values were higher, and we had good times. In addition to that a bountiful Providence gave us good crops for several years. Does the hon. gentleman forget that the worst years for failure of crops we ever saw in the last quarter of a century were the few years preceding 1896? In our section of the country we never saw the like of them since I was a boy eight or nine years of age. One of the chief factors in bringing about good times is that the people are being employed at remunerative wages, and it is not the result of the management of the country by the government or anything of that kind. In what way do hon. gentlemen claim that they have brought about these good times? Will they tell us in what way? We have asked the question over and over again and have not received an answer. We asked them to give us the particulars, to specify what way they have brought about good times. Have they given the people employment at higher wages or have they done anything else to bring about this result? If they can say that they have done so, we will be inclined to believe that they are entitled to some credit for the good times. Good times are the result of ample employment for the people at remunerative wages, bountiful crops and a good market in which to sell. What have hon. gentlemen had to do in regard to making the crops bountiful? Sunshine, rain and atmosphere have accomplished that and they had nothing to do with it. What did they do towards getting us better markets? They have not got us a new market in any part of the world other than the markets we had when they came into power. How have they increased the value of the product of the people of this country where employed industrially? Did they increase the value of the product of the farmer? No, not by a single fraction of a cent. They cannot successfully claim that they are responsible for the good times by anything they have done in their management of public affairs. What have the government had to do with bringing about this development? Nothing, except so far as their additional expenditure of public money gave employment to the people. I admit that they have spent money a little more extravagantly than their predecessors, and that in that way they may have helped to give employment to the people. Their management of public affairs might be very well criticised at the present time, may properly be adversely criticised in many lines, but I do not deem it proper to detain the House for that purpose to-night, because this debate has been prolonged to such an extent that it would only be using time that I believe I can put to a better purpose in other lines.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Are you through with me?

Mr. SPROULE. Certainly, in respect to the hon. gentleman. I thank the hon. gentleman for his courtesy because he has shown a good deal more than is sometimes exhibited by some hon. gentlemen on that side of the House when we endeavour to answer them. The government claim that their system of revenue tariff based on free trade lines, has produced an overflowing revenue, and has given them ample means for the needs of the country. Well, their tariff system has resulted in one thing, and that is that it gives them lots of money to spend. But, if the hon. member for South Oxford (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) were in opposition to a government which pursued the policy which they are pursuing, he would no doubt apply the same argument that he did to the Conservative government when they had a surplus of $6,000,000, and when he said that every dollar that you take out of the people of the country more than is absolutely needed is a dollar that goes to impoverish the people, and a dollar of taxation based upon unsound economic principles. Therefore, according to the opinion of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the past, the present Liberal tariff is all wrong in principle. These gentlemen opposite tell us that theirs is a revenue tariff approximating as closely as possible to free trade, but let us analyse that a little; let us ask ourselves: what is a revenue tariff and how should a tariff be framed for the sole purpose of getting revenue. When you impose a tariff solely for the purpose of getting revenue you impose it upon the necessaries of life which the people must purchase, and which the country does not produce. Therefore, a duty on tea, sugar, coffee, and such articles would be in the line of a revenue tariff. Nor does it necessarily follow in this, that you must impose a high tariff. I quote from Perry, a free trade writer who is one of the ablest authorities on this tariff question, and he says:

> While revenue taxes select by preference things wholly imported, protectionist taxes are placed of course on such foreign goods as are also and especially made or grown at home.

A revenue tariff taxes imported goods alone, but a protectionist tariff aims at shutting out foreign importations and, therefore, keeping the home market for the people of the country.

> Otherwise their plain and sole purpose would be thwarted, which completes the contrast between the two kinds of tariffs. For illustration, tea and coffee are the best things to tax under a revenue tariff.

Did this government tax tea and coffee? They did not. The hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) taxed them in 1876 when he was adhering to the principle of a revenue tariff, but his experience in that line did not cause him to repeat the experiment. He taxed tea and coffee two cents more in 1877, but he found still he could not raise sufficient revenue owing to hard times, and consequently greatly reduced importations. Then he acted on the correct prin-

ciple of a revenue tariff, but this time he left tea and coffee alone, because the people had checked him severely for his policy in that direction before. Although he declared before the last elections that he wanted a revenue tariff, he did not put a tax upon those articles which can only be selected to produce a revenue tariff. Tea and coffee are fit subjects to produce a revenue tariff, because they are in universal consumption and are wholly imported, and taxes upon them do not raise the price of anything else in the country. Again, Perry in his 'Principles of Political Economy,' says :

> There is a tariff for revenue. The sole purpose of the tariff, as such, is to get money by this mode of indirect taxation out of the pockets of the people for the coffers of the government, in order to be then expended. . . . As the sole object is to get money for the national treasury, and as money can only be gotten as the foreign goods taxed are allowed to come in, such taxes must be levied at a low rate.

Now, a 17 per cent tariff is not a low rate, and a 20 per cent and a 30 per cent tariff is not a low rate. I quote this to show that when the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) declared that he was imposing a tax for revenue purposes only, he wandered very far astray from the principle upon which a revenue tariff can only be imposed :

> Such taxes must be levied at a low rate on each article taxed, so as not to interfere essentially with the bringing in of that class of goods with a profit to the importers, and not at all to encourage the smuggling of them in.

Perry goes on to say that when England raised taxes on a revenue basis she placed a tax on coffee, tea, chicory, chocolate, fruit, malt, pickles, tobacco, &c. She placed a customs duty upon these because they were necessaries of life which must be imported and on which the people could not get out of paying the tax. Therefore, according to one of the very best authorities on this question, the policy of this government cannot in any sense be called a revenue tariff. Now, as to the ways and means by which they are raising that revenue. In what respect does the principle of taxation adopted by this government materially differ from that adopted by the Conservatives ? These gentlemen tell us that they impose a tariff for revenue, but so adjusted and so imposed as to give us as nearly as possible free trade. The Conservative policy was, to distribute these customs duties and excise taxes so that they not only raised a revenue, but protected the interests of the people against foreign competition. That is the principle of political economy that divides the two political parties to-day more than any other. The member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) asked a very pertinent question when he said :

> Do these gentlemen opposite charge that the government in its past management of the financial affairs of this country, or in its proposals for the future, has violated some economic principle? If so, what is it?

My answer is in the affirmative. The Liberal government violated that economic principle of tariff, when they told the people of the country that they were imposing a tariff for revenue purposes, and when they framed their tariff on exactly the same lines as their Conservative predecessors who had a tariff for protective purposes. The Liberal party always held that a revenue tariff based upon free trade lines as nearly as possible, is the correct principle, and they say that they are pursuing that policy now.

Their contention is that their tariff is a tariff for revenue only, while it is to a great extent the same tariff as that imposed by their predecessors. Let us analyse it a little further. I may say in passing that a tariff may be at once a protective tariff and a revenue tariff. That was the kind of tariff which we had under the Conservative government from 1879 to 1896 ; but a tariff cannot be at once a free trade tariff and a revenue tariff, because they are entirely inconsistent with each other. Hon. gentlemen opposite have always claimed that the national policy was a protective tariff, while their tariff is a revenue tariff, on free trade lines. Let us suppose that the Finance Minister is talking in that way to an audience of farmers. I would answer him by saying, how can you say that when two cents a pound was imposed on pork coming into the country under the tariff of 1896 that it is a high protective tariff, and the same duty is levied still, when you now call it a revenue tariff. How could it be a protective tariff in 1896 and a revenue tariff in 1900 ? It was a protective tariff in 1896, is it not the same to-day, when you have exactly the same duty ? I would like him to explain that to the farmers of the country. Then, I would take some of the other lines. He would say to the farmers : We have changed the principle of taxation ; we have given you a revenue tariff based on free trade lines as nearly as possible. Then I would say to the farmers, ask the Finance Minister this question. There was 20 per cent imposed on agricultural implements in 1896, and it was declared year after year by the Liberal party that that was a high protective duty and that the farmers should have it reduced so as to enable them to get cheaper implements ; but the hon. gentleman has been in power for four years, and the duty on these implements to-day is 20 per cent, exactly the same duty that existed in 1896. If it was a protective duty in 1896, how can it be otherwise in 1900 ? On live hogs coming into the country in 1896 there was a duty of 1½ cents a pound. There is the same duty to-day. It was a protection to the farmers in 1896; will the hon. gentleman say that, although the duty

is the same to-day, it is no longer a protective tariff, but a revenue tariff on free trade lines ? On meats brought into the country in 1896 there was a duty of 2 cents a pound, and it was declared to be a protective duty in the interests of the farmers. When the hon. gentleman went to his own province, he asked the people there, Are you going to stand a duty of 75 cents a barrel on flour that comes from Ontario, and 15 cents a bushel on wheat ? He said it was the most odious tax that could be imposed, and declared that the principle of it was wrong. But he came into power and introduced his own tariff, and continued these duties. If it was a protective tariff levied on the protective principle in 1896, it cannot be otherwise to-day ; it is exactly the same. On fresh meats there was a duty of 3 cents a pound in 1896, and there is the same duty to-day. If it was a high protective duty in 1896, it must be a high protective duty to-day. I take canned meats ; there was 25 per cent on them, and there is 25 per cent to-day. I take condensed milk : there was 3 cents a pound duty in 1896; there is 3 cents a pound to-day. If it was a protective tariff then, it is to the same extent to-day. On apples there was a duty of 40 cents a barrel then, imposed in the interests of the farmers, and it is 40 cents a barrel to-day. Therefore, I say that if the tariff was a high protective tariff in 1896, it is the same in 1900. Take hay, on which a duty of $2 a ton was imposed in 1896 ; the same duty exists to-day. On potatoes there was a duty of 15 cents a bushel then and there is the same to-day. On butter there was 4 cents a pound then, and there is 4 cents a pound to-day. On cheese there was 3 cents a pound then, and there is 3 cents a pound to-day. I merely cite these articles, because the farmer will be familiar with the argument and can analyse it for himself. It will enable him to see how he is deceived by the Finance Minister, who says to-day, our tariff is not levied on the same principle as the tariff levied by our predecessors ; it is levied as a revenue tariff on free trade lines, while our predecessors' levied their tariff for the purposes of protection. But I say that on every one of these articles the tariff that was a protective tariff in 1896 cannot be a free trade or a revenue tariff to-day. To that extent the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite are entirely fallacious. When they say that their tariff is a revenue tariff based on free trade lines, I ask, what do you think of the bounty system ? The father of the hon. gentleman who represents South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), when in this House in 1879, as the member for that riding, said that the bounty system was one of the most odious and extreme forms of protection that any government or any country could apply. But I was amused to hear his son, twenty-two years afterwards, get up and say : ' We do not object to these systems of protection, but we do object to those who use them to delude the people.' He said he did not object to the bounty system, although it is a system of protection, so long as it is kept within reasonable bounds ; and he went on to defend the bounty on iron. I thought how time brings about changes, because the father took the very opposite ground to that taken by the son. The rebate is another system of protection ; but this government are giving rebates just as their predecessors did. Drawbacks are also a protective principle. I remember very distinctly the father of the present member for South Wellington saying that drawbacks could be defended on no grounds. He was speaking of the drawback given to the millers who ground wheat being sent out of the country. Then he went on to try and get a little sympathy from the people of the maritime provinces by saying that the millers of Ontario are allowed to get a drawback on what they sent out of the country.

The millers of Ontario are allowed a drawback on what they send out of the country, but you are obliged to pay a duty of 75 cents per barrel on that flour when it goes down to you, and, therefore, it is wrong. I say that we do not object to the system of protection which these hon. gentlemen have adopted so much as we do to the fact that they have endeavoured to delude the people by telling them that the system is not what it is in reality—by pretending that they have adopted a free trade policy, or something very much nearer it than the policy of their predecessors, and that the taxes are not imposed on protective but on free trade lines as near as possible. What we on this side claim is, that in this tariff system which they have adopted, and which is to some extent protective—and to that extent we do not object to it—the protective element is very much impaired by the way it is carried out. How is it impaired ? In the first place, by the preferential rate. By that rate they have struck at one of the most important industries in the country. The Minister of Customs said that the woollen men had his sympathy, and that he was confident they would devise a means, with their energy and enterprise, of protecting themselves, and he hoped sincerely they would succeed in maintaining their status. The hon. member for South Oxford (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), in 1877-8, was just as sincere in his regard for the manufacturers who were going to the wall at that time, but, like the present hon. minister, he did not raise a hand to relieve them from their difficulties. I say that the protective system of our tariff is very much impaired by the reduction on British goods. I have cited one line, but could easily cite others, which would furnish an argument quite as strong, to show the importance of the woollen industry. I need only refer to the

fact that there is a capital of about $25,000,000 invested in plant and machinery, and the requirements necessary to keep this machinery in operation. About one-half of that is a turn over every year. That industry employs about 50,000 workingmen, to whom very good wages have been paid, until lately, when the establishments had to reduce the wages on account of their present condition. The output every year represents a value of about $30,000,000, but, at present, in all human probability, it will be reduced to about one-half on account of this preferential tariff. Will it be any satisfaction to the labouring men and others engaged in that industry to know that we have given a preference to England, when it is this preference which throws them out of employment? Will it be any consolation to them to know that in our generosity we have thrown off one-third of the duties imposed on British goods, when our generosity has prevented them earning bread for themselves and families? I do not think it will. Let me give the figures for one month to show what the preference is doing to these men. Take the importations of worsted fabrics in January, 1900, compared with January, 1901. In January, 1900, we imported worsted fabrics to the value of £82,871 sterling, and in January, 1901, the importations had increased to the extent of £105,440 sterling. Woollen fabrics, we imported in January, 1900, to the extent of £36,168 sterling, and in January, 1901, that import had increased to the extent of £50,871 sterling. Is it any wonder that the men interested in this industry are beseeching the government to protect them against this condition of affairs? Is it any wonder that they are imploring the government to give that great industry a chance to live, and not sacrifice it to their desire to show generosity to the old country. I have in my hand a copy of a letter addressed to the Finance Minister, and which shows the condition of that great industry to-day. When I read it, then the House will see that there is a strong reason why the government should not disregard with callous indifference the appeals made to them to save that great industry, and keep employed the workingmen engaged in it:

I beg to inclose herewith a paragraph taken from last week's Journal of Fabrics, showing the imports of woollen and worsted fabrics as compared with last year. You will notice a startling increase for the month of January, nearly 40 per cent, in woollen fabrics, and over 35 per cent in worsted fabrics. You will note also that there is a falling off in all other textile exports from Great Britain to Canada, except carpets, which is slightly increased, about 10 per cent.

When we interviewed you in Ottawa we told you that the 33⅓ preferential rate had not fully gotten into operation, and that we should feel it when the spring imports were received. Our worst fears are more than realized. Our future looks desperate. Surely there is some way in which you can afford relief. There were over fifty employees discharged at the Auburn mills, Peterborough, last week. Fifty more will be laid off this week, as the orders are being completed, and no new orders coming in. During the past month we have discharged over 200 employees at Hespeler alone. Lomas's mill at Almonte has completely closed down, and other mills are running on short time. The repeat orders for spring are of such a small character, and coming in so slowly that it looks as though there would not be in six months from now 25 per cent of the woollen machinery in operation that there was in July of last year. I cannot think that you will allow that condition of affairs to continue. It is a case of life and death with us, and matters should not be allowed to drift along until next year. Our help will be scattered. I am informed by Mr. Brodie that forty-seven men left Hespeler last week for the United States.

Yet, these hon. gentlemen say that their policy is giving employment to people and keeping them in the country. Forty-seven operatives, men who have learned their trade, who are valuable as consumers, who are good citizens, and who have been producing wealth every day, have gone across the line to enrich Uncle Sam, but to impoverish us to the same extent.

They left their families behind until they obtained work, when they propose to send for them. Our machinery will be lying idle and getting out of condition. Fixed charges will be running on, and there will be a very ruinous loss of capital before the end of this year. Our general manager informs us that owing to the state of his orders he will be obliged to discharge over 200 more persons by the 10th April——

Within three weeks two hundred in addition to the number already discharged, and yet the Finance Minister sits by and allows this to take place—does not move a hand to prevent it.

—which will leave only 400 at the mill, where we employed up to quite recently, 800. I fear you do not realize the serious condition of the woollen industry, and the danger it is in of being completely extinguished.

Woollen machinery is only fit for making woollen goods, and buildings are erected especially for the convenience of manufacturing woollens. It is all very well for people who have no practical knowledge of these things to say with a light heart—as many members of parliament do in their speeches—'why not turn your attention to something else?' Well, when everything one has got is invested in an enterprise, what can he turn his attention to? It requires capital and experience to embark in any manufacturing enterprise. Our capital is invested in the woollen industry, and our experience is in the manufacturing of woollen goods. I venture to say that you do realize that the woollen industry is the only one that has been hit and hit hard, and I may say, without the slightest exaggeration, is on the brink of ruin by the operation of the preferential tariff.

We do not object to the preference to Great Britain, we are prepared to support it, but the tariff should be so arranged that we should be put on an equality with the Lancashire manufacturer.

I can assure you that the situation is really serious, and the financial institutions who are

supporting the various large woollen industries —what I mean by supporting is discounting their paper and making them advances—are becoming seriously alarmed. If they withdraw their confidence and refuse to continue to make advances, the mills will have to close down, and that is just what is in sight, I fear.

It looks to us, and to a great many of the members of the House, that the woollen industry has been singled out for the severest competition, not only by reason of the extent to which German goods are smuggled into Canada through Great Britain under pretense of partial manufacture in England. You will note that the several departments of the textile trade are relatively untouched by the preferential tariff. The silk trade, the linen trade, the jute trade, and the cotton trade all appear to be exempt from severe competition suffered by the woollen mills.

I greatly regret to say that many of the members of the House I have spoken with do not vote as they talk, as I have been assured by many of them, including some members of the cabinet——

Do not forget that.

—that they were protectionists, and that we ought to have some relief; but they vote the other way when relief is asked for. I hate to put it in that way, but it is a true statement of the case.

In making this appeal I do so in the hope that the facts already before you, and the additional information contained herein will be fully and fairly considered by the government, and that something will be done for us this session.

Now, is it any wonder that the men engaged in this trade have been almost on their bended knees beseeching the Minister of Finance for relief from their present conditions.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), who is the author of that letter ?

Mr. SPROULE. There is no name on it. It is a copy of a letter sent to the Minister of Finance, but there is no signature on this copy. But the hon. minister knows who is the writer, and he will be able to give the name.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If I were reading the letter I should do so.

Mr. SPROULE. And if I had the name I would gladly give it, because it would strengthen my argument by showing that it comes from a reliable and intelligent source.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is from a gentleman engaged in the woollen trade, and the name is no secret, I take it. The writer is Mr. Millichamp, of Toronto.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose so, because it is on paper headed 'Millichamp, Coyle & Co., manufacturers' agents, woollens, &c.' In the face of all this, will hon. gentlemen opposite stand up and defend the beautiful preference they have given to England ? Will they defend it to the poor operatives who are out of work and starving ? Will they defend it to the men who are going across to the United States to find employment which, under the beautiful revenue tariff is denied them here ? Would they defend it if it came home to themselves, if starvation was brought to their own door by the unwise policy carried out by the Minister of Finance and his friends which they now laud to the sky ? I claim that this tariff is injurious, because, though somewhat protective, the protective element is very much impaired by the preference given to British woollen goods. We contend that it is further impaired by a strong bias towards free trade. It prevents the government extending protection to new lines which might be easily called into existence by a little aid. I will give you one instance. We have had before this House the question of the beet-root sugar industry. We know, from the information collected by the Ontario government and by this government and by the experiments that have been carried on for the last ten or fifteen years, that we have a country admirably adapted for beet-root sugar. All that is required is to have the same principle extended to that industry that has been extended to the iron industry. If this were done, we should have an industry that would give employment to thousands, that would bring in capital from abroad, and that would greatly benefit the farming community. Yet these hon. gentlemen are so wedded to free trade principles and to a revenue tariff that they will not lend a helping hand to assist these industries. I have do doubt whatever that if they would agree to give a bounty of one cent a pound on beet-root sugar for four or five years, inside of a few years we should have a large industry of this kind established in the Dominion.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce told us to-night that last year there were over 330,000,000 pounds imported into this country. To manufacture that 330,000,000 pounds would require between thirty and forty factories, and every pound of it could be made here in Canada. These factories would require an expenditure of $15,000,000 of money to build and to supply with machinery and plant. These thirty factories would employ over 10,000 operatives, directly and indirectly. These thirty factories would consume beets raised by thousands and tens of thousands of farmers, and the farmers would be engaged in a line of industry that would give them four times the profit they now get out of any line of industry that they are engaged in at present. I have complete figures in regard to this, but I will not detain the House by reading them. I only wish that the government would extend their principle of protection as disclosed in the bounty system ; they would thereby

do great good to the farmers, and would start an industry here out of which the farmers would get 60 per cent of all the money expended. The farmers are an important class, their profits are small to-day, and I say the government could well afford to do something in their interests. But with that callousness that has characterized their conduct in connection with the woollen industry, they will do nothing in this respect either. They have introduced a tariff which they say is framed on a revenue basis, and they want to prove to the people that they are carrying out the principle of a free trade tariff.

We contend further that the government is doing harm by inspiring the manufacturers with doubt. I believe to-day the manufacturers are becoming frightened. They remember that the Minister of Finance said that the aim of this government is to follow the same principles of trade as prevail in England, that they cannot get down to free trade in a day. The farmers remind the government that they promised to give them a free trade tariff. So we did, reply the government, but it requires time, and we are working towards that end. Therefore, I say the manufacturers are becoming timid, they are not launching out to the same extent as they would do if they had confidence in the principles of the tariff. The government are wedded to their free trade ideas and will not readjust the tariff. From time to time we hear of industries struggling to maintain themselves, and I have given you an example in the woollen trade. I could give you examples in some other lines where competition is becoming so great under the changed conditions and changed values that employers are obliged to cut down the wages of their hands. I have in my possession a letter from Brantford from a gentleman saying a strike is going on in his business because they had to cut down the wages of their operatives. Why did they have to cut down the wages? Because the competition from abroad is so keen that they cannot hold their own, because there is not sufficient tariff to keep these imported goods out. Therefore these men say they are obliged to cut down wages, and this is from the town from which the Minister of Customs himself comes. The labouring men in his own town are fighting the fight of death.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the nature of the business?

Mr. SPROULE. The windmill business, carried on by Gould, Shapely & Muir. That is the reason they give. I say the government are so wedded to their free trade theories that although they see one line after another suffering, owing to changed conditions and changed values, they will not readjust their tariff. They say: We do not want any tariff tinkering, we are going to let it go on, we are going to show you that stability is one of the important features in our tariff. Now, Sir, I come to the amendment that is before the House, which I wish to deal with very briefly. The first clause reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the welfare of this country requires a pronounced policy of adequate protection and encouragement at all times to the labour, agricultural, manufacturing, mining and other industrial interests of the country.

This clause aims at reassuring the people of our continued belief in the value of protection to labouring men, to manufacturers, to miners, to farmers, and to the artisans of this country. We believe in the principle of a protective tariff which will keep Canada for the Canadians. We reassert that principle as a good one, we are not ashamed of it. The second clause in the amendment states that we are in favour of mutual preferential trade. But they say: That is folly, because you cannot get it. I ask them, Have you tried to get it? The First Minister read the other night several extracts from resolutions passed and speeches made in England when a discussion was carried on with the object in view of getting mutual preferential trade. He said these efforts did not eventuate in anything, and that we can never get it. Does he forget that the very same arguments were used with reference to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway? We were told then: You can never build a railway, or if you do it will never pay, it won't pay for the grease of the wheels. Although the hon. gentlemen were in power, they would not try to do anything, and the people turned them out and put in another set of men who went to work, and the result has been a magnificent success. And so with mutual preferential trade, if these gentlemen won't try to get it, if they won't make any reasonable effort, then let them get out and give their places to men who will make an effort to get it. They say they believe it is right, then why do they not make an effort to get it. Ah, but they tell us, you cannot get it, the English people are not ready for it. When the hon. member for East Toronto went over to England and with others saw Lord Salisbury, Lord Salisbury would not even discuss it because the time was not opportune. Why would he not discuss it? Because the Australasian colonies were about banding themselves into a confederation. They have done so now, and they will soon be framing their tariff. So I say the present is an opportune time above all times in the history of Canada for these hon. gentlemen to make an effort. We have reason to believe that Australia desires the same principle of trade as we do, and that she will go in with us and with the other colonies. Then, I say it would be strengthening the hands of the

mother country, it would have great influence upon the English people, if we were to make a move now. I believe it would produce a change in their mind which would eventuate in great benefit for us. But we are told that because the conditions were so and so two years ago, we can never get it. They tell us that the people of Great Britain will never consent to have their breadstuffs taxed. I have here a special despatch to the Globe, dated March 25, which says :

It is reported in many quarters that the Chancellor of the Exchequer will have to find such a huge sum of money in his budget that foreign grain coming into this country may bear some of the burden of the extra taxation. It is almost impossible to further increase the amount levied on many articles that now provide the national revenue, but with a strong and well-led opposition the taxation of imported breadstuffs would be a difficult question.

He says it is rumoured that the Chancellor of the Exchequer will be obliged to put a duty on wheat. Does not that show that there is a change coming over the spirit of the dream that they have remained under so long in England ?

An hon. MEMBER. It is only a rumour.

Mr. SPROULE. It is only a rumour, but I take it that the correspondent of the Globe newspaper, if it were only an idle rumour, would not consider it worth his while to send it. He sends this as an important item of news as forecasting what is likely to occur, to the Globe newspaper. I believe that if we join with the Australian colonies and with the other colonies of the empire in an agitation, we will be successful. I feel as surely convinced as I am standing here addressing this House tonight that it will come in the near future. We may sit here until doomsday ; as long as hon. gentlemen do not ask it they will not get it. They say it is not our business, but it is the business of the empire. What does Scripture say ? 'Ask and ye shall receive.' Hon. gentlemen are not following out first principles. The hon. Minister of Customs may not have gone to Sunday school for a long time, nor the hon. Minister of Finance, and they may not recall this passage of Scripture.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hon. gentlemen ask and do not receive. I am afraid they do not have the scriptural spirit.

Mr. SPROULE. We have reasonable hopes that it will come if we try to get it, and we would have got it, I have no doubt, had our party remained in power. Hon. gentlemen say that it is only the concern of the empire. It is our concern as well as theirs, and, in proportion as we develop the outlying portions of the empire, we develop the empire itself ; we strengthen and consolidate the empire and strengthen the loyalty of the colonies to the empire. It has been said here that the two principles of protection and mutual preference trade are antagonistic to each other. Not by any means. Cannot we put one duty on goods coming from the United States and another duty on goods coming from Great Britain? Cannot we give England a preference over the United States, and still have a duty on English goods and protect our manufacturers here ? All that is required is to adopt the principle of a maximum and minimum tariff which is being adopted by many countries in the world to-day, which desire to protect their own trade. They are not antagonistic, they are compatible and they are obtainable. I would remind hon. gentlemen that the world moves, that nations change their policy, that England has changed very much in her feelings during the last few years, and is likely to change more in future. What would it mean to the Canadian farmer if we got mutual preferential trade ? I shall take a few items from the report of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. If we had 5 per cent on the wheat that we send to England let us see what the result would be as compared with the wheat of the United States farmers. The farmers of Canada would have, on the basis of their exports this year, more than the American farmers, assuming that they exported the same amount, $599,774. They would have that much more than the American farmer because of the advantage which the 5 per cent preference would give them. That must be of some advantage to the Canadian farmer. It does not necessarily follow that because that duty would be on the Yankee wheat it would raise the price of breadstuffs in Great Britain. Suppose there was a 5 per cent duty on pork, and bacon ; if the Canadian farmer sent the same amount of pork that he sent last year and the American farmer sent over the same quantity of pork, the Canadian farmer would have $640,151 more for his pork than the American farmer would receive. Would that not be of advantage to the Canadian farmer ? Then, I take cheese ; if the Canadian farmer had 5 per cent preference on his cheese, and if the American farmer sent the same amount as the Canadian farmer did last year, the Canadian farmer would have $992,816 over the American farmer. Then I take butter ; if the Americans sent to Great Britain the same quantity as the Canadian farmer sent, the Canadian farmer would have upon that butter $256,107 more than the American farmer would have.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And more than the Canadian farmer had this year ?

Mr. SPROULE. More than the Canadian farmer would have this year on the same quantity.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Would it give the Canadian farmer an increased price ?

Mr. SPROULE. It would give the Canadian farmer that much of an increased price over the American farmer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then, it would give the Canadian farmer an increased price ?

Mr. SPROULE. If we had that we would not have Canadians going to the United States to engage in farming, but, that movement would be reversed if by engaging in farming in Canada they could get 5 per cent more than the farmers pursuing their calling in the United States.

The MINISTER OF AGRICUTURE. Do they go there now. My hon. friend is not aware that our butter sells in England for a good deal higher price than American butter.

Mr. SPROULE. But it would sell for 5 per cent more.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then, somebody must pay it.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be one of the most valuable aids to the immigration policy of the hon. gentlemen, who have 273 immigration agents, most of them in the United States, trying to persuade people to come to Canada.

Mr. McCREARY. There are more people coming in from the United States than there are going out. There are three special trains a week running from Calgary to Edmonton at the present time, carrying emigrants from Dakota, as I have official information to-night.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not increase the number ? Do you object to increasing the number ? If your immigration agents can go over to the United States and tell the people that if a man comes to Canada he will have 5 per cent more for his produce than those who remain in the United States, it will be one of the strongest arguments that they could preach to them.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. gentleman says that if butter, exported from the United States, was taxed in the English market 5 per cent, it would be a large benefit to the Canadian producer.

Mr. SPROULE. I say that the Canadian farmer would have that much advantage over the American farmer.

Mr. TALBOT. If the American butter is taxed in the English market, it would be an American producer who would lose it, and the Canadian producer would not get any benefit at all.

Mr. WALLACE. If the Englishman did not have to pay the duty, he would have no objection.

Mr. SPROULE. I maintain that if this system were introduced, it would be a great benefit to the people of Canada, and especially to our farmers. No intelligent man can successfully contravene that proposition. Why, the Prime Minister stated in London, Ont., that it would be a great benefit to Canada, and that if elected he would try to get it. But when he was elected, he did not try. He got a Cobden medal instead, and that quieted his ambition. I believe that mutual preferential trade would not only be a benefit to the people of Canada, but that it would be a benefit to the empire, because after a while it would cause the empire to be self-supporting within herself. It would stimulate our industries, and the acreage under crop would be increased, because of the better market, so that, in time, the colonies could supply England with nearly all she needs, and relieve her from the necessity of depending on foreign countries. To that extent it would consolidate the colonies in the empire, it would draw the colonies and the mother country more closely together, and it would make the people more loyal in every respect. The last clause of the amendment is in favour of countervailing duties against those countries which unfairly discriminate against us. Are we to sit idly by while Germany one day, and some other country the next, puts tariff barriers against us, and are we not to move hand or foot to help ourselves ? Are we not sent here by our constituents to look after the interests of our own country, and when we find nations raise high tariff walls against us, will we not have countervailing duties against them ? If we fail in this we neglect our duty to our country. I believe the principle enunciated in the latter part of this amendment to be the correct principle, and I suppose it from the bottom of my heart. It only requires a maximum and a minimum tariff, and the minimum tariff we can apply to every country that wishes to have preferential trade with us. I believe, Sir, that there is embodied in this amendment the true economic principle in connection with the ways and means of raising a revenue and conducting government in this country, and in that belief I shall vote for the amendment with all my heart.

Mr. TURGEON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 27, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 97) to incorporate the Manufactures and Temperance and General Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 98) to incorporate the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 99) respecting Le Crédit Foncier du Bas-Canada.—Mr. Geoffrion.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE—AMENDMENT TO THE FRENCH VERSION.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville) (Translation.) asked leave to introduce Bill (No. 100) to amend the French version of the Bills of Exchange Act, 1890.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). (Translation.) Explain.

Mr. DEMERS. (Translation.) Section 59 of the French version is faulty. Under this section, as worded, in order that the payment of a bill of exchange may operate the discharge of the drawee or acceptor, it must have been made to a bona fide holder thereof, while, on the contrary, it is well known that the payment made in good faith by the acceptor discharges the bill of exchange. Therefore, good faith is required from the party paying it, and not on the part of the acceptor.

In the English statute, the wording is different, but still it is ambiguous, owing to bad punctuation. For instance, with reference to the regular payment, it reads as follows :—"It is made at or after maturity of the bill to the holder thereof in good faith."

At first sight, one would be led to infer, from the wording of the English edition, that the holder must be in good faith. This Bill does not contemplate any change in the English edition, because it tallies with the Act passed by the parliament of Great Britain, as any one can easily ascertain by referring to commentaries. At all events, the French version requires to be amended, and that is the reason why I beg to introduce this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

EXPENDITURE ON PORT COLBORNE HARBOUR.

Mr. INGRAM—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What was the total expenditure by the government on Port Colborne harbour since 30th June, 1896?

2. What is the amount expended each year on said harbour since 30th June, 1896?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). There has been no outlay made by the Department of Railways in the harbour of Port Colborne. Any expenditure made there has been in connection with the entrance to our canal, of which the House already has had information.

I. C. R.—PURCHASE OF LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. BELL (Pictou) asked :

1. Has the government entered into any agreement with any person or firm in the United States to furnish locomotives for the Intercolonial Railway?

2. What are the names and addresses of the persons or firms with whom such agreements have been made?

3. What are the prices agreed upon?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Yes.

2. The Dickson Manufacturing Company, of Scranton, Pa., the Manchester Locomotive Works, of Manchester, N.H., and the Richmond Locomotive Manufacturing Company, of Richmond, Va.

3. The Dickson Manufacturing Company, locomotives, $15,000 each ; the Manchester Locomotive Works, locomotives, $13,500 and $15,000 each ; the Richmond Locomotive Manufacturing Company, locomotives, $14,485 and $14,985 each. These contracts were entered into while the Kingston works were closed down, and before there was any intimation of their re-establishment.

I. C. R.—PURCHASE OF CARS.

Mr. BELL (Pictou) asked :

1. Has the government contracted with any person or firm in the United States to supply cars for the Intercolonial Railway?

2. What number and what class of cars have been contracted for?

3. What are the names of the persons or firms with whom contracts were made?

4. What are the prices agreed on?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Yes.

2. Six first-class passenger cars, three dining cars and four sleeping cars.

3. The Barney & Smith Car Company, Dayton, Ohio.

4. First-class passenger cars, $11,995 each; dining cars, $15,775 each ; sleeping cars, $19,255 each.

EASTERN EXTENSION AWARD.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

Has the amount paid to New Brunswick on account of Eastern Extension award been charged by the Finance Department to capital account or current expenditure?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). No amount has been paid to the province of NewBrunswick in the matter referred to.

GORDON POINT, P.E.I.—PETITION FOR PIER.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Has a petition been received by the government, during the years 1900 or 1901, from the inhabitants of Albany, Searletown and adjoining settlements, Prince county, P.E.I., asking that a pier be built at Gordon Point, lot 27, P.E.I. ?

2. If so, what action does the government intend taking with regard to the prayer of the petition?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte) :

1. Yes.

2. No present action is intended, but the question will be carefully considered.

P. E. I. RAILWAY—PETITION FOR BRANCH.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Did the government receive, through the Secretary of State, a petition, during the year 1900, from the people of Victoria, Crapaud, Tryon, Kelly's Cross, North Wiltshire and adjacent settlements, in Prince and Queen's counties, P.E.I., asking that a branch line of railway be constructed from the Prince Edward Island Railway, extending from or near North Wiltshire to Victoria?

2. If so, what action does the government intend taking in the matter, and do they mean to construct this branch railway as contemplated and recommended by the late government?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. A petition has been received by the department.

2. It has not been decided to take any present action upon the same.

P. E. I. POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Has the Postmaster General received any petition from the people of Abram's Village and Higgins Road, Prince county, P.E.I., for a daily mail service from Wellington Station to Abram's Village and Higgins Road?

2. Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to have a daily mail service inaugurated?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. A petition for a mail service over the route between Higgins Road and Wellington Station, via Abram's Village, was received in the department on April 28 last. On inquiry the depaartment satisfied itself that the present frequency of the service, tri-weekly, was not unsatisfactory to the mass of those interested in the service, but it was learned that the service might be improved by detaching the two outermost offices, viz., St. Chrysostome and Higgins Road from the route and serving them from Fitzgerald Station, which was much nearer to these two offices than is the Wellington Station. Tenders are now being invited for the two services mentioned.

Mr. FIELDING.

ATTACHMENT OF OFFICIAL SALARIES.

Mr. T. FORTIN (Laval) moved :

That, in the opinion of this House, the salaries of public officers and government employees should be attachable like those of ordinary citizens.

He said : In moving this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I cannot but feel a certain amount of diffidence and hesitation, having in my mind the history of the subject in the last parliament. The first attempt made to obtain legislation on this subject was in the session of 1897, when a Bill was introduced by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) ; but it only attained its first reading. Hon. members will remember that that was the session in which the tariff was revised, and nearly the whole time of the session was taken up with that revision. The same Bill was reintroduced in 1898. It was a very short measure, containing only two or three clauses. It was discussed at considerable length, but it found an untimely grave in the Committee of the Whole. If I remember rightly, the main objection to that Bill was that it was too short—that it contained no machinery for its enforcement. Another attempt was made in the session of 1899, when a Bill, prepared with some care, and containing apparently all the necessary machinery for putting the law in motion, was introduced and passed its second reading ; but that Bill had the same fate as the Bill of the previous session. The objections to that second measure were not of the same kind as those to the first. The first was found to be too short, unworkable and without the necessary machinery. The objection to the second was that it was too complete, that there was too much procedure in it, and the point was raised that it might be outside the jurisdiction of parliament for the very reason that it dealt with the necessary or incidental procedure for carrying out the law. With such a history before me, it might seem somewhat daring on my part to bring the subject again before this House. I have taken what I consider to be the mildest and least objectionable course. I merely want the opinion of the House expressed on the general proposition, whether it is fair and just that the salaries of public officials and public servants throughout the country should be subject to the ordinary laws applicable to the salaries of other people.

Should this proposition be accepted by the House, it will be an invitation to the government to prepare a measure, and I am sure that such measure would be as near perfection as possible. The idea embodied in the resolution is a very simple one. Is it just that public officials should form a special and privileged class or come under the ordinary laws of the country ? It seems to me that there cannot be two answers to that question. We are not living in the middle ages, nor are we living in India,

where the conditions are exceptional, but we are living in the twentieth century, in a democratic country, where all citizens are supposed to be equal before the law. Therefore it seems to me an unanswerable proposition that civil servants should be subject to the law, just as are the ministers themselves and the members of this House and the Senate and the public generally.

What are the obstacles in the way of attaching the salaries of public officials? Judging by past discussions, there seems to be an opinion in the minds of some members that there is a statute providing that the salaries of civil servants are not liable to seizure. It may be well to remove any impression of that kind. There is, Mr. Speaker, no such positive law or statute. Why then are these salaries not liable to attachment? There are two reasons. The first is that the government is not amenable to the ordinary courts. You cannot sue the government, unless with its own consent, and you must adopt a special mode of procedure, known as the petition of right. Therefore, although you might have any number of Acts declaring the salaries of public officials liable to seizure, you could not enforce them without the consent of the Crown. The second reason is this. Parliament votes certain moneys for the payment of the civil servants, and these votes are embodied in the Subsidy Bill which becomes law. To allow the attachment of any part of the salaries voted by parliament would be to divert from its purpose money specially voted by parliament.

With regard to the first objection the remedy is very simple. All that is required is the consent of the government and parliament to submit the government to the jurisdiction of the provincial courts in such matters. With regard to the second objection, that could also be met by a similar law.

Of course it does not fall within the scope of the subject I am dealing with to enter into details of what the law should be. I merely point out that these two objections, which now prevent the attachment of the salaries of civil servants, could very easily be met.

Another question may arise, and that is whether this parliament has jurisdiction in the matter or whether the jurisdiction is confined to the local legislatures. When this question was first introduced in 1898 in this House, I had some doubts on the jurisdiction of this parliament and gave expression to them, and the question was discussed to a certain extent. In 1899 it was discussed at greater length; and after giving more particular consideration to the subject, I have come to the conclusion that this parliament has ample jurisdiction to deal with the question. That jurisdiction is to be found in the British North America Act. Subsection 8, of section 91, provides that the Federal parliament shall have the exclusive power of fixing and providing for the salaries and allowances of civil and other officers of the government of Canada.

Subsection 4, of section 92, provides as being within the exclusive powers of the provincial legislature:

The establishment and tenure of provincial officers and the appointment and payment of provincial officers.

Taking these two sections together I have come to the conclusion that the Dominion parliament and the provincial legislatures have exclusive jurisdiction with regard to the fixing and the payment of the salaries of their respective employees. There can be, therefore, no question that this parliament has the right, since we vote the money, to decide how the federal employees shall be paid and determine what portion of their salaries shall be attachable for ordinary debts and what portion not attachable. If any doubt existed, it seems to me that it would be removed by the first paragraph of section 91, which provides that all powers, not assigned exclusively to the provincial legislatures, shall belong to the Dominion parliament.

Although no decisions dealing directly with this subject can be found, since no law of the kind has ever been passed by this parliament, there are nevertheless some cases in which the question has been decided indirectly. In the province of Quebec we have a statute of the kind I would like to see adopted here, a statute passed in 1875. Under that statute, some cases have arisen in which the question arose whether salaries of Dominion officials fell under it. Now, the two cases on which I was able to lay my hands are the following. The first is Crevier and De Grandpré and Lamothe, a garnishee case found in 5 Legal News, page 48. The judgment was given by Judge Rainville, and I shall translate the part to which I particularly refer:

I am of opinion that the statute, 38th Victoria, chapter 12——

That is our provincial statute.

—does not apply to officers of the Dominion government. The exemption of salaries of these officers from seizure is a matter of constitutional law, and no provincial statute can affect the rights of employees of the Federal government.

This does not directly decide the point raised here, because the judge in that case was called upon to interpret the provincial law. The statement made by the judge goes a little further than the case really called for. But it is an expression of opinion from one of the judges, a judge with a high reputation for ability, as is well known in the province of Quebec. The same judge in the case of Evans vs. Hudon & Brown, 22, L.C.J., 268, held as follows:—

That the exemption of the salaries of public employees from seizure is a matter of public order, and the parliament of the province of Quebec has not the power to declare seizable the salaries of employees of the Federal gov-

ernment. And, therefore, the Collector of Inland Revenue in Montreal is not bound to make the returns required by 38th Victoria, chapter 12, sec. 5.

Another case came before the Court of Appeals of Ontario. It was a case of the same class, although it called for somewhat different adjudication. It was a question of taxation, the case being known as Leprohon and the city of Ottawa, 2 Appeal Reports, page 522. I refer to this case because, if I remember well, it was mentioned by the Solicitor General when this subject was before the House on a previous occasion. I understand that this case was cited as showing that the parliament of the Dominion of Canada had no jurisdiction in the matter. As I understand this case, the ruling in the Court of Appeals, would prove exactly the reverse—that the provincial legislatures have no jurisdiction ; and, as jurisdiction must be found somewhere in matters of this kind, the fact that it is beyond the power of the provincial legislature would prove that it is within our jurisdiction. The Court of Appeal, in that case held :

> . . . . a provincial legislature has no power to enforce a tax upon the official income of an officer of the Dominion government or to confer such a power on the municipalities.

The question that came before the courts was this : A special tax had been imposed by the city of Ottawa upon the income of the employees of the Federal government. The by-law, whatever it was, which imposed the tax, was contested by this gentleman, Mr. Leprohon, who was an officer of this House. It was held in that case that the provincial statute could not confer upon a municipality more power than the province itself possessed, and the legislature of the province had not the power to tax the salaries of any officers of this parliament. There was a reason which, possibly, was applicable to that case alone and will not be generally applicable to this subject. It was this : It was held by the judges that to allow a municipality to impose a tax upon such salaries, or to imposing a provincial tax upon the same, would be equivalent to diverting or appropriating for provincial purposes, in an indirect way, certain sums of money voted for Dominion purposes.

Now, assuming, therefore, that we have full jurisdiction, since we vote these salaries and since these officials are our officials. it seems to me I need add very little in support of the proposal now before the House. It seems to me, as I said, only just and fair that all persons in this country should be equal before the law. I will not rest the proposition upon the assumption that a majority of Dominion public officers do not pay their legitimate debts. I believe the contrary to be true, and that the majority of these officers do discharge their legitimate debts. But, though the majority of ordinary citizens pay their legitimate debts, yet, in all the provinces and in all civilized countries there are laws by which the party who obtains judgment can attach in the hands of third persons all sums due to the defendant. Even where the majority discharge their legitimate obligations these laws are made to facilitate the collection of sums of money that are due. It has been stated on previous occasions that a law of this kind would embarrass the government. I remember that a member of this government used that argument. That condition could only arise if there were a vast number of attachments served in the hands of the government, and, if this were true, to my mind it would offer the strongest argument in favour of a law of this kind. If there are such a large number of public officers, who, under the law as it stands, abuse the law and hide themselves under the law in order to escape the payment of their legitimate obligations, then, I say, we should amend that law. That such a law as this would embarrass the government, that, I say, is the strongest reason why a law of this kind should be adopted. Possibly there might be a special department ; and it might be created at the expense of those who make its creation necessary. Instead of being presided over by a minister of the Crown, such a department might be presided over by a commissioner, who might be properly called the commissioner of dead beats ! or something of that kind ! Seriously speaking, I have not the means of knowing whether that state of affairs exist or not. But, I do not believe it does. In this matter, I judge from the experience we have had in the province of Quebec in the last twenty-six years. We have a law there which makes a portion of the salaries of public officers liable to attachment. Though that law has been in force for twenty-six years, it has always given complete satisfaction. We have not heard any complaint from any minister in the succeeding governments of that province in all that time. The law is simple, and it is very effective. The knowledge that the salary of a public officer, who is supposed to retain his position for life, can be attached for years and years, until the complete payment of the judgment, is enough to prevent those officers going improvidently into debt that may bring about that result. Therefore, I take it for granted that there will be no such embarrassment of the government as has been referred to. It is possible that when we come to deal with the details and when the law is prepared for this House, it will be necessary to make provisions for past debts.

I do not see any strong objection to that, but for the future I repeat it, the very fact of the existence of a law by which the civil servant may see a part of his salary liable to attachment for debt, will prevent him from getting into debt. I may add, Sir, that this law is desirable in the

first place on public grounds, and that it is also desired by a majority of the civil servants themselves. I am speaking within the hearing of a civil servant who told me the other day that all decent civil servants were in favour of a law of this kind, and that comprises, I dare say, a majority of them. Civil servants do not like to be treated, to a certain extent, as wards of the Crown. They are generally able to take care of their own interest, to manage their own business and to meet their legitimate obligations as well as any other class of the people. I hope on this occasion the House will express itself in favour of this resolution. I am glad to say that no question of form can be raised against it, and I hope no motion to postpone or shelve this matter will be presented. It is a non-controverisal question, it is not a party question, there are no politics in it. I may add that I have not the slightest personal interest in this matter. I have been asked by some gentlemen what object I had in pushing this measure. I may say that I have no direct or indirect interest whatever in it, not even professional. In a practice of about twenty years I do not think that I have taken more than one, possibly two, judgments against any public officer ; these have been satisfied, I am happy to say. But I am convinced that this is a good measure, and that it is a progressive measure. I am proud to believe that all the citizens of a free country like ours desire to be equal before the law, and all desire to be subject to the same law as regards the fulfilment of their financial obligations.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). It will naturally be expected that I should support a resolution of this kind, not entirely because I wish to return the compliment to the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), who rendered such valiant support to a Bill which I introduced upon two previous occasions in this House. One of the first things I did when I entered parliament was to introduce a Bill to correct what I think I will not be going too far if I call a scandal. It is well known that many civil servants have been able to evade the payment of their just debts because the law exempted their salaries from seizure. I had hopes that the premier would support me in the Bill I introduced the first session, and he gave me to understand that he would. I am not disposed to think that he had changed his mind in that respect, although probably he felt that the time was not opportune. However, in view of the manner in which my Bill was torn to pieces by the legal members of the House on successive occasions, I decided that I had better retire from the fray and leave the fight to other and abler members of the House. I wish here to congratulate the hon. member for Laval upon introducing this subject again, because I believe he is attacking an evil that should be rectified at the earliest possible opportunity. The hon. member, in view of the experience I had, has been willing to rest with the submission of a resolution to the House, without venturing to introduce a Bill. As he told the House, the first Bill that was introduced and which he strongly supported, was merely a declaration in favour of making the salaries of civil servants attachable. That Bill met with strong opposition from legal members of the House because there was no machinery provided in it. Acting in concert with the hon. member for Laval, we prepared a Bill the following session providing the machinery which seemed to be desirable, and that again met with the warmest hostility from some of the legal gentlemen, who criticised it because we did not confine ourselves to a simple declaration and leave out the machinery. However, it is a waste of time probably to go into these details now, but the experience of the past convinces me that it is almost impossible for a layman to get a Bill of this kind through the House. Therefore, I am content to take the position of a follower of the hon. member for Laval in this matter, and I am glad to give my support to the motion which he proposes.

I may say that no subject in which I have ever taken a public part seemed to elicit more universal endorsement throughout the country than the passage of the Bill that I introduced. I received resolutions from boards of trade and various bodies throughout the country commending the Bill, and expressing a hope that it would become law. I have always taken the position that I am not in any way attacking civil servants. I do not suppose that as a class they are any worse than others ; but I never could understand why they should be placed in any exceptional position, and why they should require special protection above any other class of the community. I remember that my Bill was opposed by the Minister of Justice on the ground that it might interfere with the working of the governmental machinery, that it was not desirable to have members of the civil service liable to be interfered with at any time, or taken away from their public duties and dragged into court. I have always held the view that that was a very poor argument. I do not see why our merchants should suffer because civil servants may not be taken into court the same as ordinary citizens are. In Manitoba we dealt with this question in a more radical manner. Shortly after the accession of the Greenway government to power, they passed a regulation by which a civil servant who refused to pay his debts or who might be garnisheed, would be promptly dismissed unless he paid his debts. If the present government would do that or follow some similar course, there would be no necessity either of passing this resolution or of enacting a

law. I think that we ought to have a declaration from the government that if the resolution does carry they will give effect to it by the passage of a Bill, if not at this session, then at the next session. I therefore have the very greatest pleasure in supporting this motion and I want to congratulate the hon. member for Laval for introducing it. I want to say that in my intercourse with that hon. gentleman I have come to the conclusion that he is a real reformer and that he desires to be of some use in his day and generation. He would like to introduce some reforms in this House and in this country, and I hope that he will meet with better success in connection with this matter than I met with during the two or three sessions in which I undertook to deal with it.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). Mr. Speaker, I think there is a great deal of objection to the passage of an abstract resolution upon a subject of this kind, because the essence of this whole question is as to the most convenient and proper method of carrying out the details. I do not agree with the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) that the civil service of the country are placed substantially upon any greater pinnacle of privilege than the ordinary debtor. It is just as well perhaps at the outset, in discussing this matter, to indicate some of the difficulties that are in the way of accepting the resolution. Now, let us take the case of a civil servant who may be indebted to certain creditors and let us see if the creditors, under any ordinary application of the principle of this measure, will be placed upon a footing of equality. If I am correctly informed the cheques for the payment of civil servants throughout the whole Dominion, from the province of British Columbia to the province of Nova Scotia, are issued at Ottawa from the Auditor General's office or through the department, and as a consequence in order to intercept any of these salaries which may be due the creditor in another province must have some law by which he can make service of a writ of attachment in the province of Ontario issued within the jurisdiction of these various provinces. I do not see how that can be brought about, how the Supreme Court, or a county court in Nova Scotia, or the Supreme Court of British Columbia, can, without legislation in the province of Ontario, make any writs of attachment from the courts of those provinces of any validity whatever where these attachments must be filed to be of any validity. In addition to that you are placing creditors upon an unequal basis. A creditor in Ottawa may be put to comparatively slight expense, may pursue a civil servant at Ottawa in this way, may levy upon his salary and press to secure the payment of his debt while the unfortunate creditors in a remote portion of the Dominion are not so placed, but, on the contrary, they are placed at a greater disadvantage, I do not see, without legislation in the various provinces, as well as legislation in the Dominion, that any legal process can be made by which such an attachment could be made available at the seat of government. If the financial conditions of the country are so changed that the salaries of civil servants are payable in various localities, within the jurisdiction of the courts of the various provinces, then some machinery may be available by which a measure of this kind can be given practical effect. I do not think that the hon. member for Laval has indicated any very substantial grievances as existing in the country.

Mr. MONET. The law is a grievance.

Mr. FLINT. My hon. friend (Mr. Monet) says that the law is a grievance. If we are to legislate upon ideal grievances and endeavour to bring the law into absolute consonance with our ideals, then, we will have undertaken, to a large extent, a useless task. We must legislate on positive and practical evils in a practical way. Let us see what remedies the creditor has as the law exists at the present time? A civil servant is indebted to his grocer, or to his tailor, or to any other merchant. The creditor can pursue him in the ordinary way, obtain a judgment, and seize his property. He can seize his personal property except such portion as is by law exempted in the various provinces.

Mr. McCREARY. What provinces are you speaking for?

Mr. FLINT. I am speaking of the provinces in which there are these exemptions. He can attach any debts that are due the debtor, or any moneys he has in the hands of any person or corporation except the money which is set aside by parliament for the salary of the civil servant. But, he has still a further remedy. He is competent, after he has attached all the assets which the civil servant has, he can—at any rate that is so in Nova Scotia, and I believe it is so in Ontario—bring him before a commissioner, or a judicial authority, and examine him as to the amount of his salary, as to the amount of his assets, as to his liabilities, as to his daily expenses, as to the condition of his family, and as to the condition of his affairs, and by order of the court he may be compelled, by drastic methods, to pay so much a week, or so much a month out of his income to meet the demands of his creditors. I think, that having gone that far, the machinery which already exists in the various provinces is sufficient, and in the absence of any very concrete case of abuse, I think that parliament would do well to wait for the introduction of a Bill dealing with the details before undertaking to pass a mere abstract

resolution which, of course, binds us to nothing. I think it is open to question as to whether it is desirable that civil servants should be pursued in this manner for their debts. A civil servant may have been unfortunate in business, he may have accumulated in business losses, a large amount of debts, he may be a gentleman who has failed in business and has perhaps judgments amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars entered against him. A creditor can pursue a gentleman appointed to the civil service and rob him of his means of livelihood. There is no discredit in this country for a gentleman of the highest standing to become involved in debts, debts which have been incurred for other people, debts which have been the result of misfortune. Unless some concrete abuse is made apparent I do not think we are called upon, in addition to the ordinary means at the command of creditors, to provide that a portion of the income set aside for the living of civil servants should be taken away from them. The Superannuation Act deducts a certain portion of the bulk of the salaries of civil servants in order to make provision for old age. If, in addition to the ordinary means that are at the disposal of the creditor we add a new machinery, I think it should be carefully guarded so that a civil servant should not be exposed to be harshly treated by his creditors. There is a means already existing within the competence of the government, or of a department. If a civil servant is persistently endeavouring to obtain money under what may be called false pretenses, to obtain money which, from the amount of his salary, he knows he will not have the means of paying, I think there are in the department, or in the government, the means of meeting such an emergency.

The rule has been adopted in Manitoba, I understand, that if a charge is laid that an official is persistently and unnecessarily in debt and in a certain sense defrauding his creditors, he can be examined before a deputy or chief clerk and directed to make provision to pay his creditors. No abuses of a serious nature have been shown to exist here, and if they were so shown I have no doubt the government would apply some such remedy. My principal criticism of the resolution, however, is that while it might be impossible to enforce it at the centre of government, I do not see how any legislation you could pass here could bring attachments against civil servants in distant quarters of the Dominion within the jurisdiction of the courts at the seat of government. If this resolution is passed, those who are interested in framing legislation upon it will find themselves involved in great difficulties when they come to draw up a Bill. I sympathize with the idea that it is undesirable that one class of the community should be placed on a different footing under the law from another class, but I do not consider that the present law is of that nature. The existing law is for the protection of the Crown and to ensure that it shall not be unduly harassed and put to expense and trouble in collecting debts for private individuals. It is the Crown and the various departments of government, which under the law are endeavouring to protect themselves against the expense and nuisance of being made intermediaries in the collection of private debts between creditor and debtor. In the absence of any serious abuses the public interest cannot be injured by allowing this resolution to stand over.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I wish to submit one or two matters which it is important to consider before the House commits itself to this resolution. One would be disposed at first blush to accede to the proposition that civil servants and employees of the government should be placed on the same footing with ordinary debtors; but as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Flint) pointed out it is not because of any regard for civil servants as such nor with a view of conferring privilege upon them, that the law remains as it is. On the contrary, it is because after due consideration had no doubt been given to the matter, it has been concluded to be against the interests of the government and against the public interest that any change should be made in the law. My hon. friend (Mr. Fortin) proposes that the salaries of public officers or government employees should be attachable like those of ordinary citizens. Without dwelling upon any constitutional objections which there might be to the proposal, I wish to point out that the effect of such a law would be, not to harass the debtor, but to harass the government and to seriously militate against the successful administration of public affairs. Let the House consider in what position the Railway Department, for instance, would be placed. We have 6,000 men in our employment upon the railways and probably half as many more upon the canals, and if even a relatively small proportion of this army of servants were liable to a proceedings being taken against them in the courts, then in every one of these proceedings in the different provinces of the Dominion, the Crown would have to be made a party and endless expense and embarrassment would be entailed on those who have to administer the department. Pay day comes around, a man has incurred debt for the necessaries of life, proceedings are taken, the Crown is notified that the money must not be paid over to the employee, the employee cannot get his money which may be necessary to provide for his family and himself, and he may be incapacitated to perform his duties. Then the officers of the department would have to attend court, and the result of the

trial would have to be awaited. My hon. friend (Mr. Fortin) says that we might have a head of a department at Ottawa who would be entrusted with duty, but one departmental head would certainly not suffice.

Mr. FORTIN. I merely said that as a joke.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, even so it would be necessary to arrange for some such principle as that. You would have to have officials in all parts of Canada to look after these matters, you would have to employ lawyers all over the Dominion to appear at the trials, because if you did not follow up these legal proceedings to their conclusion, the government would be unsafe in paying any money to employees who would be in debt, because they would be liable to pay it over again. We would never know when we could properly adjust a claim until the litigation had been concluded. The effect of it I do not think any man could foresee. Merely touching on the fringe of this question, I think the House will see how unwise a thing it would be to adopt any such law, and why it has been found convenient and necessary to continue the law as it is at present. On the Intercolonial Railway we have not been entirely unmindful of the claims of creditors. We have had a system in operation for a good many years under which, if a person who supplies necessaries to an employee gives notice to the department that that employee has not been paying, without any expense or litilgation being necessary, we direct the attention of the employee to the fact, find out whether it is true or not, and, if it is true, we insist that he shall pay the bill, if not all at once, by instalments from time to time. In that way we have not experienced any difficulty. We have very seldom any complaint from creditors on account of the non-payment of bills by employees on the railway; we do not require any such legislation; and if we have anything to say about it, we will not have any such law passed. It is not needed by creditors. The people in our employ know that if they continue to fall into debt or to withhold payment to their creditors when they are able to pay, we simply give them to understand that we can not retain them in the service. We exercise pressure upon them in that way, so that I do not think that there is any serious grievance. I would very strenuously oppose my hon. friend's proposal. Not that I would not like to see employees of the government placed in the same position as all other debtors; I do not wish them to have any advantage; but we must consider the public interest, and you are sacrificing the public interest on a plea which, as my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) has very clearly pointed out, is not a well-founded plea. Any grievance which may exist in probably very largely local in its character.

Mr. BLAIR.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Can you say whether the Imperial government allow attachments of this kind ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I never heard of any such.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They allow some kind of procedure.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is a special provision in the English law, but not in this direction.

Mr. W. F. McCREARY (Selkirk). Mr. Speaker, as this is a matter which has been discussed in the province of Manitoba for many years, I deem it my duty to offer what I consider a solution of the question. For some years the salaries of provincial officials as well as Dominion officials were not garnishable in that province; but in 1889 or 1890 the local government brought in an Act providing that their officials might be garnisheed ; except that $25, I think, was to remain in the government's hands. Now, I cannot see that the hon. Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) has given any argument against putting on the statute-book a garnishee Act similar to that of Manitoba. In my own practice in Winnipeg I have learned of many cases of real hardship in the case of merchants who were not able to bear the loss, on account of government officials failing to pay their debts. This failure is probably confined to 10 per cent or 15 per cent of the employees. The Minister of Railways claims that it would seriously affect the management of the railway system of Canada if such a law were passed. If he has 6,000 employees on the Intercolonial Railway system, surely the Canadian Pacific Railway Company must have twice or more than twice that number. There are thousands of officials on the Canadian Pacific Railway west of Port Arthur, and there is no trouble at all in garnishing their salaries. I myself have served a large number of garnishees on the Canadian Pacific Railway offices in Winnipeg, and the rule they adopt there is that the paymaster, Mr. Graham, notifies the court how much money he has in his hands belonging to the delinquent officials. If there is any dispute between the creditors, the court decides which of the creditors are entitled to the money. The same system could be pursued in the case of government officials. If a garnishee were placed in the hands of the government, I take it that the Auditor General would notify the court what amount of money was in his hands at the time belonging to the employee in question.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). The Auditor General would not know.

Mr. McCREARY. Very well, the official whose duty it would be to know could easily notify the court how much money was in his hands belonging to the official. That did not occasion any difficulty to the Mani-

toba government. I know that prior to the Act being brought in, it was said that it would interfere with the officials discharging their duties ; but the effect it had was to make the small proportion of officials who were deadbeats come to time and pay their old debts, and made them see that they did not afterwards incur large obligations which they were not able to pay ; because the local government took it upon themselves, if two garnishees were served, to look into the matter, and if they saw that the debt was deliberately contracted by the official with the intention of never paying it, they discharged him. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company do the same. When the first garnishee is served, they call the official into their office, and warn him that this must not occur again ; and then, if a second garnishee is served, they discharge him. Of course, there may be circumstances, such as illness in a man's family, which they take into consideration, and they will probably see the lawyer who issues the writ and discuss the matter with him. But I claim that there would be no hardship to the employees on the government railways or to any other officers of the government if they all had to pay their debts. There are no class of officials better paid, as a general rule, than civil servants, and no class who do less work. I have been a civil servant for some years, and I know what I am saying. There are civil servants who work very long hours, who at certain seasons, when there is a pressure of work, work after hours ; but there are a large number of others who have a very soft snap. With regard to serving the process of garnishee, I think that could easily be solved by a lawyer from each province meeting and arranging the details. I think a registered letter to the proper department would be all that would be necessary, and the garnishee would attach from the time the registered letter left. I may tell you that a man at Calgary, 1,000 miles from Winnipeg, who wants to attach the wages of a Canadian Pacific Railway emyloyee, has to send his garnishment to Winnipeg ; yet it works all right. I think it could be worked as well in the case of government employees. There might be other means of serving processes, but that is one I suggest. Then, I do not think the Act should be retroactive, and there might be certain classes of debts to which it should not apply.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What kind would you suggest ?

Mr. McCREARY. For instance, our law says that a man shall be brought up on a judgment summons and imprisoned ; but only on debts for the necessaries of life, which would include his household furniture, his food, and other necessaries, and there is also sickness to be considered. If you look over the British law, you will find cases cited in which the British courts have held a diamond ring to be a necessary. It is difficult to say what necessaries are. They can only be determined according to the situation in life of the individual concerned. It is said that the present law gives redress to creditors. I do not know what the law is in the various provinces, but I am sure that the law of Manitoba to-day allows a man to live almost in luxury and not pay his debts. The exemption law in Manitoba is this : you can have free of debt your food for eleven months as well as the food for your family, all your household furniture, your personal property and your house, to the value of $1,500. If you are a farmer, you can practically be worth four or five thousand dollars, and no execution of a county court or a superior court can touch you. There is no use suing in our province, because you cannot realize on execution—it can't be done—the sheriff has gone out of business. I think it is the duty of a Liberal government to take this matter up and pass a law which shall be comprehensive enough to embrace all the provinces.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice). I only desire to add one word to what has been said by the hon. member (Mr. McCreary) who preceded me. My reason for being in favour of the resolution is that I have not yet heard a good argument against it. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) tells us that he could not manage his department if the salaries of his employees were garnisheed. If I understand aright, these men are paid on a pay roll, and I do not see why we could not garnishee in their case the same as when we take a garnishee action in the hands of a railway company for the money due their men. We do not have to serve the papers at Ottawa, or to serve the minister or the deputy minister ; we can serve them at the office on the line. One hon. gentleman has stated that this was intended for the purpose of pursuing debtors. Now why should civil servants be protected more than any other class in this country ? If they incur debts, why should they not pay them the same as we do ? Why should there be a preference and one class be exempted from the payment of their debts ? Of course, there are men who are unfortunate in the service, but so there are in any business. It is not reasonable to make the government service a hospital for the unfortunate. If men are in hard luck, let them make a compromise with their creditors. These civil servants are in a better position to pay than are most men, for they have always a steady salary coming in. We have this law in Quebec, and it works well. You do not have to harass the government or to have a commission or to apply to any deputy minister. All you have to do is to serve the officer in charge in the local place where the garnishment

is taken, and he makes a return to the court that there is so much due to the employee, and the money is divided by order of the court. The government does not need to come into it at all. I do not see why the government should employ counsel in the matter. Of course, in my personal interest and the interest of the profession, I wish they would. I am in favour of this resolution, because I do not see why the civil servants, who, as the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) says, usually have very little to do and get good pay, should be a privileged class in the community and should be exempt from paying their debts as other people must do. I do not see why the law should protect them by prohibiting seizure of their money in the hands of the government, when others are not so protected.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). When the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) introduced his Bill on this subject in the last House, I took a decided stand against the measure for reasons which I then enunciated. I took the ground then, and I think it still holds good, that the hon. gentleman had not shown that there was any real demand for this legislation. I represent a constituency which has, perhaps, more civil servants than any other in Canada, yet, though the subject at the time received a great deal of attention in the House, and probably outside of it, my constituents failed to disclose to me that there was any real grievance or any necessity for garnishing the salaries of civil servants. I think that if there was anywhere a real necessity for this Bill or a strong feeling in favour of it, it would probably manifest itself in the city of Ottawa. It struck me that the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) practically admitted that there was no demand for this law, for he said he could not point out where there was any substantial evil in the matter, but his motion was prompted rather by a desire to vindicate a principle, the principle of equality. If there is no grievance, it seems to me that it would be wasting time for this House merely to affirm the principle of equality, which no one questions. But I would have opposed the measure for the reasons of convenience to the public departments, and because, on its own merits, the measure would be illiberal and unprogressive. The tendency of this age is not to increase garnishments, not to make salaries attachable, but rather in the opposite direction. In the United States, I believe, there is no such thing as garnishment of salaries. And in this country we have gone from step to step until to-day those people who are said to be in an inferior position by reason of their salaries being attachable, practically are in no such position. In Ontario, every man's salary is exempt to the extent of $25. That is practical immunity from garnishment. The making of salaries of civil servants attachable will have but one result, which, I think, is to be deplored—it will encourage credit. It will tend to make civil servants seek and obtain more credit than they need. The tendency of modern days is to make business——

An hon. MEMBER. Cash.

Mr. BELCOURT. Cash—particularly when it comes to apply to the necessities of everyday life. A man ought to pay cash for his groceries, his dry goods and things of that sort. Another point is that those in business who supply commodities to civil servants know perfectly well that the salaries of those officers are not attachable, and they trust to the debtor's honour and his sense of justice for the payment of the debt. I think it is far better that that feeling should be encouraged and that honour should be the basis of credit rather than a mere formality which will be probably found more or less unpractical. Another reason why I oppose this resolution is that it is a sort of paternal legislation, which ought not to be favoured. Legislation that looks to minor interests of that sort ought not to be brought to this parliament, but parliament ought to give its attention to matters of greater necessity and import, leaving aside this paternal legislation, of which, unfortunately, we already have too much.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to second the resolution of my hon. friend, the member for Laval (Mr. Fortin). We have heard it stated on the floor of this House, during this debate, that there were no real grievances warranting the passing of the proposed legislation. But, Sir, what are the facts? In 1895, my predecessor in this House, the lamented Mr. Béchard, introduced a Bill to enable the salaries of civil servants to be garnisheed. But that Bill found an untimely grave in the Committee of the Whole. Session after session, this question has been threshed out on the floor of the House, and why, Sir? Because there are found in every province, and more so in the province of Quebec, of which I speak knowingly, government officials who run in debt and cannot be called upon to pay. I was not in the least surprised to hear the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) state that he was opposed to the resolution now before us. In view of the large interests he has to protect here, no wonder that he should take such an attitude; but I was surprised to hear him state that this was an illiberal and unprogressive measure, and one not in line with the spirit of the age, the tendency of our times, he says, being not to increase garnishments or to make salaries liable to attachment, but in an opposite direction. The hon. gentleman has, no doubt, not failed to notice that was from the opposition side

that he received the warmest plaudits. Why, Sir, this is essentially a liberal measure and one well in accord with Liberal professions; for, if there is one principle held sacred by the Liberals, it is that, in a free country like ours, all citizens are equal before the law, and that is the reason why we are not willing to extend favours or immunity to civil servants which are not extended to other classes of the community.

In the province of Quebec, the debtor's property is held as a common pledge by the creditors. In our province, all citizens are equal before the law in that respect, and the Dominion government officials are the only class that are enjoying immunity and are exempt from the operation of the law. Now the House is invited to enact that it is desirable that the salary of civil servants should be attachable and that government officials should be put on a footing of equality with the other classes of the community in that respect. The hon. member for Laval is trying to do away with a privilege, and I hold that his resolution is essentially a liberal and progressive measure. The hon. gentlemen who oppose it are, therefore, taking an anti-liberal stand by the very fact that they are trying to maintain an antiquated privilege and one which is no longer in consonance with the spirit of the age.

In the other provinces, and chiefly in the province of Ontario, they have perhaps less occasion than we have in Quebec to complain of this evil, because the law of Ontario says that a man may be brought up on a judgment summons and ordered by the judge to pay a certain portion of the judgment out of his salary at so much per month. In former centuries, any creditor who failed to pay his legitimate debts was imprisoned, and in Rome they even went to the length of dividing the limbs of the debtor between his creditors.

In the provinces where the law provides imprisonment for debts, the civil servants may be proceeded against in an efficacious way. For instance, my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has at his disposal a summary proceeding: all he has to do is to get an order from the judge against his debtor. Should that debtor happen to be a government official who has incurred debts, and if he does not satisfy his creditors, he is imprisoned, and in that way he is given a chance to ponder over the desirability of keeping out of debt. But in the province of Quebec, such summary proceeding is not available, as my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) knows very well, being a practising lawyer for our province as well as for Ontario. That is the reason why we have to come down here and ask the government to pass a law to enable the salaries of government officials to be garnisheed.

We have been told here that seizures of this kind will cause very considerable expense and inconvenience to the government, and that the ministers are already incumbered to a sufficient extent without having them overloaded with this garnishee business. But, Sir, I submit that the government being the servants of the people, one of the prime functions of the ministers is to give satisfaction to the demands of the various classes of the people which they represent here.

Hon. gentlemen also object to this legislation because of the difficulties that may be found in working it out. Judging from the experience of the railway companies and other great corporations, I do not anticipate any trouble from the enforcement of this measure.

If the principle at stake is a good and sound one—as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) said it was—we ought to adopt it. I do not think that its enforcement will cause more trouble and inconvenience to the ministers than is being experienced by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with regard to their employees.

In recording my vote in favour of this resolution, I am not only putting on record my own opinion, but I believe that I am also voicing the opinion of the province of Quebec. We are a unit in the province of Quebec in our approval of the provincial Act which enables the salaries of the officials of the local government to be garnisheed, and I may say here that this law works very well.

In my opinion, no solid argument can be urged against this parliament adopting a similar legislation to that which is embodied in the resolution now before us.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). The resolution now before the House declaring that, in the opinion of this House, the salaries of public officers or government employees should be attachable like those of ordinary citizens, would, if adopted, leave Dominion employees subject to any law, as regards the seizure of their salaries, that any province might pass, and consequently whatever law might be passed by any province as to the mode of attachment would be binding upon the different departments of the Dominion. That could not fail to be attended with a great deal of difficulty and confusion. What the hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) has said with reference to his department would apply also, though perhaps not to the same extent, to the Department of Public Works, the Post Office and every other department. It, therefore, seems to me that the resolution should not pass.

In Ontario, until quite lately, the law with reference to garnishing salaries—I am not now referring to government employees—treated salaries exactly as other debts which could be attached for the satisfaction of judgments and of creditors' claims. But that law was amended, and to-day—as salaries are usually payable monthly—no

salary not exceeding $25 per month can be attached, and in any case $25 per month is always free from attachment.

There was some outcry in that province with regard to civil servants. It was argued that their salaries should be also attachable, and in 1898 an Ontario statute was passed providing for the garnishment of the salaries of civil servants, but stipulating that, as in ordinary cases, $25 per month should always be left for the benefit of the employee. If the salary did not exceed $25 per month, it could not be attached at all, and if it did, it could be attached for the surplus over that amount. It was deemed only right that in the case of the civil servant as in other cases, he should be allowed to draw $25 per month for the benefit of himself and his family. Under that law, the creditor, whether a judgment creditor or not, serves upon the treasurer of the province or his assistant, a notice of the amount due him. If a judgment is recovered, then the treasurer is bound to retain sufficient to satisfy that judgment, provided there is an amount in excess of $25 coming to the debtor. If there is no judgment, then the debtor has to be served as well, and if he dispute the claim, the treasurer ties up the amount of the debt until the dispute is settled. That is rather complicated. But one thing which influences me in dealing with the resolution before the House is the fact that although there was a great outcry in Ontario for such a law, the creditors have not availed themselves of it to any great extent. Last year very few persons took advantage of it, and probably on that account not much inconvenience has resulted from its operation.

If, in the opinion of this House any remedy is necessary it seems to me that the amendment I am about to propose is all that is required. I would move in amendment :

That all the words after the word 'House' be struck out and the following substituted : Provision shall be made by the government by which the salaries of public officers and government employees, or a part of such salaries, shall, so far as consistent with the requirements of the public service, be made attachable or available for the payment of their debts.

That does not mean that a law shall be passed allowing these salaries to be attached exactly as those of ordinary persons in each one of the various provinces, which would seem to me very objectionable. A great deal of weight ought to be attached to the argument of an hon. gentleman representing a city like Ottawa, where there are so many civil servants. I understood the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) to say that there is no demand for such a law by the merchants of this city, and that being the case, I do not think that any other city or town need worry much about it.

Mr. BRITTON.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS (Russell). I suppose that this is a question which could be more properly dealt with by the lawyers in the House, but having some practical knowledge of the operation of a law of this kind, I desire to say a few words. I cannot see very much difference between the amendment and the original proposition. In each case the result would be the same, so far as the government is concerned. In each case the government would be considerably harassed by the attachments provided for. While certain creditors might benefit by a law of the kind, certainly the government all over Canada would be harassed by it. The statement made by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) I think is quite correct, that questions of this kind should rest as between creditors and debtors. No man earning his living by daily labour or in a similar way should become a creditor to such an extent as to require law of this kind to be made for him. If those who give credit place themselves in such a position as to require a law of the kind, then they should be left to suffer the consequences, the consequences should not be visited upon innocent parties. Speaking myself as an employer of labour, I say that we are continually harassed because of a similar law affecting labouring men. Parties give them credit in many instances unduly. The poor fellows get sick perhaps, or disabled, or get into difficulty, and their employer is put to a great deal of trouble in consequence. Let me mention one of the chief annoyances to which employers of labour are subjected. There are many labouring men who go around from one place to another seeking work, because of the danger of seizures no one will employ them. Some employers of labour in this country have adopted the practice that the moment a garnishee is served the man is discharged, and that makes it very difficult for the man discharged to find employment. As the law stands to-day, we are continually being served with these garnishees, and we have to be continually on our guard to avoid personal responsibility as a consequence. If that be so in our case, what would be the effect on the government all over Canada ? The result would be that shop-keepers and others who give undue credits would be continually harassing the government. In every department of the service from one end of Canada to the other you would have to have a staff for the purpose of looking after this special branch of the service. For these reasons I do not think that the resolution, even in its amended form, should pass the House.

Mr. FORTIN. I only wish to say that I will accept the amendment. It has never been my intention to ask the passage of a law by which the whole of the salary of the

public officer could be attached or seized. I am well aware that the tendency of our laws is to provide that a portion only of a man's salary or wages are attachable. Such is our law in the province of Quebec, such is the law in France, and such is the law, I believe, everywhere. Therefore, if the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) and his friends attach so much importance to their amendment, I am willing to accept it, and I ask those who are in favour of the motion to vote for the amendment.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland). It is very questionable whether legislation should be enacted in this House which would embarrass the government more than they are now being embarrassed by reason of civil servants contracting debts. There is no doubt that government officials usually should be placed in the same position as other individuals so far as debts are concerned; so far as creditors' claims against government officials are concerned, the latter should be placed in the same position as ordinary individuals, with one exception. There is a difficulty attending the operation of the garnishment of public officials. The Dominion of Canada is some three or four thousand miles in extent from east to west, most of the government officials are paid from the city of Ottawa. A government official in British Columbia, or a government official in Nova Scotia who is paid his salary from the city of Ottawa, might get into debt to some one in his locality, and I can hardly understand how a garnishee proceeding could be served on the government respecting that man's salary if you say the garnishee summons must take effect from the time it is served, and it must take effect from the time it is served on the government, if it is served on the proper parties. How will the government at Ottawa be seized of the fact that that summons has been served, the effect of which is to prevent the government at Ottawa from paying the salary due to the employee? You cannot attach a salary until the salary is due. If the summons is served one moment before the salary is due, the summons is ineffectual, it is set aside by the court, the court would immediately say that the salary was not due at the time the summons was served. Consequently the summons must be served after the salary is due and before it is paid. I can see that there would be an enormous amount of difficulty surrounding the whole proceeding. In the case of railway companies in this country, it is true that if an employee fails to pay his debts and his salary is attached, it is the practice I know of the Grand Trunk Railway, of the Michigan Central, and I believe of the Canadian Pacific Railway, immediately to dismiss that employee. I am not so sure about the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I know that in the case of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Michigan Central, if an employee's salary is attached, he is immediately dismissed from the service of the company. They will not allow a servant to remain in their employ if they are served with a garnishee proceeding. Now, it would be very difficult for the government, because they are not in the same position as a corporation. If a government were to dismiss an employee the moment his salary was attached, serious embarrassment might be caused to the public service. A great corporation such as a railway company is an exceedingly cold-blooded institution. They care for nothing. They simply employ men who will do their work, and if they do not live up to the regulations and rules of their company, they are set aside at once irrespective of any consideration which may touch the heart of the ordinary individual. The government act, I apprehend, upon a different line from that. The government would consider as to whether or not an employee had reasonable grounds for not paying claims which had been brought against him. There may be exceedingly reasonable grounds. It has come well within my knowledge from practical experience that the railway companies, of which I have spoken, have dismissed men from their employ whose salaries had been attached. To my mind there was often a good excuse for the non-payment of the debts for which these men had been sued. It very often occurs, it is a matter of continual occurrence, that a man cannot pay spot cash, that he cannot pay at the time that the creditor demands his money, that he is not in a position to pay because of circumstances absolutely beyond his control. He may be an absolutely honest man who wishes to pay his debts, I know that has arisen on dozens of occasions within my practical experience at the bar; clients have come to me to look after their interests in connection with attachment proceedings that have been taken against them. The railway company act in a cold-blooded way when they treat their men in that manner. The government could not do that very well. They would not do that. They would necessarily have to inquire into the circumstances surrounding the liability and into the circumstances surrounding the ability of the man to pay. Consequently, to pass a resolution in this House declaring that it is necessary that a law should be adopted making these salaries attachable, I think, in the manner in which it is proposed, is an objectionable proceeding. If the hon. gentleman who proposed the resolution would bring in a Bill so that we could see the line upon which he was proceeding, we would then have something to go upon. Who is to be responsible for bringing in the Bill? A resolution simply propounded in this House is an indefinite affair. There is no person responsible for any subsequent proceedings. Let

any hon. gentleman who desires to see legislation placed on the statute-book in this direction bring in a Bill, let it be considered and if thought desirable that the House should pass such legislation, the hon. gentleman who brings in the Bill will be responsible. I, myself, am of the opinion that government employees should pay their liabilities the same as any other person, but I do not think that the House should lay down the bald proposition that legislation of this kind should be introduced. I do not understand that any person is being very grievously injured. I have never heard of any person who was grievously injured by reason of the non-ability of government officials to pay their liabilities. I am inclined to think that legislation should rather be in the opposite direction and that no claims should be attachable. I think it would be more conducive to the establishment of a cash system in this country. The credit system in this country does more to make paupers than any other system that could be devised. I think if we are going to legislate, that we should legislate in a manner which would be more conducive to the inauguration of a cash system by making every man pay for what he gets when he gets it, instead of passing legislation of this kind. I feel that the House should not commit itself to this resolution at the present time.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Gaspé). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two, before the vote is taken, so as to put on record my views on the matter. It has been stated on the floor of this House, during this debate, that the subjecting the salaries of civil servants to be garnisheed in the ordinary way was a liberal principle, in accord with the spirit of the age. But, sir, if that is a liberal principle, there is another principle which is still dearer to me, and it is that of provincial autonomy.

Now I am of opinion that, were this parliament to legislate on the matter under consideration, we would be encroaching on the rights of provinces. Under clause 92 of the Union Act of 1867, subsection 13, the provincial legislature may exclusively make laws concerning property and civil rights. Now, such power being clearly vested in the provincial legislature, how could this parliament introduce a legislation to enable even a fraction of the salaries of the civil servants to be garnisheed ? How could parliament create a machinery for the enforcement of such legislation ?

In my opinion, the power of legislating on such matters is exclusively vested in the provincial legislatures ; and, for my part, I am free to say this : That although the principle advocated by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) and by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) is, as they claim, a liberal principle, and the principle of provincial autonomy commends itself still more to my approbation. To my mind, upholding the sacred rights of the provinces is still more important, than giving my support to the measure under consideration, progressive and liberal as it is claimed to be.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) If the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him, I would like to ask him a question for my own information. Is it not true, as a matter of fact, that the exempting of the salaries or wages of workingmen is looked upon as a liberal principle nowadays, and as one quite in accordance with the spirit of the age ? Now, under such circumstances, how, I ask, could the principle under discussion, which aims at removing the prohibition against attaching the salaries of civil servants, be looked upon as a progressive and liberal principle ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) I am now dealing with the matter from a constitutional standpoint, and I do not care for the present to discuss any tendency of the Liberal party in connection with the matter under discussion.

I do not believe in exempting the civil servant from the ordinary liabilities of a citizen. I do not want him to escape the payment of his honest debts. I am not ready to carry liberalism to the extent of approving of public employees shirking their honourable responsibilities and refusing to pay their just debts.

Reference has been made to the railway companies, and among others, to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which has probably twice as many employees as there are on the Intercolonial. And yet, they say, there seems to be no trouble at all about garnisheeing the salaries, and no complaint is heard from the attorneys of the company upon whom the writs of attachment are served, either in Winnipeg, Montreal or Toronto. It works all right, they say. Well, during my short professional career in Montreal, I have had occasion to serve garnishee proceedings on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company respecting their men's salary. Then what happened ? Those employees immediately came to our office and told us that, if the garnishee summons were maintained, their services would be dispensed with by the company.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is it fair to assimilate the case of the employees of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to that of the civil servants ? Because the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have made it a rule not to allow a servant to remain in their employ, if they are served with a garnishee proceeding, does it follow that the government is bound to do the same ?

It is an axiom, I do not know whether in constitutional law or not, but at any rate, an axiom which is in vogue in Great Britain to-day, that 'Her Majesty's government must be carried on.' Now, I ask, are not the ministers of the Crown already

encumbered to a sufficient degree in matters necessary to the administration of the country's affairs without having them overloaded with matters of this kind ? For this reason alone—and it is not the main objection to the Bill, because I think it would be *ultra vires*, inasmuch as it encroaches on provincial rights—I am bound to vote against the resolution of the hon. member for Laval.

Mr. H. BOURASSA (Labelle). (Translation.) Does not the hon. gentleman know that in the province of Quebec the government of His Majesty—although it is only a majesty on a smaller scale—manage to get through their work, although they have to enforce a similar law ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am quite aware of it.

Mr. BOURASSA. (Translation.) Then, why could not the higher majesty of Ottawa deal with the matter here ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) Here is my main objection to this resolution. I do not believe in this parliament dealing with matters which come within the jurisdiction of the provincial government, and this resolution would be an infringement of that principle. Section 92 of the Union Act of 1867 enacts :

Exclusive Powers of Provincial Legislatures—92. In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming withing the classes of subjects next hereinafter mentioned.

And subsection 13 :

Property and civil rights in the province.

Therefore, this is a matter of civil procedure, and, as I said, it is not within the scope of this parliament to pass legislation of this sort, and were we to deal with it now, it would be on our part an encroachment upon the rights of provincial legislatures.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). Mr. Speaker, before the question is put I would like to say a few words in regard to it. I think that the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) was well advised in bringing the question before the House in the form of an abstract resolution, and I say so, because, when it was introduced into this House last session and the session before, it was reduced to the form of a Bill. It was found to be impossible to frame a Bill which would meet all of the many objections which could be brought against it. The hon. member for Laval seeks to evade all the difficulties by simply passing an abstract resolution, but, if we pass an abstract resolution we will only be face to face with these difficulties. The question which meets us is : Where is the constitutional power in this matter ? I held before, and that opinion I have not changed, that parliament has a right to declare that the common law which prevents the salaries paid by the King from being garnisheed, may be altered. We can do that. I think we can do that and thereby put salaries payable by the King or by the government on the same basis as others, but, that is as far as we can go. Then, comes the question: Who is to provide the machinery ? It does not seem that this parliament has any jurisdiction over civil procedure to provide how and in what manner these proceedings shall be enforced.

Mr. FORTIN. If the matter is within the jurisdiction of this parliament is the procedure incidental to it not within the jurisdiction of this parliament also ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin) is quite right that where a general subject such as insolvency or bankruptcy is referred to this parliament, we can legislate effectively upon it, but I do not see that because the 91st section of the Britsh North America Act says that the fixing and providing for the salaries of civil servants is given to this parliament, that therefore we have the power of determining how and in what manner the creditors can recover if they garnishee. I do not think that is an incidental proceeding. That is a civil procedure in my judgment.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Cannot you declare it to be an asset of the creditor, and then would it not come under your jurisdiction ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think it is well within the power of this parliament to declare that the common law exemption of this debt from garnishee proceedings should be removed, but when we do that we must leave it to the provinces to deal with the garnishee process. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin) thinks it is possible to frame a Bill which would provide the proper machinery——

Mr. FORTIN. It was done before.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, but the Bill which was submitted to parliament contained at least a dozen fatal objections and it was withdrawn. I do not believe there is any desire on the part of any one in this House to give an unfair exemption to civil servants, but I ask the hon. member (Mr. Fortin) if there is any real practical grievance existing.

Mr. FORTIN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then where is the evidence of it ? Have we had petitions praying for this legislation ; have any hon. gentlemen engaged in business expressed the opinion in this House that a great grievance exists ? Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin) listen to the words of wisdom that fell from the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), who told us as a large employer of labour

in this country, that he found the garnishee law most obnoxious and that the result of it was to throw many workmen out of employment, because their wages being garnisheed their employers would not keep them longer. We have heard from the member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) that so grievous had been the legislation of past years with reference to the property of debtors which was attachable by creditors, that the Manitoba government have been obliged to interfere, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary) says that so many exemptions now exist that the sheriff has gone out of business in that province. That does not show a desire to give greater facilities to the creditor to oppress the poor man, but rather to give the debtor a chance. If we pass a statutory declaration that the salaries of civil servants should be subject to garnishee proceedings, I submit that then each province would have to pass the necessary machinery to give effect to that law. One province might do so and one might not, or a province might make the machinery so intricate for the government that the difficulties would be insuperable. What would be the result of that in the case of the Department of Railways, in which the minister told us he had 9,000 men employed ? The province of Ontario has found it necessary to the practical working of the law, to make an exemption of $25, which as a matter of practice exempts nearly all the employees of the government. Assuming that the provinces can enforce their own law in this regard, how are they going to enforce it as against the central government at Ottawa in the case, for example, of employees in the Yukon, many of whom give orders on the Interior Department for the payment of their salaries to their families ? How can you garnishee these ? Suppose that in British Columbia my department has a hundred men employed on our ships and they are paid monthly, how am I to be informed that the salaries of these men are garnisheed ? What I submit is that instead of passing this resolution, the House might declare that in its opinion each department of government should take steps to ensure that the employees should pay their debts or be discharged. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways says that practice does exist in his department to-day, and that if it is brought to his attention or the attention of his chief officers that an employee persistently refuses to pay his current debts, that man is discharged. It has been stated here that the law works well with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, and that therefore it would work well with regard to the government, but the answer to that was given by one hon. gentleman who declared that it worked odiously as regards the workmen in these large corporations, because when their salaries are garnisheed they are discharged. These companies say that they cannot be dragged into court week after week and month after month in these garnishee proceedings, and so in self-defence they discharge the men. Would hon. gentlemen ask the government to do the same thing ? In my own department, when a poor sailor man gets into debt and his pay is garnisheed am I to discharge him instanter ? Do the hon. gentlemen want that ? I have great faith in the legal acumen of my legal friend (Mr. Fortin) to find some way out of the difficulty which presents itself, but it seems to me that if you pass a statute removing the exemption, then you will have gone to the extent of your jurisdiction in this parliament, and after that the process by which the salaries can be garnisheed must be left to the different provinces. That would involve us in difficulties so great that we would be very unwise indeed to bring about such a state of affairs.

When we have statements such as that made by so large an employer of labour as the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), and that made by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) as to the methods which have to be resorted to by employers of labour to escape from the restrictions of the law, I think we may well pause before adopting either the motion or the amendment. In the first place, no grievance has been more than slightly alleged ; no petitions have come from the country for such a law ; and, speaking as a minister of the Crown of four or five years' experience, I am unable to say that in my department any real grievance exists, and I believe my colleagues can say the same. Then why plunge into an experiment of this kind ? I deny that the working of the garnishee process in the case of the great corporations has been such as to encourage us to apply that process to government employees. I think it would be hard on poor men, harsh and unjust ; and if we adopted it, we would probably be compelled to resort to what the Ontario legislature has been compelled to resort to, namely, so many exemptions that the improvement sought to be effected would prove to be practically inoperative.

Mr. JOSEPH ARTHUR ETHIER (Two Mountains). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen who have opposed the resolution which is now before this House have urged an objection which I do not think well founded, and I wish to put on record my views on the question, before the vote is taken on the resolution. It was urged here that the legislation which is embodied in this resolution would prove unworkable and that the time is not opportune for passing it.

The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) has dealt with the question from that standpoint and has quoted clause 92 of the British North America Act in support of his views ; but let me call his attention to clause 91 of the same Act which deals with

the matters to which extends the exclusive legislative authority of the parliament of Canada. Subsection 8 in which are enumerated the classes of subjects within which these matters come, reads as follows :

The fixing and providing for the salaries and allowances for civil and other officers of the government of Canada.

Since under section 91 of the Union Act, the Dominion government is vested with the power of providing for and fixing the salaries, the assumption is that no other government and no other power can interfere with that matter. Therefore, provincial autonomy is altogether out of question here, and there is no attempt at encroaching upon the rights of provincial legislatures.

Another objection to the Bill is that there do not exist sufficient grievances to warrant the passing of such legislation. Now, in 1897, a Bill was introduced and discussed at considerable length. During the session of 1898 the same Bill was reintroduced. As early as 1895, the late Mr. Béchard had introduced a Bill providing that the salaries of public officers and government employees should be attachable. And have we not heard, a little while ago, the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. William McCreary) stating that in the province of Manitoba this evil was so prevalent that the government of that province, like the legislature of Quebec, had to bring in a law enacting that the salaries of their officials might be liable to seizure. I think it would be but fair to put the creditors of the Dominion civil servants on the same footing with the officials of those provinces.

As matters stand now, no creditor cares to take proceedings against any official of the Dominion government. You may sue them, you may get judgment against them, but what is the use of levying a judgment against a civil servant who has nothing in the world to depend upon but the salary he gets from the government ? No creditor would risk the payment of the judicial costs so long as the judgment he gets remains unsatisfied. But let the House adopt this resolution and then we will provide the best machinery to make this legislation workable and truly effective. Should parliament enact such legislation, it would secure to a creditor the right to recover from the civil servant as readily as he does from any one else.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Would the hon. gentleman tell me how he can reconcile that statement with the views expressed by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies)? I would like him to tell me who has the power to regulate the procedure in the civil courts ? Is that power vested in the Dominion parliament or in the local legislatures ? Now, supposing it were within the jurisdiction of the local legislature, would the hon. gentleman be ready to state that the provinces may issue writs against the Crown ?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) This parliament would have to provide the necessary machinery for enforcing and putting the law in motion—in so far as their own officials are concerned.

I know of many civil servants in the service of the government here who, having resided in the province of Quebec and got into debt there, refused to pay their bills, because they know that under the law their salaries were not liable to attachment. Now, were such legislation as is now proposed crystallized into law, those employees could be sued at law. Besides, such legislation would not imply a slur upon the character of the civil servants who were willing to pay their honest debts. It could only affect those dishonest debtors who shirk their honourable responsibilities, and thus bring discredit upon their colleagues.

One of the hon. gentlemen who spoke before me endeavoured to assimilate the case of the government employees with those of railway companies, such as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who make it a rule to discharge their officials when a writ of attachment is served in the offices of the company, and when the judgment is not satisfied without the company having to interfere. There is no parity at all between the two cases. This resolution does not provide for the discharge of public officials who do not pay their debts, but it only asks parliament to give its sanction to the principle that any man in Canada who earns a salary of from two to three thousand dollars a year shall be on a footing of equality before the law with the poor workingman who is earning but a dollar a day. For these reasons, I think that the resolution, introduced by my hon. friend from Laval should pass the House.

Mr. P. O. DUGAS (Montcalm). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have listened very attentively to the remarks fallen from the hon. gentlemen who have participated in this debate, and I may say that, out of sympathy for the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), the mover of this resolution, I am very sorry not to be able to support him.

In principle I am in favour of making not only the salaries garnisheeable, but, in fact, everything that belongs to the debtor. I have no sympathy with those laws passed by the provincial legislatures exempting from garnishment a portion of the wages of the workingmen. Those laws, I believe, have defeated the purpose for which they were framed. They have done the working classes more harm than good. I, for one, am a believer in the great principle grounded on equity and justice, in virtue of which the property and goods of the debtor are held as a common pledge by the creditors. Now, if a way could be found out of this trouble,

and if it were possible to apply that old principle to government officials, I would be the first man to approve of such a reform. But, sir, I doubt whether such legislation is within the jurisdiction of this parliament and whether we can pass such a measure without infringing the constitution which governs us.

Mr. R. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. DUGAS. (Translation.) To prove what I say, I need only refer to clauses 91 and 92 of the Union Act of 1867.

Clause 91 deals with the distribution of legislative powers, and enacts in connection with the powers of this parliament that the exclusive legislative authority of the parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects therein mentioned and subsection 8 enacts :

> The fixing and providing for the salaries and allowances of civil and other officers of the government of Canada.

The jurisdiction of this parliament, therefore, does not extend beyond fixing and providing for the salaries and allowances of the government officials.

I do not see here anything that enables this House to pass an Act to garnishee the salaries of the servants of the Dominion government.

Section 92 of the Union Act deals with the powers of provincial legislatures, and enacts that in each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects therein enumerated, and among other matters, 'property and civil rights in the province' (subsection 13, section 92.) Therefore, under the constitution, this parliament is not empowered to pass a law to enable the salaries of civil servants to be garnisheed. Under the Union Act quoted, such a matter is clearly beyond the jurisdiction of this parliament, the legislatures having exclusively the right of making laws in relation to such matter. Therefore in passing such a legislation, we would be encroaching upon provincial autonomy. Moreover, how could such a law be enforced ? I see no way out of this difficulty. The judgments of the courts of the various provinces can only be executed within the limits of the province in which they have been rendered, and exclusively as to the goods and property situate within such province.

The province of Ontario would be the only province which would reap any benefit from the proposed legislation. The seat of this government being in the province of Ontario, no other orders but those issued by the Ontario courts could reach the government officials.

Now, if in addition to what I have said, we remember this old axiom of the English law, that "The Crown cannot be a garnishee," the only conclusion that can be come to is that the proposition of the hon. member for Laval cannot be accepted.

The hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) stated, a little while ago, that under section 91 of the Union Act of 1867, this parliament is empowered to enact such a legislation as the one embodied in the proposition of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin). Surely the hon. gentleman was not in earnest when putting such a construction upon subsection 8. This subsection merely says that this parliament is empowered to deal with the fixing and providing for the salaries and allowances of the officers of the government of Canada ; that is all. This does not imply the right for this parliament to pass a law to enable the salaries of government officers to be garnisheed.

For these reasons, although in principle I am in favour of making the salaries of public employees and the wages of workingmen liable to seizure, and in spite of all esteem and respect I profess for my hon. friend from Laval, I feel in duty bound to vote against the resolution, because such a legislation as the one proposed would be unconstitutional.

Mr. B. RUSSELL (Hants). Mr. Speaker, I should not have thought it necessary to take part in the discussion this afternoon but for the fact that when the subject came before the House on a previous occasion I deemed it to be my duty to oppose the Bill in which the proposal was then embodied, because I thought that the power of this parliament to deal with the subject was extremely doubtful, to say the least. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) agreed with me on that occasion in opposing the Bill ; but as the matter is now brought before the House, not in the form of a Bill, which there might be doubt about our power to pass, but in the form of a resolution merely expressing the opinion of the House that the salaries of civil servants should be attachable for the payment of their debts like the salaries of all other classes of the community, I thought we should have the support of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries for this proposal. But it seems that when a Bill is introduced on this subject, it is wrong ; and when a resolution is brought, it is wrong and should have been in the form of a bill. So it seems whichever way we go, we cannot fail to go wrong. The reason I expressed some doubt as to the legislative power of this parliament to deal with the question was that I thought a mistake had been made in the decisions of some of our courts as to the legislative authority of this parliament, notably in the case referred to, that of Leprohon against the city of Ottawa, where a claim was made on the part of the city authorities to tax a Dominion official in respect of his income. I think it is very important that this matter should be settled, as that decision was closely relevant to the question then before the House and now before the House. I would like very

much if an opportunity could be given to have that question decided in such a way that we might ascertain whether there is to be any privileged class in the community. The reason I objected to the Bill two or three years ago was that it proposed to segregate the civil servants of the Dominion from all other classes by legislating against them in an exceptional way. I think that is wrong ; but I also think it is wrong that Dominion officials or officials of any kind should enjoy privileges and advantages that are not accorded to other people. I do not think public officials should be placed in an exceptional position, either adverse or favourable. Places in the public service are very eagerly sought after, as every member of parliament, on this side of the House at any rate, knows, and I think they should stand on the same footing as any other classes in the community. For that reason, I thought it was desirable that the decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal, I think it was, which seemed to place them in a different position from other classes of the community, should be reviewed. I thought, if it be not presumptuous to say so, that that decision was erroneous, because it seemed to be founded on an entirely false analogy. There was a judgment given a long time ago by Chief Justice Marshall in the United States Supreme Court with reference to the position of officers of the Federal government, and that decision, which was applied by the Ontario Court of Appeal to this class of appointments, was to the effect that if the state legislatures were allowed to tax the salaries of officials of the Federal government, the result might be that the States would have power to destroy an arm of the Federal government. If that was the case, then I presume that was a very proper decision to make, at any rate on political grounds, on which a great many of the judgments of the United States Supreme Court have been founded ; and it was a good judgment, because that was not a desirable condition of things, and was not contemplated by the founders of the Union. That is right enough for the people south of the line ; but my impression is that it has no application to us in Canada, because the Federal government here has a method of protecting itself which the Federal government in the United States has not, and therefore it it not necessary to invoke under our constitution any such principle of safety which might properly be invoked under the constitution of the United States. In Canada, if any legislation is passed by the provincial authorities which, although apparently within the constitutional authority of the provincial legislature, might have the effect of crippling the Dominion service, the Dominion government always has a right to effect a virtual veto of that legislation and to prevent it going into effect. The power of disallowance which we have in our constitution, I think, makes that class of decisions south of the line inapplicable to our conditions north of the line. It was on grounds of necessity that Chief Justice Marshall gave the judgment he did in that matter, and that judgment was the foundation of the decision given here in the case of Leprohon against the city of Ottawa. That political necessity does not exist with us and consequently there is not analogy between that case and our situation. Our provincial legislatures have the right to order a debtor —whether he is a civil servant of the Dominion or not—to pay a certain amount in proportion to his income, and following out that principle I am inclined to think that a provincial legislature would have authority to legislate with reference to this particular subject.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How could a provincial legislature enact a law which would make the government of Canada a party to a suit ?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was about to refer to that difficulty. If, acting within its legislative authority, the Dominion parliament chooses to pass a Federal Act, that, of course, would override the provisions of any provincial Act. In Nova Scotia, a debtor—whether civil servant or not—may be interrogated as to his means of paying his debts, and the courts have power to order him to pay so much per month or per week. If our provincial courts can make such an order as that, I do not see why they have not the right to take into consideration the fact that the person against whom the order is made is the recipient of a large income from the Federal government, and make an order based on his income. But I understand that there are some decisions in Ontario to the effect that the courts of that province cannot do that.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. We can do that in Ontario.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is a good system. As to the abstract proposition that these salaries should be made attachable, by whatever legislature has the power, I do not see why there should be any doubt on that point. I do not see why civil servants should not be placed on the same footing as everybody else.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure). There is a very general opinion in the country that some Dominion employees cannot be compelled to pay their debts. In this province, I believe, such employees can be brought before the courts and interrogated as to their means and then condemned to pay a certain amount out of their salaries per week or per month, as the case may be. And any civil servant who fails to comply with such an order is guilty of contempt of court and can be sent to jail.

In the province of Quebec, not many years ago, the wages of workingmen were seizable to the full amount, but one of our Liberal members from the city of Montreal managed, after some difficulty, to have the law amended in the local legislature by providing that only one-quarter of the salary of a workingman is seizable, and in such a case the seizure can be made continuous. That was satisfactory to some extent to the creditor, but has worked unfortunately for the debtor. It has enabled creditors to take out suits, pile up costs, turn a man out of employment first, and out of his home afterwards.

With regard to the resolution before the House, I do not think that the government should be placed on exactly the same footing as the Canadian Pacific Railway or other great corporations, but none the less, after the expression of opinion we have had in this House, some measure should be devised for subjecting civil servants to the same obligations as other people, and in doing that, I believe that the government will be acting in the interests of the civil servants themselves. One employee of this government told me it would be an excellent thing for the service if the salaries were seizable, as it would enable a certain number of them, who are residing in other parts of the country, to obtain credit, which now they are unable to obtain without having to resort to that class of moneylenders known as money sharks.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I do not propose to give a silent vote on a question of this kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Mr. DAVIS. I did not hear what the hon. gentleman said. I was just going to say that I must agree with the principle of this resolution, I do not see why civil servants should be exempt any more than other people. They are a well paid class; their salaries, as a rule, are better than those paid to persons in commercial employment. And, as an hon. gentleman suggests to me, they are paid better than members of parliament are paid for their time, and I do not know of any legislation that protects a member of parliament from the necessity of paying his debts. In the North-west Territories, we have had a great deal of trouble on account of these officials. Officers of the government who are paid large salaries seem to get the idea that they can run in debt here and there and cannot be called upon to pay. But I contend that their creditors should be in a position to levy on their salaries to get their accounts paid. The question came up in the legislature of the North-west Territories and was discussed at considerable length. The government of the Territories notified the members of the House that if they would not push the resolution to a vote, they would undertake to see that all the officers in the employ of the North-west Territories government should pay their debts or would dismiss them from the service. If the Federal government would take a similar position, it would meet the difficulty I believe. I do not know how many provinces have adopted this principle, except the province of Manitoba——

An. hon. MEMBER. And Quebec.

Mr. DAVIS. I was not aware that Quebec had also adopted it. I think the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) said that in Manitoba the government had taken the same position as the government of the North-west Territories—that is, if an officer of the government would not pay his debts, they would dismiss him. Whether the other provinces have adopted it or not, I think this is a proper principle.

If the Federal government are not prepared to make a statement like that made by the government of the North-west Territories and Manitoba, I think legislation should be allowed to go through, and I think we might expect in the future——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. DAVIS. I think the hon. gentleman will have to wait awhile for the question. I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not see why the civil servants should be exempt any more than other classes of the community.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Canadian Patriotic Fund Association.—Hon. Mr. Costigan.

Bill (No. 21) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—Hon. Mr. Prior.

Bill (No. 40) respecting the British Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Fraser.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Fort Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Arnprior and Pontiac Railway Company.—Mr. Lemieux.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Algoma Central Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.'—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—Mr. Malouin.

Bill (No. 87) to amalgamate the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company, the Winnipeg Transfer Railway Company (Limited), the Portage and North-western Railway Company and the Waskada and North-eastern Railway Company under the name of the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Canadian Nurses Association.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company (Limited).—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 95) respecting the Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company. —Mr. Dyment.

VICTORIA DAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 33) respecting Victoria Day.—Mr. Horsey.

On section 1,

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that the ministers have been holding a caucus over there for some time and that the House is not proceeding with the business. When the caucus is over I have a few questions to ask.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was having a conversation with my hon. friend (Mr. Horsey). When the Bill was introduced the Prime Minister suggested that perhaps the phraseology might be amended to bring it into conformity with the Interpretation Act. The Solicitor General has prepared an amendment to meet that point, and we were discussing with the promoter of the Bill as to whether he would accept that amendment, or whether he would require time to consider it. The proposition of the Solicitor General is to add a paragraph to section 7 of the Interpretation Act by inserting after the word Sovereign the word 'Victoria Day,' and to make this apply to the Bills of Exchange Act. Of course that is a matter which involves some commercial considerations, as to whether this is to be a legal holiday in the sense of making it a public holiday for the government offices, or whether the banks are to be closed and so on. That is a matter of some moment. We are all agreed upon the principle of the Bill, but time might be taken to discuss these other points.

Mr. SPROULE. I was about to ask if the Bill would affect the banks, or contracts made by individuals.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the suggestion of the Solicitor General were adopted it would be made a bank holiday. My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Horsey) thinks he had better have time to consider it.

Mr. SPROULE. Then had you not better move that the committee rise ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Very well, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the absence of Mr. Stephens, I beg to move that Bill (No. 77) to amend the Railway Act be read the second time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved that said Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways and Canals.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). Mr. Speaker, there is a very thin House, and I understand that it is not the desire of either side to continue this evening ; therefore I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MONK. Before this motion is adopted, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the government has come to any decision in regard to the Easter adjournment. Many members on this side of the House are anxious to know the extent of that adjournment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I believe the intention is to adjourn on Thursday evening at six o'clock until the following Tuesday at three, unless there is a very strong expression of the House to the contrary.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 8.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 28, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 101) respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). Explain.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, when the company obtained legislation in 1892 empowering it to increase its capital stock, a provision was inserted in the Bill that the rates then existing should not be increased without the consent of the Governor in Council. The intention of the Bill which has just been presented is to amend clause 3 of that Act, to compel the company to provide telephonic service on lines or streets where it has already established its system, to enable municipalities or individuals who have been charged rates higher than those in existence at the time of the passage of that Act, to recover any sums in excess that have been paid the company, and to reaffirm the provision that the existing rates shall not be increased without the consent of the Governor in Council.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

I. C. R.—SALE OF STEEL RAILS, &c.

Mr. BELL (Pictou) asked :

1. What quantity of serviceable steel rails and fastenings were sold from the Intercolonial Railway between 30th June, 1899, and 1st January, 1901?
2. To whom were they sold?
3. At what price per ton?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. 3,043 tons.
2. Acadia Coal Company, Beauchemin & Loupiers, R. Weddell, Kent Northern Railway, Salisbury and Harvey Railway, Department of Militia and Defence, Dominion Iron and Steel Company, and York and Carleton Railway.
3. Prices were $20, $21, $21.50 and $22 per ton, depending upon place of delivery.

CANAL, ROUND BAY, N.S.

Mr. BELL (Pictou) asked :

1. Was a canal excavated at Round Bay, Shelburne county, N.S., during the year 1900?
2. Were tenders asked for the work or for materials or transport of materials?
3. From whom was material purchased?
4. What price was paid for timber?
5. What freight was paid on timber?
6. Is the canal now completed?
7. For what purpose was it intended?
8. Has it been found suited to that purpose?
9. Did any government engineer recommend the construction of the work?
10. If so, what was the name of such engineer?

The PRIME MINISTER. Stand, in the absence of the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). I would like to ask my hon. friend what that question refers to. The Minister of Public Works has no knowledge of it. There was a small expenditure of $75 in my department for cutting what I suppose you might call a canal, a passage through the sand bank into a pond. If that is the matter I can answer it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—RECRUITING FOR CONSTABULARY.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. How many men from New Brunswick were accepted for service with the South African Constabulary?
2. Have any, and if so, how many, officers been appointed to said force from New Brunswick?
3. Were any applications made by militia officers of New Brunswick, or members of the first or second contingents from New Brunswick, to the Department of Militia and Defence for commissions in said constabulary? If so, by whom made, and if not granted, why not?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). All the work in connection with recruiting for the South African Constabulary has been and is directly under the control of the Imperial authorities, who sent several officers to Canada for the purpose. The government, including the Militia Department, is not responsible in any way for the recruiting or the selection of officers. The machinery of the Militia Department has been utilized by the Imperial authorities to expedite the work of organizing the force and of their transportation. I am informed that about 125 men were recruited in New Brunswick by C. W. W. McLean, an Imperial officer detailed for the purpose, and only about eleven others offered their services in that province. One hundred and sixty-two applications for commissions passed through the Militia Department, seven of which were from New Brunswick.

JOSEPH PAQUET, PILOT.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Monk—asked :

1. Was Mr. Joseph Paquet, pilot, of St. Jean, Island of Orleans, appointed by the government to any position in connection with the census?
2. If so, to what position, on what date, and what was to be his salary?
3. Has the said Mr. Joseph Paquet been dismissed from said position?
4. If so, on what date, and for what reasons?
5. On whose recommendation had Mr. Joseph Paquet been so appointed?
6. Who recommended his dismissal?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). Mr. Joseph Paquet, pilot, of St. Jean, Island of Orleans, has not been appointed to any position in connection with the census.

MANHOOD SUFFRAGE REGISTRATION.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

Is it the intention of the government to reimburse the municipalities in Ontario the cost incurred in the registration of the manhood

franchise voters for the general elections held in October and November last?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The accounts received up to the present date for the manhood suffrage registration have been paid in accordance with the order in council of October 8th, 1900, which allows the same compensation as is payable for like services under the statutes of the province. If there are any accounts which have not yet been sent in, they will be dealt with on the same basis when received.

DRILL HALL AT BROCKVILLE.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. To whom was the contract let for building the drill hall at the town of Brockville?
2. Were tenders advertised for?
3. Was the lowest tender accepted?
4. Who were the successful tenderers, and what were the amounts of their tenders respectively?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. D. S. Booth.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. D. S. Booth, $42,290.00.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the government if I may expect soon the report that I moved for in the early part of the session with regard to the sale of school lands in Manitoba. The Prime Minister stated at the time that the report of the investigation that was being held would be soon put before the House. I understand the investigation is now closed.

The PRIME MINISTER. Will the hon. gentleman send me a memorandum of this ?

THE $4-BILL ISSUE.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the government to a matter that is exciting considerable comment in the Toronto and other papers, and in order to put myself in order, if you consider it necessary, I will, before I sit down, move the adjournment of the House. It can hardly be said that the present administration have at any time evinced considerable sympathy for Canadian manufacturing concerns. With the advent of the government they took away from what was known as the British Canadian Bank Note Company, the business of printing postage stamps, and also $1 and $2 notes, as well as the $4 notes, and I may also add the printing of revenue stamps. It was pointed out at that time that the government discriminated very unfairly towards the British American Bank Note Company ; but it has remained for the government to issue through this American Bank Note Company, which is controlled by American interests, a new $4-note, which bears upon its face an imprint of the celebrated American Soo canal lock. Now, Sir, this government has spent some $4,000,000 in the construction of a large lock on the canal between Lake Huron and Lake Superior. I have been in Sault Ste. Marie, and as a Canadian I felt a little pride in the fact that this government had there such a magnificent lock. From time to time I have seen that the American people, through their magazines, and notably through the Cosmopolitan, publishing whole pages on the greatness of the American people as exemplified in the fact that they had constructed this immense lock at Sault Ste. Marie. Now, I contend that when we have any great works our own we should not endeavour to hide our light under a bushel, and having expended that large amount, and having constructed a lock that, in my estimation, can be fairly compared with the American canal lock, I think we should not try to suppress that fact, that we should give it all the publicity we possibly can. When I appeal to the government to withdraw this issue of $4 bills, that they have sent out, I fear I shall be appealing to deaf ears, because those hon. gentlemen from time to time show an inclination, go where they will, to patronize American concerns rather than Canadian ones. I recall the fact that last year I saw standing in the Central Railway station a whole train of cars, and instead of being able to boast that they were Canadian productions, made from our Canadian hardwoods and by Canadian labour, we were humiliated by the knowledge of the fact that these had been imported from the United States ; and it was only yesterday that the Minister of Railways and Canals, in answer to a question, made the announcement of the fact that nearly $200,000 worth of cars had recently been purchased in the United States. Now, we have to stand here and appeal to the hon. gentlemen to patronize Canadian industries. For myself, I hope and trust that they will have some Canadian pride among them, that they will endeavour to patronize Canadian concerns. It is a matter of fact to-day that while we have in Ontario first-class mechanics and first-class manufacturing concerns, the Minister of Railways and Canals turns his back on these and goes over to the other side to purchase that which we require. And it remains for this American Note Company, this importation from the United States, a company that has also imported its employees to come here to take the place of so many Canadians, a company which takes out of the pockets of Canadians so much money, and takes that back to their stockholders on the American side—it remains for this great concern to rub it into the Canadian people and to be able to advertise

from one end of the country to the other that the Canadians are such an insignificant body of people that they are actually paying for the privilege of advertising this great American lock on the face of these Canadian bills. Now, I do not know how this happened. Surely it could not have been through the cognizance of the Minister of Railways and Canals himself that the new American lock and not the Canadian lock should be presented on the picture. Surely, if that hon. gentleman was consulted, why did he not insist, if a lock was to be shown on this bill, that it should be the Canadian and not the American lock ? But the Minister of Railways and Canals sits by unconcernedly and does not care which lock is represented. But it may have been a spirit of envy that prompted him in this matter, because the Canadian lock had been constructed under the rule of his predecessor, and probably for that reason he did not wish to see so magnificent a work pictured on a Canadian bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Would it make any difference in the hon. gentleman's view if he were to be made aware of the fact that, except from reading the reports in the newspapers, I never knew that any such bank bill had been issued bearing any such representation ? That does not come within my department.

Mr. BENNETT. I did think that the Minister of Railways and Canals would have taken sufficient interest in the matter that came before the council, such as the issue of a new series of bills, that he would have insisted on some great work connected with this department being depicted on that bill. He might have had, for instance, a picture of the new Victoria bridge printed on it, leading the trade of Canada to Portland, and assisted by this government to the extent of half a million dollars. But perhaps a spirit of jealousy also prevented his doing this, since it was the Minister of Public Works who led off in that matter. If this occurred through mistake or inadvertence, I am afraid all the blame must fall upon the Minister of Finance, and if he will promise that these four dollar bills will be at once withdrawn from the public gaze and be replaced by bills that will bear the imprint of the Canadian lock, he will be doing the country a service. But before the bills are withdrawn, I would ask the Finance Minister not to treat them in the same way as our postage stamps have been, because it is disgraceful to know that postage stamps are lying all over this Dominion, and in foreign countries as well, unused, and yet such stamps of denominations larger than a dollar will not be exchanged by the government for ordinary stamps in current issue, nor will they be redeemed. We have thus some reason to fear that with the view of making the surplus larger, the hon. gentleman may at once declare these bills non-redeemable. He may also rely on the American public, pardonably proud of the fact that the Canadian government have the picture of an American lock adorning their paper money issue, buying them up as souvenirs and keeping them for all time to come as an example of the gullibility, if it be gullibility, or the ignorance, if it be ignorance, or the kindness, if it be kindness, of the Canadian government in advertising the American lock at Sault Ste. Marie at the expense of the Canadian lock, although the latter is equally as good, if not a great deal better. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Hon. gentlemen opposite are so much in the habit of talking economy and practicing extravagance that I am not surprised at them complaining of the action of this government in awarding the contract for the engraving of our Dominion notes to the party who put in the lowest and most substantial tender. It would have been much more in accord with the practice of hon. gentlemen opposite to award contracts to some party favourite at the cost of vast sums to the public. In this particular transaction, it was unfortunate for the hon. gentleman's friends that it was impossible to award them the contract, because, although given every opportunity to tender, they declined to supply the notes on fair and reasonable terms, and we made the contract with other people who have a great reputation for doing the best class of work. These people have built an establishment in Ottawa which is employing Canadian workmen and adding to the wealth of Ottawa and the Dominion, and giving the highest class of work.

As to the picture on the bills, I regret that my hon. friend has allowed himself to be imposed upon. This is a very large country, and I must confess that I have not had the opportunity of visiting that very enterprising portion of Canada known as the 'Soo,' and therefore cannot speak from personal knowledge. There would be some excuse, therefore, if I were imposed upon, but my hon. friend who comes from that portion of Canada has no excuse. He says that this is a picture of an American lock.

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that it is not, and I will give him evidence he cannot gainsay. The picture on the four dollar note is the picture of the Canadian Pacific Railway steamer Athabasca coming through the lock, and we know that the Canadian Pacific Railway is too patriotic an institution to patronize any other than a Canadian lock. We know that the financial critic of the opposition is himself a director of the

Canadian Pacific Railway, and are we to be told by one of his supporters that such an eminent member of the party opposite would dream of permitting his steamer, the Athabasca, to use the American lock ?

Mr. BENNETT. It went over there to coal up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no need to go there to coal. There is a magnificent lock on the Canadian side, and when the picture was submitted to me of a Canadian Pacific Railway steamer passing through the lock, I knew that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) was too patriotic to allow a steamer belonging to the company of which he is a director to go through the American lock, and accepted the picture. My hon. friend, I am afraid, has too easily allowed himself to be imposed upon.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). I had not intended to say anything on the subject, but I do know the American 'Soo' canal and the Canadian canal, and here is one of the bills, and there is no doubt that the picture on this bill is that of the American canal.

Mr. LOGAN. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is referring to a document, and the rule of the House is that all documents referred to should be laid on the Table.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it is necessary for a private member to lay on the Table a document to which he refers.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I do not understand the Finance Minister to have affirmed that the picture on this bill is that of the Canadian lock.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I gave my authority.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The only authority the hon. gentleman has is that he sees in the lock on the bill what he believes to be one of the Canadian Pacific steamboats.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A Canadian Pacific Railway steamboat.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Though this may appear a laughable matter to hon. gentlemen opposite it is more serious than they imagine. For my part, if my party were in power, and the government which I supported issued a national bill of the Dominion of Canada, and on that bill deliberately put the picture of a public work of the United States, and not of Canada, unless they would withdraw that bill from circulation, I would cease to support them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I am surprised that there should be hon. gentlemen on the other side who should treat a statement of that sort in that manner. That is all I have to say. Hon. gentlemen on that side have a perfect right to treat any matter as they choose, and to treat as a subject only worthy of ridicule the fact that on the national money of the country, the government have put the public work of a foreign country. Why do they not make the thing complete ? I see here Their Excellencies the Earl and Countess of Minto. Why do you not put on President and Mrs. McKinley ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I see on the back of this bill this parliament building, the pride of Canada. Why don't you put on the capitol at Washington ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Put them all on. You have as much right to laugh at that as you have to laugh at this thing. I am not posing on this question. I saw it mentioned in the paper last night, that being the first I had known of it. I protest against the question being treated with such levity as is shown by hon. gentlemen opposite. When hon. gentlemen care so little for the emblems of their country, the public works and the institutions of their country, I have not much confidence that they have the same feeling towards the country itself that, I thank heaven, my bringing up and my nationality, that I have.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Hon. gentlemen are welcome to shout. It may be that I am sentimental. I have got past the time of life, perhaps, when sentiment should be exhibited ; but I hope that I shall cease to live when these sentiments that I now declare cease to pervade my heart and my life and my conduct.

Mr. MACLEAN. In view of what has been said, it is evident that a mistake has been made. That being the case, is it not the intention of the leader of the government and of this House to tell us that it is their intention to withdraw this note from circulation ?

Mr. BOURASSA. I would like to put a question to the patriotic member for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale). What were the loyal feelings of these gentlemen, who would not support the government in having a picture of an American canal on a Canadian bill, when the government that they supported voted a great deal of Canadian money to build a railway in the state of Maine.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) evidently has information that I have not gained from the study of the public accounts. If he will show me

reasons to believe that his information is correct, I shall be glad to give him an answer.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). If one were to judge from the speech of the Minister of Finance he would come to the conclusion that the statement made by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) was incorrect, and that there was no picture of the United States Soo canal on the Canadian four-dollar bill. But he cannot deny that such is the case. He says that there is a Canadian steamer going through the canal, therefore he is justified in supposing it to be a Canadian canal. But if he went down to Portland and saw the Grand Trunk Railway unloading their thousands of cars at the wharfs of that city, would he conclude that he was in the city of Montreal? That would be just as reasonable as to suppose that a picture of the American Soo canal is a representation of the Canadian Soo canal. The answer of the Minister of Finance was unworthy of him, because he is endeavouring to leave an impression on the minds of hon. members that is not true. I would ask the minister squarely: Is the picture of the canal on the four-dollar bill a picture of the Canadian canal or of the United States canal?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I never had the pleasure of seeing the two and cannot give personal testimony.

Mr. WALLACE. That is no answer at all. Nobody requires the hon. minister to see the canal—that is not the question. The question is whether, now that the matter has been called to his attention by the public press and by the hon. member for East Simcoe, he is going to rise in his place and attempt to mislead the House and the country with the statement that, as it is a Canadian vessel that is going through, it is presumably a Canadian canal that it is traversing. He has heard the statement of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) who, holding the bill in his hand and knowing the place represented in this engraving, tells him that it is a picture of the American canal. The hon. minister now has the information and does not need to go to the spot to verify the statement. Having the information, what is he going to do about it? Is he going to withdraw the bill?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will consider that.

Mr. WALLACE. I think they had better consider it and pretty quickly too, and come to a conclusion quickly. And the only conclusion that will suit the people of Canada is that the bill be withdrawn from circulation. It is true that the Canadian people will lose some money by the printing of a bill that cannot be used, but this is only another evidence of the reckless disregard of the interests of the people shown by this government else their subserviency to the people of the United States. In either case it is to be condemned.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if these bills were not submitted to some person for examination and approval before they were allowed to be printed; and, if so, to whom?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course, the whole thing is submitted to me for approval before it is printed.

Mr. SPROULE. Of course, the hon. minister may have been innocently deceived—that may happen to any person. But, now that the matter has been brought to his attention, is he still going to allow our money to be made an advertising medium for the United States? I do not think he should do so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The plan has been adopted of printing upon our notes scenes illustrating our various industries. One scene shows a wheat field. I am not prepared to guarantee that it is a Canadian wheat field. Another gives an illustration of the lumber industry. An American log, does not differ very much, I fancy, from a Canadian log, and I am not prepared to speak as to the log in that picture. And so on through the whole range of our industries. I desired that the great canal works of Canada should be represented, and that, for that purpose, a canal scene should be obtained. One lock is so much like another that hon. gentlemen may have discovered in this picture some likeness to a lock on the American side.

An hon. MEMBER. Why not take the Trent canal?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One hon. gentleman suggests that we might take the Trent canal. I think the Tay canal would suit hon. gentlemen better. But if, to please hon. gentlemen opposite, we were to withdraw the bill and substitute one with a scene on the Tay canal, after it was issued, perhaps there might be difficulty in proving that it was not a representation of some other canal.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). The Minister of Finance is very kind in offering to alter the vignette on his bill to one of the Tay canal. A picture of that canal might have been published long before that hon. gentleman was born. He seems to think that he can raise some imputation by merely mentioning this canal. I have heard the same thing throughout the country, as if there was something wonderful or wrong about it, or something to be laughed at or sneered at about it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not charge anything.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Tay canal is a work that was undertaken by a private company and built before the hon. gentleman was born. The charter contained a condition that the government could take the work over at any time. The government did take it over before I was a minister of the Crown and finished it, and it is one of the most important works ever built in Canada. It will compare favourably with thirteen or fourteen schemes we voted for last session in the shape of wharfs and buildings for the county of Shelburne. The Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) who ought to be the watch dog of this administration asked us last session to grant money for fifteen or——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes; last session——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. member must not forget that we are now discussing simply the question which has been brought before the House by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is discussing some other question. The subject under discussion by the House is the printing of the four dollar Dominion bills.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If the Speaker had allowed me, before giving his ruling, I would have put myself perfectly in order. I was going to point out that instead of putting the Tay canal or the Soo canal on these bills, there are fourteen or fifteen public works which are being constructed in the constituency of the Minister of Finance, which could have been selected for the honour, better than either the Tay canal or the Soo canal. If you rule me out of order, Mr. Speaker, I have simply to say that with all due deference to your ruling, I was as much in order as was the Minister of Finance. I could proceed to show the reasons why these works in Shelburne county should be used as a vignette on the four dollar bills and circulated from one end of the country to the other. The Minister of Finance talked about the letting of contracts. He is the last man in the House who should refer to that matter. He is the spokesman of a government whose administration of the affairs of this country has been notorious; a government that does not pay the slightest attention either to the law or to their own orders in council in the letting of contracts. He is the last man who should rise in this House to taunt us in reference to contract letting. What has he to say to any contract that has been let in this country by the Conservative government? They were always let above broad——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, they were always given to the lowest tenderer, and there was none of that manipulating about them that we see every day under this government, and which is a disgrace to the name of the public men of this country. We see hundreds of thousands of dollars given to favourites——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Question.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not even certificates required——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If I happen to be out of order, I am merely replying to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Finance. In deference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, which I believe to be right, I shall say no more.

Mr. BENNETT. As ten thousand dollars is the standard amount now in vogue with this government, I hope and trust that this issue of four dollar bills will not exceed that amount. And as the Minister of Finance is like the burglar, that all locks look alike to him I suppose it makes little difference so far as he is concerned which lock is on the bill. I trust that the minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) will immediately withdraw the circulation of these bills, and that he will see the last of his advertisement of the American locks on Dominion notes. After the explanation of the Minister of Finance, I shall withdraw the motion to adjourn the House.

Motion withdrawn.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Fielding:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. ONESIPHORE TURGEON (Gloucester, N.B.) Mr. Speaker, I beg your indulgence, and the indulgence of this House, in my attempt, in the discharge of my duty to my constituents, to raise my feeble voice, after the eloquent addresses, strong in argument and lofty in sentiments, which have on different occasions, been delivered in this sanctuary of the people. Truly, from the very opening of this parliament, we have been brought under the influence of noble thoughts, reaching our mind and our heart with a magnetism, as though the great orators of the nineteenth century of Christian civilization, which have come and gone, had told us nothing of the noble virtues which have elevated mankind in the differ-

ent portions of the globe, in which great nations have founded their existence for the expansion of the sentiments of equality, fraternity, justice and charity; sentiments which are above the wealth of trade, above the ambition of commerce, and without which, commerce, trade and industry can never reach the greatness, can never possess the stability they require for the true, and permanent happiness of the people.

We admired the hon. gentleman who moved the address (Mr. Guthrie) and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcil), the seconder; the former in his able statement of the true position of the country under a beneficent prosperity which has settled steadfast in our midst, opening new industries, new avenues of trade, and in the sequel of gigantic financial and commercial operations, procuring the comfort required for domestic happiness in steady employment and increase of wages to our industrial classes. We admired the hon. gentleman for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) in his honest declaration of the true feelings of his people, nursing a sincere patriotism, permeated with generous loyalty to all races who, inspired by the sense of gratitude, cherish the one common ambition to live in harmony with other people, for the glory and the expansion of the British nation and of British liberty. That hon. gentleman has, no doubt, heard in his travels on the opposite shores of the bay which separates us, the Acadian fisherman, when the storm has abated, and he feels that he will once more reach his harbour and his fireside, after having sung his cherished hymn, 'Ave Maris Stella,' sing also, in the strain of the same emotion 'God Save the Queen.' We were then, with scarcely any notice, brought to witness the most gratifying spectacle of men of different creeds from all parts of the country, rising from their seats on both sides of this House, rising above party lines, solemnly to express their urgent desire that the only vestige of the bitterness of centuries gone by, should be eliminated from British statutes.

It was then that we admired the bright, generous leader of the opposition who followed the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall), both gentlemen from that happy province where harmony, restored in past centuries, has ever since reigned undisturbed. Their common sentiments, generous feelings are a glorious effect of a long-lived peace and harmony; their mingled aspirations the guarantee of the future. The rich and noble sentiments expressed on that occasion, recalled the days of a great epoch when the appeals, the pathetic appeals to liberty and justice, of Grattan and Curran, of Burke and Pitt, had already softened the heart of the British nation, which was only awaiting the showers of the powerful eloquence of Daniel O'Connell, to melt in a wealthy fusion of the noble sentiments of fraternity, equality, justice, liberty and charity—to the honour of the British nation, and the comfort of the rest of the Christian world, and of Canada in particular.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that I should have ere this made special mention of the eulogy of our most beloved and regretted Queen Victoria, by the right hon. leader of the government. My reticence, Mr. Speaker, is owing to the fact that it is a monument which, in the depth of my admiration, a sense of delicacy forbids me to touch. It is a monument which we are better able to contemplate than to describe. Nevertheless, one particular popular passion is stimulated by the consideration of that great speech.

It is the jealousy of the Canadian people, in the depth of their affection, of their admiration of the great sovereign who has been called away, a jealousy which forbids one to believe that another loved her more, admired her more than he did; that one can be more grateful than he for the immense benefactions she has been pleased to pour upon Canada during the happy days of her long and glorious reign. Upon him—the orator of the Canadian people—upon him alone was bestowed the providential gift of a language adequate to his feelings of appreciation of her great virtues and noble deeds. To each and every one of us belongs the just, undeniable claim to nurse in silence and modesty, the same sentiments of love, of loyalty, of gratitude—the same wishes for the welfare of her empire under the sovereignty of her worthy son and his successors. Oh, Victoria! you have prayed for your subjects on the day of your coronation, and your prayers have complacently brought down divine blessings upon your territories. Pray yet further from a higher throne, and from this continent of America, from this soil of Canada, the prayers of your French Catholic subjects will meet yours in heaven.

It was under such favourable conditions of peace, harmony, and prosperity, with opening industries, and with trade extending with gigantic strides, that the hon. Minister of Finance was called upon the other day to reveal to the Canadian people the true state of their public affairs. Great things had already been achieved by the hon. gentleman upon whom the duty devolved of looking after our home requirements, and our fiscal and trade relations with other countries. He had reached unprecedented results by his inspired combination of loyalty with figures, by his mingled gratitude and generosity in his compounding of dollars and cents, of pounds, shillings and pence, which was to establish our commercial and trade relations with the mother country.

It has been the good fortune of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, when the voice of the people placed in his hands the care of our destinies, realizing his situation, and the expectations of our mingled community, finding that he had

to form a government strong in upright and honest diplomacy, able to cope with the exigencies of the hour, and the requirements of the country, to have called to his assistance men whose well-known talent and ability were already a guarantee to the people, and to have been in a position to distribute to each of them the branch of the administration for which he was particularly well qualified.

It is owing to his intelligent distribution of offices to his colleagues that the country has been in the happy position of contemplating during the last three or four years, a series of eloquent surpluses of revenue over expenditure. I say eloquent surpluses, because they do not give us a mere mathematical subtraction of the amount of expenditure from the larger amount of revenue, but because his figures give us also, in their infallible language, the story of the great prosperity of the country, coupled with an unprecedented increase of trade.

In his budget speech, delivered on the 14th of the month, the hon. Minister of Finance was able to show a surplus of $8,054,714.51, which, added to the two previous surpluses of 1898 and 1899, form a total of surpluses since 1896 of $14,615,075. Deducting from this amount a deficit of $519,981 for the year 1896, partly due to the Conservative administration, we have a net amount of surpluses of $14,095,144 over the ordinary expenditure of the government.

During the last year the government have had to meet large expenses on capital account. They have had to provide for an amount of $7,468,843 for public works, government railways, railway subsidies, subsidy to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. Notwithstanding all this expenditure, the public debt, instead of being increased, has been decreased by $779,639. The net debt of Canada on June 30, 1899, was $266,273,446, while the net debt on June 30, 1900, was $265,493,806.

Besides this extraordinary state of affairs for the past years during the administration of the present government, the Minister of Finance also declares to us that in his calculations for the current year, he expects a revenue of $52,750,000, and a probable expenditure of $46,400,000. He is, therefore, in a position to expect, at the end of the current exercise, another surplus of $6,350,000. His happy calculations of the past are a guarantee for his future expectations.

Now, having considered the history of the revenues and the expenditures during the term of the administration, the intelligent citizen of Canada naturally turns his attention to the state of the public debt under the same administration. This administration has only been in existence for four fiscal years, and here is what the intelligent citizen finds. He finds that the increase of the national debt has been :

In 1896-7	$3,041,163
" 1897-8	2,417,802
" 1898-9	2,317,047

In 1899-1900, the public debt has been reduced by $779,000. So, the total increase during the four years has been $6,986,373, which is an average yearly increase of $1,749,000 for the four years.

Our intelligent citizen will then turn his attention to the trade of the country, to the growth of this trade, and the increase which he anticipates to a certain extent by the happy methods of our farmers, the happy turn of our mechanics, the jubilant feelings of our traders. He looks at the amount of the trade in 1897, when Sir Wilfrid Laurier established his tariff for revenue, after having lowered the tariff on 157 articles of importation. He finds that the volume of our trade in 1896 was $239,000,000, and he finds that four years later, at the end of the last fiscal year, it had reached the amount of $381,000,000, an increase of $142,000,000 in four years only, or an average yearly increase of $35,500,000.

He finds that our farmers are doing more business and making more money. For he finds also by the budget speech that during the last three years the exportations of the products of our farms to foreign markets have increased by $54,000,000.

The intelligent Canadian citizen will go further in his investigations, and he will inquire into the rate of taxation. The Hon. Minister of Finance by his budget speech shows that, taking as a basis the importations for consumption and duties imposed upon them, the proportion of duties collected in 1896 was 19·28 per cent, while the proportion of duties collected in 1900, was only 15·98 per cent, or a difference of 2·30 per cent, or one-eighth of all taxes.

But, Mr. Speaker, our opponents claim that if we have surpluses, we also have increased the public debt, and that the Conservative party, in the first years of their administration, likewise had surpluses. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), speaking on this subject the other night, referred in eulogistic terms, to the Conservative administration under the late Sir Leonard Tilley. Sir Leonard Tilley, he said, had in 1883 a surplus of $6,316,000, and in 1884 had come before parliament with another surplus of $7,064,492, or, as the hon. member for Pictou makes it, a total of $8,073,492. That achievement, said the hon. gentleman, had eclipsed the brilliant record which our present Finance Minister was able to lay before parliament on the 14th instant.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not behind the hon. gentleman in my admiration of the late Sir Leonard Tilley, for I know well the patriotic sentiments and tender feelings of this distinguished statesman, of whom the province of New Brunswick is proud. But for all that, I can hardly believe that had

Sir Leonard Tilley continued in office he would have been able to repeat these surpluses. On the contrary, I do not believe that he could have avoided the deficits which his successors had to face, unless perhaps he could have shown himself possessed of a stronger power of resistance to the clamours and pressure of the manufacturers.

But, Mr. Speaker, surpluses of similar amounts may have been produced under dissimilar circumstances. Surpluses may be produced by different causes, and with different effects.

We have seen the circumstances under which the surpluses of our present Minister of Finance have been arrived at. Under a state of unexampled prosperity, and unexampled increase of trade, an increase of trade which has leaped in four years from $239,000,000 to $381,000,000. Our present surpluses have been brought about by an immense increase of trade following a general decrease of tariff. Our present tariff is so framed as to open new markets, foreign markets to the products of the country, and above all to the products of the farmer which have proved an increase in the foreign markets only of $54,000,000 during the last four years. In a state of prosperity, and with plenty of money, our people have imported more largely. An immense amount of importation of goods has followed, producing a corresponding increase of revenue, while the percentage of taxation has been decreased by one-eighth, or more, as I have already stated.

But, Mr. Speaker, under what circumstances did the Conservative party raise their surpluses? Were their surpluses the sequel of a large increase of trade in the country? Decidedly no. For we find that during the eighteen years of Conservative administration the volume of our trade, which was $203,000,000 in 1880, had only reached $239,000,000 in 1896, a total increase in sixteen years of thirty-six millions, or an average yearly increase of $2,250,000. Whereas our trade increased by $142,000,000 in four years, their trade increased by thirty-six millions in sixteen years.

What then was the cause of their surpluses? Their surpluses were due, therefore, to an increase of taxation upon the same amount of trade. They were due to an increase of tariff upon the same amount of imports. The taxable power of the country was drained, and the surpluses of the first few years were necessarily followed by a series of deficits, which their financiers were impotent to redeem or to stop.

But our adversaries will tell us again: 'You have increased the public debt.' Our reply is simple. The public debt during the four years of the administration of our friends has received a total increase of $6,986,373, or an average yearly increase of $1,746,593, while the returns of the Conservative administration show an average yearly increase of over $6,500,000 during the sixteen years of their administration.

Our hon. friends opposite lay considerable stress on the government continuing, instead of decreasing expenditure, and reducing the public debt. Well, we all know that while there is no desire on the part of our people to see the public debt increase, they are too intelligent not to understand that we must first see that the commerce of the country, our avenues of commerce, and our facilities for expansion, are improved as much as possible. I have the honour to represent the constituency of Gloucester in which there is a mixed population. In 1896 the people of that county had not yet gained confidence in the Liberal party, but after four years experience of the administration of this government, they gave expression to their confidence in the present policy and administration, by returning me by a majority of 1,000 votes but four, although I had been defeated in 1896. This is proof positive of the satisfaction of the people of that county, at any rate, with the present order of things, and I am convinced that it is not their desire that the government should neglect the wants of the country in order to reduce the public debt. We believe in a policy of opening up new avenues of trade, of improving our facilities for the transportation of grain from the west, and I have seen with pleasure, during the last few days, hon. members opposite, joining with the supporters of the government in voting millions of dollars for the improvements of the great harbours and lakes and seaports of this country. We have voted and are prepared to vote liberally for such improvements.

The Department of Fisheries is one which has also been well looked after by the present government. I say it in all sincerity that the present government has shown every interest in the requirements of the fisheries and in looking after the wants of our fishermen, engaged in that most arduous of pursuits, and who contribute so largely to the revenues of the country.

I have been in a position to see the results of some of the expenditures for the improvement of our harbours and to provide protection for the fishermen of my own and neighbouring counties. But the further attention of the government is required in that direction. The chief pursuit of my constituents is in the deep-sea fishery. The government cannot pay too serious attention to the requirements of that hardy and industrious class. We have seen with pleasure the introduction by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in various counties of the maritime provinces of the system of bait refrigeration. I hope that the hon. minister will not slacken in his efforts until that

system is established along the whole coast of the maritime provinces and in the counties of Gaspe and Bonaventure, in the neighbouring province of Quebec. The system will prove of great benefit, not merely to the fishermen, by saving their time, but to the country at large, through the increased catch the fishermen will be able to procure during the season. Much time is now lost in looking after bait. Our fishermen, returning at the end of the week, must occupy a great part of Monday in securing fresh bait. With the new system, they will be able to attend to the fishing alone, while their sons will be able to look after the procuring of the bait and seasoning it ready for the use of the fishermen when they are ready to start out on Monday morning. I should be derelict in my duty if I did not commend this improvement with the strongest words at my command, on this first occasion of my addressing this honourable House, or, indeed, addressing any audience except my own people, among whom I have lived for thirty years, and whom I am accustomed to address in the language of my heart and without the difficulty I find in using the English tongue. I hope the government will continue to have at heart the interests of our fishermen. During the four years of their administration, this government has done much by the construction of break-waters and wharfs to protect not only the property but the lives of our fishermen. While speaking on this subject, I cannot but refer to the great storm of the 13th of September last, when thirty-seven of our most useful citizens, noble, generous sons, and faithful husbands and worthy fathers, whose sole ambition was to work for the Christian education of their children, true representatives of that simple spirit of Christianity which has always prevailed in that community, fell victims to the fury of the waves. But, while we were compelled to witness a spectacle, which, perhaps, a man could not endure to see twice in a lifetime, we had the consolation of knowing that, owing to the improvements made by the government, owing to the deepening of the channel, instead of being compelled to go twenty-five or fifty miles around Miscou Island, many fishermen were able to make the harbour and so find shelter and safety, where otherwise they must inevitably have shared the death of their comrades. Some sixty or seventy-five men who would have lost their lives on that memorable day were able to enter the harbour. Fifteen minutes later and they must have perished. While I ask the government to continue their attention to the interests of the fishermen of the maritime provinces, I should fail in my duty if I did not express the thanks of my people to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and also to the Minister of Public Works for the construction of break-waters and other improvements to facilitate the work of our fishermen and protect their lives and property.

Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to claim so long the attention of this honourable House. But I feel that I have one more duty to perform before I can take my seat and before I can return to my constituents. As the first French-speaking member who has had the honour to raise his voice in this parliament since the noble utterance of the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) the other evening as to the position of the French Canadians and the Liberal party and his splendid eulogy of our beloved leader. I cannot but express my sincere thanks, my appreciation and admiration of his noble words for the encouragement of the French Canadian population. I shall not attempt to speak for the French Canadians of the province of Quebec. They will, no doubt, express their views at the first opportunity. But, as the only French-speaking member from the maritime provinces who will address the House in this debate—as my hon. friend from Kent, N.B. (Mr. LeBlanc), I understand, will not have the opportunity, as the debate must close in a few hours—I must speak on behalf of my fellow-French Acadians. Knowing their sentiments, knowing their gratitude for British institutions and the treatment they have received under those institutions, I must thank the Minister of Customs for his eloquent expression of the feeling which I know he entertains and to assure him that the good feeling which has so long existed will be improved and strengthened by his noble and eloquent words. He has, I am sure, by those words, endeared himself to every French Acadian. The harmony that was restored centuries ago still remains undisturbed, and the sentiments expressed by the Minister of Customs are cherished in the hearts of my people. From this day, I know, we shall be able to contemplate with joy and hope the fact that we have six millions of souls from the Atlantic to the Pacific, French Canadian, French Acadian, English, Scotch, and Irish—Catholics and Protestants—working together for the welfare of the community, devoted to the prosperity of the country, united by a spirit of Christian brotherhood and with faith in the future of Canada under British institutions. I must say also that the words of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) are greatly appreciated by the French Acadians of the maritime provinces, and that owing to the sentiments expressed by that hon. gentleman and by the Minister of Customs, the French Acadians will be more essentially British in the future than in the past. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members of this House for the patient hearing that has been accorded me.

Mr. JAMES KENDRY (West Peterborough). Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have not been able to follow the hon. gentleman

(Mr. Turgeon) as closely as I would like. In the few remarks that I am about to make I intend to confine myself almost exclusively to the effects of the preferential tariff on the woollen industry of this country. As a practical woollen manufacturer of over thirty-five years, I may be supposed to know something about the conditions governing that industry in this country.

The capital employed in the woollen mills of Canada amounts to about $15,000,000 to $20,000,000, and employ over 12,000 hands, and has at least 60,000 people directly dependent upon it. Now, who are these people ? They are the sons and daughters of our hardy industrious pioneers, their fathers have helped to build up this great Dominion, they have been taxed for its development, they have struggled to provide schools for their children and fit them for good citizenship ; and I contend that they have been successful, for in no country under the sun, not even in the United States, can we find a more intelligent, more industrious, more progressive class of people than the woollen and cotton operatives of Canada. These are the citizens that this government, with the preferential tariff, is surely and certainly going to drive out of our borders to seek homes and a livelihood in the United States —a country that at least knows the value of protecting its markets for its own people.

Last session the woollen manufacturers had an interview with the government, and we pointed out exactly what is happening to-day. We pointed out that a large number of our best operatives were leaving, and would continue to leave for the United States. Within the last seven weeks I know of seven mills in this country, in one of which I am interested myself, who have had to discharge 50 hands, and within the next three or four weeks they are liable to be shut up altogether for some time. On the floor of this House on March 30th, 1900, the Minister of Customs pointed with pride to the increased importation of goods under the preferential tariff ; he gave a list of the imports of eighteen of the largest industries of Great Britain to Canada. Had the hon. gentleman stopped for a moment to consider, or had he cared to consider, he would have seen in that statement of his a very startling fact. He would have seen, Sir, that 56 per cent of the whole increase was made up of woollens and cottons, woollens alone furnishing 38 per cent of the total increase, thus leaving the remaining 44 per cent to be divided amongst sixteen other industries. He would also have found that it took thirteen of the industries to make up the value of the importation in woollens alone. But I will put these figures a little plainer. Of all the goods imported in 1900 under the preferential tariff, about 30 per cent were woollen goods. In round numbers, about $7,000,000 worth of woollens were imported out of the whole $26,000,000. Now, is it any wonder that men who have invested capital in woollen manufactures are very much discontented with the operation of the preferential tariff ? As I have already mentioned, it is driving a large number of our best employees out of this country to the United States. Would it not seem to be a wiser policy, Mr. Speaker, for this government to endeavour to keep at home our own Canadians instead of letting them go away to the south ; instead of spending large sums of money to bring in Doukhobors and other people of that class ? Our government spend half a million dollars a year to bring in immigrants, and still pursue a policy that drives away our own native born Canadians. I have a letter saying that last week some 80 or 90 left the village of Hespeler alone, they have gone to the United States, and in a short time they will probably send for their families. Now, we must say for the United States that they are careful to look after their own people, and in that respect we might take a lesson from them. I want to show you exactly what this policy will do in so far as the labouring men are concerned. I have always wanted to see the workingmen well paid, but we do not want to see them put on the same level as the workingmen of Great Britain. No man in this country wants to see our employees treated as they are in England.

Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I had better name to you those thirteen industries which I mentioned a moment ago. They are : Drugs, dyes and chemicals ; flax, hemp and jute manufactures ; glass and its manufactures ; machinery and other iron and steel manufactures ; soaps, oils, paints and colours ; paper and its manufactures ; pickles, sauces and capers ; earthenware and chinaware ; fancy goods, hats and caps ; leather and its manufactures. Now, out of these thirteen industries, woollens alone are affected, that is the industry that this preference is especially going to strike.

Now, I claim that it not only affects the woollen industry but it affects wool. In the North-west they are beginning to grow as fine a quality of wool as is to be found in any part of the world, and we are now brought under a policy which compels us to close our mills to their wool. Just when they are getting to the point where they can produce any quantity of wool for their own market, they find their own market being shut to them. This preferential tariff policy also affects the towns all over the country where woollen industries are established. Some of these towns have given bonuses to the woollen factories, and possibly exemption from taxation. Let me state here that four years ago I condemned in the strongest terms the policy of giving a preference to any other country but Canada. I stand in this House as a Canadian, and support Canadian interests. I was

born and brought up in Canada, and I say that we have no right to give any other country a preference to the detriment of our own people. If you want to build up this country you have got to do it on broader lines than the government are pursuing, we must build it up on the lines of our own interests. Surely our workingmen have vested rights in this country as well as capitalists. Those operating in our woollen mills usually occupy their own houses, they have social, pecuniary and political interests in this country, which the government ought to respect. Some time ago, when I was mayor of the town of Peterborough, I remember that many manufacturers were talking of locating there, but they were always afraid of the Liberals getting into power, knowing that if they did a Liberal government would probably pass legislation that would jeopardize their capital.

In 1896, the right hon. the Prime Minister came to Peterborough and stated on the public platform that the manufacturer of this country would not be disturbed, and that vested rights had no cause to fear the advent of the Liberals to power. Let me ask this House, if the Prime Minister has been true to his promise. What position does he occupy to-day ? I have been nearly five years a member of this House, and never heard the policy of the Liberal party defined until the last ten days, when the Prime Minister and his supporters told us what they thought about it. I had always believed that the policy of this government was on the principal of the old national policy, and for my part I found it hard to discover where the line was drawn. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) has also spoken, and he has announced what he thinks the Liberal policy is. Well, Sir, we know what his opinions on fiscal questions were in former years, we know that he stated that if he got into power he would remove the last vestige of protection from the manufactures of Canada. We did not expect much from that hon. gentleman, and, at least to some extent, we have not been disappointed. The Prime Minister, in the course of his speech, said :

> If we impose a duty of 25 per cent on articles of any kind, it is manifest that the manufacturers of similar goods in this country must have the benefit of that 25 per cent.

That statement shows how very little the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows about the trade of this country. It is well known that in countries where goods are manufactured, certain goods are sold cheaper for export than they are sold in the country of manufacture. I myself know some gentlemen in this House who buy machinery in the United States, and they can buy for export to Canada cheaper than the people of the United States can buy exactly the same goods in their own country. It is the same way in England, and, therefore, although we may have 25 per cent, it is not 25 per cent on the real value of the goods. As a matter of fact, we do not even get our old protection to-day, simply because they sell job goods, or 'seconds,' for this country. Therefore, we have not the protection we should have. This government should take means to appoint some competent authority to adjust the value of the goods imported into Canada. As a matter of fact, we do not know what the duty is to-day, because at one port they collect one duty and at another port another duty. There should be appraisers in each town, as is the case in the United States, and no matter whether they are job goods or seconds or anything else, they should pay duty under the regular tariff and at their full proper price.

Now, the provinces most directly affected by the preferential tariff are the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, which are the largest manufacturing provinces in the Dominion. And while I speak with particular reference to the woollen industry, I wish to say, that although other industries are less affected by the preference, yet, all our industries must be injured to a greater or less extent. The great question with us in the woollen industry is the question of labour, and the more labour we put on our goods the further we get away from competition with England. We pay our workmen in Canada from 50 to 75 per cent higher wages than they pay them in England, and hon. gentlemen will see at once to what extent we are handicapped in this respect. I believe that it is impossible for us to reduce our wages in Canada, because we have a high protectionist country to the south of us, and high class labour will not stay in Canada unless it is paid about the current wages in the United States. We, therefore, cannot get as cheap labour in Canada as they have in England. I have some experience in this matter, Sir, because I visited some large manufacturing establishments in England, and I state here that I, as a Canadian manufacturer, never wish to see Canadian workmen in as poorly paid a position as are the workmen of England. Therefore, if we have to compete with English goods under this preferential tariff, it is absolutely certain that we will have to reduce the wages of our workmen, or else close up our manufacturing establisments. As a matter of fact, I do not see anything else for it than to close our places up. This, of course, would be a hard blow to Canadians who have their money invested in the woollen industry, but it will bear harder still on the thousands of workingmen who are engaged in Canadian woollen factories. The importation of low woollen goods is going on by leaps and bounds since the total preferential tariff came into force in July last. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have argued time and again that a tariff

was not made to suit one class of individuals above another, but, Sir, in face of the above facts, can you not see that this preferential clause is aimed directly and almost entirely against the woollen operatives and manufacturers of this country, and directly and largely in favour of the woollen manufacturers of Great Britain. Just consider, $8,933,000 worth of woollen goods imported in one year into a market of something less than 6,000,000 of a population, or nearly one dollar and a half's worth for every man, woman and child in the whole Dominion.

I would ask what share can there be left for our own woollen mills, or what prospect can there be of this industry holding out against such a competition? During the last election, the hon. the Minister of Labour went up and down this country proclaiming himself to be the apostle of labour, the friend of the workingman. He was introduced as such at a public meeting held in Peterborough, and the workingman's vote was solicited on the strength of this new portfolio in the interests of labour. Where is he now? Is he to speak on behalf of the 12,000 operatives? Is there one member on the government side of this House who is independent enough to speak a word in favour of so arranging this fatal tariff that this industry may be saved for the country?

We have a Minister of Labour in Canada —at least I heard we had such a minister during the last election—but I have heard little about him since, and I wonder where he is to-day. I assume that he is on his way to Australia, but nobody seems to have been appointed to take his place in the cabinet. I wonder the Minister of Labour did not interfere when the government decided to embark in this policy of giving this preference to England, because there is no doubt that labour in Canada will be greatly injured by it. This preference will undoubtedly be the means of injuring not only the woollen industry, but other industries throughout Canada, because you cannot injuriously affect one without injuring all. There are other considerations which enter into the woollen industry of Canada which, perhaps, the government do not pay heed to. Let us take the plant which is required for carrying on that industry. We will say that the plant of a mill cost $130,000 in Canada. That plant in England would be worth only $100,000, because we have to pay the duty and freight here. There is $30,000 more that a Canadian woollen mill has to invest in its industry at the start, and besides that, our coal costs more in Canada, the interest on our money is more, and the cost of our labour is higher than in England. I believe, Sir, that there are any number of manufacturers who will bear me out in the statement, that if we could put down the cost of labour in Canada to what it is in England, we could compete with the English manufacturers to-day. But, Sir, I never want to see labour in Canada as poorly paid as it is in England. However, this preferential tariff is bound to militate against the interests of labour in Canada, and I have no doubt that when the next four years come around the government will have some trouble with their own supporters to keep them in line on this question. I understood the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Ross) to say that he had a hosiery concern in his constituency, and that they were perfectly satisfied with the present conditions. I hardly think the hon. gentleman is right in that. But, was it not inconsistent on the part of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross) to announce that he was a free trader all his life, and at the same time to tell us that he is in favour of the bounty system, which is about the most drastic form of protection that can be imagined. I, for my part, Mr. Speaker, am in favour of giving a bounty or adopting any other fiscal policy which will tend to strengthen the industries of this country, but I do not believe in helping out one industry at the expense of another. I often think that if we had our woollen mills located in Nova Scotia we would be a good deal better off than we are, and that, perhaps, if we moved down in the neighbourhood of Sydney, this government might give us a bounty, the same as they have done to the iron and steel men.

There has been a good deal of talk in this House about the beet-root sugar industry. The Ontario government have granted a bonus to that industry, but when the farmers of Ontario, who can grow beet roots as well as in any other part of the world, asked this government to grant them a bounty, the government declined to come to their assistance. I always understood from gentlemen opposite that the farmers were their special care, but now we see that the government allow the farmers to get out of their difficulties as well as they can, while they render all the assistance in their power to the iron and steel manufacturers.

Now in reference to the position taken by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), we all know that in 1896 those of us who were candidates in Ontario never heard of that hon. gentleman then. I understood that the Liberal party repudiated him altogether in my riding. They said they did not want to have anything to do with him, and he was not seen in any of the constituencies.

Mr. BENNETT. Oh, yes, he was in Lincoln.

Mr. KENDRY. I did not know he was in Lincoln. I may say that that hon. gentleman visited the town of Peterborough, where I live, and he got there the same kind of reception that he gets all over the country. His friends had engaged the

opera house and hired a brass band, and I think all they could muster to meet him was about seventy-five. He thought it was a cold place, and he left it for other parts.

The Minister of Customs the other evening said this :

> I may state here that when we introduced the preferential tariff, it was entirely out of love to Great Britain, and losing sight of every other consideration.

The hon. gentleman was satisfied to give the capital and the labour of this country to England, for that is exactly what this government are doing with their preferential tariff. They are willing that our employees should leave the country, and that the labour on the goods which come in should be done in Huddersfield, Birmingham, and the woollen centres of England. That is exactly our condition to-day. I understand that this parliament is here to legislate in the interest of the people of Canada, and not in the interest of the manufacturers of England.

I think we were told by the Minister of Customs the other evening that the woollen manufacturers should go home and work harder and eat less, and that they should be more alive. Well, I consider that the woollen manufacturers of this country are just about as much alive as the man who makes biscuits. The biscuit manufacturer has double the protection that the woollen manufacturer has. The hon. gentleman made the statement that there was only 25 per cent on biscuits, but the fact is that there is 27½ per cent. Besides, he gets his raw material, his flour, in this country, and his labour is largely wind, or something of that kind, while the woollen manufacturer has to import his raw material from other countries. I did not intend to allude to any personal matter, but it was brought on by the Minister of Customs himself. I want to say, so far as that gentleman is concerned, that he is looking after the biscuit industry of this country, if he is not looking after the woollen industry.

So far as the preferential tariff is concerned, I hold that this government are doing a great injustice to the towns of Canada. In the town of Peterborough, as in other towns, we have done everything we could, in the way of exemption from taxes and otherwise, to have manufactories located there. The object was to build up our town. And after the people of this country, both in Ontario and Quebec, have given all the encouragement they could, in exemption from taxation, in buildings and lands in some cases, for the promotion of manufacturing, this government comes forward and takes it all away. In my place in this House, I want to denounce in the strongest terms the preferential tariff of this government.

We had the minister without portfolio from Quebec (Mr. Dobell), saying the other day that the people of Quebec were perfectly satisfied with the tariff. I understood him to say that the shoe industry of Quebec was perfectly satisfied with it. Did he say that ?

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. No, I did not.

Mr. KENDRY. Well, I will read what the hon. gentleman did say. I want to show his position, because I understand that in Quebec there is an industry suffering greatly under this tariff, and I want to get him right. He said :

> I claim for the present government of Canada that they have passed a resolution by which the products of Great Britain are admitted in the rate of their tariff at 12½ per cent, and next year at 25 per cent reduction. This we have done, not asking any compensation. There is a class of our fellow-citizens who ask that all such concessions should be made for a quid pro quo. The Canadian government has ignored such sentiments. We have done it because we owe a debt of gratitude to Great Britain. We have done it because it is no intention of ours to disturb in any way the system of free trade which has done so much for England.

I understand that the hon. gentleman is a free trader. We want to know where he stands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to put myself right so far as the preferential tariff is concerned. I do not speak for my leader in this House; I am quite satisfied with his resolution; but in what I say, I am speaking for myself, and I condemn in the strongest terms any preference to any other country. That is my position to-day.

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. May I say a word in explanation ? What the hon. gentleman quoted a few moments ago was what Sir Wilfrid Laurier stated on his arrival in Liverpool. I gave it as a quotation, and I was very proud of it as coming from the lips of a Canadian.

Mr. KENDRY. And you agreed with it ?

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. Entirely.

Mr. KENDRY. That is the same thing. Now, I want to say to the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the premier of this country that I consider that these gentlemen have done a great injustice to this country. In 1876 and 1877 I was in the manufacturing business. We all remember the deputations which came here to interview the government at that time; we know how those deputations were received; and I want to say that the deputations of manufacturers who come here to-day to wait on this government are received in exactly the same way. It has been said in this House that we do not want any tinkering with the tariff; but these gentlemen, ever since they came

into office, have been tinkering with the tariff. They first gave a preference of 12½ per cent, then they altered it to 25 per cent, and afterwards they altered it to one-third. What is that but tinkering with the tariff? I want to say that no man is warranted in going into manufacturing in this country to-day under this tariff. I would not invest one dollar in manufacturing in this country, with such a preference against me. If we owe England anything, let us pay it, no matter what it is—whether it is one million or two million dollars. But I say it is not fair to this country that the government should give this preference, not to England—we are not giving it to England—but to the manufacturers of Yorkshire. I say it is a matter of vested rights in this country; but it seems that we have no vested rights in this country which this government is not willing to legislate away.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a letter, part of which I intend to read to the House. I understand that the Prime Minister has received a copy of it. I may say that it comes from the manufacturers of this country as a whole, and not from any individual manufacturer. It is as follows:

Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I beg to inclose herewith a paragraph taken from last week's Journal of Fabrics, showing the imports of woollen and worsted fabrics as compared with last year. You will notice a startling increase for the month of January, nearly 40 per cent, in woollen fabrics, and over 35 per cent in worsted fabrics. You will note also that there is a falling off in all other textile exports from Great Britain to Canada, except carpets, which is slightly increased, about 10 per cent.

When we interviewed you in Ottawa we told you that the 33⅓ preferential rate had not fully gotten into operation, and that we should feel it when the spring imports were received. Our worst fears are more than realized. Our future looks desperate. Surely there is some way in which you can afford relief. There were over fifty employees discharged at the Auburn mills, Peterboro', last week. Fifty more will be laid off this week, as the orders are being completed and no new orders coming in. During the past month we have discharged over 200 employees at Hespeler alone. Lomas's mill at Almonte, has completely closed down, and other mills are running on short time. The repeat orders for spring are of such small character, and coming in so slowly that it looks as though there would not be in six months from now 25 per cent of the woollen machinery in operation that there was in July of last year. I cannot think that you will allow that condition of affairs to continue. It is a case of life and death with us, and matters should not be allowed to drift along until next year. Our help will be scattered. I am informed by Mr. Brodie that forty-seven men left Hespeler last week for the United States. They left their families behind until they obtained work, when they propose to send for them. Our machinery will be lying idle, and getting out of condition. Fixed charges will be running on, and there will be a very ruinous loss of capital before the end of this year. Our general manager informs us that owing to the state of his orders he will be obliged to discharge over 200 more persons by the 10th April, which will leave only 400 at the mill, where we employed up to quite recently 800. I fear you do not realize the serious condition of the woollen industry and the danger it is in of being completely extinguished.

Woollen machinery is only fit for making woollen goods, and buildings are erected especially for the convenience of manufacturing woollens. It is all very well for people who have no practical knowledge of these things to say with a light heart—as many members of parliament do in their speeches—'why not turn your attention to something else?' Well, when everything one has got is invested in an enterprise, what can he turn his attention to? It requires capital and experience to embark in any manufacturing enterprise. Our capital is invested in the woollen industry, and our experience is in the manufacturing of woollen goods. I venture to say that you do realize that the woollen industry is the only one that has been hit, and hit hard, and I may say, without the slightest exaggeration, is on the brink of ruin by the operation of the preferential tariff.

We do not object to the preference to Great Britain, we are prepared to support it, but the tariff should be so arranged that we should be put on an equality with the Lancashire manufacturers.

I can assure you that the situation is really serious, and the financial institutions who are supporting the various large woollen industries—what I mean by supporting is discounting their paper and making them advances—are becoming seriously alarmed. If they withdraw their confidence and refuse to continue to make advances, the mills will have to close down, and that is just what is in sight, I fear.

It looks to us, and to a great many of the members of the House, that the woollen industry has been singled out for the severest competition, not only by reason of the peculiar advantage of British manufacturers of woollens, but by reason of the extent to which German goods are smuggled into Canada through Great Britain under pretense of partial manufacture in England. You will note that the several departments of the textile trade are relatively untouched by the preferential tariff. The silk trade, the linen trade, the jute trade, and the cotton trade all appear to be exempt from the severe competition suffered by the woollen mills.

I greatly regret to say that many members of the House I have spoken with do not vote as they talk, as I have been assured by many of them, including some members of the cabinet, that they were protectionists, and that we ought to have some relief; but they vote the other way when relief is asked for. I hate to put it in that way, but it is a true statement of the case.

In making this appeal I do so in the hope that the facts already before you, and the additional information contained therein will be fully and fairly considered by the government and that something will be done for us this session.

I have nothing more to say, Mr. Speaker, on this question except to express again the hope that the government will see its way to afford some relief to this very important industry.

Mr. R. SMITH (Vancouver). Mr. Speaker, as a new member in this House, I deemed it more fitting that I should, during this, my first session, sit very quietly in the House and take in all that was happening around me. And therefore, on this occasion, I shall not take up the time of hon. members except for a very few moments.

Indeed I should not have risen were it not for certain arguments presented by some hon. gentlemen opposite on the question under discussion, on which I considered it necessary that, on account of the position I occupy, I should say a few words. The position is taken by these hon. gentlemen to whom I have referred, that the protection of the manufacturing industries of this country necessarily implies the prosperity of the labouring classes—that to have, for instance, the wheels of the woollen factories constantly revolving is always an evidence of the prosperity of the industrial classes. That proposition was started very strongly by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), the hon member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Kendry). These hon. gentlemen all strove hard to impress this House and country with the idea that they are supporters of a high protective tariff, not merely on account of the manufacturers themselves, but more especially on account of the labouring men. That, Mr. Speaker, is the same old argument that was set up against the principles of Cobden and Bright. The argument set up in England, when the repeal of the principle of protection was brought about in that country, was the same that these hon. gentlemen have advanced, and as a representative, interested more particularly in the industrial classes from an organized standpoint, I wish to state that I do not believe at all in the principle which these hon. gentlemen have enunciated.

With reference to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), I desire to say that I have taken a very great interest in that hon. gentleman. I have sat very quietly in this House, being anxious to learn, and to make haste slowly and see my way ahead, and have been very much interested, particularly in the hon. gentleman from East York. I was interested more particularly in what he said on the question before the House, and I will tell you why? I thought that the position which he then took is very different to the strong and persistent one which he has hitherto taken. The hon. gentleman, previous to this debate, constantly advocated the claims of the people, as opposed to corporations and trusts, and took every occasion to bring to our attention the importance of guarding the interests of the people against these institutions, and I had come to the conclusion that the position which the hon. gentleman took, so far as it could be made practicable, was deserving of my support. But what do we find in this debate? I find that he is just taking the opposite course, and is doing his best to apply the principles of protection in favour of those very corporations and trusts, whose existence he had hitherto considered a menace.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am working on behalf of the manufacturers and the Canadian workingmen.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). I will prove before I get through that the hon. gentleman never mentioned the producers at all, but that the whole of his plea was for the manufacturers. On the one hand, he comes repeatedly before this House, advocating the interests of the people, in the shape of government ownership and control of industries. On the other hand, he comes on the floor of this House and asks the people of this coutnry to tax themselves in favour of that same class.

Mr. MACLEAN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACLEAN. I wish to put the hon. gentleman right, and I hope he will allow me to do so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman does not want to be put right.

Mr. SMITH. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) described himself as an out-and-out protectionist.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear—for Canadian labour.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). The hon. gentleman never mentioned labour. He said he was a strong believer in government interference and in the authority of government. I believe—and I am glad to say it—that I also believe in the control of government. I believe that the political tendency of our time is to place greater authority in the hands of the government and to make greater demands upon the government. But I take a different view of that question from that taken by the hon. member for East York. I believe in government interference for the weak against the strong, for the poor against the rich, for the masses against the few. And when the hon. gentleman advocates so persistently the principle of protection for the manufacturers, in my opinion it is not possible for him to render the best service to the workers of this country. There can be nothing in common between the call for high protection to the manufacturers and the demand for benefit for industrial classes.

The two principles are altogether opposite. The man who works for wages in the factory does not sell the products of the factory. If the competition is lessened in favour of the owners of the factory, and they are thus enabled to raise prices, how can the industrial classes be benefited ? The article produced by the labourer must be bought by the labourer as well as by others, and, if the price of the article is raised and the price of labour is not raised, by what course of reasoning is it to be shown that he is benefited ?

The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) took the same position as the hon. member for East York, and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) put up a strong plea in favour of the same position as that taken by the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Kendry)—in fact, both those gentlemen read the self same letters. All these hon. members put in a strong plea in favour of the industrial classes of this country, and have tried to show that if no greater protection is given to the manufacturers, the labouring men will have to move to the other side of the line. As I say, that is the old argument. But I do not at all believe that, when hon. gentlemen come to this House and seek special favour in the way of protecting their industries, the position of the industrial labourer is present to their minds at all. It is not with them a question how much the labourer should get ; it is a question how large the profit of their particular industry should be. The whole history of the agitation of capital for the benefits of protection is a history of benefit to the capitalists themselves, without any reference to the condition of the labourer. Let us look for a few moments at the history of the case and consider some of the countries that are most highly protected. And here again, I wish to make some reference to the hon. member for East York, because he spoke on this line. Take the case of the United States. There you have an ideal country for the working of a protection system. If ever the principle of high protection could work out beneficially to a people, it would work out in favour of the people of the United States. You have there a country containing within its borders the greatest variety of natural wealth in the world—a country that produces everything necessary for the sustenance of life. That is a country where, if anywhere, they could afford to build a wall around their industries. And what is the condition of labour in the United States ? Has the protective principle, which has so greatly benefited certain capitalists, benefited correspondingly the producers and industrial labourers ? Mr. Speaker, the condition of the labour market in the United States in the most aggravated of any country in the world. It is beyond dispute that there are more strikes, more disturbances, greater difficulties in the way of industrial labour demanding a fair share of the product, there is more trouble and labour agitation in the United States, that highly protected country, than in any other country in the world. There is a greater combination of capital on the part of the workingmen, there is a stronger and more powerful organization of trades unionism than elsewhere, and there is constant agitation amongst the industrial labourers of that country to secure something like a reasonable share of the produce of their labour. In the United States they have an ideal condition for protection ; in the United States they have strikes, they have bloodshed, they have constant trouble and agitation, they have the militia sent to put down men, and women, and sometimes, even the children, as against the honest agitator who goes out to claim his rights. Can it be said that protection has benefited the American labourer or that he gets a greater share of the produce of his industry on account of protection ? Not at all. Now, let us take the converse of all this—let us take the case of England. There you have a free trade country. Now, I am not advocating free trade for this country. I came from England a few years ago. I am glad to say that while I was there, I always found myself on the side of the reform movement of that country. However, I have observed conditions sufficiently to discover that it is not possible to carry out that free trade principle in this new and undeveloped country. I think that the government has the right ideal—a tariff for revenue. There is in that a tremendous force of protection. What is the condition of the labouring man in England ? A great deal has been said by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) about the labourer in England—and I am going to deal with that subject a little later on. The labouring men in England have greater numbers in their organizations and have greater benefits by legislation than they have in the United States. The legislation in favour of the industrial classes in England has some permanency. The factories in England today are better under the supervision of the government than are the American factories. And the factory operatives to-day have a better standard of wages—considerably better—than they have had for many years. Now, the hon. member for Centre Toronto mentioned the other evening, that one of the difficulties of the manufacturers in this country was the dearness of the fuel they had to import from the eastern states, as compared with the cheapness of the fuel necessary for the operation of the factories in England. Not a single argument that has been put before this House affords a stronger condemnation of the principle of protection than that. I wish to ask the hon. member for Centre Toronto how it is that they have to pay more for the fuel than the manufacturers in England have to pay ? Is it difference in the labour ? Does the

man who digs the coal in England get less than the man who digs the coal in Pennsylvania ? As a matter of fact, the coal miner in England to-day has a larger wage than the coal miner in Pennsylvania. Then the dearness of the article is not because the labourer has benefited, but because of the intermediate agencies that handle this product.

Mr. BROCK. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him ? How many months in the year do they require to heat their factories in England, and how many months in a year do they require to heat their factories in Canada ? Quantity as well as price has got to be taken into consideration.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). If I were to answer the question and give the exact proportions it would not alter the principle at all. I said that one of the reasons given by the hon. member for Centre Toronto why Canadian mills could not compete with the cotton mills of the other colonies and of England, was that they had to pay so much for their fuel in this country. Now I ask you why ? Remember I am not contending against the position that protection gives a benefit to industrial labour, what I contend is that the difference between the price of fuel in Canada and the price in England does not affect the difference in the actual benefit to the workingmen because the miners of Pennsylvania have much less wages than the miners of England, showing that in this highly protective country the benefits simply go into the hands of the few and are no advantage at all to the men.

I have a letter here written by a responsible gentleman concerning the condition of the industrial classes in the woollen factories of the southern states. I have not time to read it, but I am quite sure that if it was read in the hearing of a few hon. gentlemen opposite who have taken such a strong stand for high protection, it would be very refreshing to them. The tenor of the article is that there is no protection at all for the men working in the woollen factories of the States ; that they are positively working for starvation wages, and under the worst conditions. All acts of parliament which have been made for their protection have operated to the benefit of the manufacturers and not of the workingmen. I contend that in England to-day, taking the value of the money earned by the industrial classes, taking the reasonable protection they have, taking the reasonable laws of labour that have been made for them, taking the minimum education that has been given to them, taking everything into consideration, I contend that the labourers in the woollen factories of England to-day are better off than the labourers are in the woollen factories of the southern states of America, very much so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Kendry) had put up a tremendous wail as to the condition of the woollen operatives which he said was brought about. The same argument was used by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) the other evening. Well, I sat for two hours taking in the whole of his arguments, and from that time until now I have been busy making myself acquainted with the facts connected with the hon. member for Peterborough. I want to state these facts on the floor of the House, and I hope in the presence of that hon. member. I was down in Peterborough three weeks ago interesting myself to some extent in the operatives of these mills, and in the labouring men generally ; and after this statement made about the condition of the mills in Peterborough and the discharge of these men, and after hearing the letter read by the hon. member for Grey, the same letter which was read by the hon. member for Peterborough this afternoon, I thought it was absolutely necessary that I should at least strive to get some information in this matter. My position was that if it were true that the preferential tariff was going to result in the ruin of the woollen industry and to the great injury of the woollen operatives, it was time for me to consider the question carefully and seek to prevent such a catastrophe. In looking into the facts connected with the Auburn woollen mills, owned by the member for Peterborough, I acquired some information which I wish to give to the House. Since the preferential tariff came into force these mills have been running full time and at times night and day. I make these statements boldly, and I expect that some hon. member will be in a position to answer them. It has been stated that this company has paid more for lighting the last four years than for many years before. This statement was made by the Hon. Mr. Stratton in the Dominion elections. I have been looking over the Conservative papers in the reading-room, and I expected to see this statement challenged, but as it has not been challenged I take it to be correct. During the elections I looked over the files of the Peterborough papers, and I could not find any statement, editorial or otherwise, contradicting the position taken by that hon. gentleman. Is it not a fact that on account of running so fully they have employed a larger number of hands these last four years than in the four years previously ? Now if these things are true, there is no calamity about them. If it is a fact that these mills are operating night and day and employing more labourers, then they must be paying a larger wage-bill, and if that is done under the operation of the preferential tariff I do not see any argument against the position of the government and in favour of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Is it not a fact also that the men are paid now more than they were in 1895-6 ? That is an important question, and I would

like to have an answer. Are these signs of depression or of prosperity ? There are evidences to show that since the preferential tariff came into force the energies of this company have been stimulated ; as a matter of fact they have equipped their factory thoroughly with up-to-date machinery—that has all been done, mind you, since 1897. The machinery itself was said to have cost $50,000, and it is an undoubted fact that during these last few years they have turned out a much higher and finer class of goods than at any time in their history.

Let me mention that in British Columbia five or six years ago the people would not go into the stores and purchase Canadian manufactures, but to-day there is a growing disposition in favour of them, people are going into the stores and demanding Canadian woollens. I say there is a stronger demand for Canadian manufactured articles than ever before, showing that the articles are of higher value. I state that these mills have doubled their output, they are paying fair wages to their employees and they have made an average dividend of at least 6 per cent. Now these are very strong statements made on the floor of this House and hon. gentlemen must be in a position to answer them one way or another. If they are true, then where is the argument about the ruination of their property and of their business ? If they are not true, then we are driven to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman is prepared to take a position that is not correct. I am credibly informed that this company did not pay any dividend at all in 1895-6 before the preferential tariff, but they were closed down entirely for intervals of weeks at a time. Remember, Mr. Speaker, at that particular time there was a Dominion election going on, and the hon. member for Peterborough was running in that election, and I want you to know that the mills were closed down at that particular time. And when protection is sought for by these hon. gentlemen the mills are very likely to be closed down again. But this is an old trick, we are used to that. Any one who knows anything at all about the history of labour is well aware that this is a trick often resorted to. Now, at that time the hon. member for Peterborough, speaking on a platform, said this :

If Sir Wilfrid Laurier was returned to power his factories at Peterborough that were closed at that time would never be opened again.

Now I want the hon. members of this House to remember what I have already stated. They have made large profits, they have employed more men, they have doubled their output, they have enhanced the value of their productions since the preferential tariff came into operation ; and yet at that very time the hon. gentleman stated that if the Liberal government came into power it would ruin his business.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver).

Now, Sir, I did more than that. When I heard the statement read about the discharge of these men, I wanted to know if the hon. gentleman was saying exactly what was true, and I put myself to the trouble of having some very rapid correspondence with responsible men in Peterborough, and I am prepared to read the answers of those men in this House. I was anxious to know if the workingmen of this country were going to be driven out of employment, as the hon. gentleman had stated ; I was very anxious about that question, because I was desirous of preventing a calamity of that kind. But I wanted to know what the facts were before I did anything. Now, this is the answer I received to questions as to the men being discharged and as to the possibilities of the mill being closed down :

Ralph Smith, House of Commons.

Auburn woollen mills have been continually running night and day during these last four years——

Now, these are the mills belonging to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendry), who has just taken his seat.

—they have employed twice as many hands and have over twice as large a pay-roll as before, and turn out more than twice as much goods and of better quality than they did before.

This is a telegram that I am prepared to put on the records of this House, and when I am done reading it, I shall give the name of the sender.

They have improved their machinery out of their earnings at least $50,000, and have for three years been too busy to partly close down to accurately take stock, and as this is the period——

I would like to remark that this is an explanation of very many things that have been said by hon. gentlemen opposite.

—as this is the period that they change from summer to winter goods, they now take stock and are extensively repairing their machinery and have laid off a very few hands temporarily for that purpose, as stock cannot be taken and machinery repaired with the mill running full capacity. They regularly pay good dividends to shareholders for five years, and are making money. Close and private corporation.

The name of this gentleman is to the telegram, and the telegram is sent by R. F. McGregor, chairman of the Associated Labourmen of the city of Peterborough. Now, Mr. Speaker, my experience with the strong plea in favour of protection has always been this : That the men who seek for special favours in the way of protection are always the men that object to protection when it comes down to the interests of the labouring classes.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) excuse me for a minute. Before he drops that subject, would he tell us has he any information from the Hespeler mills?

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). I have not; I have not had time to look into it.

Mr. BROCK. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) attack any statement I made in connection with the woollen mills? What I stated referred to fifty mills in this country and not to one.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). Special mention has been made of the mills at Peterborough. The hon. gentleman from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) read a most serious letter setting out that these mills had actually discharged their men and would be likely to shut down, and the proprietor of these mills himself read that same letter on the floor of this House to-day. What I am doing is to prove to this House that there is no importance to be attached to that statement, as this telegram sets out.

Mr. KENDRY. I would like the hon. gentleman to read the telegram.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He has read it.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). I think the demand made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendry) is fair, and I will read it again:

Auburn woollen mills have been continually running night and day during this last four years, have employed twice as many hands, and have over twice as large pay-roll as before, and turn out more than twice as much goods, and of better quality. They have improved their machinery out of their earnings at least $50,000, and have for three years been too busy to partly close down to accurately take stock. As this is the period they change from summer to winter goods, they now take stock, and are extensively repairing their machinery, and have laid off very few hands temporarily for that purpose, as stock cannot be taken and machinery repaired with mill running at full capacity. Have regularly paid good dividends to shareholders for five years and are making money.

Mr. KENDRY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to explain, I will explain exactly the position. Mr. Speaker, so far as that telegram is concerned, the whole statement is incorrect. We are to-day not doing any repairs at all, and we are closed on account of having no orders in the mill. Whoever gave that information to Mr. McGregor, the whole thing is incorrect.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What about the dividends?

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). I have no disposition to dispute the word of an hon. member of this House. That is not my practice. But what I say is this: That I consider the authority of a disinterested man in Peterborough is of as much importance and far more likely to be correct than the statement of an hon. member of this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). Especially that of an hon. gentleman who has a direct interest in making a statement like this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. KENDRY. Mr. Speaker, I may say that I am one of the proprietors of that establishment, and surely I ought to know the position better than any outsider.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). Well, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to take the full responsibility of what is stated in that telegram. I will be perfectly fair with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendry). I am prepared to meet him under any proper conditions and to discuss this question with him, and if it is demonstrated by the hon. gentleman that this is incorrect, then of course, that view of the case can be presented.

Mr. RUSSELL. He does not say it is incorrect.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). Mr. Speaker, it is almost six o'clock, and I think I should be allowed to finish my remarks.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). No; I want to speak for another five minutes, and then I shall finish. I wish to refer now to my hon. and genial friend the member for Victoria, and I want to do so because I want to mention a matter which illustrates the importance of the principle under discussion.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. There are so many constituencies named Victoria, that I wish to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) which he refers to.

Some hon. MEMBERS. The genial one.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Which is that?

Some hon. MEMBERS. You.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). The senior member for Victoria, B.C. A few days ago we were discussing in this House the necessity of placing an import duty on lumber, and that is a question which very materially affects my interests as the representative of Vancouver Island. I may say, Sir, that I had telegrams from important bodies at that particular time asking me to support this resolution, but I disagreed with the resolution entirely. What I want to get at is this: In discussing that resolution the senior member for Victoria, B.C. (Hon. Mr. Prior) stated that the reason why the lumbermen of British Columbia at the present time had to employ Chinese and Japanese labour was because they were not able to compete with the American lumber manufacturers. This, Sir, is a matter which bears directly upon this discussion. I have been contending that the high protective tariff did not protect the labourer, but protected the manufacturer. The statement of the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Hon. Mr. Prior) was a very bold statement to make on the floor of this House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) is referring to a past debate.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). I am sure that the hon. gentleman from Victoria will not take any umbrage at what I am stating now. I will illustrate the point under discussion if I get time. That was a bold statement for the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Prior) to make, because the Chinese and Japanese were employed before the tariff was taken off by the Conservatives, and I want to ask my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Prior) can he give the House a guarantee that if the government impose a duty upon lumber coming into British Columbia corresponding with the duty on Canadian lumber : That Chinese and Japanese labour will be dispensed with. If the labourmen are protected by this protective tariff then we ought to be able to have a positive guarantee that that will be brought about. I want to tell my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Prior) that if he can give me that guarantee on the floor of this House then I will abandon my principles for once and support protection.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman an easier question than that still. I ask him: Suppose that this duty is imposed, can we have any guarantee that the white labourers of British Columbia would receive any more wages than they do now ? That is the great question. Does protection protect the industrial classes ? Decidedly not. You put $2 per thousand upon lumber coming into British Columbia ; you advance the price of lumber ; you lessen the competition, but, Mr. Speaker, they have all the Chinese and Japanese they want in the labour market of that country to manufacture that lumber. I want to know if the lumbermen are going to take the high moral position of discharging the Chinese and Japanese because they get a benefit from the government by the imposition of this duty ?

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. The hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. The hon. gentleman has asked me a question, and surely I may be allowed to say a word in reply. The hon. gentleman asked me if I would guarantee that the lumbermen would do away with Chinese and Japanese labour if the duty was put on. Of course, I cannot guarantee for them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Hon. gentlemen laugh, but it is a very foolish laugh. I cannot give a guarantee for them, but I can say that I stood up in this House and advocated a Chinese tax of five times the amount the government was willing to put on.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). Well, Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to deal with the position of the hon. gentleman, because he was a member of this government for many years and had an opportunity of putting on a Chinese tax.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. We were the first to put the tax on.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). In concluding my remarks, I want to say that when it can be demonstrated to me, when subsidies are granted to railway corporations, and high protective duties are placed upon manufacturers, that corresponding protection is given to the industrial labourers, then I am prepared to support the granting of those privileges. But that is not the condition of things that exists to-day. As I said before, the men who seek protection are the last men who want protection to be given to the industrial classes; but they are the very men, as their history shows, to forward petitions and requests to this House and to every other parliament in this country, against any law likely to provide for any restriction or protection on behalf of the labouring man. That is the position I take. The amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition, speaks of protection to labour; and if he is serious, he will seek to bring about corresponding legislation to protect the industrial classes. When you impose a tariff to protect the manufacturer, you want to have some guarantee that the labourer who makes the article protected shall be paid a minimum living wage. Until that is done, you may introduce all the protective tariffs you please, but you will have no assurance that the labourer is going to receive a share of the protection or be benefited by it in any way.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. JOHN R. LAVELL (Leeds and Grenville). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who spoke just before recess, gave us another example of the many different attitudes adopted by gentlemen who support the government of the day on questions which are directly involved in the debate now going on in this House. Starting out as only a free trader could start out, and comparing the condition of affairs in a country which is most decidedly a country of protection, the United States, with the conditions in a country which is recognized as the ideal free trade country, that is, Great Britain, he drew a distinction very strongly in favour of the mechanic or labourer in Great Britain; but then, realizing that he was somewhat of an anachronism in this House, in dealing with the question in that way, he took the precaution to say that he was not a free trader. Then, proceeding along some other

lines which I shall deal with shortly, he wound up with what may possibly be termed the most ultra doctrine of protection which we have yet heard in this House. He said he would support the opposition's policy of protection if we would add to that protection, legislation fixing a minimum wage for the mechanic. Such legislation, it is needless to say, is not within the province of this House, nor has it been undertaken, so far as I am aware, by any legislature which has authority to enact laws relating to such a subject. While he was giving us these different samples of his financial creed, he told us, possibly with a desire to make it clearer to us, that his ideal of a trade policy was the ideal of the present government. It may be that others who are more familiar with the views that have been enunciated in this House in the past can form a clearer opinion than myself as to what is the ideal of the present government; but, speaking as one who has only heard this present budget debate, I must confess that I am still in very great doubt on that point. There was one keynote struck by the hon. member, perhaps inadvertently, which may indicate more clearly than he did in any other words, just what the policy of the present government is. When he rose, he said he had come here to take in all he could; and, if I am not mistaken, the present policy of the Liberal party can only be reconciled with those of past years on the assumption that they were all intended to take in all they could.

It is too late now in this debate to make any attempt to review the various policies which the Liberal party of this country have put forward. They include the different policies which have been put forward in this debate. The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) declared in most vehement tones that he was a free trader, and as such he supported this government. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) said he was a protectionist, and as such he supported this government; and it is a matter of discussion whether the present government, after having come into power, did not, as has been repeatedly said, steal the clothes of their opponents. But I submit that that question is put too broadly. When the Liberal party are accused of having stolen the clothes of their opponents, it has led to some differences of opinion, and it has also led to some criticism of the opposition for making that charge in one breath, and asserting in the next breath that there ought to be more stringent protection in this country. The difficulty, Mr. Speaker, is this, that when the Liberal party stole the clothes of their opponents, they did not steal them all, they only stole, as it were, their upper garments, and the species of protection which they have put in force may be called a kind of kilted protection, that is, a protection which protects part of the Canadian body, and leaves the other part as minus the 'breeks' as a Highlander. We have had very good examples of this in the course of the present debate. For example, the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Ross) described in most glowing terms the prosperity of the principal town in his riding, the town of Oshawa, the great advance which had taken place in the industries of that town, and the consequent prosperity of the country around, declaring that this was entirely due to the fiscal policy of the present government; and he also stated, if I am not very much mistaken, that it was the result of the change from the national policy to the present policy. I wonder if the hon. member took the trouble to ascertain the facts before he spoke. Going over the industries of the town of Oshawa, one by one, I find that every industry in that town is a protected industry, not in any technical sense, in which the term may be used in this House, but protected under the national policy.

The various industries similar to those in Oshawa received a certain amount of protection. Under that protection they prospered and grew, setting their roots deep and wide, and when this government came in and changed the tariff in part in 1897, the tariff, so far as it affected the interests of that town, was left severely alone. That is a part of the stolen clothes absolutely appropriated in full by the Liberal party, and the preferential tariff, of which so much has been said, practically in no way affects any one of the industries in Oshawa. It is no wonder then the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Ross) should have dilated as he did on the prosperity of Oshawa. That town is prosperous, and I am glad to know it, and the country in its neighbourhood is prosperous, largely because of the wages paid the artisans.

But, the hon. gentleman must go a little further back to find the cause of that prosperity. So far as it is due to any fiscal policy, it is due to the policy of the Conservative party inaugurated in 1878-9, and not to any change made since. This is a matter of which I have personal knowledge, because in the riding which I have the honour to represent, we also have a prosperous town, and prosperous for exactly the same reason. In the largest town of that riding, there is not a single industry affected by the fiscal policy of this government. The government left every industry in that town undisturbed, and it was most interesting in the last election contest to hear the former member for that riding, largely interested in one of its particular industries, getting up on platform after platform and declaring that in 1897 his party had wiped out the national policy with a stroke of the pen, and then raising his hands in holy horror at the suggestion of one of the members of the Conservative party in Manitoba, that the duty on agricultural implements should

be wiped out. That, however, is simply in line with all that has been said by these hon. gentlemen in connection with the fiscal policy of this administration. To the extent this government has retained protection, the country has prospered, and I challenge any supporter of the government to show that in any case where they have retained the duties on manufactured articles, which were in the tariff prior to 1896, there has not been prosperity. In fact, I go still further, and challenge any one to show any case in which a reduction of the duties has not reduced prosperity. The government removed the duties on some articles to show their affection for free trade. They took the duty off binder twine, for example, and barbed wire, and it is interesting to know that the prices of these articles have increased in larger proportion than the prices of any manufactured articles on which the duty was maintained. The price of binder twine increased very largely because of the trust, and the removal of the duty made the forming of a trust all the easier. The manufacture of barbed wire has been entirely destroyed in the country, but the prices have increased. Every man who buys barbed wire now has to pay a good fair toll to the freight carriers and others who bring it into the country.

The hon. gentleman who spoke just before recess, the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith), made some rather vigorous statements about the evils caused by protection, which he described as class legislation, or legislation in favour of the manufacturers. He said, in language that I cannot hope to imitate, that it was an injury to the industrial classes. Why, Sir, the whole foundation of the national policy is the retaining of work in this country for our workingmen. The whole argument, from beginning to end, in favour of the national policy, from the time it was first introduced, was that it would enable us to manufacture in our own country the articles that we use, and thus give employment to our industrial classes. And never before has the contention been so openly made that protection could possibly be an injury to the industrial classes, though it has often been said that protection was class legislation, not so much because it was for the benefit of the manufacturers, as because it was for the benefit of those who labour in the factories. This question was treated in that way in the elections that took place a short time ago on the other side of the line. The people of the United States are essentially protectionists, and the free traders, who are making an attack on protection there, have to do it in the veiled way as that which the free traders in this country have to adopt. The question was whether protection should be maintained, and what was taken as the type of protection ? The full dinner pail, nor was the propriety of that being taken as the type for one moment questioned. Surely it is too late in the day, with the many years' experience we have had, to intimate for one moment that protection is not a benefit to the industrial classes who work in our shops and factories. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) spoke about the men working in the coal mines, and compared their lot with that of the coal miners of England. But, the members of this House must have noticed that when the hon. gentleman wanted to pick out a class in the United States, which may not be benefited by protection, he picked out a class that is notoriously drawn from the lowest populations of Europe—not skilled labourers, not the men who work in protected factories, but the men who went into that country from various European countries and worked there in sets and gangs, and even then I question if, looking at the subject from the widest standpoint, his statement would bear examination for a moment. If he had taken as an example the men who work in the factories, if he had taken the men who work in the woollen mills, about which there has been so much discussion, he would have found a vast difference between their status and the status of the same class of men in a free trade country. And it is because such a difference was noticed years ago by the great leader of the Conservatives, under whom the national policy was inaugurated, that the national policy was adopted by the Canadian people and put so successfully in force.

The hon. gentleman confined himself to the example of labourers in the mines of the United States, trusting to his sweeping statement, that protection must of necessity injure those who are working in the factories, and who come under the heading of industrial classes. I say that our experience under the present fiscal tariff proves the contrary. The instances I have just mentioned, given us by the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Ross), prove the contrary. In those factories, which have been properly protected, the men are working at good wages, and the towns they inhabit are prosperous. In those where the duties have been reduced, the men are without work, or are working at lower wages, and the towns are not prosperous. I regret to say that in the riding I represent, there is a woollen mill which has been seriously affected from the causes mentioned by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Kendry). But, there is another result that I might mention. At the time when this preferential tariff came into force, affecting as it did principally our woollen and cotton mills, the farmers of this country found a very large home market for their wool, and prices ruled from 20 to 25 cents per pound. But gradually, as the preferential tariff went into operation, our woollen mills had to reduce the prices, and to-day our farmers are only getting 15 cents and 16

cents for their wool, as compared with 22 cents and 25 cents. This shows how incidentally protection to one class of men equally protects a large number of other classes.

One interesting result of this debate is that we have had from the leaders of the Liberal party another statement of what their policy is. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs stated in very vigorous language that this tariff now in force is not a protective, but a revenue tariff, and, so far as there was any protection in it, it was purely incidental. And it has been repeatedly said by hon. gentlemen on the other side, that protection is almost impossible so far as certain classes are concerned. They have mentioned especially, over and over again, that the protection was impossible for this class. Now, if this is a revenue tariff and is not intended to give any protection whatever, it is an interesting question to ask how it comes that duties that were protective prior to 1896 are no longer protective, though they remain exactly the same. The right hon. the premier (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) implied in his speech that this was a revenue tariff, because imports increased under it. It becomes an interesting question to ask whether the tariffs of the United States and Germany are also revenue tariffs and not protective, because in those countries imports have increased. These are questions that I will not attempt to answer, but I would suggest that they possibly show some weakness in the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite. But, if this is in part a revenue tariff, and if any credit is to be obtained for the reduction of duties—and I presume that none of all those items that are put on the free list can be included under the head of revenue tariff—we have to deal with the dutiable goods only; and, as I said, the great bulk of these dutiable goods bear the same duties that they did under the former tariff, save so far as the preferential tariff is concerned and so far as these reductions have been made year after year on the imports of Great Britain. Part of the policy as declared, was that there should be no change one way or the other. That must be looked upon as a new policy, because, so far as this tariff differs from the old tariff, it differs from it practically in no other way than by these preferential duties, and these have been changed for several successive years—in fact, I think it was last year that the last change was made. If there is no change further to be made, that is something brand new this year. Judging from the words we heard in sonorous tones from the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), one would suppose that it was reprehensible for a party not to have a new policy every year. He spoke with scorn of a policy which he said was old. If it was more than two years old, I do not wonder at it coming under his displeasure. It does seem as though in the minds of some men in this country it is impossible to retain the same policy for more than a few years in succession. But we have now a statement which I hope will last a few years, of just exactly what the present tariff policy is. If I might be permitted, I think I would say that when we review the tariff policy of the Liberal party for the last few years, we find that though it has had many forms, though they have placed themselves on many platforms, possibly it is not right for us to say that they have changed completely. I question if they have changed. I think, as I said, that the hon. member for Vancouver expressed it when he intimated that he would take in what he could while he was here. All these policies, from the time when they advocated commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity, and so on, were undoubtedly policies that the Liberal party took up because they thought they would please the country, feeling that when they came into power the fact that they had made strong protests against protection would not prevent them hanging on to protection if they thought that to do so would help them to remain in office. It was a change of policy, but not of spirit. It suggests the case of the doctor in a country village, who, going into a corner grocery was met with a request from a somewhat loquacious German to be told what this new religion was that they were bringing from China. The doctor wished to know what it was he referred to, whether it was buddhism or theosophy. 'No, not that, doctor,' said the German, and he attempted to give a description of what he meant. The doctor at last understood, and said, 'Oh, you meant the doctrine of transmigration of souls.' 'Yes,' was the reply, 'vot vos dot?' The doctor attempted to explain, and at last said, 'Well, it is easier to give you an illustration.' He drew the attention of the German to the fact that death must come to every man, which the German admitted with a regretful sigh. 'Now, Strauss,' said he, 'suppose that when you die, your soul, when it left your body, instead of going to some unknown region, went into the body of a little canary hanging in a gilded cage, in a lady's boudoir, and fed from her delicate fingers.' The German thought that would be very nice. 'But, one day the door of your cage is left open; the cat comes in and kills the canary. Of course, your soul must leave the body of the canary and flies out of the window and takes refuge in a beautiful lily blooming in the garden and shedding its fragrance on the air.' 'Yes,' said the German, 'dot is goot.' 'But, your soul cannot stay in the lily, because a careless servant leaves the gate open, a donkey comes in and bites off your head, and your soul passes into the donkey. You are

driven out of the garden, and as you go out some old friend meets you and looks you in the face and strokes your long ears and says, "Oh, Strauss, mein old friend, how leedle you haf changed."' Having listened to the speeches here and to the speeches on various platforms in this country, the only conclusion that one can come to is that though the form has changed, there is very little change in the true inner soul of the policy held by the Liberal party or their leader. They are prepared for any change, and now they have grown so used to changes that they cannot understand how a party can maintain the same principle for a dozen years. It is a bad condition of affairs in this country when it is possible for a great party not only to change its views when any occasion of party exigencies seems to requre it, but to speak words of scorn against another party which, having tried a great principle and found it to be in the best interests of the country, retains it and backs it up. Seeing the criticism to which the Conservative party is subjected by the hon. gentlemen opposite, this is all the more remarkable inasmuch as, in some lines, hon. gentlemen opposite have really gone further in the line of protection than have the Conservative party when in power, although still maintaining that the fiscal policy is one of a revenue tariff. No attempt has been made to answer the questions thrown across the floor of the House: How can bounties on iron be part of a revenue tariff? How is the maintenance of duties of 30 and 35 per cent on articles imported into this country, part of a revenue tariff? How is even the maintenance of a duty of 27½ per cent on biscuits part of a revenue tariff? The hon. Minister of Customs referred to that the other day, and, in very vigorous language called attention to the tremendous reduction caused not by his tariff, but by the preferential duties, showing that it was down really to 25½ per cent, only ½ per cent higher than it was for most of the time when the national policy was in force under the Conservative government. And that reduction was not due to the tariff policy as enunciated in 1897, but was due almost entirely to the preferential tariff. Now, incidentally, before I sit down, I wish to say something about the line that has been taken over and over again by hon. gentlemen opposite, when they said it was simply impossible to give protection to the farming community or to the industrial class. Until the hon. member for Vancouver spoke, I was under the impression that that class meant the industrial class of this country so far as they worked in manufacturing. But the hon. gentleman seemed to confine himself to an attack on capitalists. Now, as to that, it must be recognized by every person in this country that capital and labour are so indissolubly united that they cannot be separated—it is impossible to get a divorce. I would refer the hon. gentleman to his friend the Liberal leader of Ontario, who, when he was asked that in granting certain franchises it should be provided that only home labour should be employed, distinctly refused on the ground that capitalists should be free to select their own labour. That, possibly, is going further than the Conservative party offered to go before. But that is the principle of the leader of the Liberals in the Ontario House.

He said that this was simply legislation for a class; it has been said over and over again, and I presume the hon. gentleman meant the industrial class. They have insisted that the farmers were not benefited. If the farmers were not benefited, it would be interesting to see some hon. gentlemen opposite analyse the tariff so far as it affects agricultural products. If this is only a revenue tariff and if the farmers cannot be protected, why is there three cents a dozen on eggs? If it is not there for revenue, and if the farmers cannot be protected, was it put there to blind their eyes? Was it put there hypocritically? Was it put there as a species of farce? If the farmers cannot be protected in any way, why are duties maintained on these agricultural products, when they practically got no revenue, when it means nothing in the way of revenue? It would be interesting to have an explanation of that. I maintain that the farming community can be protected, they are not protected simply by duties on agricultural implements, but by the growth of our home markets.

Some hon. members on this side of the House have already referred to the fact that it is impossible for a country purely agricultural to prosper and fulfil its destiny, and that manufacturing countries, on the other hand, are always strong and prosperous. When manufacturing and agricultural industries are closely allied a country reaches its highest development. We have had examples of that truth in Canada. In the lean years when industries were stagnant in Canada, our agricultural population prospered so far as good crops could make them prosperous, but they felt the depression as well as others did. But with the improvement in manufactures, under the operation of the national policy, the farmers prospered as did all other classes of the country. When there is a good home market the farmer must feel the advantage exactly the same as any other citizen will feel it. But no country can have a good home market unless it has prosperous manufacturing industries.

Considerable stress has been laid on the prosperity of the last four years. I am glad to know that the country has been prosperous during the last four years. I am glad that Canada has been able to share with

the rest of the world in the unexampled prosperity that has prevailed everywhere. But when hon. gentlemen opposite get up and tell us that our prosperity is due to their fiscal policy, they ask us to assume something that is incapable of proof. As well might a man who goes into a wheat field for the first time, shortly before the wheat is ripe, and when he has gathered the harvest, say: Look, at the harvest I have gathered in. You people who have simply sowed the grain have no credit whatever for this glorious harvest. A country's growth is not of a few days or of a few years. A mushroom will spring up in a night, but not so the maple. Canada is not a mushroom country by any means, and no such industrial development as we have enjoyed during the last four years can be produced simply by the stroke of a pen or within a few hours after the passing of a statute in parliament. The fiscal policy was changed by this government in 1897, but the prosperity of this country began prior to 1897. Our prosperity had been preparing for years, owing to the fact that the previous Conservative government had fostered trade, had fostered the industries and commerce of Canada, and when, by the favour of Providence, good times came, Canada was in a position to take advantage of them. Surely it is recognized as a great general principle that there is a time of quiet growth, a time of underground sprouting, so to speak, before anything appears on the surface. We will, perhaps, during the next month, pass through one of the most disagreeable seasons of our climate, one of the months when possibly nature takes on its most forbidding appearance; but will any person say that we can have the development of vegetation during the summer months without the preparation of these previous disagreeable months? In the same way the prosperity of the last four years is not due to the almost imperceptible change in the fiscal policy of the country that took place in 1897. As to that particular feature of the tariff on which hon. gentlemen pride themselves most, the preferential feature, I say without hesitation that it has done infinitely more harm than good, in view of the conditions in which this country found itself when it went into force. It has, in fact, only been in force twelve or fifteen months, with any activity. If you deduct this period and look at the country as it was in 1897, such credit as may be due to any one from legislation must be given to the predecessors in office of hon. gentlemen opposite, to the men who for so many years led the fortunes of the Conservative party.

There are a number of other matters on which I intended to speak, but at this hour it is desirable that the speeches should not be long. I will close by emphasizing the point I made, that where there has been prosperity there has been no interfence by the present government with our fiscal arrangements, and wherever the present government has interfered, it has done so to the absolute loss and injury of Canada.

Hon. WM. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Hon. gentlemen opposite are much troubled in their minds about the differences of opinion that they say exists on this side of the House. Well, they put me in mind of the sea birds that come close to the shore in the fall and spring of the year, when the weather is calm, they swim backwards and forwards with the greatest ease; but when the storm begins, then they cluster together. Wait, gentlemen, till the vote is taken, and then you will see the difference of opinion that exists. Our friends opposite speak much of broken pledges, they are horrified that pledges have been broken before the public of this great Dominion. Well, if a man breaks his pledge to me once I never trust him. You have heard of the Scotch proverb; Man cheat me once, deil fa him, man cheat me twice, deil fa me. The people of this Dominion have passed their verdict on the action of the government twice, and they have approved of their policy. The majority of the people of this Dominion have shown that they have confidence in the men who occupy the Treasury benches.

Reference has been made to the preparation of the late tariff for protective purposes, and it has been said that a master mind had prepared that tariff. Now, if my memory serves me right, the government of that day had to send to Washington to get a man to prepare that tariff, and when it was prepared it was something that nobody in this Dominion could interpret or understand. It was the American tariff pure and simple, except, of course, as to the figures of the duties. The meaning and principle of the tariff was exactly the same. Down in Halifax we found the appraisers and importers quarrelling all the time. The importers said they had to hire one of their clerks all the time to do nothing else but to prepare their entries for the customs-house. One part of an article would be so much a square yard, and you had to make a calculation as to how many square yards would be in a piece. Another article you had to put on your scales and weigh it. Then merchants would send to Ottawa samples of the goods on which they paid a certain rate of duty, and there would be a different interpretation made, and a rebate of duty would have to be ordered. I do not know if there are any importers within the sound of my voice in this House, but I am sure that there is not an importer in Canada to-day who desires to go back to the protective tariff of the Conservative government. It was like nothing in heaven above or in the earth beneath, it was confusion from start to finish.

One thing that the present government have done is to simplify the tariff, they have made it plain, it is easily understood.

I have it here before me, and there is not an item in it where you do not know exactly the duty that is to be paid on it. I may differ from the government as to the rates of duty that are still levied in certain instances, but anyway there has been a reduction in the duties and the tariff is easily understood, and no person can make any mistake about it. I felt sorry to hear the speech delivered by my hon. friend to my right (Mr. Charlton), and if he continues to make such speeches, I doubt very much that this is the right side of the House for him to sit on.

Mr. MACLEAN. What will you do with him ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I will tell you what you did with him last fall. He wrote a letter and by that letter he imposed on the Conservative party so much that they allowed him to be elected by acclamation so that the Conservatives have been beguiled by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton). Now, every member here should desire this country to be settled, and that we should have immigration—I would qualify that by saying that we should have immigration of the proper sort.

Mr. MACLEAN. The Highland Scotch.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) You want the right kind of immigrants in this country, and you want them to build residences and out-houses and such things as are necessary for permanent settlement. Some hon. gentlemen have proposed here that you should put a duty on cheap American lumber which would be used by the settlers, and thus make it harder for them to get along. One of the things that surprises me, and I may say disgusts me, is the way that some members of this House have come here to advocate their own personal interests. I sat in a parliament for eight years, and at that time a member would be ashamed to advocate any principle in which he was personally interested. It is highly improper for men to come here and day after day plead for their own personal affairs. If we look at ourselves what are we ? We are selfish animals at best, and when a man begins to advocate his personal interests in this House, you can always begin to doubt his sincerity and his honesty. The member for Peterborough (Mr. Kendry) in the course of his speech today, said : I speak for myself. When a man speaks for himself, and for himself alone, this is not the proper place for him to speak at all. He has a right to speak for his constituents, but when he comes here to speak for his own selfish ends he should be ashamed of himself. I am glad to know that in all the divergent opinions that have been expressed on this side of the House no man has so far forgotten himself as to plead for his own personal interests.

Mr. MACLEAN. What about your friend there ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Speaking of my friend on my right, sometimes I am afraid that I am sitting too close to him. I heard the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) quoting Scripture the other day, and I congratulate him on his knowledge of it, but I would say to my friend beside me here in the words of the prophet : How long will you halt between two opinions ? If protection be his God, then let him worship that, but if revenue tariff be what is right, then let him vote for revenue tariff.

Mr. MACLEAN. What is your god ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I will go back in sacred history further than did my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean). When the great patriarch Jacob found that he could not get corn in his own country, he sent his sons to Egypt, and he got free corn, and the present government have so changed the tariff that we have free corn in Canada to-day, and therefore they follow the old free trade principles that were practiced in those early days.

Mr. MACLEAN. You are a few thousand years out.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) There are several other things that I hope their supporters will be able to teach them in that line before the present term of parliament will expire. I am glad to see my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) smiling, and I would remind him that he condemned free trade and said that the people of Britain are ashamed of the ghosts of John Stuart Mill, and Cobden and Bright. Well, he will get few to agree with him in that respect. Gentlemen in this House have the habit of speaking of England as if it meant Great Britain, but to my mind it includes Ireland and Scotland as well as England, and when you come to deal with these trade questions on broad lines it is well to bear in mind that it includes the whole empire. I have no objection to Englishmen, but I like Irishmen better, and I like Scotchmen best of all. The hon. gentleman from East York (Mr. Maclean) stated that free trade has been a failure. Let me point out to him that New South Wales is the colony which has adopted the nearest approach to British free trade, and New South Wales has prospered in a greater measure by far than any other of the Australian colonies. The hon. leader of the opposition stated that in the commonwealth of Australia they would likely have a moderate protective policy. I read the speech of Mr. Barton, the new premier of the commonwealth, and he stated that there were two parties in Australia, one advocating a protective tariff and the other advocating free trade. He mentioned that several of the premiers of the different colonies were in favour of free trade, but that the policy

that would be adopted would be a revenue tariff, and he indicated that it would take a year or two after the commonwealth was properly established, before they could arrive at what would be a proper revenue tariff. I want to point out the fallacy of thinking that Great Britain will give a preferential market to Canada and to Canada alone. That is out of the question. If anything comes out of that matter it must be by the commonwealth of Australia, and New Zealand, and the other British colonies combining with Canada. When that will be done, and we place ourselves properly before the British government you may get a hearing whatever the result may be; but it is very doubtful if Great Britain will depart from her present free trade policy.

The great grievance of hon. gentlemen opposite appears to be about the woollen trade of this country. I remember the time when the woollen manufacturers prospered under a 10 per cent tariff. When I first came to this House there was only a 15 per cent tariff, and there were woollen industries in the country prospering at that time. The tariff was increased to 17½ per cent under the Mackenzie government, and there was no complaint in those days of the failure of the woollen industry. Perhaps the most outrageous part of the tariff of the late government was that imposed upon woollen goods. In some instances it ranged as high as from 60 per cent to 70 per cent. Under the preferential arrangement made by the present government with Great Britain, there is a protection of from 21 per cent to 23½ per cent on woollen goods, and if the woollen mills cannot thrive and prosper under such protection as that, it would be better for the country to let them go down.

I was amused at the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), speaking of the preferential tariff, he shook his head, and said there is nothing in it—it is not of the slightest importance. But, then he took up his paper again, and said, there are $13,000,000 of woollen goods imported into this country; and he almost cried at such a calamity. What became of those goods? Why, the fashionable ladies of Canada used some of them, which they were enabled to get at cheaper rates than before, the working classes used them, the farmers and fishermen used them, and they were of benefit to the country. The great complaint in this country is, that it is too dear a country to live in. The great object is to induce people to come into the country, and we can only do that by making their supplies as cheap as possible. I was amused at hearing the hon. member for Lanark, the other evening, complain of the absence of ministers from their places in the House, instead of being here to listen to his eloquence. He forgot to say that the benches on his own side, including that of his leader, were also vacant; so that, the inattention paid to him was as much on his own side of the House as on this side. He made a speech in which, without considering it from an intellectual standpoint, he worked himself up into a high state of excitement, reminding one of a chief who was preparing his tribe for a war dance; and speaking of the surplus of the hon. Minister of Finance, he declared that there was no surplus, but a deficit of $1,000,000. Some of the gentlemen opposite say there should be no surplus—that it is an unfortunate thing for this country that there is a surplus. Another one wants the harbour of Collingwood deepened and improved; another one wants a harbour at some other place made; and probably another one wants the channel of the St. Lawrence made deeper and straighter. This shows the difference of opinion that exists on that side of the House. How can they expect to get all these things done without plunging the country into deeper debt than it is in at present, unless the Minister of Finance has a surplus with which to make these improvements? I think it will be a sad day for the country when there will be no surplus. If the Minister of Finance finds that he has a diminished revenue at any time—and I want to impress this upon him—all he has to do is to reduce his tariff——

Mr. MACLEAN. And cut off the bounties on iron.

Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.)—and then there will be larger importations, and an increase in the revenue accordingly.

Mr. ROSAMOND. What about the bounties on iron?

Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Now, I am going to tell something to the hon. member for West Prince.

Mr. WALLACE. What about the bounties on iron?

Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) That is something in the future. We will speak of things as they appear. They say it is time enough to fight the devil when you meet him.

Mr. WALLACE. The devil is here now.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does the hon. gentleman propose to raise the devil with the iron bounties?

Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) The hon. gentleman from Peterborough (Mr. Kendry) spoke about the 15,000 people who are engaged in the woollen industry. Well, I belong to a province where there are 32,741 men engaged in the fishing industry, and all we want for those people is that everything they consume shall be made as cheap as possible, because they have to buy everything, and I do not want them to be compelled to buy their ready-made clothing from the shoddy manufacturers of Ontario. I say

shoddy, because there have been some very shoddy speeches made in that interest on the other side of the House. When I tell you that there are six mills in Ontario preparing shoddy for the manufacture of woollen goods, you can form your own idea of the kind of goods they would compel us to wear under their high tariff. We regard it as a great privilege to be enabled to buy goods of good quality. If you buy a coat made of the shoddy stuff that comes down from Ontario, the colour all goes out of it in a very short time. We have woollen mills in Nova Scotia, and in Cape Breton, and every one of them will exist and prosper under the present tariff. If any of those mills go down, it will be because they expect too high a price for their goods or, perhaps, it may be from another reason—over-production ; they may manufacture too much for the consumption of the Dominion. Let them make goods of good quality, and they will always find a market for them, even in this Dominion. People are getting more enlightened in this age. I am glad to find that even a minority of our friends from the province of Ontario are getting more enlightened. We hear hon. gentlemen say to us : 'Look at Ontario,' as if Ontario were the whole of the Dominion. Thank heaven, it is not. And, after all these great bombastic speeches about what Ontario has accomplished, these hon. gentlemen had to go down to little Nova Scotia, and out of the five members of the opposition returned from that province, select their leader. They had not a man among themselves capable of leading them or keeping them together. Our hon. friends opposite tell us what Ontario and the people of Ontario are going to do at the next general election. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that there will be a progress of enlightenment even in that province before another election takes place.

We were told that before we had a protective tariff, we had to eat Canadian pork. All I have to say in reply to that statement is that under the protective tariff we collected $113,748 of duty on American pork consumed in the provinces for the use of the fisheries, which does not show that, even with a high tariff, we were compelled to use Canadian pork.

I am not going to weary the House with figures. The resolution of my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, is so broad that it may mean anything. You can put any construction on it you like. In that respect it resembles some passages in the Book of Revelations, on which commentators have been giving different interpretations for the last 500 years, and are still as far from the correct meaning as when they began. If this resolution is satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite, then it is very pleasing to us, and it reminds me of a story told about the early settlement of Dakota. A man of rather shabby appearance and riding a poor-looking horse came to a settler's house one evening. The settler asked him whether he was a lawyer or a doctor or a vendor of medicine or what he was. And at last the newcomer said : I am a follower of the Lord. Well, my friend, said the settler, you will be a long time before you will catch up to him with that horse. So it will be a long time before the policy propounded in the resolution of hon. gentlemen opposite will bring them to the Treasury benches.

I was glad to find by the high tone taken by the leader of the opposition and one or two of his followers that they have no aspirations to occupy this side of the House in the near future. They are aiming at something higher, they are to be a band of brethren, who would teach the people everything almost necessary for salvation, and they put me in mind of an incident which happened at a Methodist camp-meeting. At that meeting there was a very attractive young lady, and five nice young men from New York, such as sometimes stray to those meetings, went over to attend this one. One by one they related their Christian experience, and in each case that experience was that they had a call from the Lord to marry this beautiful young lady. The old deacon said : I thought I knew something of the mind of the Lord, but this is the first instance in which I have found that there was a call from the Lord to five young men to marry the one girl at the one time. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been fifteen years continuously in public life, and this is the first instance in which I have found the Conservative party not working to occupy the Treasury benches, and I am pleased to see that they have a higher aim just now. No doubt their desire will be gratified, and they will continue to occupy the position which they now fill so acceptably to hon. gentlemen on this side.

The hon. gentleman for West Prince (Mr. Hackett) said the other day that race and religion was the stock-in-trade by which this government gained power. I can, from my experience, characterize that charge as a slander, at least so far as the province of Nova Scotia is concerned. In my own constituency, composed of a few men of French origin, a good many Irishmen and a large number of Scotch Catholics, and of course a larger number of blue banner Presbyterians, I never heard any expression used which conveyed any reflection on the race or creed of the Prime Minister of Canada or the party that supports him from the province of Quebec. But I remember the time, which must be in the recollection of the right hon. the First Minister, when it was not so easy for the Liberals of the province of Quebec to assert their principles as it is to-day. I remember when a pronounced Liberal principle was considered a crime in some instances in that province. I had the pleasure of supporting a

government which had for Minister of Justice a gentleman who was afterwards promoted to be Chief Justice of the province of Quebec. I refer to my departed friend, Sir A. A. Dorion. A more pure, a more perfect and a more capable man I never met. I am a Scotchman but I never knew a Scotchman in public or private life outside my own family, that I held so dear as that pure-minded man. He was as nearly perfect as humanity could be. Of him it could be truly said, in the word of the Psalmist, 'Mark the perfect man and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace.' I consider it a privilege to be even at this late day able to pay this tribute of respect to my dear departed friend.

One word more. We must not forget even in this country that there is a Providence over us—that there is an overruling Providence in the lives of individuals and families and communities and provinces and particularly in the life of the Dominion. And Providence, in His anger, thought wise to punish this Dominion with an unjust government for eighteen years. But hearing the groanings of the people when they were in bondage, as the Israelites of old in Egypt, he came down and relieved them of that bondage. And I want to say to my friends in the government, that, so long as they continue to do what is right, so long as they continue to do what is just and honest and upright, there is a discerning public opinion growing in this country that will continue them in power. One thing I wished to say before I finished. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) said the other evening he was proud of the Conservative party, and was anxious that their history should be published. I think, for the sake of his own friends, they had better allow the present century to pass away before that is done, because there are certain things in connection with that party from 1872 until the recent defeat that had better not be written. If the hon. gentleman were in his place, I might enumerate these things, but——

Mr. EDWARDS. Enumerate them.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Oh, no. I do not want to hurt the feelings of my hon. friends opposite. I only advise them not to be in a hurry in writing the history of the Conservative party from 1872 until their defeat in 1896.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). At this late hour of the night, and at this late stage of the debate, I do not intend to detain the House long. I think I had better commence with some reference to the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Ross, Victoria, N.S.) who has just taken his seat. He is a sort of Rip Van Winkle, who appears to have been asleep ever since the honest Liberalism of 1873. He has not wakened up to the condition of the new Liberalism of this country, or he would not make the statements he has with reference to the Conservative party. His treatment of the sacred word and his effort to weave it in with the conduct and policy of the Liberal party to-day, certainly does not result in a very harmonious production. You could no more apply the sacred word to their conduct—why, there comes in the Rip Van Winkle again. He is thinking of the honest Liberals, of the Dorions and Mackenzies. He said that they had free trade in corn and spoke of Joseph going down into Egypt. It was not Joseph, but Joseph's brethren, the rascals who sold him there.

Hon. Mr. ROSS. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I said that the patriarch Jacob, when he found he could not get corn in his own country, sent his sons to Egypt for corn.

Mr. BRODER. He had to send to Joseph, who was in Egypt.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, B.C.) I know the whole history.

Mr. BRODER. I am sorry that, if the hon. gentleman knows it, he has not profited more by it. They had free corn long before Christianity was introduced, and we had to come back to that when these hon. gentlemen came into power. And we have it now. My hon. friend—I was going to call him our reverend friend—is not very happy in his allusions to the sacred Scripture and to free corn. But there is this point with regard to free corn. If there was one argument more than another that the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite used as an argument in favour of free corn in Canada, it was that it would give the farmer who wished to fatten his cattle for the English market an opportunity to do so—so that we would not be obliged to send our cattle to the United States market as stockers or unfed cattle. And what are the conditions to-day? I will quote from a paper that there will be no dispute about, because hon. gentlemen opposite will believe the paper, and my friends on this side will believe me—so there will be no dispute. I will quote the Globe, showing the figures it gave on the 30th October last, just on the eve of the people going to the polls. The Globe says:

During four and a half years ending 31st December, 1896——

That is previous to the Conservatives going out of power.

—Canada shipped to the United States 3,762 cattle, receiving therefor $52,606. Since December 31st, 1896——

That is, while hon. gentlemen opposite were in power——

—the shipments have reached 301,073, valued at $4,377,852. The Laurier government secured the

removal of the United States quarantine restrictions.

Now, I want to say that that was a very mistaken policy in the interests of the country. What was the value of those cattle? You would think, to hear hon. gentlemen opposite talking on the platform, that the effect of it had been to enhance the value of our cattle by $10 a head. I have heard that statement made myself. But what are the figures given by the Globe? These figures show that the value of the cattle sent to the United States during the Conservative regime was $13.98 on the average, while during the four and one-half years of Liberal regime, the value was $14.54—just 56 cents per head additional. And, if you take into account the four years previous to 1896, there is no comparison at all in their favour, but rather the reverse. But consider the effect of this upon the interests of the country and the prospective interests of the cattle shippers of Canada. It has put beyond possibility of chance the removal of the embargo upon Canadian cattle in the English market. But, have hon. gentlemen opposite attempted to do anything in that respect? They boast wonderfully because they have got the cattle quarantine regulation changed as between this country and the United States. But this affects us injuriously in the English market, and in every other market where it is proposed to ship cattle. Now, it always happens when I address the House that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is not in his place. I wish to make reference to him, and I may call him the ager-minded Minister of Agriculture, who thinks of nobody but the tillers of the soil. To hear what is said of him one would suppose that his tender hands are blistered holding out blessings to the farmers of this country. But what market has the Minister of Agriculture opened up for the farmer that the farmer did not have when this government came into power. From the premier down to the smallest man that sings his praises, not one of them can point to a single market that has been opened by them for the products of the farmers of Canada. But one thing that they did do was to close the German market against the Canadian grain. They gave the West Indies some privileges that had not been given when they came into power; and, since then the West Indies have raised their tariffs against Canada. The Minister of Agriculture is heralded throughout this country as a practical farmer. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that he never ploughed a furrow or hoed a row of corn in his life.

Mr. MACLEAN. He cut his corn.

Mr. BRODER. Yes, but it was on his toe. I wish to make reference to some things said by the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Ross) who has just taken his seat. He stated that the woollen industry was prosperous during the Mackenzie regime under a tariff of 17½ per cent. If the hon. gentleman will recall the history of that time, I think he will find that it was by no means prosperous in many parts of this country. He has spoken of the poor Canadian with the faded coat made of goods of Canadian manufacture. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the class of goods made in some of the factories in this country are a credit to any man to wear; and I do not wish to deprecate home manufacture in favour of the labour of any other country. The hon. gentleman was good enough to refer to the fact that the representatives of the great Conservative party of Ontario had to select as their leader a man from Nova Scotia. So far as that is concerned, Ontario is not provincial. The Conservative party is a national party, not a provincial party, and it would be well for this country, if hon. gentlemen opposite could say that they were not a provincial party. More than that, we lay our hands upon an able man wherever we can find him. And still more, when we select an hon. gentleman to be our leader, we select a man who is ready to stand by his guns and keep confederation intact against the machinations and efforts of a man like the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), who, when he was premier of Nova Scotia, tried to take his province out of the Dominion; and when he came down to the conference in Quebec to sit in solemn council with Mr. Mercier and Sir Oliver Mowat and the premiers of this Dominion—only one Conservative premier among them—the only condition upon which he would confer with them was that they should put upon the minutes the statement that nothing that conference might do, should hinder Nova Scotia from seceding from the Dominion. That is the kind of men hon. gentlemen opposite follow. I do not intend to follow such a man, no matter where he comes from. We will take a man that is national wherever we find him. We are a national party, we are not provincial. It would be well for our hon. friends opposite to wake up and get a little bigger than the province of Nova Scotia, get a little bigger than the province of Quebec. It is high time. The people who govern this country were larger in their outlook than the mere province in which they live. It is a mistake for Canada, and unless her public men can take a broad national view they will not succeed in governing this country.

Mr. McLENNAN. Nova Scotia received better terms from this Dominion as a result of this protest from the Minister of Finance.

Mr. BRODER. The hon. gentleman must take his medicine. Now this preference they talk so much about, this preference without any quid pro quo, what has it done? Now, I am going to use a homely simile which every man can understand. Our old

friend, the Rev—I beg his pardon, I mean the hon. gentleman who just took his seat, referred to our policy as something like what you saw in Revelation, you could not tell what it meant, you could make it mean one thing or another. Well, it will be a happy day for those hon. gentlemen if they ever get as near Revelation as that. Their conduct and their policy is like Revelation because nobody can understand it, you cannot even put two meanings on it, you cannot even put one. It is all out of joint like the hon. gentleman's speech, and I would advise him either to read the Scripture over again, or to leave it alone, in the House. Now, what have these hon. gentlemen done? They are living in the good old Tory House, and they have simply put a bay window to the House. Just like the bad boy running away from justice, he runs into the bay window, and thinks he is out of danger. They have merely put up a bay window to this building, but it will never stand the storm, because the roof is not good, it will leak, and they will be driven out. The opinion is looming up all over this country that this English preference is a mistake. They say they have a revenue tariff. Supposing it is a revenue tariff so far as England is concerned. Is it a revenue tariff to any other country in the world? No, Sir, and they cannot claim it is. The most they can claim for it is that it might be a revenue tariff so far as English goods are concerned. But when they apply it to any other country it is a highly protective tariff, and the principle of protection is as much embodied in it as it ever was in this country before, and in some instances more.

When you come to consider the farmers, do mowing machine, reapers, binding machines and all the heavy articles farmers are obliged to purchase—does one single article come into this country under the English preference? The farmers' interests have been totally overlooked. So they need not claim so much for their English preference. But what does the mutual preference mean? Hon. gentlemen say: Oh, you need not ask for it. Is that a position for a public man to take? Is that what the followers of hon. gentlemen opposite do when they want anything? No, they are knocking at the door every day of the week, Sunday included, for something they want. They believe in that principle when they are after the public chest, they ought to believe in that principle when they are after the markets of the world. But no, you must not ask for it, you can never get it. Now there is just this question to be looked at: We have got to come to some different conditions in this country from what hon. gentlemen opposite propose. I say seriously that the economic conditions of this country are in danger under the present regime. We are standing to-day in this position: Chinese labour, one-third of the world's population, knocking at our western gate for admission. What does that mean? Five cents a day, ten cents a day, fifteen cents a day for labour. If hon. gentlemen admit that free trade is the policy of Canada, then they have got to open these western gates and let this horde of cheap labour into this country in order to enable us to compete with other manufacturing countries. You have got to decide either for high protection in this country or taking care of Canadians, or opening your gates and letting this cheap labour come in, in order that Canada may compete with foreign manufacturers. That is a question worth considering, and ought to be considered. What do we see to-day in that wonderful country? Every commercial country in the world in arms out there watching the great interests that are at stake. If the country is divided up, no doubt England will be a great factor in the ultimate decision, and who then can compete with England in that country, with her money and with her cheap labour? Canada is not in a position to do so. We wish to have the closest possible relations with the mother country, but we want to protect our interests in the future; and hon. gentlemen opposite are derelict in their duty if they do not take up that subject and deal with it before complications arise that they will be unable to cope with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few things that ought to be said, and this cold storage business is one matter that I wish to refer to. After all the boasting that we have had with reference to what these hon. gentlemen have accomplished I say, without fear of successful contradiction, that cold storage, so far as fruits are concerned, is but in its experimental stage. They don't know to-day what policy is best to adopt, they do not know under what conditions it is safest to ship fruit; and I fancy that one of the causes of failure is that they have sent out to England their camp followers who know as much about the conditions that should govern the shipment of fruit as about those that govern the shipment of swine, and no more. They boast about their cold storage for shipments of butter and cheese to England; how is it then that these articles stand several shillings, in the English market, under the products of Denmark and of Australia? They say that butter reaches there under the conditions it ought to be in, yet it has to take a back seat in the English market so far as prices are concerned. The quality is right, and if it was shipped there under proper conditions the price would be higher than it is. But in order to get good prices something more must be done. What are they boasting about? There is another matter they have got to learn, and that is that you cannot take butter, or cheese, or any other perishable article out of a low temperature and put it into a higher temperature, with safety to that article. That has been one

of the great difficulties in shipments of our fowls over there. After all the boasting of hon. gentlemen, there is no place over there for a man to put his articles into cold storage by government provision? There is for his butter and cheese, but there is not for his fowls, and he has got to go to the Englishman who makes a business of cold storage, and he puts his fowl in there—at what price? From two and a half cents to three cents per pound for thirty days. That means that the Canadian shipper of fowl makes that much less profit on it. These gentlemen are not looking after the interests of the farmers as they ought. Shippers may stuff their chicken as much as they like here, but if they do not put it in proper condition on the English market the chicken won't bring a proper return. If you look up the records you will find all the shipments that have been made. Now, they cannot surely ask businessmen to ship goods under the condition of things that they have brought about themselves. I was looking up the articles of shipment going over to the old country, and it is a losing game, according to their own reports. Then why do they expect private individuals to invest their capital in such enterprises? It is about time we had somebody running this concern that knew what he was doing. It is time for them to quit singing this song: See what we have done for the farmers, look at the cold storage we have given them. What was the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite in reference to cold storage in 1896 when it was almost in its inception? Why, when the Conservative government had an item of $60,000 in the estimates of 1896, and when Mr. Foster, who was then acting Minister of Agriculture, asked hon. gentlemen opposite to allow the item to pass in order that he might keep up the continuity of the system, they refused point black to allow it to pass. Still, they go around this country boasting of what they are doing for the farmer. They are not willing to do for the farmer what they profess, they are now after something else. He is the last man in the account. They try to make him believe that their bowels of compassion are as warm as ever for him. Sir, they are as dry as a ram's horn.

Now if hon. gentlemen opposite were honest, were sincere in attempting to get a revenue tariff for this country, no government had a better opportunity. They had a buoyant revenue, a surplus of millions. They claimed to have made a reduction in the tariff, although they have a surplus of eight millions. No attempt to carry out what they professed to think this country wanted. They claimed that the country wanted a revenue tariff. Why, Sir, we never had such a revenue in this country. That is the sense in which it is a revenue tariff. A revenue tariff properly speaking should only meet the requiremnts and just

demands of the country, but hon. gentlemen opposite have a revenue tariff that meets more than the just demands of the country and $8,000,000 to boot, according to their story.

I say that the mutual preference which is proposed in the amendment before the House, means a great deal more than many people may see upon the face of it. It does not mean that because England may put 5 cents a bushel on wheat or may put a very nominal duty on cattle and the products of other agricultural countries entering the British market, that therefore we will get a trifle more for our agricultural products; but it means the first place for us Canadians in the English market, and it means an unlimited market for the products of Canada. It means a great deal more than hon. gentlemen opposite assume; it means an unlimited market for the products of this country for years and years to come. It puts the Canadian farmer in the position of the man who drives down to the Ottawa market with a load of produce and has an hour to sell his goods before any one else is allowed to get there. It means that his load is sold whether other people's loads are sold or not. If there is one thing more than another that England is interested in, and if there is one thing more than another that the government ought to represent to the authorities in England, it is that we in Canada have the land and we ought to have the energy and the population to produce all the bread and meat that England wants. We have got the broad acres to do it, thanks to the Conservatives who opened up our country, and the moment it would dawn on England that we would be able in a few short years to give her all the food products she wants, then there would be no difficulty in bringing about this mutual preferential trade which is advocated on this side of the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite say it is impossible to do it. Sir, it is worth the trial, and any public man who is not willing to make the effort, is not honest to the interests of Canada.

Now, Sir, I want to speak of a matter which has often been referred to by gentlemen on the Liberal benches. They will get up there and talk about the race cry, and the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Ross), was good enough to say that there was no race cry in Nova Scotia. Well, that is to the credit of the Conservative party in that province. The Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) waxed loud and eloquent—loud, whether eloquent or not—about some little paper away up north saying something about Laurier-Tarte & Co., and so on. If there is one thing more than another that these hon. gentlemen, from the premier down, persist in, it is in refusing to be held by the opinions expressed in newspapers. They repudiated their organs from the

Globe down to the smallest sheet—I do not want the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) to leave the House until I tell him something. There was another cry in North Bruce, and what was it? It was the harbour cry and the dock cry. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was up there wading through the snow up to his waist—and that is not far—and skating on the ice to inspect the harbours to see what the people wanted, just two days before the election. I am very glad he went up there, because I think he helped to elect a good Tory.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We only had fifty votes more there.

Mr. BRODER. Well, with all the trouble you had in your special car and all that, they were a pretty expensive lot. I am not finding fault with that, because I think the minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) ought to be used well—when he goes away.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODER. It is very significant that two ministers of the Crown should be in the neighbourhood of North Bruce. The hon. member (Hon. Mr. Ross) told us that Providence has been kind to the Liberals, but Providence did not favour these two ministers because the storm stayed them and snowed them in. Providence is beginning to leave you fellows over there. There is a good deal said by gentlemen opposite about the race cry, but I state here fearlessly that they are in power to-day because of the race cry. The race cry is not the product of a few months nor of a few years even, but you can go back to 1885 and 1886 and you find the right hon. the Prime Minister on the Champ de Mars in Montreal backed up by the Hon. Mr. Mercier trying to unite his people in one phalanx irrespective of party. There is the crop across the House to-day: fifty-eight members from the province of Quebec in a solid phalanx supporting the government, and seven Conservatives. Talk about the race cry. Can you find a single instance in the history of the country parallel to that. They have now the crop from the seed they have sown, and the moment you speak of the fine crop that they have grown on this soil that they have cultivated so long, they answer back: Oh, you are raising the race cry. I say that there is no honest man who should stand up and endeavor to make capital out of a race cry in this country. I have never done it, and I have stood up for the minority when my political interests would have been better served by taking the other side. That is known all over this country. I say that the men from the leader down who have attempted to unite the people because of their race and religion irrespective of party, have not worked in the interest of Canada. Is not this a significant thing? I have here a quotation from speeches of the First Minister and the Hon. Mr. Mercier on the Champ de Mars as published on the 26th November, 1885, in La Patrie, and that speech of the Prime Minister is not to be found in the volume of speeches which the friend of the right hon. gentleman has published to be read by the people of Canada. Was that speech intended for Quebec? It was not intended for the rest of the world, because it is not published. That is rather significant. It is time hon. gentlemen opposite should cease harping on the race question. Why, you can scarcely mention the name of the Prime Minister or of the Hon. Mr. Tarte without being accused of raising the race cry. Have we not the right to deal with the conduct of public men no matter who they are or what they are? The Conservative party is the party that has stood up for the rights of minorities in every respect. If you want authority for the statement that the Liberals have raised the race cry, you can read your own newspaper. You can turn back to the Montreal Herald of the 28th March, 1885, and you will find that it refers to the present Prime Minister and to the Hon. Edward Blake as endeavouring to make capital out of the condition of things in the North-west, and it speaks of the Globe newspaper as having for two years attempted to bring about disturbances in the North-west. I can quote from the documents of the Liberal party to prove that they are the party who live on racial cries. But, Sir, I say with pride that while the Conservative party stands here with a small phalnax from the province of Quebec, they stand as representing the best element in that province; the best element among the French Canadian people of the province of Quebec. Sir, the best element of the people, English and French, in the province of Quebec, stand behind the Conservative party in this parliament, and to-day we hear the rumblings of discontent of certain men who want to follow the lines laid down in 1885 and 1887. They stand up here and they say: Whist, whist, we have got all the advantage in Quebec that we can get out of that condition of things, and now we want to talk to Ontario a while. I do not believe that any honest public man should make use of such a weapon in political warfare. These gentlemen opposite cannot hurl taunts across the floor of the House without expecting a retort, and if they get a retort they have brought it upon themselves. I say, Sir, that the people of Canada irrespective of race or creed are willing to stand side by side in the great national interests of this country, and they should be allowed to do so without interference from the Liberal party.

Our old friend (Hon. Mr. Ross) spoke about the iron bounties. I think he was hardly fair in his argument, because at the present time we are paying more for iron bounties than was ever paid before in this country, and that is a condition of things he is willing to support. He told us it was time enough to bid good morning to the devil when you met him, but the hon. gentleman was between the devil and the deep sea, and he did not wish to answer that question. He has been too long in public life not to know what that question meant. He himself tells us he has been fifteen years in public life and he knows very well that was a fair question put in a fair way, and he should answer it.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I will answer it if you wish.

Mr. BRODER. I am going to answer it, perhaps better than you can. The hon. gentleman's province is much interested now in the iron bounties, and he did not want to say anything about it. Provincial interests came in again, and he is a provincial man. He is not a Dominion man at all, and if he is true to his province, he should support our leader here. If he is a free trader, I do not know how in the world he can sleep in that House over there.

Mr. ROSS (Victoria). We have a leader from our province on this side of the House.

Mr. BRODER. I only wish to say that consistency is a jewel which you will never find over there, and we need not look for it. Men who have talked free trade for twenty years are there now, declaring themselves to be tariff revenue men or free traders in principle, who cannot apply free trade to this country. If there is anything at all in the free trade argument, the sooner you apply it to a young country, the easier it is to apply it. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not honest when they make that statement, because they try to shelter themselves for not applying their policy to the country behind the statement that this is a new country and it cannot be applied. If they cannot apply their policy to the country, the honest, straightforward course is for them to go out of office and give others a chance to apply another policy. There is no danger of that, however, in this case. If the country is too young for a free trade policy, I suppose it is because the patient is not strong enough to stand the medicine. The fact is, that hon. gentlemen opposite are afraid of public opinion. They never announced to the country their British preference as a part of their policy. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) put a small motion of about three lines on this subject on 'Hansard' some years ago, but it was never discussed on the public platform. They never attempted to put forward that policy until they got here among their friends who had been fighting for free trade for many years, and who said to them : You must do something in the direction of free trade ; and then the ingenious brain of the Finance Minister conjured up a preference to England, and they threw it to their followers as you might throw a plank to a drowning man ; and on that plank they got ashore. Is that what you talked about to this country for eighteen years ? In all that time it never was mentioned, and hon. gentlemen have not been honest in adopting it. They adopted it merely as an emergency food for their friends ; but it is very weak, and they will not live on it long, and they know it.

Now, the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) made some reference to the condition of labour in the United States. Does it not occur to that hon. gentleman and to the House that his argument was not pertinent at all ? Because you find in Europe that the manufactured products of the United States, such as iron, are disturbing the economic conditions of all Europe. Yet, this hon. gentleman talks about protection being a failure to the labourer in the United States. Where are the labourers who are shut out of our mills going to-day ? They are going to the United States, a highly protected country. Hon. gentlemen could not use an argument more detrimental to their own interest than a comparison of the United States with any free trade country. American iron is displacing English iron in the world's market, and even our own Minister of Railways has to go to the United States to buy engines and cars. When we look over the history of the United States we find that their difficulty only came when they receded from a high tariff, and in every instance they have had to go back to a high tariff in order to keep their labour for their labouring men, and in order to keep pace with the great requirements of the country. There is no country in the world to compare with it, for the enormous success it has had as a commercial country, in the few years, nationally speaking, of its existence. Another thing I wish to refer to is the great increase in the value of the agricultural products of that country under high protection. The increase in the value of agricultural products last year over that of the previous year was no less than four billions of dollars. Yet hon. gentlemen talk about the condition of things in this country. When they make these comparisons, they must expect to be met with the facts.

These are things which every public man should understand before he atempts to legislate for the requirements of this young country. With its enormous resources and the great energy of its people, all it wants is proper management and the proper investing of capital to attain the position it ought to attain as a prosperous and growing country.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, with the customary respect which I bear to the constitutional usages of parliament, you will allow me to return to the question which is before the House, that is, the motion of the hon. leader of the opposition. So many arguments in this debate have been devoted to several questions which are not at issue, like the race question, the religious question, and other questions which I fail to see covered by this motion, that the House will pardon me if I do not discuss these issues. When they are before the House, let us talk about them ; but when the budget of the country is before us, and when we are called upon to decide either for the policy of the government or the policy of the opposition, we should discuss the finances of the country, and consider whether we should approve or disapprove of the policy of one party or the other.

For my part, I would not have taken any part in this debate if my reasons for opposing the motion of the hon. leader of the opposition were not slightly different from those that have been given by most members on this side of the House. It may be due to the fact that most of the members of the ministerialist party are free traders on principle, whilst, as I have told this House very frankly, and as I told my own electors when I went before them in 1896, and again last year, I am a moderate protectionist. The right hon. leader of this government has defined the difference between the two parties, or rather between the government and the opposition, thus : On your left, Mr. Speaker, the principle of protection to manufacturers, and on this side of the House a tariff for revenue, with incidental protection contained therein. Of course, that is a very clear distinction ; but when we have a surplus of $8,000,000 out of a total customs revenue of $28,000,000—I speak in round figures—following a year when we had a surplus of $5,000,000 out of total customs revenue of $25,000,000, it seems to me that the incident is becoming very near the principal, and that, instead of having protection as the eventual consequence of a tariff revenue, we are getting a very swollen revenue from a protective tariff. This reminds me of an incident in one of the most charming stories of Merimee. A Huguenot soldier, disguised in a monk's garb, fleeing from the massacre of St. Bartholomew, stopped one morning at a country inn and called for breakfast. It was a Friday morning. He happened to catch two fat chickens in the yard, and asked the hostess to prepare them. She was scandalized, and said to him : ' Don't you know this is Friday morning ? ' To which he replied : ' Oh ! don't worry yourself : I baptize them carp and perch.' When I heard the old fighters who stood for so many years against surpluses gathered from the sweat of the farmers and the workingmen of this country, applauding the announcement of a surplus of $8,000,000, it seemed to me a little strange. Of course, I am no authority, and pretend to be no authority, on trade matters ; but it seems to me that a tariff capable of such results is a tariff for revenue and for something else. The question is, what is that something else ? I leave it to the free traders on principle to baptize it with a very mild name, which will cover their past scruples. For myself, I call it protection. Of course, if I were a free trader on principle, it would be very easy for me to swallow that kind of protection ; but being only a moderate protectionist, I begin to feel a little uneasy about it. And when I heard the hon. Minister of Finance giving a warning to the manufacturers of this country, and telling them : Do not dare to come and tempt our virtue, for no change in the tariff will be made in your favour by this government, for some years to come, it seemed to me that the same warning applied to the consumers and farmers of the country. To these, it meant : Do not expect any alleviation of your burdens.

Of course—I might as well confess now—on this, as on most political matters, I am a man of very few principles. I envy those rich men who can afford to abandon a few principles at every corner of their public life and still keep an ample supply. My poverty forces me to stand for what I believe. On these matters, my confession of faith is a very short one. I have no theory. I believe in a tariff framed, kept and modified according to the natural circumstances of the country for which it is framed, and according to the developments that may take place in the national life of that country. And I admire the frankness of speech of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith), who told us that, though born and brought up in a country where free trade was not only a principle, but the declared policy of all public men, yet, having come to this country, and having found here different circumstances, though he still believed in the principle upon which he had been brought up, yet, he avowed that we needed some protection in this country. And I think it would have been far better and more courageous on the part of the government to tell us, when they came into power, or in the first year when they were called upon to frame a tariff, and every year when they were called upon to modify or maintain it, that, though they believed in free trade, yet, finding it impossible to adopt free trade in this country, finding it necessary to keep a certain degree of protection, they would keep it as long as necessary, instead of trying to make us believe that this was a tariff for revenue. The longer I am in public life, the more I believe it is as well to speak of things as they are, instead of

trying to find some fine names to make ourselves seem in accord with declarations made twenty-five years ago. The Canadian people is broadminded ; it does not ask its public men to show that their action to-day is copied from a dictum a quarter of a century old, so long as their action is a right one, and one in the interests of the country. I believe that, as a general rule, the taxation of this country should be proportioned to the requirements of the government, meaning that there should be a high rate when the total revenue is not up to the required expenditure, and a lower rate when the total revenue is too high. This is a general principle, which, I admit, must be applied with some care. It does apply indeed, and has been applied for several years in France. Now, I am free to admit that I am not a great admirer of the French system of government, so far as politics are concerned. I have never made any bones about it. I think it will be admitted that I am not moved by a desire to flatter anybody—I am not a flatterer, I think I may be granted that much—if I say I am a great admirer of the British system of government, so far as politics are concerned, so far as the balance of power is concerned, so far as concerns the granting of individual liberty and the keeping up of social liberty. But, so far as economic policy is concerned, I may be granted leave to say that the French nation is the best-ruled nation in the world. It may be said that under the French system of economy the trade of France has not expanded, while the trade of England, the trade of Germany, the trade of the United States have expanded. To my mind, the end of government is not so much to help the manufacturers and tradesmen of a country to make and sell more goods, but to see that, through a sound economical policy, each class of the people shall share in the benefits of industry. The richest country in the world, to my mind, is not the country which manufactures and sells the most, but in which there is an equal proportion of wealth amongst all classes of people. And, so far as that is concerned, there is no nation that equals the French nation to-day. And why ? Because their economical questions are outside of politics. There are free traders and there are protectionists in France ; but there is no party of free trade and no party of protection. There is a non-political commission which, every year, looks into the production of the country, considers the industrial condition of the country ; and, if it is found that the prices charged by the producers of goods are too high, the duties are lowered and foreign goods are allowed to come in to compete—not to crush the national industries—but to force the producers to sell their products to the people of France at a fair profit. Now, I admit that in Canada, it would be harder to apply that system, because this is a new country ; new industries are developing, new natural resources are found which change every year the conditions of industry. But, I say that we should move towards this end. A tariff should not be prepared and maintained forever simply to protect this industry or that industry, simply to flatter the farming community on one hand or to favour the manufacturing community on the other hand. The tariff should be framed free from political aim, so that all classes of the people should get a legitimate profit by it, and no class should be allowed to make profit at the expense of another. I say that we need some kind of protection in this country. Even in 1896, before I knew exactly what would be the tariff framed, should my party get into power, I told the electors of the county in which I ran, that I was a protectionist, my reason being, I believe, that of the hon. member for Vancouver. The hon. gentleman did not get to the point of telling us why, having come to Canada, he had changed his mind or rather found that a policy which he admired in England could not be applied in Canada. To my mind, the reason is a simple one. As I said, I believe in the tariff being framed, not upon theory, but upon actual and real facts with which we have to deal. What is our position ? Here, on the northern part of the North American continent, are two nations. One is a nation of seventy-five millions of people, separated commercially from the rest of the world by the highest protective wall that exists on the globe. The other is a young rising nation of six millions of people. My reason for saying that we need that, and for some years yet to come, and, perhaps, for many years to come, we shall need a protective tariff in this country, is not merely to give revenue to the government, but to protect ourselves against undue competition from the Americans. I would have no objection to the American goods coming into this country and competing on a fair basis with the Canadian goods ; but I have, and I shall continue to have, objections to the American manufacturers, having made up their enormous profits in a protected market of seventy-five millions of people, coming and competing with the Canadian industries and slaughtering prices in Canada. I may be told by my free trade friends : But the Canadian consumer will get the benefit of it, for he will buy cheaper ; and why should you tax all the people of this country for the benefit of a few manufacturers ? I find my reply in the very words of the hon. member for Vancouver this afternoon. As he told us, the manufacturer is the most tyrannical monopolist in the world. It may be that the Canadian consumer, for a short time after the barrier was lowered or removed, would benefit by the low prices of American goods coming into this country, slaughtering our markets and destroying our

manufactures. The consumer might get American goods for two or three years at cheaper rates and so make money. But once the Canadian manufactories were closed and competition in Canada was no longer possible, the prices would go up, as we have seen the price of coal oil go up. And, as against the profit we should make for two or three years, the consumer would pay tenfold in the following years when the Canadian manufacturer was crushed and the American manufacturer had control of the market. I would be a free trader as much as any man on this side of the House, if there could be fair competition from other nations with the American manufacturer. If the conditions were such that the German or English product could come in and compete with the American product, I would say : Let the Canadian manufacturers be driven out, and let the Canadian consumer profit by the cheaper market. But what do we see now : the steel king of the United States sells his goods, not merely in British possessions, not merely in the competitive markets of the world, but in England, at the very door of the English manufacturer, competing in an industry which has been for years in the hands of England. He forces the English railways to buy American steel rails manufactured in a protective country, after they have been transported to the seaboard on American railways, carried across the Atlantic, taken to the very door of the English steel manufacturer and sold at cheaper prices than the Englishman can make them.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) allow me to ask him a question ? Does he pretend that it is as a result of protection that these steel rails were manufactured more cheaply in the United States and sold in the British markets ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Then, the hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. BOURASSA. Before my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) passes judgment on my knowledge, let me answer his question by saying : No, I do not pretend so. But, I take the facts as they are. Whether it be on account of protection or on account of more skilful labour, or better means of production, I find that the manufactures of free trade England are driven, not merely out of the markets of the world, but out of the British market as well, by the products of the United States. Therefore, I say, before we open our doors, let us consider these facts. I do not say, however, let us nail up our doors. And it is for that reason that I cannot adopt the first paragraph of the declaration of the leader of the opposition, which says :

That, in the opinion of this House, the welfare of this country requires a pronounced policy of adequate protection and encouragement at all times to the labour, agricultural, manufacturing, mining and other industrial interests of Canada.

I simply say that so long as we cannot find better means of preventing American manufacturers slaughtering their goods in foreign markets, after they have made an honest profit in their own ;—so long as we cannot otherwise prevent their killing our own industries in this way—we need some protection for some time to come. But when we come down to the details, then we should find out the difference between protectionists on principle and protectionists by accident. The difference should be this : Instead of abiding by the straight rule laid down by the leader of the opposition, men who have fought all their lives for the doctrine of free trade, should carry their principles into practice by at least giving the lowest protection possible and concentrating that protection upon those industries which make the most use of the natural products of this country. That protection should also be administered in favour of those industries which are liable to be killed by the competition of foreign monopolists, and should be applied more particularly to Canadian manufactures that are not under the control of monopolies and trusts. In other words, we should fight, not only against foreign but against domestic trusts as well. Of course, I know that in the tariff of 1897 there is a special provision giving power to the Minister of Customs to discriminate against trusts and combines. But how is that law applied ? I shall not go into the details of the tariff, not only because I do not pretend to be an authority, but also because I do not believe that a great accumulation of figures implies a great deal of science. But I shall simply take the three industries of sugar, cotton and wool. These three, I would, in my ignorance, classify under the heading of artificial industries, and what I mean by an artificial industry is one which does not use any national product, but imports the foreign product and then converts that product into something else. The three industries I have mentioned, I refer to more particularly because their products are those most required by the mass of the people, especially sugar and cotton. Woollens perhaps are not so totally required by the poor, because they include the more expensive articles of clothing.

What about sugar ? We are told by the Minister of Finance that he does not propose to encourage the manufacture of beetroot sugar. I am not a believer in bounties on principle, but if under a free trade government bounties are to be given to capitalists, to owners of iron mines and iron smelters, why should not a similar favour be extended to the Canadian farmer, especially

when that would encourage competition against one of the largest and best known trusts of this country. If there is an artificial industry in the world, as far as Canada is concerned, it is that of sugar. We do not produce one cent's worth of the raw material required by the refiners, but thanks to our tariff—not only the tariff framed four years ago, but the present tariff—the sugar refiner has ample protection. According to the statement of the Minister of Customs the other night, our revised tariff of to-day gives 8 cents more per 100 pounds of protection to the refiner, which means the swelling of the dividends of the sugar trust and an increase of revenue to the government at the cost of the Canadian consumer. Yet, when the Canadian farmer asks a little bounty, he is told in reply : Oh ! no, this is a free trade government.

Let us take cotton and wool. Here are two industries which are most directly affected by the preference accorded to Great Britain. We had the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) telling us this afternoon that the woollen industry had not suffered from English competition. But on the other hand, we had the declaration of the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Kendry) telling us that it had. In this matter, I do not profess to be a judge, but I know that last week I met one of the representatives of the biggest woollen concerns of Canada, and was told by him of the efforts which the woollen manufacturers had made to meet English competition. He said that when the 25 per cent reduction was made in the tariff of 1897, they got new implements and improved machinery, and were prepared to fight the English competition. And even when the further reduction of 8⅓ per cent was made, they did not cease their efforts ; but they were very much afraid that when the trade, which was now very brisk, became slack, they would not be able to stand the pressure. They were afraid that at first the smaller manufacturers would have to shut down and then the others would have to follow suit. I voted heartily in favour of the reduction of 25 per cent in the tariff of 1897, not for the reason, given three years later, that it was going to create a stronger bond of unity between England and the colony, but because it meant a reduction of duty to the Canadian consumer. For the same reason, I supported the further reduction last year, but at that time I made a reservation. I said : I am in favour of this reduction because I believe that industries, which cannot hold their own with two-thirds of the actual duty in their favour and the cost of transportation, are not worthy of existing on Canadian soil, and the Canadian people should not be taxed for their maintenance.

I expected that this year the question would be looked at with a little more care by the government. I would be disposed to say that these industries which cannot exist under the present preferential tariff of England, should not exist. But then let the law be the same for all. How is it that previous to the reduction that was made in favour of British goods, the duties on woollen articles remained the same but the duties on cotton fabrics went up ? We had a letter from the most important cotton manufacturer of this country, Mr. Gault, congratulating this government on the way they had framed their tariff. The Minister of Customs says to the woollen manufacturers : Go on, display skill, and the Almighty will help you ! But when the cotton industries were concerned, perhaps the government said the same thing : Display skill, help yourselves and the Almighty will help you,—and perhaps they added : We will help you a little too, and we will raise the duty. Why this different treatment ? Is it because the woollen industries are not combined and the cotton industries are combined ? I would be very much surprised, though not being a free trader on principle, if, under a government elected to power by free traders, combined industries should receive special protection, while industries who are striving to live separately receive no consideration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to the second paragraph of the amendment of the leader of the opposition, the paragraph in favour of mutual preference throughout the British Empire. To my mind that paragraph is a direct contradiction to the first one. Hon. gentlemen opposite have complained that Canadian industries are hurt by the preferential tariff, and they say they want a preference in the British market as a compensation for the preference we give. I have followed pretty closely the declarations of hon. gentlemen opposite, from the leader of the opposition to the last speaker, and I have not yet been able to catch their idea. I would like to put this question to the leader of the opposition : Are we to understand by this paragraph in favour of mutual reciprocity between Great Britain and her colonies that, if the leader of the opposition should come to power, he would protect the industries which his party claim are hurt by preferential trade, by raising the duties on foreign articles to the rate that existed before, in order to make up for that preference in favour of British goods ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not see that there is any difficulty at all in what the hon. gentleman suggests. It is perfectly easy adequately to protect Canadian industries, and at the same time, so far as we have to import from foreign countries, to give a preference to Great Britain.

Mr. BOURASSA. I think the reply is very indefinite. These gentlemen are attacking the preferential policy of the government on the ground that it hurts some Canadian industries. I do not think they would go so far as to say that, should they come to power, they would first raise the

duty on those article by 33⅓ per cent of the old duty, and then raise the duty on all other articles except British so as to make up for the preference. Therefore, should they leave things as they are, and simply ask for compensation by a protection on colonial goods in the British market, that would not afford any help to the woollen industry. The fact that we would sell more cheese, more flour, more butter, and that we might sell them at a higher price in the British market, would not be any compensation to the woollen manufacturers. Therefore, I say that from the point of view laid down in the first paragraph of the amendment that there should be ample protection to certain industries, the kind of preference which they suggest would not be in accordance with their promises to those industries.

Now the question is, what advantage would be derived from mutual protection? To my mind—and that is especially where I differ from the government—I do not oppose this motion simply on the ground that mutual protection cannot be obtained from England, I oppose it on principle. But the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance say that we cannot get that preference, while the hon. gentlemen opposite say we can. The evidence given by hon. gentlemen on this side that we cannot get the mutual preference, is especially drawn from the deliberations of the congress of the Chambers of Commerce in London last summer. I am one of the first men in this country who read that report. It was sent to me directly from London by an English friend of mine, who is like myself an anti-Imperialist, only that he is free to say in England what I am not free to say here. The Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs have referred to that report, but only to that part of it which relates to commercial preference. But the question was not presented to the congress of the Chambers of Commerce in London, it was not presented to the British people, it was not presented to the Prime Minister of England, it was not presented to Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, upon the ground that it was simply a matter of trade; therefore I may be allowed to complete the record made by the Prime Minister and his colleagues. The document is a very interesting one, and is illustrative of the present state of mind throughout the empire—of the juvenile colonial enthusiasm in comparison with that stern common sense and sound British spirit of which we have had such a good example in the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith). And I may say to that hon. gentleman that I would be pleased one of these days if he would come down to the province of Quebec, and I would help to elect him in one of our French constituencies; we need Englishmen like him in this country. The first question that was presented to that congress was not the question of mutual preference, it was the question of a consultative Imperial council. Gentlemen who are familar with this congress know that all the resolutions discussed in it are framed previously in all the Chambers of Commerce throughout the empire, and then sent to the Secretary of the Association in London, and therefore are printed long before they are discussed. A motion in favour of an Imperial council was proposed by a delegate from Birmingham, Mr. Tonks, and in order to give the House the spirit of his motion I will just read a word or two from his speech:

> It might be better in this matter of the Imperial council to begin with consultation with the idea that we might end with federation.

Later on:

> I believe one of the most important questions which we have to consider at this congress is this question. But if we are willing to take the first step, I feel sure, from what I know of the feelings and views of the Secretary of State for the Colonies that he is only anxious to take such a step if the colonies themselves are united in desiring it.

Well, the colonial representatives were so united that they were not satisfied with the suggestion of the representative from Birmingham: he was not expecting enough from the colonies, he was not opening wide enough the doors of the Council Chamber in favour of the colonies. The representative of the Ottawa Chamber, a civil servant of this government, Mr. Macfarlane, came there and seconded an amendment which was moved by the representative of the Cape Town Chamber, to the effect that not only did the colonies want to be represented, but they wanted to be taxed. The Englishmen said: No, you go too far, we do not want your money. But the colonials, full of pride and enthusiasm, insisted: We want to pay, we want to tax ourselves! And Mr. Macfarlane, a civil servant of this government, was offering the money of the Canadian people to the Englishmen who did not want to take it. Sir, I will read the amendment that was proposed by the Cape Town delegate:

> The time has arrived when a serious effort should be made to formulate a scheme of Imperial federation, whereby the self-governing colonies shall be represented in the councils of the empire; that as a means to this end, all the self-governing colonies should contribute a percentage (to be decided by the representatives in conference)——

Not even by their parliaments. Oh, no; parliaments are a small thing under the new system.

> That representation in any federal council should be in proportion to the respective contributions of the several states;
>
> That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Lord Salisbury and the premiers of the self-governing colonies for their consideration.

References were made to the war in South Africa, and to the display of devotion by

the colonies, and, therefore, it was said, that we should not stop these devoted colonies from paying a little more. The representative from Ottawa arraigned Lord Salisbury, who, to his mind, was not Tory enough. He said that the policy for England should be Lord Beaconsfield's policy, and he quoted some words from Lord Beaconsfield, regretting that autonomy had been given to the colonies without some restriction, so that the colonies could be ruled from London. Some very distinguished Englishmen protested. Lord Avebury, delegate from the association of Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom, said : Do not go too fast ; we may come to that but wait a little. Here are his words :

In voting for the original resolution, we desire it to be understood that we so vote because we believe that the resolution of the Birmingham chamber will carry us as far as we are prepared to go. Many of us, in supporting what is proposed by the Birmingham chamber today, believe that the time is not far distant when we shall see carried what is suggested by the Cape Town chamber.

Again, the colonies protested. Senator Drummond, one of the representatives of Canada, arraigned the mild language of the Birmingham resolution on the ground that the Englishmen did not want us to be English enough. He said :

I maintain that the language of this resolution of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce is entirely insufficient and disappointing. I can assure this assembly that the people of Canada who sent their sons to South Africa were not influenced by any such milk-and-water sentiment as 'increased cordiality and sense of union' —increased cordiality—to the extent of inviting you to an afternoon tea, or something of that sort, and to any social function.

Finally, a compromise resolution was arrived at in order to make up for the sentiment of the English people who did not want to take too much from us, and for the sentiment of the colonials who wanted to make us pay more. It was found that in the wording of the compromise resolution, the consultive chamber was to arrange for all this, and thereupon a common-sensed Englishman said : You are making a legislature of this council ; it should be made to consider and advise and not to legislate. Again, a Canadian delegate said : No, no ; we want it to legislate for and govern and rule Canada. But, finally, the common sense of the English people prevailed, and the resolution which was carried was some kind of a resolution which leaves us yet the right to say that we can select to be taxed or not by Mr. Macfarlane, just as we please.

Then, the question of commercial relations came up. As has been said in this House, the matter was introduced by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp), who gave a great display of colonial sentiment. Mr. Macfarlane came to the rescue, stating that we had sent our sons to Africa, and, therefore, we wanted to be united and blended with England, and so on. In fact, the only colonist to talk a little common sense was Mr. Cockshutt, one of the Brantford delegates. He said that the British Empire was a commercial empire, and that if it wanted to last it should continue to act on business principles. There was an amendment brought in by the Manchester Chamber, which has not been referred to in this House ; it said.

This congress, rejoicing in the growing evidences of unity between the mother country and the colonies, and recognizing the material and political advantages of the largest possible exchange of commodities between the various portions of the empire, is of opinion that all measures for the promotion of this end should respect the liberty of each portion to purchase in the cheapest market wherever it may exist.

Again the colonials protested. Dr. Parkin spoke of the display of Imperial sentiment in Toronto, Montreal and elsewhere. Mr. Scott protested, that even if we would not be granted any favour by England we were still willing to give our money and our blood for England. That did not disturb the British common sense, and Mr. Thompson replied, speaking of the colonies :

Their trade is of great value to us, but we esteem their friendship even more highly than their trade. The events of the past year have brought home to every Englishman the immense moral and material support which our colonial kinsmen can and do render to the mother country in the defence of the empire. This is far better than any mere community of interests, it is emphatically a union of hearts.

The delegate from the Edinburg chamber, Mr. Anderson, was still shorter and clearer, for he simply said :

Sentiment is one thing and business is another.

Well, the result was that the colonies, in spite of all their display of sentiment, had to come back to accept a compromise resolution, which meant simply that a delegation would interview the Prime Minister of England and ask his opinion, in order to know if some possible favour could be granted to the colonies. We know what was the result of that. The Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) has told us the result of that with much wit and eloquence. The Prime Minister of England, who had been so glad to accept our soldiers, who had been so glad to have our blood shed, who had been so glad to have our moral support in Africa, did not want to receive the Canadian delegates, because it might hurt him in his elections. And though Dr. Parkin, when that compromise motion was adopted, received it as a 'nunc dimittis,' and said it was the opening of a new era for the empire, yet, the Prime Minister of England, and Mr. Chamberlain, reduced it to nothing in a few days.

There was a third question brought up, and it is a question which was coupled in-

timately with the question of the Imperial council and the preference in the British market. It was the question of Imperial defence. Again, of course, it was moved by a colonial. The man who moved it was Mr. Hadrill, of the Montreal Chamber of Commerce, and Mr. Macfarlane, who must have much time to prepare his speeches when he is not analysing for the Dominion government, said the motion did not go far enough for him. He wanted Canada to be taxed 5 per cent on all its imports in favour of the British army and navy. This year that would have meant $6,000,000. It is a fine thing for a Dominion civil servant to go to London and to say in our name, without consulting the government of this country, without consulting the Prime Minister of this country : That Canada is ready to tax herself $6,000,000 a year as a contribution to the English army and navy. But, Sir, what is most peculiar of all is this : Among the three hundred delegates present, one delegate, Mr. Geoffrion, of the Montreal Chamber of Commerce, had probably read the eloquent words of the Prime Minister last session on the question of the South African war, when the right hon. gentleman said : That Canada was keeping her liberty; that Canada would judge of each case according to its merits, and would interfere in British wars only when she thought fit to do so. Imbued undoubtedly with the eloquence of the Prime Minister, Mr. Geoffrion stated that the contribution of Canada towards the South African war, in sending 3,000 men, and in expending several million dollars without being obliged to do so, should be a proof of the devotion of the colony, and, therefore, he moved as an amendment :

> That the colonies be not asked to contribute to the defence of the empire unless they do so willingly, and without coercion or written law.

We have heard, Mr. Speaker, of the great influence of the words of the Prime Minister of Canada in Great Britain and throughout the empire. Here Mr. Geoffrion uses words taken almost literally from the right hon. gentleman's speeches, but they did not find one seconder in that assembly. Mr. Geoffrion could not find one man to second his motion, and he had to sit down, and the motion which prevailed was not the one inspired by the Prime Minister of this country, but it was the one supported by a Dominion civil servant, and proposed by the Montreal delegate of the chamber of commerce. To sum up, the result of that congress in London, which is far more important than some imagine, is this : When it was a question of giving some representation to the colonies in the Imperial council, there was a division of opinion pro and con ; when it was a question of getting some favour of the colonies from the mother land, it was set aside ; but, when it was a question of taxing the colonies entirely and solely for the benefit of England, it was carried unanimously ; not a word of protest from the English delegates—not even a word of thanks.

Mr. Speaker, I do not utter these words as a reproach to the distinguished representatives of English trade and politics who were there. No, Sir, they were up to their duty. British statesmen and British tradesmen understand that their first duty belongs to the British nation ; and therefore when the colonies go there and offer favours which they are not asked for and not obliged to give, British statesmen and British tradesmen would be very foolish not to accept them. But, I am sufficient an admirer of Great Britain to say that we should be the worthy sons of that great nation and look first after our own interests ; because if we wait for her to look after our interests, we may be left in the dark. The whole problem of political, military and economic Imperialism was summed up by no less an authority than Lord Selborne, Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, in his opening address at that congress, when he said :

> A century and a quarter ago it was this question of Imperial defence which lay at the root of that quarrel with our American colonies which finally lost them to us. To-day it is the same question operating more than any other to draw the different parts of the empire together.

I cannot but echo the words of Lord Selborne. The question of to-day is no new one. It is not the development of a new Imperial policy. It is the same old question which took from England the finest part of her empire. It is the question whether the colonies are to be ruled from London or at home. Sir, the present system is finer, I admit ; it is better framed ; sentiment is better developed in the colonies. Good governors and good majors-general are sent to the colonies ; there is a press which was not in existence 120 years ago ; and the press of this country is influenced to work up sentiment. The eyes of the colonies are veiled by sentiments of loyalty which are not at stake, and politicians are scared. We are proud to compromise the liberty of the colonies and their autonomy under the new name. The representative of the Ottawa Board of Trade, at the London Congress of the Chambers of Commerce, eulogized the policy of Lord Beaconsfield, and I do not think we shall have to wait very long before we shall have some apologists telling us that the best rule that existed for the colonies was that of Lord North and George III. We are coming to it very fast.

It may be answered that the parliaments of the colonies are free, that they can object to anything sought to be imposed upon them by the British government. Yes, but do not forget that the Irish parliament was free not to sell the liberties of Ireland, and

they were sold just the same. I admit that the operation was very quickly done; but I do not think that it was more surely done than it is being done now in Canada. You may say that there is a good deal of politics in all these things. Yes, there has been a good deal of politics in the way the question of Imperialism has been treated in this country. No doubt it was politics when one party in Ontario was telling the people that love to the mother country was the only inspiration of its policy, and in Quebec was saying that they had only done it for the sake of Canada; and when the other party was saying in Ontario that their opponents had not done enough for England, and was saying in Quebec that they had done too much. But the men who were gathered together at the conference of the Chambers of Commerce in London, were not politicians, but representatives of British capital and industry. Not only was the trade and commerce of the whole empire represented there, but also the bankers, the large navigation companies and the railway companies; and the influence of British capital is very strong in all these institutions. When a Canadian or Australian or Cape Colony company has debentures to float or money to borrow, where do they go? They go to London. You may say they go to London for business and not for politics. I may be allowed to mention a little incident to show how the London capitalist can influence politics in other countries. It may scandalize very much the loyalists of this House to hear it, but in England it would not do harm to any man; so I will speak as if I were in England. I met last year in New York the chief secretary of the pro-Boer committee, who told me that he had gathered funds, not to help the Boers, but to send help for their wounded and sick soldiers, just as another committee in New York had been organized to send help to wounded and sick British soldiers; and he said he had tried to place his funds in fourteen American banks, and he was refused permission to do so, because he was told that it would hurt their business in London. When we see that the influence of English capitalists is strong enough to prevent a banker in New York accepting money which was to be devoted, not to military purposes, but to charity, we may be sure that the English capitalists can influence capital in Montreal, Halifax, Toronto, and elsewhere in Canada, and can also influence Canadian politicians. I do not mean to influence them corruptly, but I mean to influence public opinion. How was this influence of the Chambers of Commerce carried to the politics of the colonies? In a very simple way: through the British Empire League, a branch of which exists in Canada, and to which belong ministers of the Crown, members of both sides of the House, and senators—Conservative and Liberals, French and English. Two or three members of this cabinet were there; and what did you see? At the meeting of that league held in Ottawa, during this very session, the same resolutions were passed which had been adopted by the Chambers of Commerce, and it was very skilfully done. These resolutions are always moved by a Conservative and seconded by a Liberal, or moved by a Liberal and seconded by a Conservative. The president of that league read an address, which has been scattered all over the country in pamphlet form, and in which the very idea dominant at the congress of the Chambers of Commerce in London was set forth, namely, that all the colonists should be taxed to contribute to Imperial defence, meaning, in the very words of the president, a contribution of over six millions of dollars from Canada, for this year alone.

Now, with regard to getting an Imperial preference for Canada, I do not see that it is a very remote possibility. It is true, Mr. Chamberlain has said that it will not come. But Mr. Chamberlain is not there for ever, and he has changed his mind on a few subjects, from home rule down. We know that Mr. Chamberlain is not only the master, but the prophet of this government and of this country; but, Sir, there is something more powerful than even Mr. Chamberlain; there is British capital, and there are British interests. British trade is suffering to-day. The British manufacturers are finding that their products are coming more and more into competition with foreign products in foreign markets, and foreign products are coming into competition with their products even in their own market. At the same time they see that the trade of their colonies is increasing and that their purchasing as well as their producing capacity is growing every day; and they may come to the conclusion before long that something might be done with the colonies to the exclusion of the rest of the world. Of course, the British capitalists will not act as long as they can pay us with declarations and sentiments. John Bull is a practical fellow, and he will pay us with compliments and medals as long as we accept them, like the savages who exchange gold and ivory for glass pearls. But the time will come when the colonies will not accept such things as sufficient compensation for their blood and money, and what will then be offered? Then we shall be offered an Imperial council, first to consult, and afterwards to federate and deal. I need not say that such an Imperial council does not mean representation for the colonies. I do not mean to say that there may not be two or three men in it from Canada, and two or three men from Australia, New Zealand and other British colonies; but that does not

mean representation for the colonies. Of course, I may presume that these men will always be the best we can send ; but after all they will always be, as far as each colony is concerned, a small minority in the whole council ; and moreover, they will always be under the direct influence of the London government. I say the Canadian people can have proper representation only in a chamber which is on Canadian soil, and over which they have exclusive and direct influence. You may say that this is not becoming, but our Canadian representative, Lord Strathcona, has already approved the idea. Addressing a Scotch audience some months ago, at some festival in the Aberdeen University, he said he was in favour of the organization of an Imperial council, on which each colony would be represented by one, two or three men, and which would deal with Imperial affairs.

The next step would be commercial preference, and I would not be surprised if it should come. But when it does come, it will mean that the amount of taxation which the British people will impose on themselves in order to give a preference to colonial products, would be more than compensated to them by the sacrifices of money and men required of the colonies to keep up the Imperial army and navy. There is some talk of reorganizing the army in England and the word 'conscription' which, six months ago, could not have been uttered before an English audience, has been pronounced by a minister of the Crown in England. On this question of preference, on which we are told that Lord Salisbury and Mr. Chamberlain have made up their mind, it is true there is no public declaration ; but, according to all the reports, the English cabinet are divided, and while Sir Michael Hicks-Beach still stands by the old principle of free trade, Mr. Chamberlain is inclined to give some kind of preference to the colonies. But as far as I am concerned, I shall vote against the resolution of the leader of the opposition, not because I think we cannot get this preference or because it may not come for a long time, but because I do not want it. And I do not want it for the reason that it would cost us a great deal of our liberty and commit us to Imperial federation. My position to-night is exactly the same as that taken by the right hon. the Prime Minister in 1891, when he said in Boston that Canada would never consent to Imperial federation because that would mean contribution to England's wars. The right hon. gentleman may have changed his ideas since, but I may be permitted to stand on the same ground as he did then, and refuse English preference because I believe that the price we would have to pay, namely, the obligation to contribute to England's wars, would be entirely too costly.

I now come to the third paragraph of the amendment, but evidently any reason for that third paragraph has disappeared since the hon. gentleman has told us that it does not apply to the United States. If the policy of discriminating in favour of or against foreign countries according to the advantages they give or refuse us, were to apply to any country, it would apply to the United States, and therefore if the hon. gentleman is not in favour of applying it to the United States there is no reason for its existence in the resolution at all. On this point I fully agree with the First Minister, when he says that our tariff should not be framed with regard to Germany or the United States but with regard to Canada. I believe with him that we should not impose a high duty, which would mean higher taxation on our own people, simply because a low duty might be of some advantage to American or German manufactures. On the contrary, we should frame our duties to meet the needs of Canadian consumers. The same remark applies to British goods. In this question we should treat all countries on the same principle. I have never preferred the American dollar to the British shilling, and I now worship the British shilling no more than I do the American dollar. The one principle upon which we should stand in our political, economical and military matters should be the devotion to Canadian interests in preference to American, British, German or any other. You may say that this is a policy of egotism. It may be, but egotism is the only law of nations. I do not say that we should disinterest ourselves completely from the welfare of other people, but our first duty is to Canada before every other country.

As regards our relations with the United States, I am a little embarrassed as to the treatment of that question. But my connection with the International Commission is now sufficiently distant to allow me to interpret the events that have succeeded, I may say this much, that if that International Commission did not come to any satisfactory conclusion, no blame can be cast upon the representatives of Canada. They did their duty to Canada. They asked what they should have asked for. They showed sufficient spirit of conciliation and at the same time retained their dignity. But I will venture the opinion that if we did not succeed in getting better and fairer treatment from the Americans, the fault lies at the hands of the British government. That commission sat during six months—three in Quebec and three in Washington. After it was over, one of the British commissioners, who was at the same time a member of this cabinet, Sir Louis Davies, went to England and passed a few months there. And on his return he told us that he had found such prejudices in the minds of English statesmen that he had been obliged to write

a big volume in order to make them understand that Canada was right. Yet for six months the British government was represented on that commission by Lord Herschell, one of the ablest of English public men, and who was in correspondence with his government during all that time. Lord Herschell passed several weeks in Canada, and discussed the question with this government as well as with the American delegates, and was besides in correspondence all the time with the British authorities, and yet we had to send a delegate to London to persuade our dear cousins, the employees of Mr. Chamberlain, that they should look a little more to the interests of Canada and a little less to those of the United States. How is it that the British government succeeded in getting from the United States a settlement by arbitration of the Venezuela question ? Yet when we, under the same British flag, invoking the same law, ask the Washington authorities to apply the same principle of arbitration to the interpretation of the treaty between Great Britain and the United States, as successors of Russia's rights, they replied : No, the same principle no longer applies. In the war with Spain, the United States had the friendship of England and it has even been claimed that that friendship was the cause of the United States not having been disturbed by European interference. In the war between England and the Transvaal, the first nation to acknowledge the annexation by England of the Dutch republics was the United States. How is it, then, that, with all these friendly relations between the two countries, the Canadian case has received no attention ? How is it that the Washington authorities have been induced to agree with the British authorities on every question but the Canadian one ? I think it arises from the fact that as long as the British authorities are convinced that the Canadians are simple-minded enough to give their money, blood, and assistance and to send over a representative to declare to the English people 'Even if you do not give us any return, we will still be always ready to help you,' they will take our money, blood and help, but when it comes to settling our difficulties with the United States they will only give us a faint-hearted support. So long as we do not make ourselves respected we shall not be respected.

Out of that great friendship between England and the United States, I had hoped for much. I had hoped that a country like Great Britain, which has done so much for the benefit of humanity, and the United States, which has done so much for the development of the world, would have agreed together upon a prompt and peaceful settlement of any dispute. But it seems that the spirit of grab is the basis of that friendship and cannot be fruitful of peaceable results. And perhaps the United States are not so much afraid of Great Britain as they were before this South African war. Of that we have had evidence by the way they have treated the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

Upon this question of the financial policy of the country, I wish to be clearly understood. Whether I may have a future or not in Canadian politics, I intend voting against the whole motion of the leader of the opposition, on account of its spirit. The principle enunciated in the first paragraph, I cannot accept. And I cannot accept it, not because I am a free trader, but because I am a moderate protectionist. The second paragraph also meets with my disapproval, not because we cannot get the preference asked for from England, but because we cannot get it without sacrificing a good deal of Canadian liberty and self-autonomy. And the third paragraph I am opposed to because, as matter of fact, we have no interest in applying the policy indicated to the United States or to other countries.

For many years, parties in this country have been divided on questions of political economy. The aim we should have, the end towards which we should move, is to secure the gradual control of our trade relations with all the countries of the world. I say that the adoption of the principle laid down by the leader of the opposition would have for its practical consequence the framing and control of our tariff policy by some kind of a board in London. It would be a check on our control of our own tariff not only with Great Britain but with the nations of the world. Therefore, Sir, as a Liberal, as a Canadian, attached to the interests of Canada, and wishing that the interests of the Canadian people should be looked after by the Canadian parliament, rather than those of any other country in the world, I shall vote against the three propositions of the leader of the opposition.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention at this late hour to offer any criticism of the speech which has been so ably delivered by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). In fact, even if time permitted, I do not feel that I should be justified in offering any adverse criticism of the discussion he has given to the fiscal policy of the country, for the reason that there seems to be much in common between that hon. gentleman and those sitting on this side of the House. I shall, therefore, follow what I intended to say without reference to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, knowing that he will not regard it as in any way discourteous on my part if I do not offer that criticism which, perhaps, a speech of such ability would be entitled to.

We have been told again and again during this debate that we are living in prosperous times, in fact, that has been the burden of nearly all the speeches that have been delivered by hon. gentlemen sitting on

your right. And I may say that it has been well responded to by hon. gentlemen sitting on this side of the House. We are glad we do live in a time of very considerable prosperity. Hon. gentlemen to your right, however, I think, unfairly claim too much credit for the government now in power for the prosperous times that we now enjoy. They believe that all the large exports and imports of our country have been brought about by reason of the fact that a change of government took place in the year 1896. But, Sir, I see that even in far off China the gross trade of the country has doubled within the last ten years ; and I do not suppose, for one moment, that it will be claimed that the Prime Minister of this country had anything to do with the large increase in the trade of China. It is said that in the United States last year the gross trade was $319,000,000 more than that of any preceding year in the country's history. Surely it will not be contended that the government of this country had anything to do with the increase of the trade of the United States during the past year. We must look elsewhere for the reasons of the prosperity of this country. I think we shall be obliged to go a little further back in order to find who really is responsible for the wave of prosperity that is passing over the country, so far as it can be brought about by any governmental action. Thirty years ago, the government then in power, led by the late Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, acquired the great North-west country, about which so much has been said. I question if there is any one single act of the government of this country from confederation down to the present time that has tended more to add to our prosperity than that. The acquirement of the territories of the great North-west, that vast domain now dotted with cities, towns and villages, and filling up with prosperous farms sending forth its millions of bushels of grain year after year for export and bringing back millions upon millions of money into the country, to swell the prosperity of Canada—there is something that a government did that has had the effect of adding to our prosperity. Then, Sir, we had the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, an act that was brought about by the Conservative party long before the advent of the Liberals to power. This great undertaking has undoubtedly done much to add to the prosperity of the country. It enabled the great North-west to be opened up, it enabled the products of that country, the grain and cattle of the plains, the products of the mines of British Columbia——

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I would like to say one word. The first staff of surveyors sent out to survey that road was organized by Mackenzie when he was premier of the Dominion. And he continued the survey.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, the first surveyors who went out to survey the water stretches on the line attempted to be built by the friends of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Ross), were sent out by Mackenzie. But I refer to the construction of the great transcontinental road, the road which has opened up that vast country and brought about the prosperity of Canada by making a highway for the products of the North-west to the sea, that they might be transported to the old country, a return being made in the gold which helps to make this country prosperous. Had we remained contented with the amphibious route of ancient days, which has been referred to by my hon. friend, there would not have been very much prosperity brought to Canada by it. Then, Sir, the Conservative government inaugurated the construction and deepening of the canals and in that way assisted transportation, facilitating thus the sending of our products to the foreign market and securing for us a better return, and thus again bringing prosperity to Canada. And then, what legislative act has ever done more to bring prosperity to the country than the great national policy inaugurated by our old chieftain, Sir John Macdonald—a policy that is not only revered by hon. gentlemen sitting on this side of the House, but is respected and admired by hon. gentlemen who sit to your right, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) sneered at the national policy because it was twenty-five years old. Twenty-five years old ! Why, it was a surprise to the hon. minister that we should stand by a policy for twenty-five years. How many policies have the Liberal party had in the last ten years ? Continental free trade, commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity, free trade as they have it in England, preferential tariff, tariff for revenue only—they are constantly changing. An average of about a year and two-thirds is as long as they can endure any one policy. How long has free trade been the policy of Great Britain ? Three score years or more. And do hon. gentlemen opposite say that the British people should change their policy because it is getting old ? Is it not a fact that in England there was a system of protection for two hundred years prior to the advent of free trade ?—a protection that made England what it is to-day, what it never would have been had they adopted a policy such as is approved by many hon. gentlemen opposite.

Speaking very briefly of the national policy and of the great advantages it has brought to this country, I propose to give one single instance. I will take, for the purpose of illustration, one industry that is being carried on at the present time, I refer to the hog industry. In 1889, we had very low duties on hogs and hog products. It was found the farmers of this country could not secure or retain the home mar-

ket. The government of the day came to their rescue by increasing the duty upon hogs, mess pork, fresh pork, bacon and hams, in such a way as to give the farmers confidence that if they entered heartily in the production of hogs they would at least have the home market for their product. Well, Sir, in 1890, we imported from the United States nearly 36,000,000 pounds of hog product. In 1900, so effectually had the system of protecting that industry been that we imported only 12,000,000 pounds of hogs and hog products. Thus, in ten years we secured for the farmers of this country a market of some 24,000,000 pounds of hogs and hog products—something, I am sure, that adds to the prosperity of the country, and something that must be attributed to the national policy. But, Sir, that was not all—that was only a small part of it. Not only did we secure the home market; but, when the farmers of this country felt secure in their position, they commenced to develop the industry, so that, while, in 1889, before the duties were increased, we only exported about 4,000,000 pounds of hams and bacon, last year we exported from this country the immense quantity of 135,000,000 of pounds of hams and bacon. Year by year from 1890 the export of hog products has increased. As I said, in 1889, it was but 4,000,000 pounds. In 1890 it had reached 7,000,000 pounds. In 1892, it was 12,000,000 pounds—I omit the odd thousands of pounds. In 1894, 28,000,000 pounds; in 1896, 53,000,000 pounds; in 1898, 85,000,000 pounds; in 1900, 135,000,000 pounds.

Year by year has this industry gone on, year by year stimulated by the protection given to it in 1890 under the national policy, this industry has gone on and has become a source of immense wealth to the people of this country, not only supplying an increased home market of 24,000,000 lbs., but an increased foreign market in hams and bacon alone of 131,000,000 lbs., bringing back into this country $12,000,000 in one year. There is the foundation of Canada's prosperity, and that alone can be credited to the national policy of the conservative party.

Now, the Liberals have claimed that this policy, this large increase that has been shown to have taken place since 1896, is chiefly due to the administration that we have in power at the present time. As I have already mentioned, the Liberals have had various policies, they have had commercial union, they have had unrestricted reciprocity, they have had continental free trade, and tariff for revenue only. They have been shouting all these policies during the last ten years. They remind me of the story of a man who went into the backwoods and hewed out a home for himself, and put up a little house. One day a bear came round, and the good man became frightened, just as the Liberals did in 1897. The man climbed on top of the house, and allowed his wife to use the axe until she had killed the bear. Seeing the bear was dead, he came down, and after making a thorough examination, said: Yes, wife, we have killed the bear. That is what the Liberals are saying. They were shouting all these different policies during the last ten years, and when prosperous times came they said: We have killed the bear—when as a matter of fact they did nothing more than come in and help consume the carcass.

Now, one word with reference to the expenditure of this country. When the Liberals were in opposition, if there was one thing they talked about more than another it was the necessity of reducing the expenditure. One of them promised that he would reduce it by $1,000,000, another one promised to reduce it by $2,000,000, another one by $3,000,000, another one by $4,000,000, another one by $5,000,000, and so on. We had immense promises of reduction of expenditure, but I fail to see that these pledges have been implemented by these gentlemen since they came into power. I think it well, even at the close of this debate, just to call attention to the fact that these promises have not been implemented. When they came into power the expenditure on consolidated fund account was $36,949,000; in 1900 it has reached the enormous sum of $42,975,000, showing an increase of $6,026,000. In 1896 we find the expenditure on capital account was $3,781,311; in 1900 it had reached $7,468,843, an increase of $3,687,532. I ask, where is the evidence of the promises made by the Liberal party when in opposition, having been carried out that the expenditure of the country has been reduced? The total expenditure in 1896 was $44,096,000; in 1900 it was $52,717,000, or an increase of $8,621,000 in the short space of four years. The same can be said with reference to net public debt. From 1896 to 1900 the increase has been $6,996,374. Now, is this what the Liberal party throughout the country expected? Is this what hon. gentlemen were sent here to approve of by their votes? Is this what they were told to vote for to-night?

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the finances of this country are not thoroughly understood by the people, and I think the time has arrived when some change in the system of our book-keeping ought to be adopted by which the idea that we have a surplus of $8,000,000 will be entirely dissipated. I dare say there are many people who actually believe that the government last year met all the wants of the country and had a surplus of $8,000,000. Now let us see how the account stood. We find that there was expended on consolidated revenue account, as follows: Charges of debt, $10,873,673; subsidies to provinces, $4,250,608; sinking fund,—about which I shall have more to say—$2,465,640; collection of revenue, $11,044,526; other expenditure, $14,340,832, making a total expenditure

on consolidated fund account of $42,975,279. Besides this there was an expenditure on capital account of $7,468,843, railway subsidies, $725,720, other charges amounting to $1,547,624 ; or a total expenditure of $52,717,466. Now, how much money did we realize last year for the purpose of meeting this expenditure ? We are told there was a surplus of $8,000,000. If there was that surplus, the general public would understand that we must have had a revenue of $8,000,000 in excess of that, but that is not the fact. Our total consolidated fund receipts only amounted to $51,029,994, with other small receipts, making altogether $51,031,466, or an excess of expenditure over all our revenue of $1,686,000. Yet the Minister of Finance comes down and tells the people of this country that he has a surplus of $8,000,000. So great a change has been made in the public accounts in the manner of dealing with capital account, that I think the time has now arrived when the consolidated fund account and the capital account should be merged in one, so that a full and complete statement of the finances of this country would be given to us, by the Minister of Finance, and we should know exactly whether there is a surplus or a deficit, I trust that will be done, I think we are nearing the time when it ought to be done, and I am quite sure that only then will the people come to realize the fact that instead of having a surplus at the end of the year, we are gradually getting deeper and deeper into debt.

Now the government say that they reduced the debt last year by $779,640. It does seem a very strange thing how a government that spent $1,686,000 more than its revenue, could possibly have something to apply in the way of reducing the national debt. Well, it is simply a matter of bookkeeping. The Finance Minister paid the sinking fund which he was compelled by law to provide for, $2,465,640, he paid that over, and when he found he was short $1,686,000, of meeting the expenditure, he borrowed back the sinking fund again, not only enough to pay his deficit, but he actually borrowed the whole sinking fund back, and then he was able to show a reduction in what he calls the net debt of $779,640, although the gross debt of the country is larger in 1900 than it was in 1899.

We are constantly met with the statement that the Conservative party when in power also increased the national debt. We never denied it. The Conservative party were justified in doing it because they had great public works to construct. We constructed the Canadian Pacific Railway at an expenditure of $65,000,000. We spent $36,000,000 on the canals. We spent $20,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway. When the provinces were hard run for funds we gave them $10,000,000, and there were other items amounting to $11,000,000, making a total of $142,000,000 spent on capital account by the Conservative government from 1878 to 1896. Of that amount $24,000,000 was met out of revenue, leaving the increase of debt only $118,000,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite taunt us with this. The hon. Finance Minister taunted us with it in his budget speech, but I ask any gentleman in this House to rise and say if he can, that we should not have expended money on any single item I have enumerated. Do hon. gentlemen opposite object to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway ? I had occasion once before to read the opinion of the Hon. G. W. Ross with respect to that, and I need not repeat it now, but I can point to the fact that that expenditure is approved of by all classes of the people of Canada today. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) has ventured to apologize for the $7,000,000 increase in the national debt during the regime of the Liberal government. The Conservatives have no apology to offer because every dollar of their expenditure was justified. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) told us in explanation that the Crow's Nest Pass Railway had to be built and that it cost $3,500,000. He ought to have selected something that would have better justified the increase of the national debt than the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. He should have omitted that apology because I believe that had the subsidy originally granted by the government of British Columbia been used solely for the purpose of constructing that road, only a very small subsidy indeed would have been required from the Federal government. The South African appropriation of a million and a half dollars had the hearty endorsement of the people of Canada and the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) need not have apologized for that. There is another item of one million dollars loss sustained in the sale of our bonds at a low rate of interest last year, which the Minister of Finance charges to capital account, and that is another reason why the two accounts should be merged in one. While we realize a million dollars less on our 2½ per cent bonds than if we had placed them at a higher rate of interest, I do not say but that we will get a return for that million dollars—yet when the saving in the payment of interest comes back to the people of Canada it will be credited to consolidated revenue account, whereas the loss itself is now charged to capital account.

The question was discussed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce as to what became of the large surpluses which he claimed the government had during the past two or three years. He told us they had a surplus of $12,000,000 for the past two years, and his explanation of how that money had disappeared was in my opinion very unfair, as I intend to prove. He said that when the Conservative party went out of power it had left large undischarged liabili-

ties amounting in the case of the railway subsidies to several million dollars, but he failed to show that one single dollar of these subsidies had been earned. Consequently they were not a charge upon the country at that time and therefore should not be considered as a liability of the late government. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that some $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 had been spent to complete the canals, and this he charged back as a debt of the Conservative government. Well, Sir, just to find out how much of this ten or twelve million dollars was due to contracts of the late government, my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) put a question on the Order paper the other day asking what amount was paid by the government for the construction or improvement of the canals in each of the years 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1900, and how much was paid on account of contracts entered into by the late government and not re-let. To my surprise the government answered that of the sum of $12,095,087 paid on canal construction during the last four years, only $4,132,251 was paid on account of contracts let by the late government, and not re-let. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright, therefore, was misleading the House when he accounted for the disappearance of the surplus by saying that the present government were compelled to assume the liabilities of the late government on canal construction to the extent of ten or twelve million dollars.

Well, Sir, another of the promises of the Liberal party was that they were to reduce taxation. Instead of that we find as usual the very reverse. The gross taxation from customs duties which was $20,219,000 in 1896 had risen to $28,889,000 in 1900, and the total taxation of the country has risen from $27,759,000 in 1896 up to $38,242,000 in 1900. The Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), in his very able speech the other night told us that the government could not help it and he led us to understand that they were perfectly powerless in the matter. He said there were more goods coming into the country and that that was the reason why there was a larger revenue. But, if a proper fiscal system were adopted by the government, even that would not cause such an enormous increase in taxation. In 1899 they had a surplus of $4,837,000; in 1900 they had a surplus of $8,054,000, and we are told that next year there is to be a surplus of $6,500,000. In the face of this no effort is being made by the government to stop the growing taxation. It means taxation which they say is not necessary, but unfortunately at the end of the year we find that this money is used to meet the expenditure of the country. No man ever condemned in stronger language than did the Minister of Customs the surplus of Sir Leonard Tilley in 1883. On that occasion he said:

> When the government find that they have beyond a doubt a surplus, when they can calculate with certainty on having one, it is their bounden duty to reduce taxation. It is no part of the duty of a Finance Minister to extract more money out of the pockets of the people than is absolutely wanted to carry on public affairs.
>
> What would be said of a Chancellor of the Exchequer in England if he could not estimate the requirements of the public service nearer than $82,000,000? He would be ridiculed as being unable to grasp the financial conditions of the country.

And yet $82,000,000 compared with the immense revenue of Great Britain is not more than $8,000,000 as compared with the revenue of Canada. We must therefore conclude that it is the opinion of the Minister of Customs, that the present Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has not a proper grasp of the financial conditions of the country. Sir Leonard Tilley in 1883 found no difficulty in disposing of the surplus. He did not allow it to grow from year to year. He did not desire to take more money out of the pockets of the people than was necessary to meet the ordinary affairs of the country. He struck the duty off tea and coffee and in that way disposed of a large part of this excessive revenue, the same as Mr. Foster did in 1891 when he found he had more revenue than was necessary to meet the current expenses, he drew his pen across the duty on raw sugar and gave back to the people of Canada during the next five years about $20,000,000, thus helping them to tide over the depression of these years. But the present government say: Oh, we cannot help it; we are powerless; there are more goods coming into the country. Can they not adopt the policy of their predecessors in this matter as they have adopted the policy of their predecessors in many other matters? Would it not be possible to-day to reduce the enormous taxation of this country which they tell us is not required to meet the ordinary expenditure? What is to prevent the Finance Minister wiping out the total duty on raw sugar which amounts to $1,828,084? Let him strike that item off and he will find that he has a very considerable reduction in taxation. There are many other articles which might be dealt with in the same way, such as dried fruits, nuts, oranges, lemons, and so on. Then, there was the enormous increase in the tobacco duties of about $1,000,000 a year, which might be removed. You could also take off the duty on rice. In this way three or four million dollars of duties might be taken off, and the taxation reduced. It seems to me there is a great deal of truth in what the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) said in 1883, that the Finance Minister evidently had not a grasp upon the financial condition of the country.

Before leaving the question of the sugar duties, I desire to draw attention to some statements which were made a couple of evenings ago. In the year 1900 we paid

an increased duty on raw sugar of $489,966, and on refined sugar $35,819, or a total increase of duty on raw and refined sugar of $525,785, more than we would have paid if the policy of the Conservative party had been still in force. Yet the hon. gentleman claimed great credit the other night for having reduced the protection on sugar. Now, what was done ? Mr. Foster left the duty on raw sugar at 50 cents per 100 pounds, and the duty on refined at $1.14 per 100 pounds, giving a protection of 64 cents per 100 pounds to the refiners. Had Mr. Foster continued to be Finance Minister I do not suppose for a moment that he would have allowed that duty to continue. As soon as the revenues of the country did not require the duty, I have no doubt that he would have removed it, and given back to the people from $1,000,000 to $1,500,000 a year in the shape of sugar duties. But the other night the Minister of Customs, while claiming credit for having reduced the protection on sugar, had to admit that he had increased the duty on raw sugar by 18 cents per 100 pounds, which amounts to an increase of nearly half a million dollars of taxation, all of which goes into the treasury. In 1897 the government placed a duty on raw sugar of 50 cents per 100 pounds and on refined sugar of $1 per 100 pounds, leaving a protection to the refiners of 50 cents per 100 pounds. The other night the Minister of Customs charged that the Conservative party had given too much protection because they had given a protection of 80 cents per 100 pounds in 1891, and in 1895 had brought that down to 64 cents ; and he said that if the sugar manufactories could live with 64 cents per 100 pounds protection in 1895, why could they not do so in 1891 ? Yet we find the hon. gentlemen pursuing a course of very much the same kind. Although the refiners had a protection of 50 cents per 100 pounds, we find the hon. gentleman in 1898 increasing that protection to 56 cents per 100 pounds for the benefit of the sugar barons whom we used to hear so much about. In 1900 the duty on raw sugar was 68 cents per 100 pounds, and the duty on refined sugar $1.24, or a difference of 56 cents per 100 pounds, being six cents more than in 1897. And yet the hon. gentleman skimmed over that part of his address very nicely, and tried to leave the impression on the minds of the people that he had kept the protection down, when he knew that he had given these sugar lords $150,000 more protection than they had in 1897, on an imports of 250,000,000 pounds. I am very glad to see the hon. gentleman in his seat.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. As he is in his seat, might he ask you if the protection is as great now as it was under Mr. Foster ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I should decidedly think not ; but what I mean to say is that you have not followed out your own policy. The hon. gentleman came down the other night and in language as loud as thunder, blamed Mr. Foster for giving protection to the sugar refiners of 80 cents in the early nineties, which he reduced to 64 cents in 1895, although the hon. gentleman himself did in 1898 increase the protection from 50 to 56 cents.

With regard to the rate of taxation, which is perhaps the most disputed question we have before us at the present time, the Finance Minister and the Minister of Customs differ, one saying that it is one thing, and the other saying that it is something else. I do not believe either is right. The rate of taxation is a simple problem which any schoolboy of ten years of age can solve for himself. If he has the figures before him, there is nothing difficult about it. The hon. gentleman says he did not make up the figures, that they were made up in his department. I am saying nothing against the officers of his department ; but I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman told his officers what data they should take to make up the rate of taxation. That is the way the country was misled. The Minister of Finance says the average rate of taxation last year was 16·41 per cent. while the Minister of Customs puts it at 15·98 per cent. Then the Minister of Finance, in order to show how much better off we are now in that respect than we were under the Conservative regime, takes the highest year during the last four years of the Conservative regime, and compares that with the lowest year of the Liberal regime, and makes out a reduction of something like 2 per cent. He says that if the Conservative party had remained in power, notwithstanding the immense revenue that was raised last year from customs, we would have taken out of the pockets of the people last year $3,292,230 more than we actually did. The statement is an absurd one, because if the Conservative party had remained in power they would not have allowed these customs duties to remain as they were when the money was not required. Mr. Foster, I have no doubt, would have again struck off the duty on raw sugar. He should have done, as Sir Leonard Tilley did in 1883, when he struck the duty off tea and coffee, and as Mr. Foster did in 1891, when he took the duty off raw sugar. Yes, as Mr. Foster did in 1894, when he put on the free list from 175 to 200 articles and reduced the duty on many others, particularly agricultural implements. Why the Conservative party found no difficulty in managing the finances of the country so as to prevent millions of money being taken from the pockets of the people from year to year, which were not required for the purpose of the government.

Hon. gentlemen opposite, when out of power, promised that if returned to office they would reduce taxation. We have seen, however, the Finance Minister getting up deliberately and saying he did not intend to reduce taxation. And we had the Minister of Customs saying the other night that they had reduced the rate of taxation. Where are we to find these hon. gentlemen ? Let me read an extract from a speech delivered by the hon. the Finance Minister, in which he said :

When we reduced the tariff in 1897 we made a large number of changes which, in the main, were in the direction of lower taxation. We reduced the duties on many articles, we added a number of articles to the free list, we made large changes in the way of reduced taxation. It was of the utmost importance that we should maintain a strong financial position, and in view of the uncertainties as to the amount of revenue that might be produced by the lower rate of taxation, it became necessary that we should take some steps to make good any possible loss that might result. It was thought that it might fairly be met by providing for the raising of some additional taxation in order to balance, or make good, the loss occasioned by the reduction of duties.

Again, he said :

It was necessary to have an increased revenue in certain directions when we were to lose revenue in other directions.

There we have a direct declaration by the Finance Minister that, notwithstanding all their promises and pledges to reduce taxation, they did not intend doing so. The government simply intended to play the game of taking a little off on the one hand and adding as much more on the other, and thus, in the language of the hon. gentleman, prevent any reduction in the revenue of the country, and maintain a firm financial position.

With reference to the actual rate of taxation, let us see what it really is. In 1899, the total imports of this country, dutiable and free, amounted to $154,051,593, but in that year there was imported into this country and entered for home consumption, $6,362,683 of corn, which never entered into home consumption at all, but passed through the country. It entered at one port and passed out at another, although it appears under the heading of goods brought into this country for actual consumption. We are, therefore, justified, and the Finance Minister says we are, in deducting that amount from the gross imports. This leaves a net import for home consumption of $147,688,910.

In 1897, a change was made in the law with regard to the duty on tobacco, and $1,151,345 were added to the duty on tobacco in 1899 by this change. The hon. gentleman may say that this is excise and not customs. But, it makes no difference to the people whether that tax is collected as an excise or a customs duty. It is none the less a tax, and an increase in taxation. It is one of those taxes which the Finance Minister said he would add in order to make up for something that he took off—in order to maintain a strong financial standing in the country. Adding to $25,734,228 customs duty in 1899, the increased tobacco duty of $1,151,345, we get a total taxation for that year of $26,885,573. It is now an easy matter to show the average rate of taxation, by simply dividing the total duty by the total imports, and I find that the rate for 1899 was 18·20 and not 16·70, as stated in the blue-book. Let us deal in the same manner with the imports for home consumption in 1900, and deduct the corn that simply passed through the country, although entered for home consumption. It should not have been so entered, and was not by the previous government, and if we are to have a fair comparison, we must have the same basis of comparison.

Total imports in 1900..	$180,804,316
Less Indian corn exported	4,757,595
Net imports	$176,046,721
Total customs collected	$25,559,110
Increased tobacco duty	991,995
Total.....	$29,551,105

Making a total taxation of $29,181,185, or an average rate of 16·98 instead of 15·98, as entered in the blue-book by the Minister of Customs, which the Minister of Finance said was all wrong.

We have no difficulty, then, in finding out whether we have now a higher or a lower rate of taxation than before. I am not going to take one year, because the fairer way is to take the full four yeas 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1900, and compare them with the last four years of the late Conservative government. Taking the Trade and Navigation Returns, I find that the rates of taxation were as follows, for last four years of Conservative rule :—

1893.....	$17 38
1894.....	17 13
1895.....	16 99
1896.....	18 28
Total	$69 78

or an average of 17·45 for the four years.

Compare that with four years of Liberal rule :

1897.....	$17 87
1898.....	16 95
1899.....	18 20
1900.....	16 98
Total	$70 00

or an average of 17·50 per year.

Thus, the average of the last four years of Conservative rule was 17·45, and of the first four years of Liberal rule 17·50, showing an increased rate of taxation of 1-20th of 1 per cent.

But the hon. the Finance Minister said that in order to maintain a strong financial position, when he was compelled to take the duty off one article he had to put it on

another. If he had done that fairly, perhaps no great exception could be taken. But, in all these shifts of duty from one article to another, a great deal of unfairness has been dealt out to the people. Let me give you a few illustrations. For example, the duty on pianos was reduced by 5 per cent, but, in order to maintain a firm financial position in the country, it was necessary that the loss should be made up from some other source, and, consequently, the hon. gentleman added 5 per cent to the farmer's cutter. Why transfer 5 per cent from pianos and put it on a cutter ?

Then, they took the duty off corn for the benefit of the farmers of the western states, and they did this without asking the Americans permission to send our barley into their country free of duty. They also took the duty off binder twine and made it free, and then, in order to maintain a strong financial position, which the Finance Minister said he was compelled to do, they made every man who uses tobacco contribute to make up the loss sustained by the reduction on corn. On what principle is every workingman on a farm compelled to contribute to the revenue in order to please the farmers of the western states ?

And here again, I say the government made another blunder. They did not ask that twine should be admitted free into the United States. They gave free twine to the United States, and allowed the Americans to retain the duty of 20 per cent on manila twine going into that country. We have manufactures springing up all over the country for the production of manila binder twine, and I say it is not fair to these people who are putting their money into that industry that the United States should be allowed to send their product here free of duty and our manufacturers, if they have a surplus, if they want to ship a few tons of manila twine into the United States should be met with a duty of 20 per cent. If we were willing to give free twine, we should have exacted free twine—no preference should be given to the United States manufacturers that was not given to the Canadian manufacturers. I do not believe in a one-sided policy. Then, they reduced the duty on iron and steel. But, in order to maintain a strong financial stand, they put over half a million dollars of increased duty on sugar. Thus, whilst the bloated manufacturer who makes all these agricultural implements about which we heard in the past is given a reduced duty on iron and steel, the man who wields the sledge for him, who works at the forge or the bench is compelled to pay more for his sugar in order that his master may get his iron cheaper. Where is the fairness of that ? Well, then they go to the farmers and tell them what they are going to do for them. The hon. Minister of Finance in his magnanimity says : We will reduce the duty on scythes. Scythes—that went out of use forty years ago. But, in order to maintain a strong financial stand, he doubles the duty on grindstones. Then, we come to cotton goods. They reduced the duty on white cottons, but, in order to maintain a strong financial stand, they increase the duty on coloured cottons. The man who wears a white shirt, such as the hon. Minister of Customs or the Minister of Finance is protected all right. The duty on their goods is a little less than 17 per cent. But the farmer, the toiler, the man who works in the foundry or the shop, who cannot, by reason of his occupation wear a white shirt is compelled to pay 35 per cent. Where is the fairness in that ? These hon. gentlemen say : Why does not he buy it in England, for the preferential tariff reduced white cotton from 25 per cent to 17½ per cent. But the duty on the coloured shirt is not reduced by the preference, for the simple reason that we do not bring these goods from England. The heavy coloured cotton goods, the ducks, the denims, the cottonades, the heavy cotton shirtings, do not come from the old country, but from the United States, because the American goods are better in quality. What I am saying I saw in the presence of a gentleman who is a large importer and who knows whether the statement I make is correct or not. I did not consult him before making it. I make it from personal knowledge that these goods are not, to any extent, imported from England. The English goods of that class are not what our people want. The fine cotton wool is used in England for making the muslins, the lawns, the laces, &c., that come to us from that country, while the coarse cotton fibre is allowed to go into the coloured goods, and so an inferior article is produced. The Canadian consumers want either the Canadian goods made out of the genreal run of cotton, or the American goods, and they will pay higher prices for them rather than take the inferior goods that come from England. So, there is no competition between the heavy coloured cotton goods coming from England and those coming from the United States—one has no effect whatever upon the other. We were told the other night that because there was a reduction on goods coming from England, therefore,—this is what the Minister of Customs said—every dollar's worth of the same class of goods coming from the United States would come in at a reduced price. But in this case there is no competition, and so the workingman, the toiler, is compelled to pay the higher duty on these heavy coloured cotton goods—100 per cent more than that on the white goods. Is that fair treatment ? The duty on silks is reduced, but the poor man's rice is taxed to make up for it, so that the government may maintain a strong financial stand. And look at the unfairness of the matter even with regard to silks. The lady wants a nice silk dress—we will not say even the finest article, but take goods at about $2 a yard in the old country.

That is brought in at a duty of 30 per cent making a duty of 60 cents a yard. Under the preference, this is reduced one-third, so that the lady who wears a dress at $2 a yard gets a reduction of 20 cents a yard. But the domestic, or the wife of the workingman, who cannot afford to buy silk at $2 a yard, but is satisfied with a dress costing originally 40 cents a yard and sold here, with profit, duty, and other charges added at about 75 cents a yard, instead of getting a reduction of 20 cents a yard, must be satisfied with a reduction of 4 cents a yard. And all the way through this tariff, there is the same unfairness. The poor man, the poor woman, the toiler is compelled to bear the burden, the benefit going to those who are better able to pay. The government reduced the duty on coal by 7 cents a ton to help the great railway corporations. But, to maintain a strong financial position, they increased the duty on furs by 5 per cent. So, if a farmer wants a fur coat to wear when driving into town, he must pay more for it. If he wants to buy a fur coat for his wife, he must pay 5 per cent more for it. If he wants a pair of mitts, if he wants a sleigh robe, he must pay 5 per cent more. Go through the country and many of the farmers you meet have good fur coats. The increase of duty on their furs goes to pay the duty on the rich man's coal—that is the effect of the tariff. Then, they reduced the duty on salad oil, which was 30 per cent, but which was brought down to 20 per cent. This was for the benefit of the rich man, because the poor man has not salad oil on his table every day. Then, in order to maintain a firm financial stand, they increased the duty on batts and wadding. They reduced the duty on flowers and feathers, and, to maintain a firm financial stand, they looked around to see something that could be taxed. Here, they say are a fine lot of fellows going up to Muskoka hunting ; these are sportsmen and do not mind a few dollars; we can bleed them—and so they raised the duty on guns from 20 per cent to 30 per cent ; and not a gun comes in under the preferential tariff. Then they considered the case of the farmer building a new house. He is putting the windows into it and the government increases the duty on the putty he has to use—they could not allow the farmers even to have that. They take the duty off mushroom spawn—for whose benefit I do not know ; but, to maintain a firm financial stand they increased the duty on putty by 33⅓ per cent. Then they took up the case of the farmer's wheat, and said to the farmer : You are getting too much protection on your wheat. And so, they reduced the duty on wheat and flour, but they were very careful to maintain a firm financial stand by leaving the old wagon to pay 25 per cent. Then, in their magnanimous way, they reduced the duty on scythes, snathes and reaping hooks, hay rakes, and even on the old fashioned flails,—two sticks tied together with a string—all these old things that became obsolete, thirty, forty and even fifty years ago—they reduced the duty 10 per cent on every one of these. But desiring to maintain a firm financial stand, they were careful not to give a dollar of reduction on the plough, the harrow, the sulky rake, the mower or the binder. That is the policy of the present government with regard to the tariff, and that is how it is that they managed to tax the people and how they maintain a firm financial stand while still declaring that they have made enormous reductions. They make reductions on the one hand and then make up by increases in some other way.

Now I desire to say something with reference to the preferential tariff. The manufacture of woollens has been spoken of as an illustration of the injurious effect of the preferential tariff. Why was this preferential tariff ever introduced ? It was long a puzzle to me to know why the government had introduced a preferential tariff until the Minister of Customs disclosed the secret the other night, and in his own words, he said it was entirely out of love for Great Britain. Well, I am thankful, Mr. Speaker, that I belong to a party that does not require to pass an Act of parliament to show our love to Great Britain. We never required to pass any specific legislation to show that we were loyal to Great Britain. I am not going to accuse those on your right of disloyalty, but when we look back for ten years and see their various policies —continental free trade, unrestricted reciprocity, commercial union, and all those other policies, it is no wonder, I say, that when they came into power they felt it necessary to pass an Act of parliament and do something to show that they were as loyal, at least, as the Conservative party. Now with reference to woollen goods, of which complaint has been made, I apprehend that there are very strong grounds for the complaint. I realize that fact, because I am personally acquainted with woollen manufacturers in my own county, and from the accounts that I get from them the condition of that industry is a very serious one. This afternoon we had the statement made by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Kendry), and we had that statement flatly contradicted by the hon. gentleman from Vancouver (Mr. Smith). Now, the member for Peterborough knew what he was talking about, he had a personal knowledge of the facts ; the member for Vancouver had no information except what he had got from some outside source, and which he was unable to verify. However, I give the hon. member for Vancouver the full benefit of his contention. He said that the Auburn mills had been running for the past four years ; whether he was playing on words and meant that they had been running behind, I do not know. But I will give him the credit for having the information that

the mills had been running night and day for the past four years, although that is a strong statement. Now I do not doubt the fact that during the past three or four years those mills have been very busy. I know the same thing occurs in my own county. There is a firm that manufactures yarn and blankets, and until last fall they had been busy, running full time, although they told me they were not making money. But you know that every manufacturer in this country has a barometer, and that barometer tells him exactly how his trade is extending. He sends out his agents all over the country to get orders, and these gentlemen come back or report back ; they are not getting orders, they are getting nothing ; orders are not coming in. The manufacturer at this season of the year ought to know exactly how many dollar's worth of goods he is going to sell during the next six months. The man who manages the Auburn mills knows now what his trade is going to be for the next six months, and he knows whereof he speaks. The member for Vancouver knew nothing about it, and consequently was not able to give information. I am sorry to say that there is too much ground for the complaint that has been made, and I do hope in the interest of the people of this country that the appeal of this large industry will be listened to by the Minister of Customs and by the Minister of Finance. To show the condition of affairs I will make this statement : In the year 1898 there were $7,985,847 worth of woollen goods entered for consumption into this country ; in 1900 that had increased to $9,809,565, or an increase of $1,823,719, an increase of 22½ per cent over the importations of two years ago. What would that be in four years at the same rate ? An increase of 45 per cent. Where will the woollen industry be if this state of affairs continues for five or six years ? We can expect to find it exactly where the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) told us the other night we would find this industry. He said there were only three alternatives ; one was to close down, the second one to run on half time, the third to reduce wages, and he feared the latter one would be followed. We know what the consequences would be. Men would not accept half wages in this country, they would go where they can get paid for full time. Now, 22½ per cent of a reduction in the output of a factory certainly means at least 22½ per cent in the profits of manufacture alone ; it means 30 or 35 per cent in my opinion, and to the workingman it means a reduction in his wages of from 25 to 30 per cent. I say the condition demands the most careful attention on the part of those who control public affairs.

I wish to make a reference to another industry, the manufacture of gloves and mitts. In 1898 we imported $564,081 worth ; in 1900 we imported $703,009, an increase in only two years of $138,928, or an increase of almost 25 per cent. You see that in four years half the output of the glove factories of this country would be captured by the foreign trade, and what would be the result ? But this is perhaps not the worst feature in the matter. The glove manufacturers are not only met by competition, but they are met by an article produced by cheaper labour, with cheaper fuel, with cheaper money, and their raw material is taxed in order to maintain a firm financial standing in this country. Take the raw material of a glove manufacturer, take the fur goods ; the amount of imported fur, goods which come from France, Germany, Russia and the United States, was 64 per cent of the entire import, so that only about 36 per cent came in under the preference. Of sewing silk and twist, 38 per cent came in from the United States, only a fraction of the silk came in under the preference. Take wool felt, at 35 per cent, used by glove manufacturers as lining, there came in from the United States 90 per cent of the whole import ; and of glove leather which forms the foundation of the whole business, out of which the glove is made, 99 per cent came in, not under the preference but from countries with which there is no preference ; only 1 per cent of the glove leather coming into this country under the preferential tariff. So that practically the man who makes gloves in this country—and it is a very large industry—is subjected to a very heavy competition under the preferential tariff ; and when he comes to buy the raw material he is not permitted to buy it under the same favourable terms. How is a man going to compete and pay living wages to workingmen under circumstances such as these ?

The Minister of Customs said the other night when addressing this House that we are buying woollens cheaper because of the preferential tariff. Now, I speak as a business man of twenty-five or thirty years' standing. I do not believe the people of this country on the whole are buying, quality for quality, woollen goods any cheaper than they were buying them five years ago. We never had better woollen goods, better tweeds, or cheaper tweeds, than we had under the reign of the national policy. We never had cheaper agricultural implements than under the national policy. With regard to these woollen goods, I say the preference affects the Canadian manufacturer because there are more goods coming in. And how is it that there are more of these goods coming in if they are not being sold cheaper ? There are reasons for that. There is a quality of English goods with a fine finish but not possessing the wearing qualities of the Canadian tweeds, and that captures the eyes of those who are not judges. They are not cheaper goods, but if you take them quality for quality at the same price they are the dearer goods of the two. The pre-

ference given on woollen goods is equal to about $600,000, and that $600,000 is simply a bonus given by the government of Canada to the manufacturers of Great Britain ; a bonus which they use for their own benefit. They devote a large part of that money towards the employment of agents who go through Canada pressing the manufactures of Yorkshire and Lancashire on the people. The Minister of Customs told us that the woollen manufacturers should use more energy in the business and they would succeed, just as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) told the manufacturers twenty-two years ago to go home and eat less and work more. The government is giving to these English manufacturers a bonus equal to $600,000, and that $600,000 is being made use of by these men to pay their agents and push their wares in this country, not at a cheaper rate, but every one knows how a business can be increased if it is pushed. That explains how it is that the manufacturers of this country are not keeping the trade of the country. If we gave our own manufacturers a fraction of this $600,000 to enable them to push their wares in the country, they could meet the competition to a certain extent, but the Canadian manufacturers have to do that out of their own pocket, while the Canadian government actually furnishes the English manufacturers' money to do so.

The total imports under the preferential tariff last year amounted to $27,095,791, and on that there was a duty paid of $5,639,035, and 25 per cent preference would amount to $1,879,676. That is what was lost to the revenue of this country last year, and the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) says that was saved to the people of this country. Why, Sir, it has to be made up in some way. The duty on raw sugar just simply balances it in order to maintain our firm financial standing. If you take the duty off raw sugar you would save to the people of this country just as much as you would save to them if they got every cent of the preferential duty. You have your choice. Take the duty off raw sugar, the total of which was $1,863,903, or on the other hand, take 25 per cent off the duties on goods coming from England, which amounts to $1,879,676, but I contend that the latter is not saved to the peolple of Canada. I do not believe that more than a small fraction of that goes into the pockets of the people of Canada. I wonder if the Minister of Customs will stand up to-day and say that we buy all our goods cheaper because of the preferential tariff. I hold in my hand a small article which costs the people of this country over $2,000,000 a year. It is a small article which enters into every household of the Dominion of Canada, and cannot be done without. I tell you that for that small article the people of this country under the present tariff pay $1,000,000 more than they did in 1895. There is the article. It is a common spool of thread. Any lady will tell you that in 1895 she bought two of these spools for five cents, but go down Sparks street to-day and you can only get one for five cents. The price has increased 100 per cent. Why is this so ? The government tinkered with the tariff. If they had let the tariff alone it possibly would not be so. Under the old regime spool thread came in at a duty of 25 per cent, but thread in hanks not spooled came in at 12½ per cent, and the difference of 12½ per cent protected the man who spooled the thread, and that was enough to enable him to make a profitable living and to sell cheap thread. But this government said : We will leave the 25 per cent on spool thread, but we must maintain a firm financial standing, because we have lost it on something else, and they raised the duty on hank thread up to 15 per cent, and then the preferential tariff was applied. As it stands now, there is one-third off the 25 per cent, or about 16½ per cent duty on the spool thread, and 10 per cent on the hank thread, or a difference of 6½ per cent now as against 12½ per cent formerly. The government cut the protection in two until the men who spooled the thread in Canada had to go out of business or do what men in desperation will do, join the combine, one of the largest in the world to-day, namely, the great English and American Trust of Spool Thread. By joining the combine, they get their price for spool thread, and instead of 2½ cents, a spool of thread costs 5 cents to-day. If you take the quantity of thread that is imported in hanks to this country and convert it into spools, you would find that it would make about 32,000,000 spools, and as there are about 18,000,000 spools imported, this would give a total of 50,000,000 spools, or a consumption of about fifty to each family. The former price was 2½ cents. They are now sold in some places at 4 cents and in other places at 5 cents, or an average of 4½ cents, an increase of 2 cents, and 2 cents per spool on the 50,000,000 spools means exactly one million dollars more than the people of Canada have to pay for that little spool of thread to-day than they did five years ago. They have to pay that in order that a firm financial standing should be maintained in the country.

Let us consider why this preferential tariff was introduced at all. The Minister of Customs told us it was love for Great Britain, but I have often thought it was hatred to Germany—not so much love of the mother land as dislike to the father land. I shall not discuss that to-night, however, but I do say that whatever was the cause of the preferential tariff being introduced, it has proved a very disastrous thing for the people of Canada, as we are beginning to realize now. Let me ask : do the farmers get any benefit from it ? Why, our cattle to-day in the British market have no prefer-

ence, although we give millions of dollars to help the manufacturers and workmen of Great Britain. They took from us last years some 7,000 head of cattle less than they did two years before. In the last three years of the Conservative regime fat cattle in Great Britain realized an average of $75.94 each, and for the first four years of Liberal rule they only realized an average of $60.57, or a decrease of $15.36 per head, notwithstanding the preference we gave to the people of Great Britain. Now, Sir, notwithstanding the fact that we open our doors to Great Britain, she is closing her doors to us. Two or three articles were mentioned the other evening in which there was a decreased export to Great Britain, and the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) complained that only a few were mentioned. At his request I shall name a few more and I shall make them of a diversified charter. Great Britain in 1900 took less from Canada than she did in 1898 of the following articles, and to the amount stated:

Leather, sole and upper	$ 2,750
Sewing machines	3,170
Agricultural implements	12,000
Carriages	42,000
Wood pulp	114,000
Pine deals	565,000
Wood and manufactures of	740,000
Beans	37,000
Oatmeal	69,000
Hams	466,000
Horses	643,000
Oats	586,000
Animals (all kinds)	398,000
Fish all kinds	922,000
Flour	2,289,000
Wheat	5,127,000
Total breadstuffs	7,273,000

Of corn we sent none to Great Britain in 1900, although in the same year Great Britain took from the United States 5,413,000 bushels more than it took in the previous year, notwithstanding the fact that the United States gives no preference to Great Britain at all. Of cattle we sent to Great Britain 7,600 less; of cheese, 10,000,000 pounds less, and of eggs 171,000 dozen less. We sent more bacon, butter and apples, because we produced a great deal more.

Now, let us see how Great Britain treated the United States. She took from the United States large increases in 1900 over 1898, notwithstanding the fact that the United States gives no preference. She took from the United States in 1900 the following increased amounts over 1898:

Corn	$5,413,000
Canned beef	1,224,000
Beef, fresh	6,252,000
Pork, fresh	1,154,000
Tallow	565,000
Lard	101,000
Hams	2,861,000
Cheese	1,185,000
Horses	1,133,000

Now, let us see for one moment what we have lost in addition to all this. It has been stated over and over again that the present government have not secured for the great agricultural classes of this country a single market. Not only have they not secured a new market, but unfortunately they have lost an old one. The wheat exports of Canada to Germany in 1898 amounted to 199,747 bushels, and in 1900 to 92,839 bushels, a decrease of 106,908 bushels. Of peas we sent to Germany in 1898 44,425 bushels, and in 1900 22,902 bushels, a decrease of 21,503 bushels. Of oats we sent in 1898 637,400 bushels, and in 1900 28,727 bushels, a decrease of 608,673 bushels. Of rye we sent in 1898 505,738 bushels, and in 1900 none. Why did we send in Germany in 1900 smaller quantities of these articles than in 1898? The United States sent to Germany of wheat in 1898 3,218,401 bushels, and in 1900 9,065,713 bushels, an increase of nearly threefold, whereas we sent a great deal less. Of wheat flour the United States sent to Germany in 1898 190,039 barrels, and in 1900 691,782 barrels, an increase of 501,743 barrels. Of corn the United States sent to Germany in 1898 39,263,528 bushels, and in 1900 46,256,978, an increase of close on 7,000,000 bushels. Why is that market closed to us and open to the people of the United States? Just because of the preference we gave to England. You know how the trade arrangements between England and Germany were disturbed and how the German government took offence at our action because we insisted on the denunciation of the treaty between England and Germany. Was it to be expected that Germany would treat us as it had treated us before? Human nature in Germany is much the same, I suppose, as human nature in Canada. So Germany turned round and passed a discriminating law against Canada, placing a discriminating duty of 9·7c. a bushel on wheat, 3·3c. on pease, 4·4c. a bushel on rye—duties which are actually prohibitive, because they are more than the duties charged against similar products from the United States. The farmers in Ontario have been asking how it is that in Buffalo No. 2 spring wheat was selling last week at 77½c. a bushel, whereas in Toronto wheat of a like quality was selling at the same time at only 68½c. a bushel, or 9c. less than at Buffalo. The solution of the problem is simple. The man who buys wheat in Buffalo can send it to the German market and sell it there at 10c. a bushel more than the Canadian buyer who buys in Canada. In that way he can give to the farmer in Buffalo 10c. a bushel more than the Toronto buyer can give to the farmer in West York. That is one of the dire consequences of this tariff, which was intended, I dare say, as a preference to England, but which turns out to be a very disagreeable thing for Canada. Wheat

sold in Canada in 1895 for 20c. a bushel more than the Liverpool price. To-day wheat of the same quality is selling in the city of Toronto at 16c. a bushel below the Liverpool price. See how our farmers are handicapped by the action which the government took, I hope unwittingly, under which they are actually selling their wheat, rye and oats for less than they otherwise would and under which the British market is taking smaller quantities of the other articles which we have to export, such as eggs and cheese.

Now, I realize that one o'clock having arrived, I have exhausted the reasonable time allowed to me, and I desire to bring my remarks to a close. I hope and trust that when the House comes to a vote on this question, it will weigh every argument well and give a fair verdict according to the evidence. If it does so, apart from all prejudice, I am sure that the motion of my hon. friend who leads the opposition will receive the hearty endorsement of the members of this House; because I am convinced as one who has listened to this debate carefully during the last ten days, that the arguments have been almost solely in favour of the contention of the opposition.

Before I sit down, I want to emphasize something which the Finance Minister drew our attention to a few days ago. In his budget speech he told us that we were on the crest of the wave, and sounded a note of alarm. While he did not anticipate reverses, that was simply a matter of speculation, he said there was going to be a check on the prosperity of the country. He said the country was going to take a rest in order to get ready for another spring, and that it would go on again with leaps and bounds. It has occurred to me that we had better not take a rest. Let the government help those men who are engaged in the woollen industry, in the glove industry, and in all the other industries of the country. What is the use of closing up these factories? Let the government amend their fiscal policy. From 1891 to 1896 was there any country in the world that stood the depression of those years better than Canada? There was not, because we had a sound fiscal policy which protected the industries of this country and our financial institutions. When in the United States the banks were going down by the hundred, in Canada they withstood everything and came through all right.

I do hope that the government will reverse its decision and give us a policy that will enable us to tide over those lean years which the Finance Minister says are approaching in the near future—those years in which the pendulum will swing the other way, and thus enable the people to prepare for the crisis when it comes.

Mr. THOMAS MURRAY (Pontiac). I am here, Mr. Speaker, contrary to the advice of my physician, in order that I may give my vote in the division which, I understand, is to be reached to-night and while I do not propose to take up the time of the House at any length, I am unable to cast a silent vote on this occasion. I have taken a pretty active part in the political history of this country, and have always strongly opposed the so-called national policy, and intend opposing, with all my power, the resolution now before the House. I have always believed that the national policy was conceived and born and nourished in iniquity, and died as it lived, and should be left at rest.

In 1867 I was a candidate. I was a pretty young man then, and am not a very old man yet—not quite old enough to be shelved in the Senate—and I have a pretty fair knowledge of the history of this country since confederation. Neither in 1867, nor in 1872, did we hear anything of protection or the national policy. It was only when the late Sir John Macdonald was hurled from power, and when suffering penal servitude for his political offences, that that wily politician found it necessary to inaugurate some scheme by which he would get back into office. It was then that he conceived the idea of the national policy. I was a candidate in 1878, and my opponent then, Mr. Poupore, who was a strong man in the county, said to me: Murray, if you will only support Sir John and the national policy, I will retire from the contest and allow you to be elected by acclamation. Why, I said, what is it anyway? What does it mean? But, Mr. Poupore could not tell me the first thing about it. He, like many others, went it blind, and the country followed suit. The people of the county of Pontiac were told that if we only had protection, they would have home markets for all the products of their farms, and would get so much more for their butter and their eggs. Every little water power was to be utilized, and manufacturing industries were to spring up on every hand. The people allowed themselves to be seduced and charmed by all these promises, and returned the Conservative party to office. What followed? We have not a single manufacturing industry in the county of Pontiac today, although between here and Pembroke is the finest water power to be found in the world. The people were deceived and lost faith in the national policy. Did Sir John Macdonald ever appeal to the people fairly and squarely on the merits of that policy, after it had been inaugurated? No, but he introduced the infamous gerrymander Bill, and resorted to the system of appointing partisan revising barristers to fix up the lists, and it was by such means that he succeeded in retaining office.

In 1891 I happened to have the honour of representing the county, for which I now have a seat in the House. We know what then took place. We know that this very

bad man Tarte—who was a very good man then in the Conservative ranks—made certain grave charges against the administration, which charges were proven, and we know that those charges and the failure of the national policy brought about the downfall of the late government in 1896. Was the country then in a state of prosperity? Not a bit of it. I have had an experience of forty years as a general trader, and I know that never was the country in a more perilous condition. Was it any wonder then that the Conservative party was hurled from office? And is it to be wondered at that the present government should have been sustained at the last general election. At that election, the fiscal policy of this government was submitted to the severest scrutiny and discussed in every detail, and I venture to say that the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), who has just addressed the House, has simply being going over all the ground which he went over on the stump at the last election. All these arguments which we have heard in this debate were then put before the people, but the people gave their verdict, and that verdict was in favour of the present administration.

I was pleased to see the opposition elect their present leader (Mr. Borden, Halifax), because I think he is a very honest man, and disposed to do what is right. I was pleased with his utterances, but I think he made a mistake in introducing the resolution now before the House. I think we might well have given our attention to more important and practical matters. I was in hopes that this House would have got down at once to practical business and taken up questions in the general interests of the country. I expected that we would have grappled with some of the great enterprises before the country, for instance, the construction of the Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal. That is a work which should receive the attention of this House and government. The government, I believe, are doing something in the way of making surveys along the Ottawa and the French rivers, and I understand, from some statements made by the Minister of Public Works, that the government propose to construct a canal at French river which will be a part of the general system. The construction of the Georgian Bay canal, however, is a national enterprise, the importance of which we cannot overlook. We have along the Ottawa river, dividing two great provinces, a water communication that to-day lies dormant. And the enterprise of building this canal, whether it be taken up by a company or by the government, should be entered upon at an early day, so as to develop the great resources of that northern country. I represent a county twice as large as England—a county which is to-day practically undeveloped, which has only fifty miles of railway, and which is rich in agricultural and mineral wealth and in timber. Yet, although within a stone's throw almost of these parliament buildings, that county is still undeveloped, and I am sure I will have the sympathy and support of both sides of the House in my efforts to have the great resources of that northern country made productive. When northern Ontario is being developed, should northern Quebec be left to lie dormant?

I do not intend to take up any more of the time of the House, but before concluding, I might say a word on this racial question which has been discussed in this debate. That question was used in my county at the last election. At the upper end of the county of Pontiac, which is occupied by Frenchmen, we had the right hon. the Prime Minister stigmatized as a traitor to his creed and race, and Sir Charles Tupper, forsooth, held up as the great champion of separate schools, and through these appeals I lost some votes. Then, in the lower end of the county, which is largely Protestant, the people were asked to vote against Sir Wilfrid Laurier because he was a Frenchman, and against Murray because he was a Catholic.

There is no question at all about it—these appeals were made. Some hon. members have stated that these things were not done in Ontario, that Ontario acted from national motive. But we know better than that. I know better than that as one who has been in the local legislature of Ontario. I know what the Conservatives did there, when they appealed to race and creed prejudices of the province on the question of separate schools and the use of the French language. I know all about it, and the country knows about it too. And my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) was in that legislature also; and he knows it as well as I do, and he was a party to the business when I was there. Nothing more should be necessary to convince hon. members of the truth of what I say than the vote that took place on the motion of the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) the other day. Fifteen Conservatives from the province of Ontario voted against that motion, and why? Because they dreaded their constituents. I do not accuse these men of being bigots themselves. And two hon. gentlemen, one from one of the Yorks and one from Toronto, had the courage of their convictions and voted for the motion. And how do we find a certain society in Ontario acting towards these men? They pass resolutions denouncing them because they voted as their consciences dictated. Is that an evidence of the liberty of conscience or equal rights that these men talk about so much, or does it show that these prejudices exist? These prejudices do exist in Ontario. The fact that fifty-eight members from the province of Quebec support the Liberal government is not due to the fact that the Prime Minister is a French-

man. It is because he is an honest and an able man and because he has been successful in the administration of the government of this country. Talking about Frenchmen, Irishmen, Englishmen or Scotchmen in this country—why it is ridiculous; it is time these cries were done away with. But it is not to be wondered at, human nature being what it is, if some did vote for the Prime Minister because of the recklessness with which he was abused on account of his race by the Conservative press of Ontario. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said that the premier had appealed to the French Canadians and said: I am a Frenchman; the same blood that runs in my veins runs in yours. When he was attacked in the manner I have shown, attacked on account of his race and creed, was he to say nothing in his own defence? I will venture to say that he never asked a man to vote for him on account of his race or creed. I know that I have never done it, and I have been through more elections, probably, than any other man in this House. I defy any man to say that I have ever appealed for support on grounds of race and creed.

Mr. CLANCY. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Murray) a question?

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly.

Mr. CLANCY. Is not the hon. gentleman conscious that he is making a disgraceful appeal at this moment?

Mr. MURRAY. No, Sir, I am not; I want to disabuse your mind of that. When I was running in Pontiac, my opponent was an English Protestant. I said to the people: Mr. Levecque—who was speaking on my behalf—has appealed to your sympathies on account of the school question and Sir Charles Tupper's action in that connection: Mr. Brabazon, my opponent, is an English Protestant: do not vote against him on account of his religion: vote for him or against him on the merits of the question before you—on the merits of the national policy if you like—but do not vote against him on account of his religion. I have never appealed to my co-religionists on the ground of faith. Why, I would not put myself in the power of any elector to say that I appealed to him for sympathy or support on such grounds. I am a Canadian and I want to meet all men on equal grounds and to do away with these prejudices to fight them down—and I think if any man in Canada has done his part in fighting them down, I have. I have been elected in a constituency in Ontario which is largely Protestant. My opponent tried to take advantage of me on account of my belief. When he was nominated for the next election, I said to him: You have endeavoured to prejudice the electors against me in a former election, and this time I had hoped to avoid a contest with you: do you object to me yourself on these grounds? When I cornered him thus, he had to say: Yes; it was born in my bones. Do you see the point?—if he had said that he did not object to me, on these grounds, he could not have appealed to the electors to vote against me on those grounds, because the answer would at once have been that he himself, when asked, had not objected to me. But when I met him before an audience that was largely Catholic, I said: This gentleman has made certain statements against me, but, so far as religion is concerned, your interests are as safe in his hands as in mine. That is the way I dealt with him. I need not tell the House who the man was, I merely cite the case as showing the course I have taken in trying, as a public man, to put down these prejudices.

My hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) who is smiling at me now and with whom I had the pleasure of sitting in a council of the united counties, stated in his speech the other evening that he stood by the national policy and was going to appeal to the country on that policy; and he said that all enlightened countries favoured protection. That was paying but a poor compliment to free trade in England. For my part, I have fought the national policy. And I will fight this motion. I want to see it buried, never to be resurrected. I am in favour of a revenue tariff as it was in Mackenzie's time. I do not take any stock in protection at all. Some of our hon. friends, even on this side of the House, talk protection. But I do not believe that there is a single man who listens to me now but will say that had Mackenzie's revenue tariff still been in force in this country, we should have enjoyed as much prosperity, perhaps more than we have had. But, Sir, the death knell of protection has been sounded. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) may appeal to the country as he has done time and again. But I say as I have already said that the friends of the national policy never appealed to the country on the merits of the national policy. They appealed to the country in the last two elections on all sorts of issues. But the verdict of the people has been given, and they ought to be satisfied. Let us get down to business. There should be less party animus than there has been. Hon. gentlemen will not allow that anything good can emanate from the present government, but would have us believe that prosperity and every good thing came from the national policy and the great Conservative party. And yet when they last appealed to the country, they could not agree among themselves but were fighting like the Kilkenny cats. I say again, let us get down to business, let us get down to work. Let my hon. friend the leader of the opposition propose the abolition of the Senate, let him propose to reduce the representations of this House, and I will join him. Let us have cheap government,

let us have honest government; let us have men who will look to country before party; let us do something for our common country.

Mr. ROBERT A. PRINGLE (Cornwall and Stormont). Mr. Speaker, at this very early hour in the morning, I do not think it will be at all becoming in me to take up very much of the time of the House. I did not intend until this afternoon, speaking on this motion. But, representing as I do the electoral district of Cornwall and Stormont in which is situated the town of Cornwall, known in eastern Ontario as 'the factory town,' I felt that it was incumbent upon me, even if I only said a few words, to give my reasons for supporting the amendment so ably spoken to by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), and the other hon. gentlemen who have supported it. I listened attentively to the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray). He says he is not a very old man, but he has been in politics for a great number of years. He says that in 1878, when the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald went through the country advocating the national policy, he did not know what it was and had to ask his opponent what it meant, because he had never heard of protection. Well, if the hon. gentleman, in 1878, had never heard of protection, he had not followed the political history of the different countries. He complains that no manufacturing industries have reached the county of Pontiac, and then he tells us that the county is entirely undeveloped and that they have no railway communications. I have no doubt that manufacturing industries will reach the county of Pontiac within a very short time, if the national policy is adhered to, and that these valuable waterpowers will be used to drive the wheels of manufactories. He refers to the Conservative party having been hurled from power in 1896. It is quite true that they were defeated in 1896, and they were defeated upon pledges given by the hon. gentlemen opposite, not one of which they have fulfilled to the present day. He referred to the speech of the non. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) in which the latter had made some statement about the enlightened countries favouring protection. I would like the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray) to name one country which has not framed and which is not now framing its commercial regulations in such a manner as to guard its own interests against the encroachments of its rivals. He cannot name one that is not adopting such a policy. The only statement a free trader can make is that Great Britain to-day is a free trade country. But they do not tell you of the years and years of protection in Great Britain which built up the industries of that country until they felt they were able to control the markets of the world, and then they threw down the walls of protection.

The hon. gentleman has referred to the race question, and I for one hope it will be the last time that it is referred to in this House. I cannot understand why hon. gentlemen opposite are continually getting up and talking race and creed. You do not hear it on this side of the House, we don't want to hear it in this House, and we don't want to hear it in the country. When a motion is made in this House in favour of a policy of adequate protection, and encouragement to the labouring, agricultural, manufacturing, mining and other interests of Canada, why should a gentleman speaking on that motion give us a long tirade about race and creed ? Why should he get up and say to hon. members who did not see fit to vote as he voted on some motion in this House, that the constituents which elected these men were fanatics and bigots?

Mr. MURRAY. Why do hon. gentlemen on your side of the House introduce this question ?

Mr. PRINGLE. I have not heard it on this side.

Mr. MURRAY. The member for West York (Mr. Wallace).

Mr. PRINGLE. The first thing that the leader of the opposition said was that he did not desire to hear anything of that sort discussed in this House.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). The member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett) stated that it was race and religion that brought the Liberal party into power.

Mr. PRINGLE. Well, the hon. gentleman may rest assured that he is not able to drag me into a controversy on the race and creed cry. I think, Mr. Speaker, among the greatest questions of legislation, there is probably not one which bears more directly on our future welfare than that of the national policy, and the tariff which we adopt in this country. To all theories and all reasonings against protection stands opposed the unanswerable fact that experience has been always and everywhere is in its favour. Our government is made for all. We are not asking for any special protection for any one class in this broad Dominion ; we are asking for ample protection to be given to every class, and the class that requires it most is the labouring class. I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the speech delivered the other evening by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), and I was a little struck at some of the remarks that he made. One of his remarks especially attracted my attention, in which he said that Sir John A. Macdonald, for the purpose of obtaining power, did not hesitate to introduce a tariff which was anti-British. Sir John A. Macdonald gave fifty years of his life towards building up the empire of which we form so important a part. You never heard Sir John A. Macdonald ad-

vocating unrestricted reciprocity, or commercial union ; but you did hear him, in that manifesto which he published just prior to that election, use these words :

> As for myself, my course is clear. A British subject I was born, a British subject I will die. With my utmost efforts, with my latest breath, will I oppose the veiled treason which attempts by sordid means and mercenary proffers to allure our people from their allegiance.

The people of Canada responded to that appeal, and they buried for all time to come that policy which was so strongly advocated by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and by other ministers who sit before me to-night ; and we did not hear any more of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Since the hon. member has mentioned my name, will he allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman who has the floor is willing.

Mr. PRINGLE. All right.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure) I want to ask the hon. gentleman if he has taken cognizance of the cablegram which is published in this evening's papers containing a declaration from the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England that the policy which is now advocated by the opposition will not be countenanced in England ?

Mr. PRINGLE. I am not accustomed to pay much attention to all these telegraphic despatches that we find in promiscuous newspapers. Now, the hon. memebr for Bonaventure says that this tariff is nothing more than a repetition of the old policy. But I will do him the credit to say that he stands up in this House and says that he is in favour of protection. He is on record in the 'Hansard' as saying that he is in favour of moderate protection. But he goes on to say that this country has made no progress during the regime of the late Conservative administration, that it remains stationary. I would like to take him down to that little factory town of Cornwall, where, in 1881, we had a population of 4,468, and, according to the census of 1891, we had a population of 6,805, an increase of 2,337 in ten years, or about 52 per cent. I want to tell him that from 1891 to 1896 our population increased until, counting the town and the suburbs, built up largely by the manufacturing industries established under the national policy, we have a population now of between 9,000 and 10,000. Without going into a number of items that I could mention, showing the great prosperity of the country between 1878 and 1896, I will only take the deposits in the savings banks. In 1877 there were 24,074 depositors, and the amount deposited was $2,639,937 ; in 1896 the number had increased to 126,442 and the amount to $28,932,930, or an increase of $26,292,993 during the term of the Conservative administration.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). May I ask the hon. gentleman what was the increase in the population of Cornwall under the Liberal administration ?

Mr. PRINGLE. Under the Liberal administration the grass grew in the streets of Cornwall, from 1873 to 1878.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I mean during the last five years.

Mr. PRINGLE. The increase has been practically nothing from 1896, because the manufacturers of this country had no confidence in the administration of the hon. gentlemen. I do not hear of any new manufacturing industries started in that town since 1896. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) says that the United States have not prospered under a protective tariff. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) said that the protective tariff is injurious to the labourers of any country in which it is enforced ; that it creates strikes, and he cited the United States as an example. But he did not say anything about the strikes in free trade England, and I could point him to the town of Valleyfield and other places in Canada where strikes have occurred during the regime of the present Liberal government. If protection injures the United States and if the labourer is not successful in that country, why should we find that 448,572 immigrants went into the United States in 1900 with the expectation of having their labour rewarded, and we know that the United States never had a higher protective tariff than it had that year. I am glad that the hon. gentleman referred to the United States because there is no country that gives to Canada the object lesson that that country does. Let me glance for just a moment at the commercial history of the United States. We can go back to the report which that great statesman, Alex. Hamilton, made in 1789, in favour of a protective tariff ; we can go back to 1813, after the protective tariff had come into force, and we can see how in that time the manufacturing industries of the United States took root. We find that in 1815 there were 140 cotton manufactures in the vicinity of Rhode Island, operating 130,000 spindles, and that many places such as Pittsburg sprang into existence as manufacturing centres. Five years after the protective tariff had been introduced into the United States the number of cotton spindles in operation was estimated at 500,000, employing 100,000 men, having a capital of $40,000,000 and paying about $15,000,000 in wages. That was the inception of protection there. We find that every time a party opposed to protection has been elected in the United States that country has gone backward ; business has become

demoralized, and we find that when the people got a chance they returned to a protective tariff as the only safeguard of that great country. In 1888 the policy advocated by the Republican party was :

We are uncompromisingly in favour of the American system of protection. We protest against its destruction as proposed by the president and his party. They serve the interest of Europe; we will support the interests of America. We accept the issue and confidently appeal to the people for their judgment. The protective system must be maintained. Its abandonment has always been followed by general disaster to all interests except those of the usurer and the sheriff.

The Republicans denounced the Mills Bill introduced during the administration of President Cleveland. The people had had four years of tinkering with the tariff and they returned the Republican party by an overwhelming majority. In 1892 the Republicans were returned on the same policy of protection. In 1896 they appealed again and were returned on the policy of protection to American industries. In October, 1890, President Harrison gave his assent to what was known as the McKinley Bill which advanced duties on many articles, and the object of which was to reduce the revenue and increase protection. I freely admit that if you increase the protection you will reduce the revenue; but who will benefit by that? Is it not the workmen and the people generally whom you are protecting ? In the fiscal year of 1890 the customs of the United States amounted to $230,000,000 and in the year 1891, part of which year the McKinley tariff was in force, it was reduced to $220,000,000 while in the following year, in which the McKinley tariff was in full force, the customs revenue was reduced to $177,000,000. But they had all the revenue they wanted and they protected the artisans and mechanics of their own country. I again tell the hon. gentleman from Vancouver (Mr. Smith) that the United States to-day are more prosperous than they have ever been in their history. There are 18,500,000 spindles going night and day in that country while there are 45,400,000 spindles in Great Britain and 33,000,000 spindles in all the rest of Europe.

Let me refer for a moment to the iron trade of the United States. In 1840 the United States had not entered the field of international competition in the iron trade, but in 1897 the United States undersold the English manufacturers in London, and her products for 1898 equalled that for Great Britain and France combined. Every great industry was built up under a protective tariff in the United States and now she is in a position to compete with any country in the world. I quote from the Economist, the well known English financial paper, the following in regard to the iron trade of the United States :

The fact that the United States is now able to produce pig iron and some forms of steel cheaper than this country is a serious menace to our foreign trade in the future.

I may say that I was very pleased to hear the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) come out squarely in favour of protection. In fact I have listened very carefully to this debate and it puzzles me to know just where these gentlemen opposite are. The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) is in favour of protection ; the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) is in favour of protection; the hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Hon. Mr. Ross) is an out-and-out free trader ; the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray) is a tariff for revenue man, and they all seem to have a different view as to the proper fiscal policy for this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, a word with regard to the preferential tariff. I may say that I have never been able to understand why this preferential clause was put in the tariff. The Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) told us that it was done out of love for Great Britain, but I have never heard that Great Britain asked that any preferential treatment should be given to her. I did understand that the Right Hon. the Prime Minister in 1896 gave a solemn assurance that if he were returned to power he would appoint a commission to take this matter up, and see if some mutual preferential arrangement could not be made. The preferential tariff as it stands is a direct injury to the manufacturers and the artisans of the Dominion of Canada.

I have not time to go over many articles which are covered by that preferential tariff. I will merely mention one article—linseed oil. Under the preferential tariff there is only a small duty upon linseed oil, and we imported in 1899 some $300,083 worth. There are in this country a large number of agriculturists who are engaged in the raising of flaxseed, which is used by the manufacturers of linseed oil. These agriculturists have no protection at all, for flaxseed is admitted free of duty, and Great Britain can import flaxseed from some of the southern countries, take it to England, manufacture linseed oil from it, and bring that linseed oil to Canada, to the detriment of our agriculturists and the men who are manufacturing linseed oil here. There are factories in Winnipeg and Waterloo, and it is a very great hardship to these men.

I find also that there has been an immense increase in the importations of cottons from Great Britain in 1899. I believe we have men in Canada who are just as competent to manufacture cotton as the British manufacturers, and the preferential tariff is a great injustice to our manufacturers without securing to the public cotton goods at any less price. In 1900 there were imported from the United States, $1,520,655 of cotton goods.

An industry in which I feel a deep interest is the woollen industry of Canada. No man concedes more readily than I do that the great and important industry of the Dominion of Canada is agriculture; but after that we should see that our manufacturers are taken care of by a proper regulation of the tariff. Of all the lines of home manufacture which are adversely affected by the preferential tariff, the woollen manufactures are singled out for the severest competition, not only by reason of the peculiar advantages of the British manufacturer in this line, but by reason of the extent to which German goods can be smuggled into Canada through Great Britain under the pretense of being partially manufactured in England. Now, that does not affect the woollen mill only, but it affects all the other industries. It affects the ready-made clothing industry, and a number of other industries which depend on the woollen manufactures of this country. To this government, who, I understand, have turned down the deputation from the woollen manufacturers, and have told them that they could have no relief, I want to say, why not pass a Bill providing that no goods imported into this country shall get the benefit of the preferential tariff unless they come through a Canadian port? In that way we would build up our ports of Halifax, St. John, Quebec and Montreal, instead of building up Portland, Boston and New York. If the government cannot see their way to grant relief to the woollen manufacturers of this country, I think they should do that. The woollen industry at the present time in Canada is in a most precarious condition, and the prospects of the future are most discouraging. I say that advisedly. In the town in which I reside there is one of the largest woollen factories in the Dominion of Canada; and those people have come to me and asked me to urge on this government the advisability of giving them some relief as against this preferential tariff. I am not at all familiar with the position of the mill in the town of Peterborough. I understand that the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) has received some information in regard to that mill running night and day. The information which I have received from a thoroughly reliable source, is that the orders are falling off, and that in a very short time that mill will either have to shut down or run on half time. We find that the total imports of woollen goods in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, were $9,968,899, and in 1891, $7,116,097, an increase of 40 per cent, or $2,852,802. The increase has been greater and more marked during the few months that have passed of the present fiscal year. I have not the exact figures for that period, but I have the figures for July, August and September, as shown by the monthly returns, and the imports for those months amount to $3,669,000. I am free to admit that the consumption may have increased to a slight extent, but not to a very large extent. The total imports of all classes of dutiable goods exclusive of woollens, in 1897, was $59,925,608, whereas in the three months of July, August and September, 1900, they amounted to $24,715,609. Now, if the imports of woollen goods had increased in the same proportion, they would have approximated for the three months $2,525,000, making a surplus of the imports of woollen goods for the three months of $719,000. That means a great deal to the manufacturers of woollens in the Dominion of Canada. It means work for at least twenty-eight factories, each turning out $100,000 worth of goods. One-third of this amount would go in wages. I am not going to discuss the reasons why the woollen industry of this country should receive a moderate protection—at least 30 per cent. That ground has been fully and amply covered by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). But I say this, that that industry is a large one, it is distributed throughout the Dominion, and it has a far-reaching effect. If hon. gentlemen will look at the newspapers of to-day, they will find that there is a larger amount of wool unsold on the Canadian market than there has been for some time, and I understand that only 15 or 16 cents a pound is offered for it. That means a great deal to the farmers of this country, and I believe it means a great deal to the great North-west, which I believe can raise a quality of wool which would be almost universally used by our woollen manufacturers throughout the country.

Now, as I said from the start, I did not intend to take part in this debate; but as I come from a manufacturing town, and the manufacturing interests of that town are very seriously affected by the attitude of the government in regard to the tariff, I felt it incumbent upon me to say a few words in support of the amendment.

Mr. A. McLENNAN (Inverness). Mr. Speaker. While we must admit that it is now difficult to bring into this debate anything new, interesting or original, I feel that, representing as I do, a very important constituency and coming from a portion of this Dominion which has prospered to so great an extent under the policy of the present government, I feel I would be recreant to my duty if I did not offer a few observations on the subject before the House. I was somewhat surprised, coming from the same province as the hon. leader of the opposition, to find that hon. gentleman submitting to us a resolution in opposition to that policy which has brought such an unprecedented degree of prosperity to that province. As an indication of the improvement which has taken place during the past four years, I might point out that that portion of the

government railway, which runs through the province of Nova Scotia, and which formerly moved very slowly and leisurely along during the daytime, is to-day and has been for the past two or three years utilizing every hour of the twenty-four, so great is the demand on its resources for the carriage of freight. Some idea may be formed of the immense improvement in traffic when I state that over that portion of the Intercolonial Railway which runs through the Island of Cape Breton, the revenue for the year 1900 was $500,000 in round numbers, as compared with $125,000 in 1899, and that a small sleepy town in eastern Nova Scotia, which four years ago had a population of 3,000 or 4,000, is to-day a city of 10,000 or 12,000.

There are many points to which I could call the attention of the House, but as we are all anxious to have this debate brought to a close, I shall limit myself to very few. Referring more particularly to the county I have the honour to represent, let me inform the House that it possesses the only undeveloped coal properties east of the Rocky Mountains, and these properties remained undeveloped until the present government came into office and furnished an opportunity for capital to take hold of and develop them. The present administration voted a very handsome subsidy to that enterprising firm, Messrs. McKenzie & Mann, who have constructed a railway from the Strait of Canso to the Inverness coal properties, four in number, and I would ask the attention of the House while I submit a few figures showing the extent of these properties. These figures are taken from the report of an expert mining engineer sent out by an English company, and this is what Mr. Ross has to say with regard to them :

> One hundred and eighty million tons of coal at Port Hood, twenty million tons of coal at Mabou, over one hundred million at Broad Cove, and two hundred and forty million tons at Chimney Corner.

All these properties are about being touched by the railway built by McKenzie & Mann, and thus prosperity is not only brought to the working people of Inverness, but a market to the farmers as well, for the county of Inverness is one of the finest agricultural counties in this Dominion. In view of these facts, I cannot understand how any representative of Nova Scotia should show any disposition to go back from the present era of prosperity to that era of paralysis of trade and of every line of industry which prevailed in that province during the eighteen years of the so-called national policy.

It has been charged that the present administration is expending money beyond its means. But these hon. gentlemen who make that charge forget the policy of their late honoured leader, Sir John A. Macdonald. In the year 1890, Sir John A. Macdonald addressed a large meeting near the city of Halifax, at a place called Prince's Lodge, and at which were present delegates from all parts of the maritime provinces. The elections of 1891 were then approaching, and the Conservative leader was gathering his friends from all parts of the provinces. He there declared that his policy was to give the people their own money to expend upon their own public works. As an instance of the wisdom of this policy, he cited the fate of John Sanfield Macdonald, once premier of Ontario, and the success of Sir Oliver Mowat who had succeeded him. Premier Macdonald, he told his audience, thought he was doing wonders when he husbanded the people's resources and locked up the people's money in a strong box, but the people grew restless and wanted their money. While they admired that characteristic of Mr. Sanfield Macdonald, which induced him to thus husband the resources of the province, yet they found that their public works were being starved out, and they rose in their might and hurled him from power and elected Sir Oliver Mowat in his place. And from that day, for twenty years, Sir Oliver Mowat went on expending the people's money upon the people's public works, and by this means kept himself in office by meeting the public requirements of his province. That policy, Sir John Macdonald declared he approved and intended to follow. This country, he said, was a comparatively new country and our public works needed money, and so long as he led the party the people of the Dominion would get their own money to expend on their own public works. And then, he said, 'when my successors come to power, they will find very little after me to spend.' This was the language of the late Sir John Macdonald, the leader of the Conservative party, and this was the policy he advocated in his palmy days.

And while, as Sir John Macdonald truly said, this is a comparatively new country, with various and pressing wants, a progressive government certainly could not fail to apply the people's money to the people's wants. It would not, indeed, be a matter of surprise to see a resolution of the character of this which has been introduced by the leader of the opposition brought into this House, if this parliament had been here for years, with the trade of the country paralyzed, with revenues falling and the public works of the country starved out. If we had had a condition of that kind year after year for several years, then, indeed, it would not be a matter of surprise if the leader of the opposition and his party should suggest an alternative policy. But, at a time when the present government and parliament are fresh from the people, when the people of Canada have pronounced their judgment as to the government's policy of the past four years, and that only four

months ago, it is difficult to understand why hon. gentlemen opposite find it advisable, or even justifiable, to bring in a resolution condemning a policy which the people of Canada have approved in a manner not to be mistaken by the opposition or anybody else. There was a time when the majority of the people of Canada approved of a somewhat high tariff. Indeed, I was one of those who thought that, while the industries of Canada were in their infancy, while they were under severe competition from the older industries to the south of the line, a fair amount of protection was necessary until those industries should be, as it were, self-sustaining. And, as is well known throughout the country, the original intention of the national policy was, that it should be a temporary affair, that these heavy duties should not be maintained beyond the period during which these industries might fairly be called infant industries. But, the trouble was that the high tariff was kept up to such an extent and for such a time as to render the manufacturers of the Dominion almost independent of the government, in fact the masters of the government at last, so that they could defy that government to touch their interests by the threat of swooping down upon them at an election. I compare the mistaken policy in that regard with the mistake which this government would make if they continued the bounties on iron and steel. The iron and steel manufacturers would, like other pampered manufacturers, become masters of the situation. Suppose that plants like that at Sydney and Sault Ste. Marie were established at Montreal, Halifax, St. John, Toronto, and other places, and the present bounties on iron and steel were continued until these institutions became so well planted that they would actually become the masters of the situation, the administration would then learn their mistake, and so would the country. But, the present administration evidently saw this danger, and they drew the line at seven years. We will back you, say the administration to the manufacturer of iron and steel, for seven years; if you are then able to walk without support, you can walk, but if you cannot, we are through with you anyway. This encourages the manufacturer of iron and steel in the meantime, but, when these establishments are self-sustaining, the people will be relieved from further supporting them. I heard it stated by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) that the present government made no effort to secure trade, that they had not opened any new channel of trade. Well, there is one thing to their credit, and that is, that if they have not opened up any new channels of trade, they have clearly demonstrated to the people that they were capable of developing, widening and deepening the channels that already exist. To demonstrate this, let me quote a report from an American consul reporting to his government. This is a quotation from the report of Mr. James Boyle, American consul at Liverpool:

The statistics of the British blue-book on trade for 1898 presents two striking facts—that the notable increase in American imports last year was chiefly in manufactures, and that Canada is the leading competitor of the United States in forest and farm products. This Canadian competition in the British market is now keener than it ever was, and American farmers and shippers would be wise to appreciate the fact that the outlook is that it will increase. That there should be competition is inevitable, owing to the similarity of the natural and farm productions of the United States and Canada and the equidistance of the two countries from this market. But during the past two years——

That is two years of Liberal administration.

—the Canadian trade has been given a great impetus through the operation of a system of government supervision and subsidies. Possibly influenced by the Canadian example, Russia is shortly to introduce the experiment of subsidizing sold storage service on ships bringing dairy produce to Great Britain, and already Russia sends enormous quantities of these products to this market (Liverpool).

In the annual for 1899 of the British Co-operative Wholesale Societies (which do a yearly business of $60,000,000) there is a long article on Canada and its productions, from which is taken the following statement of the official efforts that are being made to increase the sale of Canadian products in Great Britain.

Government Enterprise.

It is a government enterprise, and is unique in the history of governmental connection with trade. The plant for two years past has been worked from the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa. Its object is not only to increase the demand in Great Britain for Canadian cheese, butter, eggs, poultry and fruit, but to so improve the means of transportation by rail and sea that these Canadian products shall be sent into market in the best possible condition and in the most attractive form. The scheme even goes beyond this, for another of its aims is to steadily improve the grade of all produce sent to Great Britain, and thus secure for Canadian produce a good and abiding reputation.

To secure these advantages, the Department of Agriculture, in the first place, sent out its experts to aid in the establishment of creameries.

It goes on to give figures with regard to the exports of Canada to Great Britain during the same years. It starts in this way:

The exportation of Canadian butter to Great Britain has greatly fluctuated. It reached its highest figures in 1881, when the value was $3,333,419; from then, against European competition (particularly Danish), it gradually declined until 1889, when the value was only $174,027; after 1889 the trade revived, but has not had a regular growth. Its present development dates from 1897, when, under the stimulus of governmental instruction in manufacture, shipment, &c., and subsidized cold storage steamers, it jumped up to $1,912,389, as compared with $893,053 in 1896. In 1898, the value was $1,915,550.

The Canadian cheese trade has been one of steady growth. In 1868 the value of the exportation to Great Britain was only $548,574;

in 1880, $3,772,769; in 1897, $14,645,859, and in 1898, $17,522,681. These figures, both as to butter and cheese, are taken from the last report of the Canadian Minister of Agriculture, covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1898.

From the same authority is taken the following table, showing the rapid growth of Canadian farm products exported, and, speaking roundly, over 90 per cent of these exportations were to Great Britain:—

Articles.	1896.	1898.	Inc. p.c.
Wheat	$ 5,771,521	$17,313,916	200
Flour	718,435	5,425,760	655
Oats	273,861	3,041,578	1,010
Oatmeal	364,655	554,757	52
Pease	1,299,491	1,813,792	39
Cattle	7,082,542	8,723,292	23
Cheese	13,956,571	17,572,763	25
Butter	1,052,089	2,046,686	94
Pork, bacon and hams.	4,446,884	8,092,930	82
Eggs	807,086	1,225,304	55

Following is a table which shows the value of the leading Canadian importations into Great Britain, with the value of the same kind of products from the United States, for the years 1894, 1897 and 1898.

He then gives a comparative statement for the two countries, Canada and the United States, by which it will be observed that just as American exports decrease Canadian exports increase :

VALUE OF IMPORTS INTO GREAT BRITAIN.

Articles and whence imported.	1894.	1897.	1898.
Apples, raw—			
From United States	$ 2,129,234	$ 2,443,228	$ 1,954,298
From Canada	1,541.368	1,355,643	2,179,782
Butter—			
From United States	612,102	3,079,048	1,386,601
From Canada	437,988	2,162,029	3,217,004
Cheese—			
From United States	7,816,848	6,867,563	4,892,007
From Canada	13,068,277	16,278,574	14,306,503
Eggs—			
From United States	126,034	205,806	325,717
From Canada	450,249	942,830	1,223,310
Fish—			
From United States	2,000,079	3,482,593	2,983,276
From Canada	3,074,844	3,571,448	4,278,695

Other farm products are in the same ratio; just as American exports to Great Britain decline, Canadian exports increase. These figures furnish satisfactory testimony in favour of the improvement of the trade of Canada with Great Britain, as compared with that of our neighbours in the United States. This is an index pointing out that the present government stands for encouragement to the marketing of agricultural products. There was an item passed in this House not long ago for the encouragement of fishing, that is an item of $25,000 beyond the ordinary grant. I will give the House a few figures that were handed to me a few days ago from the official in charge of this department, and they go to show the value of this appropriation to the various parts of the country. I will give the statement for January, 1901, because it is short :

Shipments of Fresh and Frozen Fish from Mulgrave, January, 1901.

To	No. of pounds.
Montreal	578,550
Quebec	81,160
Points west Montreal	209,350
Points east Quebec	65,550
United States via Halifax and St. John	74,590
By express	36,250
Total	1,045,450

I give this as a justification for the appropriation made by the government on behalf of the fisheries in the maritime provinces. I will also refer for a moment to the favourable condition of trade in this country, which fully justifies the government in continuing the even tenor of its course. In 1900 the trade of the Dominion was $60,000,000 over the year 1899, thus showing an improvement in the trade of this country in one year closely approaching that in the trade of the country for the eighteen years of this so-called national policy was in force. I ask my hon. friend the leader of the opposition then, coming as he does from the same province as myself, how can he justify fighting this order of things in his province by his resolution ? We see an improvement in the trade of this country of $60,000,000 in one year as compared with the improvement for eighteen years under the very policy that he wishes this country to revert to.

I need scarcely call the attention of the House to the revenue of the country. For the past year it has been $51,000,000, the expenditure has been $43,000,000, leaving a surplus of $8,000,000. Let me say in this connection that while hon. gentlemen opposite clamour against what they call the useless expenditures made by the present government, the present government at least is living within its means ; whereas when they, the opposition, were governing this Dominion and receiving $38,000,000 of revenue, they had to go to the money markets of the world and borrow by the million. For eighteen years their borrowings averaged $6,000,000 a year. I am stating this fact chiefly to show the unreasonableness of offering a resolution that is calculated to combat this most satisfactory order of things in the administration of the public affairs of this country.

Having thus briefly referred to some of the points which I feel justify me in voting against the resolution submitted by the leader of the opposition, I shall not weary the House further than to say that while the trade of this country flourishes as it does, while the revenues of this country are ample, while public matters are attended to without an increase in the public debt, while all industries in Canada are prosper-

ing, the policy of the present government is good enough for me and I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. H. A. CALVIN (Frontenac). Mr. Speaker, I wish that I could give a silent vote on this question, and I wish so because it is not very pleasing for me to hear the sound of my own voice in this Chamber, and it would save you the infliction of any extra words at such an early hour in the morning. I feel that I cannot give a silent vote on this question. I am not a strict protectionist and this amendment is a protectionist amendment. I am in favour of the preferential tariff, and although this amendment does not very distinctly ask for the abolition of that preference, yet many of the speeches on this side of the House have tended very decidedly in that direction, and to that extent I am not in accord with them. We must have a revenue. That goes without saying. That revenue must come largely from customs duties. These customs duties may be arranged in such a way as that they may be incidentally protective, and that seems to me to be not much out of the way. I am not a protectionist for protection's sake, and I rise to make this explanation in order that I may stand clearly before the House and before my constituents on this point. I hardly go as far in the matter of absolute free trade as my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) who certainly is consistent. I cannot help but admire the manner in which he stood up for free trade even against a proposal to put a duty on lumber, he being a large lumberman himself. I cannot say that I admire so much the stand taken by his neighbour (Mr. Charlton) who, professing to be a free trader, and sitting amongst those who profess free trade, yet when his own trade is attacked, comes out a strong protectionist, and speaks in favour of the motion of the hon. gentleman from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). If there is any trade in which this country should be impregnable, and I think is, without fear of being successfully assailed, it is in the lumber trade. You have a country carpeted with forests ; you have a population who are quite capable of developing that great national resource to the very best possible advantage, and in that trade, if in any trade, I believe we are unassailable.

I am much interested in the attempt—I call it only an attempt—to show that it is possible to protect agriculturists, the prices of whose products are fixed in a foreign market. I am not going to argue that ; it does not seem to me to be necessary. The price is fixed by the foreign market, and it just means that the farmers who produce these goods should be able to produce them under the most favourable circumstances possible. That does not mean a high protective tariff. Further, I would say this : That the professions of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are not quite consistent with their practices. They profess to be free traders ; they really are protectionists. The practices of the two sides of the House, it seems to me, do not differ very materially, and I may say while on this subject, that it will be a happy day for Canada when they do not differ at all When the tariff will cease to be a football in this House, and in the country, and when the business of the country will not be continuously disturbed for fear of tariff revision or lowering or raising—and if there is anything which disturbs business it is the uncertainty attending what may be done at any particular session by any particular party that may be in power—I repeat, it will be a happy day for the country when the tariff ceases to be the football of parties, and when the two parties will divide on the general administration of the affairs of the country ; for I suppose it must be that the country will be governed by either one party or the other. Right here I think that the government are very fair candidates for condemnation now. They have an abundant revenue; the most abundant revenue the country has ever had, but there is no suggestion of the lessening of taxation to the extent of one solitary cent. It is a case of spend, spend, spend. Collect every dollar that we can from the people and spend it all. I do not think that is a sort of thing that can go on in this country for ever. The government claim a surplus of $8,000,000. If that is so, why not lessen some of the taxes ? Why not take some of the duty off coal, or why not take the duty off sugar, as has been suggested by my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) ? But what is the use of going through the list ; the government know just as well as I do where duties can be knocked off and where the burdens of the people can be lightened. In spite of all the revenue that comes in every dollar of it goes out and the public debt is growing. I rose, Sir, not to make a speech, but to put myself right in this matter, because on this amendment I intend to vote with the government. Though that is technically voting confidence in the government, and perhaps it is, I want to say that I do not wish my vote to be taken as a vote of confidence in the government. I have not confidence in the government. I do not think their general administration is such as should commend itself to me or to any other—I won't say 'other'—but to any fair-minded person. May I be permitted to go back some years in the history of the neighbouring republic, at a time when their position as to population and unoccupied territory fairly nearly resembled ours. I refer to this to illustrate what I mean by a wasteful administration of public funds. Let me read a sentence or two from the fourth annual message of President Munroe. It looks like ancient history, but it will illustrate my point :

On the 30th of September, 1815, the funded and floating debt of the United States was estimated at $119,635,558. If to this sum be added the amount of 5 per cent stock subscribed to the Bank of the United States, the amount of Mississippi stock, and of the stock which was issued subsequently to that date, the balances ascertained to be due to certain states for military services, and to individuals for supplies furnished and services rendered during the late war, the public debt may be estimated as amounting at that date, and as afterwards liquidated, to $158,713,049. On the 30th of September, 1820, it amounted to $91,193,883, having been reduced, in that interval, by payments of $66,879,165.

Here is the United States after coming through a costly war with a debt of nearly $160,000,000, with a population of seven or eight millions, and with a large unexplored and unoccupied country. Except as regards their war experience their condition was pretty nearly akin to ours at present. Having come through a war which called for a debt of $160,000,000 ; in five years they paid off $60,000,000, and just let us go along a few years further to see where they landed in the latter part of President Jackson's term. In his seventh annual message in 1835, he said :

The condition of the public finances was never more flattering than at the present period.

Since my last annual communication, all the remains of the public debt have been redeemed, or money has been placed in deposit for this purpose, whenever the creditors choose to receive it. All the other pecuniary engagements of the government have been honourably and promptly fulfilled, and there will be a balance in the treasury at the close of the present year of about $19,000,000. It is believed that, after meeting all outstanding and unexpended appropriations, there will remain nearly $11,000,000 to be applied to any new objects which congress may designate, or to the more rapid execution of the works already in progress.

Now, I call that good finance; I call it pretty common sense kind of work, and it is not the kind of thing we are accustomed to in this country. In about twenty years they extinguished a debt of $160,000,000, and in 1835 they had it all clear, and had something like $1,000,000 in the treasury. Is that the kind of road we are on in this country? What is the end of this road? Are hon. gentlemen opposite never going to say to company promoters: No, we are not going to give you any bonus, we are done with that; we are guardians of the public money, and we have stopped the bonusing of railways. I am afraid that time has not come yet, but I hope it will come soon. Must we spend, spend, spend, without any end to this sort of thing ? Must we be face to face with repudiation before we think it is time to call a halt ? Must money be thrown away, as it has been in the Galops cut, where $1,000,000 has been thrown away. I do not say that it has been thrown away by hon. gentlemen opposite; but they condemned that work when they were on this side of the House, and yet they themselves have spent $200,000 on what is an absolutely worthless undertaking. It is a channel that is never going to be used. I do not know how many expenditures have been made in the country of the same sort, but I do know of that one. I say it is time to call a halt on these heavy expenditures. We cannot go on the way we are going for ever, and I think I have given a fair sample of what I mean by reasonable, fair, and correct finance.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). Mr. Speaker, I had wished to speak on this subject, as I think every member has a perfect right to do; but at this time of the morning, for the sake not only of the feelings of the House, but my own feelings, I will refrain from so doing. I think every member of this House, especially a member who claims to be independent, should express his views on this first vital question that has divided this House this session, and I had expected to speak somewhat lengthily in expounding my views upon it. But, Sir, I feel more like protesting against what I consider the unparliamentary procedure followed in this House in the carrying on of its debates, rather on what I regard as debating society lines, making it necessary for a member to call in the services of an intermediary before he can get a place in the line of speakers. I do not think a member should be expected to speak at this hour of the morning. The system that is followed has this result, that some members can drop into this House in the course of a debate that lasts for days, deliver their speeches, and be gone. This has the effect of lengthening the debates. I have also proved that a member can sit in the House, and try for hours and even days to get the floor without succeeding in getting it. However, Mr. Speaker, I can well be content to dispense with my speech on this subject this morning, because I had the pleasure, as we all had to-day, of hearing my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Smith) in an eloquent and forcible speech, give expression to very similar views to what I hold on this question. I am totally opposed to the claim that has been made time and again in this House in the last few days, that we want more protection, and want it for the sake of the workingmen of this country. I believe that is wrong. I am absolutely sure that high protection has nothing whatever to do with wages. When I hear gentlemen in this House or on the platform in the country, talk in this way, I always think of Ruskin's remarks about the make-believe of the Russian court. He said that in the Court of Russia, with all its pomposity and all its make-believes and its cringing, servile officers, it always struck him that surely the leading men there must wink at one another when their followers were not looking. So when these gentlemen, especially the manufacturers, those

who have worked the national policy for all it is worth, are telling the workingmen of this country that this is what they want to make them rich, I think, they must wink at one another. I regard high protection as a double tax on industry, and the people employed in industrial pursuits, the producers of this country, are the people who have to pay these taxes. I am sorry I have not a fair opportunity to go more fully into this subject; but at this time, it would be, as I say, not only an infliction on the House, but on the member who tries to deliver a speech.

Mr. A. S. KENDALL (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, I regret that at this late hour it is incumbent upon me to make a few remarks, particularly on the resolution of the hon. leader of the opposition. But representing as I do one of the leading constituencies of the Dominion, the county of Cape Breton, the greatest coal mining county in the Dominion, and the site of the new iron works, and representing as I do a large labouring element in that constituency, I feel that I should not give a silent vote. Let me say that I am a free trader. From the day I first took the hustings five years ago, to this day. I have never ceased to preach that doctrine. The resolution of the hon. leader of the opposition calls for more protection. I regret that to-night I have to curtail the remarks that I had hoped to address to the House, so I shall at once come to the subject of which I wish particularly to speak. Away back in the seventies the coal trade of the county of Cape Breton was no doubt in a desperate condition. Hon. gentlemen opposite appealed to the country on protection, and a duty of 60 cents a ton was put on coal. Following the imposition of that duty came a rapid increase of the coal trade of the country. I admit that; but I want hon. gentlemen opposite also to admit this, that coincident with the introduction of that duty came a rapid lowering of the freight rates. In the seventies the rate on coal from Cape Breton to Montreal was $2.50, $2.75, $3.00, and $3.50 a ton. Soon after the introduction of the national policy came a rapid lowering of the freight rates down to $2.00 and $1.50 and $1.00 until in 1897 the rate fell to from 65 cents to 90 cents a ton. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, if the imposition of the duty of 60 cents a ton was of value to the establishment of that trade, how much more beneficial was this great reduction of the freight rates ? I claim that the coal barons of Cape Breton took the whole advantage of the duty and put it in their pockets. I claim that they overcharged the consumers of coal in Montreal and other places, and kept the labouring men of Cape Breton and other parts of Nova Scotia labouring for from 80 cents to 90 cents and $1 a day. These are facts. Now, Sir, I wish the record of the Conservative party on the coal trade in the province of Nova Scotia to be well known in this House. We found in 1890 and 1891 that the home market was no longer able to absorb the output of our collieries. We were told on the hustings in 1891 that what we proposed was a fatuous policy—that it was impossible to send coal to any other market than the home market. In this House in 1889, Mr. McKeen, now senator, quoted letters from a gentleman in Boston stating that our coal was so sulphurous that the Americans would not take it; at any rate, the commercial conditions were such that no matter how good the coal was it could not be got in there. Some Liberals took a different view, notably the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), and the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia (Mr. Murray). Which policy was to prevail ? The one based on the ideas that only a restricted market was available for the coal trade of Nova Scotia or the policy of expansion ? In 1893 the Minister of Finance brought a resolution into the Nova Scotia legislature providing for the equipment of the collieries of Nova Scotia, in a way they had never been equipped before, and with the object of forcing our coal into other markets.

Mr. MACLEAN. Was not that the national policy.

Mr. KENDALL. No, it was not. The national policy is a policy of restriction Ours is a policy of expansion. What happened ? In 1893 the measure brought down by the Minister of Finance was fought by the Halifax Herald, and by every Tory influence that could be brought to bear against it. Even in Cape Breton, which would be most benefited by the policy, the candidates of the government were defeated by the opponents to the measure.

We were told that the coal would not go abroad. Well, mark the results. In 1896 some 200,000 tons went into the United States. Last week from the port of Louisburg some 29,000 tons went into Boston. And this year, in all probability, we will send between 800,000 and 1,000,000 tons into that country.

I wish to point to another fact. The great difficulty years ago in the Cape Breton collieries was the fact that they only had work during seven or eight months of the year. The restricted home market did not require a sufficient output to work our mines all the year round, but with the policy of expansion since adopted, we have work for every miner, not only throughout the summer months, but every day in the year, and we could employ a thousand more miners if we could get them.

Let me remind hon. gentlemen also that the Conservative party in Nova Scotia sent demonstrations to Ottawa to endeavour to thwart this movement of the Finance Minister who was then premier of Nova Scotia. We therefore have the records of the two parties before us, and we find that

while the country was depressed under this great protective policy, called the national policy, it is to-day thriving under the policy of expansion.

Mr. MACLEAN. And iron bounties.

Mr. KENDALL. I am speaking now of coal. Last year there was more money expended in the equipment of the collieries, independent of the iron business, than was ever expended in former years. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) the other night, intimated that my colleague and I and several others of the maritime provinces were sent here through the money furnished by the Dominion Steel Company. I am going to refute that charge. We are not here by the help of the corporations, but in spite of them, and I think I can convince the House that the statement I am making is absolutely correct. My colleagues and I were elected in 1897 to the local legislature of Nova Scotia. We then made certain pledges and carried them out. We determined, from the day we entered public life, that our main effort would be to destroy the hold which the corporations had on the people of our country. We curtailed the powers of the coal companies, and when the new Dominion Iron and Steel Company came looking for a charter, we said to them: So far you shall go and no further. We had certain restrictions put on their charter which aroused their displeasure, and even Liberals in connection with that concern were anxious that we should not be elected to this House. If they had no other reason, they probably judged it advisable, in view of the possibility of the government being defeated, that the county should be represented by Conservatives. I wish once more to reassert that we are here to-day in spite of the corporations and not by their favour.

I shall not speak entirely from the Nova Scotian standpoint, because no man is worthy of being a member of this House who does not measure the interest of his province by those of others. But I shall now refer to the industries of Nova Scotia, and in doing so I will only be following the lead set by hon. gentlemen from the other provinces. I wish to bring a few facts to the notice to the hon. the leader of the opposition. Down in that hon. gentleman's province, there is an apple industry worth from $800,000 to $1,000,000 a year. Can he show us how a protective tariff is going to benefit that business? In what way would such a tariff help the apple grower to grow or sell his apples. There is also a gold mining business down there, worth from $600,000 to $800,000 a year. How is protection going to assist the gold miner to get and sell his gold. There is a large pulp business and deal business in that province, the products of which find their way into the French, American and English markets, where they have to fight against the products from Norway and other parts of the world. How will protection benefit those industries? Then there is the fishing industry, worth from $7,000,000 to $8,000,000 per year. How can protection help the fishermen, who have to send their fish to the United States, to the West Indies, South America, the Argentine Republic, the Mediterranean, and there compete against the fish from Norway and Sweden, from Newfoundland, and the bounty-fed fish of St. Pierre. Will he show us how a protective policy is going to benefit the 27,000 fishermen of his province? I would also point out that the very first cargo of iron manufactured in Sydney went to the United States, and that the next goes to Europe. Our main trade connections must be over the sea. Protection can only hinder, not promote our trade.

Let me congratulate the hon. the leader of the opposition on certain statements he has made. He has stated that questions of race and religion will never be raised by any one in his party with his sanction or approval. He has stated also that it is in the interests of the Dominion and of the British Empire and the advancement and enlightenment of humanity that our relations with the great republic to the south should be of the very best and every effort should be made to strengthen the good relations that now exist. But I commiserate him on this one fact, that the hon. gentleman put up to speak for him as the financial critic of the opposition took the ground that no further subsidies should be granted in Nova Scotia or any of the older provinces. I can well understand the difficult position in which he would be placed if he were to announce such a policy in the counties of Queen's, Shelburne or Lunenburg. I can well understand the difficulties that the leader of a political party has in meeting the constituents along the line from Shelburne to Louisburg.

One word more, and I shall sit down. I say that the policy for the maritime provinces—and I have heard the same policy propounded in the lower part of Quebec, in parts of Ontario and the North-west—should be a policy of expansion rather than a policy of restriction. Hon. gentlemen opposite should recollect also that Sir John Thompson stated on one occasion that, in the development of industries under the national policy, there were certain mouldering branches which should be lopped away. Have we not instances of mouldering branches that require to be lopped away now? I think that during the last few days instances have been produced showing that there are one or two industries of this country that cannot survive except at the expense of the other industries. That has become apparent. Now, speaking for the county I have the honour to represent, I wish to say that our labouring men will rely on their strong arms and the gifts that

God has given them to operate upon. And, having the opportunity to operate upon those gifts and the opportunity to freely exchange their products, whether with their next door neighbours or with people ten thousand miles away is the best way to protect them. They want opportunity to freely exert their energies and to exchange their products for the products of other labour, and this they think will be the best protection that parliament could give them ; and as far as parliament is concerned it can best exert itself in the interest of labour by favouring measures that have for their effect a fair division of the profits of industry.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Borden, Halifax) :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lancaster,
Ball,	LaRivière,
Barker,	Lavell,
Bell (Addington),	Lefurgey,
Bennett,	MacLaren (Perth),
Birkett,	Maclean,
Blain,	McCormick,
Borden (Halifax),	McGowan,
Boyd,	McIntosh,
Broder,	Monk,
Bruce,	Morin,
Cargill,	Northrup,
Carscallen,	Osler,
Clancy,	Pope,
Clare,	Pringle,
Clarke,	Prior,
Cochrane,	Reid (Grenville),
Culbert,	Richardson (Grey),
Earle,	Roche (Marquette),
Fowler,	Roddick,
Ganong,	Rosamond,
Gilmour,	Sherritt,
Gourley,	Simmons,
Hackett,	Smith (Wentworth),
Haggart,	Sproule,
Henderson,	Taylor,
Hughes (Victoria),	Tisdale,
Ingram,	Tolton,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Vrooman,
Kaulbach,	Wallace,
Kendry,	Ward, and
Kidd,	Wilmot.—64.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Archambault,	Laurier (L'Assomption),
Bazinet,	Lavergne,
Belcourt,	LeBlanc,
Bernier,	Legris,
Bickerdike,	Lemieux,
Blair,	Lewis,
Borden (King's, N.S.),	Logan,
Bourassa,	Lovell,
Britton,	Loy,
Brown,	Macdonald,
Bruneau,	Mackie,
Bureau,	Maclaren (Huntingdon),
Calvert,	McColl,
Calvin,	McCool,
Carroll,	McCreary,
Champagne,	McEwen,
Christie,	McGugan,
Copp,	McIsaac,
Costigan,	McLennan,
Cowan,	Malouin,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Marcil (Bagot),
Davis,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Dèchene,	Martineau,
Delisle,	Matheson,
Demers (Lévis),	Meigs,
Demers (St. John),	Mignault,
Desmarais,	Monet,
Douglas,	Murray,
Dugas,	Oliver,
Dyment,	Parmelee,
Edwards,	Paterson,
Emmerson,	Préfontaine,
Erb.	Proulx,
Ethier,	Puttee,
Fielding,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fisher,	Richardson (Lisgar),
Flint,	Roche (Halifax),
Fortier,	Ross (Ontario),
Fortin,	Ross (Rimouski),
Fraser,	Ross (Victoria),
Gallery,	Rousseau,
Gauvreau,	Russell,
Geoffrion,	Schell,
German,	Scott,
Gibson,	Sifton,
Girard,	Smith (Vancouver),
Gould,	Stephens,
Guthrie,	Sutherland (Essex),
Harwood,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Heyd,	Talbot,
Holmes,	Tarte,
Horsey,	Thompson,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Tobin,
Hyman,	Tolmie,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Tucker,
Johnston (Lambton),	Turcot,
Kendall,	Turgeon,
Lang,	Wade, and
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Wright.—118.

PAIRS :

Against.	For.
Messieurs	
Dobell,	Brock,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Angers,	Bell (Pictou),
Bourbonnais,	Lennox,
McCarthy,	McLeod,
Morrison,	Hale,
Charlton,	Wilson,
Maxwell,	Seagram,
Madore,	Kemp,
Mulock,	Corby,
Fitzpatrick,	Casgrain,
Galliher,	Robinson (Elgin),

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I must ask to have my name withdrawn from the division list, as the chief whip on the opposition side has called my attention to the fact that the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) is absent on the assumption that he was paired with me.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) has not voted.

Mr. BROCK. I am paired with the hon. member for West Quebec (Hon. Mr. Dobell). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

House divided on motion (Hon. Mr. Fielding) :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Archambault,	Lavergne,
Bazinet.	LeBlanc,
Belcourt,	Legris.
Bernier.	Lemieux,
Bickerdike,	Lewis,
Blair,	Logan,
Borden (King's, N.S.),	Lovell,
Bourassa,	Loy,
Britton,	Macdonald,
Brown,	Mackie,
Bruneau,	Maclaren (Huntingdon),
Bureau,	McCool,
Calvert,	McColl,
Carroll,	McCreary,
Champagne,	McEwen,
Christie,	McGugan,
Copp,	McIsaac,
Costigan.	McLennan,
Cowan.	Malouin,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Marcil (Bagot),
Davis.	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Dèchene,	Martineau,
Delisle.	Matheson,
Demers (Lévis),	Meigs,
Demers (St. John),	Mignault,
Desmarais,	Monet,
Douglas,	Murray,
Dugas,	Oliver,
Dyment,	Parmelee,
Edwards,	Paterson,
Emmerson,	Préfontaine,
Erb,	Proulx,
Ethier.	Puttee,
Fielding,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fisher,	Richardson (Lisgar),
Flint,	Roche (Halifax),
Fortier,	Ross (Ontario),
Fortin,	Ross (Rimouski),
Fraser,	Ross (Victoria),
Gallery,	Rousseau,
Gauvreau,	Russell,
Geoffrion,	Schell,
German,	Scott,
Gibson,	Sifton,
Girard,	Smith (Vancouver),
Gould,	Stephens,
Guthrie,	Sutherland (Essex),
Harwood,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Heyd,	Talbot,
Holmes,	Tarte.
Horsey,	Thompson,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Tobin.
Hyman,	Tolmie,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Tucker,
Johnston (Lambton),	Turcot,
Kendall,	Turgeon,
Lang,	Wade, and
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Wright.—117.
Laurier (L'Assomption),	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lancaster,
Ball,	LaRivière,
Barker,	Lavell,
Bell (Addington),	Lefurgey,
Bennett,	MacLaren (Perth),
Birkett,	Maclean,
Blain,	McCormick,
Borden (Halifax),	McGowan,
Boyd,	McIntosh,
Broder,	Monk,
Bruce	Morin,
Calvin,	Northrup,
Cargill,	Osler,
Carscallen,	Pope,
Clancy,	Pringle,
Clare,	Prior,
Clarke,	Reid (Grenville),
Cochrane,	Richardson (Grey),
Culbert,	Roche (Marquette),
Earle,	Roddick,
Fowler,	Rosamond,
Ganong,	Sherritt,
Gilmour,	Simmons,
Gourley,	Smith (Wentworth),
Hackett,	Sproule,
Haggart,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Tisdale,
Hughes (Victoria),	Tolton,
Ingram,	Vrooman,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Wallace,
Kaulbach,	Ward, and
Kendry,	Wilmot.—65.
Kidd,	

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). At this hour of the night, I presume there will be no desire to proceed with the business in committee, and I beg to move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the right hon. gentleman tell us what business the government propose to take up to-morrow ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We will take concurrence upon some items of supply with regard to the St. Maurice, then Bills, and then supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What items of supply will be taken up ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 4.10 a.m.—Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 29, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MANITOBA RAILWAYS AGREEMENT.

Mr. McISAAC moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 102) respecting a lease of certain railways in Manitoba.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. McISAAC moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 103) an Act relating to an agreement between the government of

Manitoba and the Canadian Northern Railway Company respecting certain railways.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Is that entirely in conformity with the rules, Mr. Speaker ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes. There has been a report of the Committee on Standing Orders.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I understand the committee reported yesterday.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I have been led to believe that the Bill would be referred back to the Standing Orders Committee.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, but I was not aware that the committee had reported yesterday.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Nor was I.

The PRIME MINISTER. We will watch it in future.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Eternal vigilance——

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company.—Mr. Fraser—by Mr. McIsaac.

Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the Kamloops and Atlin Railway Company.—Mr. Prior.

Bill (No. 106) respecting the South Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 107) to confer upon the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of John Abell.—Mr. Rosamond.

Bill (No. 108) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment—by Mr. Holmes.

Bill (No. 109) to incorporate the Canadian National Bank.—Mr. German—by Mr. Holmes.

Bill (No. 110) to incorporate the Debenture and Securities Corporation of Canada.—Mr. Osler—by Mr. Barker.

Bill (No. 111) to incorporate the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Murray—by Mr. Holmes.

Bill (No. 112) respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Carroll—by Mr. Lavergne.

GREAT NORTHERN TRANSIT COMPANY.

Mr. OLIVER moved :

That that portion of the sixth report of the Select Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, reporting the preamble of Bill No. 38, respecting the Hudson Bay and Northwest Railways Company, and to change its name to the Great Northern Transit Company, 'not proven,' be referred back to the said committee for further consideration.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would ask my hon. friend not to press this motion, but to withdraw it until we have a fuller House. This is a matter of great importance and we have a thin House, and no one has had an opportunity of looking into the case.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Motion withdrawn.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT (Renfrew) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 113) in further amendment of the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.

He said : This is practically the old Act of 1900 with this addition, that the ballot paper is entirely different from anything we have had hitherto. Each ballot paper has the portrait of the candidate with his name printed underneath in large legible type. A ballot will be provided for each candidate, and on the back will be the initials of the deputy returning officer. When the voter comes in to the polling booth, these ballots are handed to him, and he goes into an ante-room and there selects the ballot bearing the portrait of the candidate for whom he desires to vote. This ballot he folds up and gives to the returning officer, who places it in the ballot box, after verifying the initials to make sure that it is one of the ballots handed to the voter. The other ballot the voter hands to the deputy returning officer, who examines it to see that it has his initials, and then destroys it in the presence of the agents of the candidates. This will prevent the spoiling of ballots, because the voter does not require to mark any of them, and the ballot is just as secret as any ballot can be. Any one who can read may vote in the same manner as heretofore, but a man who cannot read can easily see, by the portrait of the candidate for whom he wishes to vote, which ballot he should cast.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE PRIME MINISTER.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the right hon. the Prime Minister whether the title of Privy Council of England which, according to the press of the last few days, has been conferred on him, is a renewal of the same title which had been already given the right hon. gentleman, and which renewal was rendered necessary by the death of the Queen ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I may say to my hon. friend that I have no more information than he has himself. I only know of this through the newspapers.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT TO BUDGET RESOLUTION.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). I would like to draw attention to the record of last night's vote in the 'Hansard.' I am credited with having voted for the amendment. This is a mistake. I was not present, Mr. Speaker, and if I had been, I would not have voted for the amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend refers to the fact that his name appears as having been paired with Mr. Galliher. The pair should read Robinson (Northumberland), in place of Robinson (Elgin).

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider certain resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In the earlier days of the session we brought down a special supplementary estimate, consisting of two or three items of urgency. These were adopted and passed through their various stages, but we were unable to submit them in the form of a Bill, owing to the fact that such procedure was blocked by the motion for Ways and Means. That motion being now out of the way, we are in a position to proceed, and after mentioning the matter to the hon. the leader of the opposition, I propose that we take the different stages in the case of these small items and introduce a Bill. These items are $10,000 for public buildings at Ottawa, $50,000 for St. Maurice slides and booms, and two items of $30,000 each in the Department of Agriculture, one for the Paris and one for the Buffalo exhibition.

Resolutions read the first and the second time and agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—EMPLOYMENT OF CHINESE AND JAPANESE.

The Minister of Finance moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means to consider the following resolution :

Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1901, the sum of one hundred and twenty thousand dollars be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Hon. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Before you leave the Chair, I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) to a matter to which my attention has been called from the city of Victoria, B. C. On the 18th of this month I asked a question in this House as follows :

1. Has the government issued orders to their agents in British Columbia not to employ Chinese or Japanese on any public works or government steamers?

2. Is the government aware whether Chinese are employed as cooks on any government vessels in British Columbia?

3. If they are so employed, is it the intention of the government to continue their services?

4. Is the government aware that there are plenty of white cooks obtainable for such employment?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). No special instructions have been given, but it is understood that Canadian labour is to be employed on the government steamers where it can be obtained, and we are not aware of any departure from the rule.

Yesterday I got the following telegram :

E. G. Prior, Ottawa :

Chinese all signed on steamer Quadra's Commission.

This refers to the government steamer Quadra, that is now going into commission for the year. If it is true that the officers of the government have signed on Chinese—it does not say how many, but I presume it must be two or three at least, I think it is much to be deplored, for the government is aware of the strong feeling in British Columbia against the employment of Chinese or Japanese, especially on government works. Time and again for years past the British Columbia members in this House and also the local government have brought to the attention of this government the strong feeling that exists against the employment of these men. It seems to me after this answer that was given to me in this House, the government might have found out whether they were employing these men or not. Certainly they should send special instructions to their officials that under no circumstances should they give employment to Chinese or Japanese on public steamers or on public works. I believe that the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) had some correspondence in regard to the employment of Chinese in his department, and he very properly put a stop to it, as I am informed. I hope the minister will telegraph to see if this statement is correct. I have not the slightest doubt it is, because the gentleman who sent it to me is a well-known gentleman of veracity and good standing in Victoria. I hope the minister will give instructions that if these men are employed they will be discharged at once, and that white men be put in their places. I do not believe there is the slightest difficulty in getting white cooks, if it is cooks that are employed, because I was informed some time ago that several were to be got if they were only asked.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). I have no special information with respect to the particular complaint the hon. gentleman makes that a Chinese cook has been taken on board the Quadra. I do know that for many years back under the late government as well as under the previous government,

there was a Chinese cook on board the Quadra. I rather understand that a change was made in that respect last year, because instructions were given to prefer Canadian labour to Chinese in all cases where it could be done. I will make inquiries and ascertain how far the hon. gentleman's statement is correct.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Is the hon. gentleman certain about his facts when he says that under the late government there were only Chinamen employed on the Quadra ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I believe so.

NON-PAYMENT OF ELECTION OFFICIALS.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, there is a matter I wish to bring to the attention of the House, and that is with reference to the payment of election officials in the North-west Territories during the election on the 7th of November last. I may say it is now some five months since the election was held, and the people who were employed by the government as enumerators, returning officers and deputy returning officers, have not up to the present time been paid. I do not know who is accountable for this. I was told it was on account of the Auditor General not being able to pass the accounts. If the Auditor General has got so much work on his hands that he cannot attend to business of that kind, I think the government should provide him with a larger staff. He informed me that he had his report to get out. While I do not know whether it is necessary that the Auditor General should have so large a report, it appears to me that if it keeps on growing, we will have to have a horse and cart to carry it about with us when we want to use it. In the meantime the fact that the Auditor General is busy should not be an excuse for allowing so many people in my section of the country, and I presume it is the same all over the Dominion, to remain unpaid simply because he appears to be too busy. I may say that in my riding some very long trips have to be taken, and it entails a good deal of expense, because the men who were appointed enumerators and deputy returning officers had to go to out-of-the-way places, in some cases they had to go to the bank and borrow money in order to carry out the work which was entrusted to them. They had to pay for that money something like 10 per cent, and some of these men had to borrow $200, and here they are paying 10 per cent on that money for fifteen months after this money has been earned by them. This is a fact that the government should take up and look into, and if the Auditor General is to blame he should be censured. It appears to me that the Auditor General passes a good deal of his time in trying to pare down small accounts of this kind that he might very well allow to pass. For instance, if a man makes a trip to the North-west Territories for 200 or 300 miles, when he puts in his account, the Auditor General gets down with his rule on the map and starts to figure how much this man could have travelled by the distance he figures on the map. Now, Sir, you cannot arrive at the distance a man has to travel in the North-west Territories by a rule on the map, because there are lakes and muskegs that he has to go round. In my experience, a man might be inside a house half a mile away, and the enumerator would have to travel ten miles to get to it. Evidently the Auditor General is not posted in North-west matters, and he gets down with his rule and starts paring down these accounts. That is one of the reasons these accounts have not been paid. The Auditor General has to go through each one of them and keep paring them down, and in the meantime these poor people are kept out of their money for ten months. I do not think the Auditor General should assume that he and his staff are the only honest people in this country, and if he would show a little more judgment in these matters it would be better for all concerned. I would ask the government to take this matter up and see that these people get justice. They may be kept out of that money for three or four months yet. I believe in some cases the Auditor General has not done anything with these accounts, and he should be spurred up. If he would cut off a few pages of that book he presents to the country every year, I think it would be well for all parties concerned.

Mr. W. F. McCREARY (Selkirk). I want to corroborate the statements made by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). Since I have been in this House, I have received probably seventy-five or one hundred letters about the great delay in paying these election accounts. I do not think it is necessary for the Auditor General to pare down the accounts in the manner in which he does. Take, for instance, my section of the county, if a man is living along the Red river and has to report to the town of Selkirk, he has to go to a bridge or ferry to cross the Red river to get down to the town of Selkirk, yet he is only allowed mileage from the polling booth to the town of Selkirk, in a direct line. As one man said : I don't know how he expects me to go in a straight line unless I swim the river. The result has been that some of those same parties who have acted as returning officers or deputies and have been requested recently to act as enumerators, have refused to do so on two grounds : first, because their accounts are pared down to almost nothing, and secondly, because they have not been paid the small amounts to which they were entitled. I understand also that some of

the enumerators in British Columbia have refused to act on account of the great delay in paying the small accounts they were entitled to.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I wish to add my testimony to that of the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) and the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary). In the district which I represent there are cases where accounts which were earned in the early part of November are unpaid yet, and, so far as I know, may lie for four months more before they are paid. The result is that the credit of the government is below par because of the non-payment, and the government is already being compelled to pay higher prices and to make payments in advance for census work that they would not have if these election accounts were paid in proper time. I wish to emphasize the fact that the people of this country do not know anything about the intricacies of the methods of payment out of the treasury. They know they do certain work, they know that the government of Canada is responsible for the payment, and they look to the government and to their representatives in parliament to see that they are paid honestly. I say that when payment is delayed for four months it is absolute dishonesty, and the people will hold to account those who are responsible for that dishonesty. If the routine is such that these payments cannot be made more promptly, then the routine ought to be changed. If the fault can be located in the person rather than in the system, then certainly the person should either be changed or reformed. It is intolerable that the representatives of the people in this parliament and that the government should be put in such a disgraceful position before the electors of this country, as to seem to be defrauding honest men out of their honestly earned money, and deferring payment for a period extending from four months to an interminable time.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS (East Assiniboia). What these hon. gentlemen have said in reference to the Saskatchewan, Lisgar and Alberta is equally true of the constituency that I have the honour to represent. Day after day I have received complaints in reference to this matter. I do not wish to occupy the time of the House further than to insist strongly that something should be done to facilitate the public business. If the Auditor General has not time to do the work he ought to have an increase in his staff, so as to enable him to overtake the work of the country in proper time.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). Lest the House should think that this grievance is entirely confined to the North-west Territories, I wish to say that my constituents are suffering similarly. I had a letter the other day from one of them in which he asked the very pertinent question as to whether or not the government had become bankrupt, and I was glad to be able to write back to him and assure him that we had a surplus of $8,000,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. Tell him to draw on it.

Mr. THOMPSON. I asked my constituent to have patience for a little while longer, but I would point out to the government that the grievance is a real one, and should be removed.

Mr. J. McGOWAN (Centre Wellington). I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) to some complaints sent to me in connection with the tuberculine test of cattle going into the United States. I understand that the minister has been informed of these complaints by letter. Formerly the test was applied by local veterinary surgeons in different parts of the province, but now Mr. Stubbs has been appointed veterinary surgeon for the whole province, and he is located, or supposed to be located, in Toronto. My informants state that it takes about four days to make the test, and those gentlemen who live in my constituency, Messrs. Watts, Groff, Richardson, Armstrong, Lindsay and others, who are men of what I might call continental reputation as shorthorn breeders, are put to great inconvenience. They sent their cattle to the World's Fair, and to other places, and they wish to have local veterinary surgeons apppointed to make the test. They are sending cattle every day to the United States, and the present system is most inconvenient to them. I will send this letter over to the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) so that he will see the nature of the complaint.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). There has been a misapprehension in the country in regard to this matter of the testing of cattle for export to the United States with tuberculine. It will not be out of place for me to explain in a few words what has occurred. Some years ago an arrangement was made with the veterinary authorities of the Department of Agriculture at Washington in regard to the quarantine between the two countries. At that time it was decided that animals would have to be tested with tuberculine when passing across the frontier either way, for breeding or dairy purposes. It is only these animals that are subjected to this test.

Mr. McGOWAN. It is these they complain about.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Washington authorities accepted the test made by veterinarians not named by the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa. Difficulties arose, and complaints were made

in regard to some of these certificates. Further complications arose as between the Washington authorities and the Imperial authorities in regard to the importation from the old country, both direct and through Canada, and the Washington authorities made a new regulation of their own department, by which all animals coming into the United States from Europe or Canada for breeding or dairy purposes, had to be tested by a United States veterinary official. They refused any longer to accept the certificates of the English or Canadian veterinaries. This was evidently going to largely block the trade, and an effort was made to secure some mitigation or improvement in regard to that regulation. After some communication with the Washington authorities, I was invited to go to Washington to discuss the matter personally. About three weeks ago I did so, and I came to an agreement with the American authorities by which they would accept certificates of the permanent officials of the Department of Agriculture of Canada, but no other Canadian veterinarians. As a consequence of that, I have been naming to them the official veterinarians of my department. In order to facilitate the export trade and to enable the breeders in Ontario to secure the test of their cattle, when sold to the United States, as promptly as possible, I have added one or two names to the former official list of our permanent officers. Should it be necessary to add more, I shall be glad to do so, but as this test has just commenced, at the present moment there is undoubtedly a little congestion, and there are a larger number of demands at the present time than will likely to be the average in the future, because a large number of men were waiting to ship animals to the United States until this arrangement was completed, and the United States customs officials were ordered to accept the certificates of our veterinaries. In addition to Mr. Stubbs, I have sent two officials of my department into western Ontario to take up this work, and they are to-day doing the work as rapidly as possible. I am satisfied that when the congestion which has occurred in consequence of the block has passed away, the officials of the department will be able to overtake the work, and do it as rapidly as the breeders require. If not, I shall be happy to name one or two more veterinaries, so as to accomplish the object of the arrangement, and to facilitate the trade in our throughbred cattle with the United States as much as possible; a trade which is of the utmost importance to the farmers of this country.

Mr. McGOWAN. Would the hon. minister not appoint some local veterinaries ? These gentlemen ask for the appointment of Mr. Armstrong, a veterinary surgeon of Fergus. He is a good Reformer, and there should be no objection on that account.

Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can only appoint the permanent officials of my department, and by the arrangement with the United States, I am not permitted to appoint men at random throughout the country.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). Coming back to the subject that occupied our attention before the hon. member for Centre Wellington spoke, I wish to emphasize the protest that has been made respecting the cutting down of these election accounts by the Auditor General. The injustice perpetrated with reference to the cutting down of the accounts for travelling expenses must be clear to every member of the House when the rule is applied to men travelling in a country like the North-west, or indeed any part of Canada, because men passing through the country cannot possibly follow the lines set down by the rule. The cutting down of the other expenses connected with the elections by the Auditor General works considerable injustice, I believe. Several protests have reached me, not so much from my own district, but from other constituencies in the Territories, and also from Manitoba. The gentlemen in the printing business, who worked for the government in connection with the elections, allege that their accounts have been pared down to the extent of 30 per cent, or 40 per cent in some cases. The Auditor General holds that he is not responsible for this, because he is guided by the schedule which has been fixed by the King's Printer. If that be so, then I have to say that the schedule stands in need of revision. Ever since elections have been held there have been many complaints on this score in western Canada. A few days ago, at a meeting of the Western Canada Press Association, held in the city of Winnipeg, this matter was taken up. The meeting was a very representative one of the press of Manitoba and the North-west Territories ; and it was found that all the printers who had to do with the last election had reason to complain on this account, and the association unanimously passed a resolution, strongly protesting. I would ask the members of this House, and the government, to take cognizance of the matter, and endeavour to see if there is no possible way to bring influence to bear upon the Auditor General, or upon the King's Printer, or upon the person who is responsible for these delays in the payment of the accounts, and for the improper and unjust paring down of the accounts.

Mr. DAVIS. I wish to say a few words in reference to the question before the House——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. DAVIS. But I wish to speak on a different matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. The only question before the Chair is the motion, that I do leave the Chair, and as the hon. gentleman has spoken to that motion, he has exhausted his right to speak again.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). A very remarkable state of affairs is threatened in this country. We are told by the hon. members who have spoken that the government will not be able to procure officers to carry out the census enumeration, the supporters of the government in those constituencies having apparently lost all confidence in the government, and therefore the work which is to be started on the 1st of April, will be indefinitely postponed, if it is ever done at all. We will have to inquire what the government are going to do about the matter. It has just been suggested to me, and I think it is a very good suggestion, that there is an army which was recently in North Bruce, and if it is impossible to get census enumerators otherwise, those artists might be very easily induced to go out there and undertake any kind of duties which the government may require of them.

Mr. SCOTT. Is the hon. gentleman at present in communication with any of the members of that army ?

Mr. WALLACE. I am not in communication with any of them, but I know their public history very well, and I know that when any kind of work for the government requires to be done, they are at the service of the government to an unlimited extent.

An hon. MEMBER. They do not count very well. They did not in North Bruce.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I would like the hon. member——

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member can have the floor when I get through.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I merely want to ask a question.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the question ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). The question is whether in the township of Arran, in North Bruce, the sole question discussed was not the vote which was given in this House on the coronation oath ?

Mr. WALLACE. That is a conundrum, and I give it up. The hon. member has evidently been sleeping for a week or two, and has not kept track of affairs. Now, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that this strike of proposed government officials is a most serious matter. We are told that these gentlemen, who, we will assume, performed services for the country last November, are not yet paid. The Auditor General is, I understand, the watch-dog of the treasury. When he finds crooked accounts, he does not pass them. If an account is straight, it goes straight through, but when there is any crookedness in an account, the Auditor General lays it aside, so that he may first dispose of those that are straight. These people were appointed deputy returning officers and returning officers. They thought they were going to have the whole public chest at their command, and that all they had to do was to dip in, and put in enormous bills for services supposed to have been rendered. There is a law regulating what returning officers shall be paid, and what deputy returning officers shall be paid. The Auditor General is bound by that law.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. If he holds that the Auditor General is paring down those accounts because they are crooked, I would draw his attention to the statement made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), that he said he would pay what was right. If he disputes the accounts, let him pay such amounts as are not disputed. That is all we are asking for.

Mr. WALLACE. I would suggest that the hon. member for Saskatchewan should buy up the claims. He might find it as profitable as dealing in scrip.

Mr. DAVIS. I did not get any scrip myself. The hon. member for West Toronto has it all corraled.

Mr. WALLACE. We know that the Auditor General is performing his duties conscientiously. He has an able and competent staff, who will not be hoodwinked by any bogus accounts which may be sent in, but who will protect the treasury of the country. That is what the Auditor General is there for, and he is doing his duty ably and well, and his course should be endorsed by this House.

Mr. DAVIS. Does the hon. member say that he is doing his duty in not seeing that these parties have been paid for five months ?

Mr. WALLACE. It is as well to be accurate. These accounts have been made up and sent in; but they have not been paid, for the reason that they were wrong. The Auditor General sends them back and says that under the regulations they are entitled to be paid for services rendered, and nothing more; but these men were out as electioneering agents. They were the same class of men as those who were gyrating in North Bruce in the recent election, and they thought that they would be paid for services as electioneers in North Bruce.

Mr. DAVIS. Chamberlain was not there.

Mr. WALLACE. And now they discover their mistake. Parliament has no money to recoup them, and now they come to the House with a grievance and ask that the House shall punish the Auditor General, who is performing his duty by protecting

the treasury and trying to deal fairly by every man who has performed services for the government. If these gentlemen were anxious to have the business settled properly, they would not come to the House and air their grievances here, but they would go to the Public Accounts Committee, where the Auditor General would be present, and where they could make any charge, and have it fully explained by the Auditor General in a proper business way. But that is not what they undertook to do, and in that regard they are not looking after the interests of the country. The Auditor General must be ready to defend any account of his or his department, and I have no doubt that if the matter is brought up before the Public Accounts Committee, he will defend and explain his course, and justify whatever may have been done or whatever may have been left undone. So that, if these hon. gentlemen have a grievance, let them go to the Public Accounts Committee and have it fully investigated. These men have not apparently full confidence in that government surplus of $8,000,000. They think the treasury is about empty and that they may never see their money. I think we might reassure them on that point, that the government will always pay its honest debts.

Motion agreed to, resolution considered in committee, reported, read the first and the second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 114) for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th of June, 1901, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

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

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not wish to delay my hon. friend's Bill, but there is certain correspondence with reference to some items of the public works and some papers with respect to the building of the Canadian exhibition at Paris, which will have to be discussed. I presume there will be no objection to our discussing these matters on other items.

The PRIME MINISTER. There can be no objection to any question being raised with regard to these matters when the other estimates are before the House.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the $30,000 complete the expenditure for the Paris exhibition ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think so.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WALLACE.

INSPECTION OF FRUIT PACKAGES.

Bill (No. 32) to provide for the marking and inspection of packages containing fruit for sale (Hon. Mr. Fisher) read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

On section 2,

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that it would be a great mistake to bring a Bill of this character into operation on the first of July next. Not only the men who pack the apples, but the men who make the barrels, should have sufficient time to make themselves acquainted with the provisions of this Bill before it comes into operation. I would suggest that 1901 be changed to 1902.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think I could accept that amendment. This Bill does not deal at all with the making of the barrels, but applies only to the packing and the making of the packages. Even supposing it did somewhat interfere with the character of the packages, it would be necessary to make the Bill law this session. Practically the same kind of Bill was introduced in this House last year and pretty thoroughly discussed, and the people were warned that legislation of this kind was required. The people interested in the trade have asked that some Bill of this kind to protect the trade and the reputation of our fruit should be introduced.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would suggest that this clause be allowed to stand until we have gone through the other clauses, and then decide whether or not the Bill should go into operation the first of July next.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am quite willing, but in my judgment the proposition to suspend action for another year would be hurtful to the trade, and prevent the advantages resulting which we expect to flow from this Bill.

On section 3,

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I think it was intended that the term 'closed package' should only refer to fruit in barrels and boxes, and this definition might include fruit in baskets. I would suggest that it be made clear that the term 'close package' means a barrel, keg or box, the contents of which cannot be seen when the package is closed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The suggestion is one I would have to consider a little before I accept it. This question of the definition of a closed package has been found one very difficult to solve. The intention of the Bill is that this should apply to packages in which the public purchasing the goods cannot fairly see and judge of the contents without opening the package. The difficulty which

my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) refers to arises from the fact that grapes are sometimes packed in baskets, which, if not opened, hardly show the quality of their contents. That is a point on which I am not able, on the spur of the moment, to give an opinion. But I thought that the whole intent and purpose of the Bill is covered by the definition here given of a closed package. The object of the Bill is to regulate the contents of a closed package, being a package in which the purchaser cannot examine for himself as he purchases, without turning it out or opening it, the character of the contents. I think the words here used fairly cover the definition.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I might point out that in case of a basket with a wooden cover the contents would not be visible, but the cover can easily be removed, so that the purchaser need not be in doubt as to the quality of the grapes.

Mr. WALLACE. I think, perhaps, the hon. member for Wentworth has given an accurate description in the form of words he has suggested. Baskets with wooden covers, or mere temporary packages, should not be included under the Bill, because they cannot be stamped and otherwise treated as is provided by the Bill, and it would not be desirable in any case.

Mr. BRITTON. I am inclined to think the objection is well taken, to some extent at all events, because it will be seen that according to the definition under clause 3, a closed package 'means a package of which the contents cannot be seen or inspected when such package is closed.' The whole question is as to the definition of the word 'package,' and some form of words such as that suggested by the hon. member for Wentworth seems to me to cover all that is required. Unless something of that kind is put in, it seems to me difficulties will arise in the attempt to enforce the law.

Mr. ROSS (South Ontario). I would support the contention of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith). I am accustomed to handling such packages as he speaks of—baskets of grapes and other fruit covered with a wooden cover and so arranged as to be easily detached. It would be a great hardship in the fall of the year when we are getting hundreds—and still more in large centres where they get thousands and tens of thousands of baskets—to have them called closed packages under this law, and to be made responsible for their contents.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The suggestion of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) is on record in 'Hansard' and we can look at it a little more carefully. In the meantime, I would suggest that this clause be allowed to stand. We can return to it a little later on.

On section 4,

Mr. PUTTEE. When this Bill was introduced, as I understood the hon. minister's explanation, it was the intention to have it apply to the domestic or North-west trade, and I would like to know how far this is being provided for under this clause. It seems to me that clause 4 provided only for the marking of packages with the initials, the variety and the grade, the same as is done now in our domestic trade, while clause 6, which calls for the grading, is limited to the export trade.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. PUTTEE. Then I would like to have the matter explained.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The intention certainly is that this Bill should apply to the internal trade, but the grades which are defined in clauses 6 and 7 were intended to apply to the export trade and not to the internal trade. We have found by experience that the marking of grades or definition of the class of fruit contained in packages is very difficult. Different packers use words to designate or grade their fruit. For instance, one gentleman who was present when this Bill was discussed by the fruit growers and shippers, said he always marked his fruit 'Imperial' and 'selected,' 'Imperial' being the best and 'selected' being the next best. Other gentlemen use other names. It was understood that it would be impracticable, without serious injury to the present trade, to require that certain definite marks or brands should be put upon all packages. But, for export, the two definite brands contained in clauses 6 and 7 are suggested. Even these are not compulsory for export, and if one chooses to export under another brand than these, he can do so. Clause 8 will cover this and all other packages, as it provides that the interior of the package shall be of the same quality as the ends or faces shown. It was thought to be unnecessary to define the grades otherwise than in that way. But, for the purpose of encouraging our exporters and to establish definite Canadian grades which shall be known in the foreign markets in the future, we have introduced into this Bill clauses 6 and 7 to give a definite grade with the name 'Canadian.' This explanation, I trust, will show my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) that the internal trade is dealt with by this Bill practically in the same way as the export trade—that is, the package must contain a uniform and even quality of fruit similar to that in the exposed portion of the package.

Mr. WADE. I would like to point out that subsection b of this section 4 provides that the name of the 'variety or varieties' shall be stamped on the package. Under section 7 it is provided that there shall be

only one variety of apples in a package. I think, therefore, we should strike out the words 'or varieties' in subsection b. I may say that I would object to making it compulsory to put the word 'Canadian' upon the packages. I think that it would be objectionable to the growers and the shippers of Nova Scotia, because they have, so far—and they think for good reason—retained the name 'Nova Scotia Apples,' and their fruit is so known in the English market. They seem to think—and it appears with good cause—that the Nova Scotia fruit is superior. Certainly it reaches the market in superior condition to the Ontario fruit. That can be understood because the Ontario fruit has a long railway carriage, and as fruit is apt to sweat, by the time of its arrival at Montreal, the port of shipment, it is in bad condition. On the other hand the Nova Scotia fruit has only a short railway haul, and is put on board steamers in better condition than the Ontario fruit. Be that as it may, I cannot see any reason why Nova Scotia shippers should be compelled to change the name of their fruit and call it Canadian.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think my hon. friend caught what I said in regard to sections 6 and 7. These sections are not compulsory, they are simply a definition of the grades which we would like to encourage exporters to put on their fruit. If they do not wish to use them, they can put any other brand they choose upon their packages. But, even supposing this grade is put on, there is no reason that the word 'N.S.' should not be put along with it, and have it shown that the fruit comes from Nova Scotia, just in the same way as a Quebec or an Ontario man might put the words 'Ont.' or 'Que.' along with their definition of 'A No. 1 Cndn.' Then, in regard to the other point which the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) brought forward, pointing out that the word 'varieties' was used in subsection b of section 4, and in sections 6 and 7, where they are required to have only one variety, here again clauses 6 and 7 are not compulsory. But, we wish to encourage people who are exporting fruit in large quantities not to mix up varieties of fruit in the same package for the export trade. If a man is sending a considerable number of packages for shipment abroad, it is hardly likely that he would want to put more than one variety in the same package. Therefore, in the definition of what I hope to call national brands or grades, it is required that only one variety shall be put in a package. I may say in this connection, that amongst many arguments which have been urged, both from the old country and in our home markets, the desirability of putting only one variety of fruit in a package has been strongly impressed upon us. I would not, therefore, like to see that qualification in sections 6 and 7 struck out. While in other markets and for other purposes it is necessary that if there are two or three varieties in the barrel, the names of those varieties should be put on the packages.

Mr. WADE. Would the minister consider it necessary that words should be added to these two sections 6 and 7 so that in addition to the mark 'A No. 1 Canadian,' parties can add the province in which the fruit is shipped ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think that is necessary at all ; providing there is nothing to prohibit it being done, it could be done.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) There is objection to having too many brands on each barrel. I think it is better to confine the Ontario packing to Ontario, and the Quebec packing to Quebec, and in the same way with Nova Scotia. You will then keep the shipping separately.

Mr. GOURLEY. I agree with the hon. member for Annapolis, that it is essential that we should put on the barrel the place of growth of the apples, and we need not interfere in the slightest degree with the standard. Let the standard be the same for all the provinces. I have heard, and I will take the opportunity of bringing it before this House, that last summer the Nova Scotia apples at the Paris exhibition were mixed up with Quebec apples, and the prizes that went to Quebec were owing to the superior excellence of the apples of Nova Scotia. We want to avoid that difficulty in future.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would remind the committee that we should discuss section 4 instead of sections 6 and 7.

Mr. McCREARY. I have already spoken in the Committee of Agriculture on this matter. My attention has been called to it by the Winnipeg Board of Trade, and also by several merchants in my own county. A great deal of attention is paid in this Bill to the export trade. I submit that one of the most important localities for the consumption of applies from the eastern provinces are the territories west of Lake Superior. As a matter of fact, most families up there use from one to ten barrels of apples every season, and we find that the first two or three rows of apples on the top of the barrel are all right, while the apples below are useless. There are some very unkind remarks made up there against the fruit-growers of the east on account of the way in which they pack their apples. We supposed they all came from Ontario, but I am surprised to know that a large quantity comes from Nova Scotia. I trust for the sake of Nova Scotia, they are not guilty of the charge that we lay at the door of the Ontario people. Great care should be taken in passing this Bill. I am sorry I had not sufficient time to send a copy to the various wholesale men in Manitoba and the Territories, in order to get

their opinion upon it. I want strongly to impress upon the committee the importance of passing this Bill in such a way that it will be of some use to us. I do not see why a rule somewhat similar to that which we have established for wheat may not be applied to fruit. As you know, wheat is graded, not only for Manitoba, but for the entire Territories ; it is graded No. 1 hard. No. 2 hard, No. 1 Northern, No. 1 rejected, and so on, and I do not see why apples should not be graded in the same way, without designating the province that they come from.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I am glad that the minister has introduced this measure, because I believe it is a step in the right direction. I agree with the remarks of my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), when he says that in the west we are made the victims of men without conscience in the east with regard to the way they pack fruit. I have in my hand a letter dated March 7, which was sent to me by the Winnipeg Board of Trade on this very question, and which I will read :

Winnipeg, March 7th, 1901.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRivière, M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I have the honour, by direction of this board, to ask if you will kindly, on their behalf, urge upon the government, and the Minister of Agriculture in particular, in whose department we understand the matter rests, to, if necessary, enact such legislation as will secure the public from fraud in connection with the packing of apples in barrels for sale by the barrel.

There is probably no article of consumption in Manitoba in connection with the sale of which such fraudulence prevails, as in connection with the apples shipped to Manitoba, from Ontario principally. It is well within the mark to say that it is the rule rather than the exception when a consumer purchases a barrel of apples to find dishonesty exhibited in the packing, and there appears to be no recourse against the fraud perpetrated by the ordinary packer. It is extremely rare that the apples in the middle of the barrels are anything like those placed at either end, with the evident intent of deceiving the consumer. The necessarily high freight paid on apples from Ontario to Manitoba adds greatly to their cost to the consumer, and the latter pays high prices for apples which, through the fraudulent packing, he does not actually receive.

This board suggests that there should be either an inspection of apples barrelled for sale, or that a penalty should be imposed on any packer who does not brand the barrel at the time of packing with the class of apples so barrelled, and his name and address, and such packer should also be open to severe penalties in case he brands the barrels as containing a higher grade of apples than they actually contain, or with the intent to defraud.

Thousands of dollars are lost to the people of Manitoba in connection with the sale of apples in this province, and this board considers that it is the duty of the government to protect the people in this matter.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) C. N. BELL,
Secretary.

Although provisions are made here whereby the barrel should be stamped, I think the law is not yet stringent enough to put a stop to other frauds that are committed, not by the packers, but by middlemen. After a barrel has been stamped and after the proper brands of apples that it contains have been removed, there is nothing to prevent parties from replacing those brands with fruits of an inferior quality while the stamp remains on the barrel. With regard to tobacco, there is a provision whereby the moment a box that is stamped is opened the box has to be destroyed. I would not go to such an extreme with regard to the barrels containing apples, but at the same time I think the law should be much more severe than is here proposed against those who commit this fraud which to my mind is equal to a straight robbery. A mere fine of from 25 cents to $1 is ridiculously low to punish such a fraud. It is an ordinary case of robbery, and I believe should be punished as such. I hope that the Bill will be so amended later on as to make more stringent provisions against such frauds. This Bill is a step in the right direction, and I hope that the minister will see that it is made more perfect and more complete in order to attain the object in view.

Mr. ROSS (South Ontario). I am glad to hear from hon. gentlemen commendations in regard to the principle of this Bill. I think that perhaps the most important clause is section a of clause 4 : that the initials of the Christian name and the full surname and address of the packer shall be given. That makes the packer responsible. A man cannot put his name on a package of fruit unless the contents are just what they are represented to be. I believe that the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. LaRivière) is a good one. When tobacco is sold, the packages have to be destroyed, and would it not be well to provide that after the contents are taken out of a barrel of apples all the marks on the barrels should be obliterated so that they cannot be used again. That would be a further protection to the public. The moment a barrel of coal oil is emptied we have to scrape off the marks of the inspector, and I think the same rules should be applied to apple barrels. I believe that this Bill will prevent a good deal of fraud, and I am glad the minister (Hon. Mr. Fisher) has introduced it. I represent a number of shippers in my riding, and have had letters from them in regard to this Bill. I am informed by one of the largest shippers that when the apples come to be sold in Liverpool, for all quantities over twenty barrels a sample barrel is turned up, but for all quantities under twenty barrels the head is just taken off the barrel and they are sold by the sample of the top of the barrel. Consequently the cull apples are shipped in quantities of less than twenty barrels, and the top of the barrel only being

seen, numerous frauds have been perpetrated upon the English buyers. If the number of barrels is over twenty, the whole of the fruit in one barrel has to be exposed and the rest are guaranteed like the sample. On quantities less than twenty barrels, no name is necessary, and the shipper himself does not put the brand on them, so that fraud results. I think the pith of this whole Bill lies in the fact that the man becomes responsible for the fruit he puts in the package.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as I understand the scope of the Bill, I do not think there is any necessity for a provision that the marks should be erased, because they are not put on the barrel by the inspector, but by the man himself, and therefore if you compel him to erase the marks he can put them back again the next moment. If the marks were put on by the inspector the suggestion of the hon. gentleman would be in point.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) is quite right. There are no marks intended to be put upon the packages by the inspector except where the packages are found to be fraudulently marked, and then the inspector stamps it 'falsely marked' and erases the original marks. In the case of coal oil barrels the marks are put on by the inspector, and of course they must be erased, but in this Bill there is no provision of that kind, and I do not think it is necessary. I do not think this Bill can deal with the use of packages over again. It would be a straight case of fraud without regard to the marks at all, and the package would be liable to the penalties under section 5. Although the person may not be himself a packer, still if he offers a barrel falsely marked for sale he is liable, and I think that clause covers the case. In reply to my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), I may say that I received the resolution of the Winnipeg Board of Trade after this Bill had been printed and distributed, and I was very glad to know that the Winnipeg Board of Trade entirely endorsed the principle of the Bill. A Bill of a similar character last year was pretty thoroughly discussed, and so I did not think it necessary to go into details when I moved the second reading. I shall be very happy to receive any suggestions which may tend to improve the Bill.

Mr. WADE. It appears to me from a perusal of the Bill, that if the packer or shipper puts upon the package the designation of the fruit and calls them 'A No. 1,' and it turns out they are inferior, that there is no penalty.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is under clause 5.

Mr. WADE. I do not think that would cover it. Subsection c of section 4 says that you should put the designation of the grade of fruit; section 6 says that if he is going to mark 'A No. 1' or 'A No. 1 for Canadian export,' they must be of a certain quality, and the description is given of that quality. The same provision is made in section 7. Then, under section 8 there is a penalty for the violation of any of these sections.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Section 8 applies to the whole Bill.

Mr. WADE. It does, but all section 4 requires him to do is to put the designation of the grade, and it does not say anything as to what the grade shall be. There are two classes of people we wish to protect by this Bill. One class is the honest packer and shipper, a very important class and the class that I am interested in; the other is the purchaser. Now, the dishonest packer can comply with the provisions of section 4, and ninety-nine purchasers out of one hundred would not know that it made the slightest difference in a barrel of apples being marked 'A No. 1' or 'A No. 1 Canadian.' The Bill does not go far enough in that respect. I believe that every man who ships a barrel of fruit should not only put the designation of the grade of fruit, but that we should also designate by this Bill what shall be 'A No. 1' and 'No. 2,' and so on. Then there is some protection to the shipper and some protection to the purchaser. I trust the minister will see his way clear to amend the Bill in that direction.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am pleased that the Minister of Agriculture has introduced a Bill of this character because it will be a protection to the fruit-grower, a protection to the packer, and a protection to the purchaser. Clause 4, which seeks to guard against fraud, is a very important one. I was sorry to learn from the hon. member from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) that a poor quality of apples was shipped from the east to the west, and I think he said that these apples were of Nova Scotia production.

Mr. WADE. He was only joking.

Mr. KAULBACH. Well, he included Ontario, but he may have referred more particularly to Nova Scotia. Now, I am correct in saying that Nova Scotia is renowned throughout the world as having the very best character of fruit; and I will corroborate that statement by informing this House that at an exhibition in the city of London some years ago, among the many varieties of fruit there exhibited, the Lunenburg fruit took the first and gold prize, and Nova Scotia fruit has continued to maintain its reputation ever since. The county I have the honour to represent is engaged very largely in fruit-growing, and its soil and climate are well adapted to produce fruit such as I have described. Annapolis is also known as a fruit-growing

county, the fruit of the Annapolis valley being particularly renowned, though it does not surpass the fruit produced in the county which I have the honour to represent. I think it is well, as the hon. member for Annapolis says, that we should mark the grade of apple on the barrel, giving the kind of apple and the name of the packer, so that if any fraud is committed by anybody, the packer will be the person who will be looked to for redress. I feel that every safeguard should be thrown around the fruit-grower, and this clause should not pass until every part of it is carefully considered.

Mr. GOURLEY. I want to point out that the grading of an apple does not depend on the mere name of the apple. Thus, a No. 1 Gravenstein of Ontario is not the same fruit as a No. 1 Gravenstein of Nova Scotia. I come from an apple-growing district myself, though it is not so extensive as the Annapolis valley; and I think we ought to listen to each other with respect in regard to these matters, in order to learn the capabilities of Canada. In the Annapolis valley there are two ranges of mountains, one on either side, which in the day time protect the fruit from winds, and secures great heat, which is essential to give growth and colour to the fruit; and the nights are cool, which give the apple flavour and juice. In Nova Scotia there is an ideal climate for growing apples of the finest quality. In Ontario you have hot days, in which the apple stews to death, and hot nights which dry it up; so that in the morning you have an apple without a particle of flavour or juice. Therefore, if I went into the London market and asked for a No. 1 Gravenstein apple, and if it were not a Nova Scotia apple, I would be imposed upon. The apple should be distinctly branded 'Gravenstein No. 1, Nova Scotia,' so that the Londoner will know when he buys it that he is getting a beautiful, highly flavoured apple, which is an ornament to any table in the world. I want to differentiate the apples of Nova Scotia from the apples of Ontario; for the two are as different from each other as daylight is from darkness. If you want to grade the apples, you must make your standard honest and just; but you will not be doing so, if you call them all Canadian alike. Call them apples No. 1 Nova Scotia, and apples No. 1 Ontario, and then a fool in London will know which to buy.

Mr. KAULBACH. The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) has taken this House quite by surprise by showing himself to be a fruit scientist. I fully endorse what he has said, for a very great deal is to be said for mild days and cool nights in producing flavour and colour in apples. If those points could be carefully considered by those who profess to be scientists in the matter, and a record kept with regard to the proper growth and care of apples, I think it would be very valuable, and an educator to fruit growers.

Mr. McEWEN. I think our friends from Nova Scotia should have one end of the barrel labelled Nova Scotia, and leave the other end for the rest of Canada. I would like to ask what will be done in the case of apples of the same variety which are differently named by different people.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is well known that there are certain varieties of apples which pass under one name in one place and under another name in other places. Two or three names are sometimes applied indifferently to the same variety. But where we require the name of the variety to be given, there could be no exception taken to a name being used which is generally known in the locality. As a matter of fact, I understand fully the situation which the hon. gentleman mentions, and the fruit-growers and shippers who discussed this matter thoroughly, did not consider that there would be any difficulty in that respect.

Mr. ROSS (South Ontario). I understand that nearly all apples are bought by men who have their storage warehouses, where they select and repack the apples. I know that is the case with apples for export; I do not know how it is with regard to the local trade. But in case hon. members should get the impression, from the discussion which we have had, that it is only in Nova Scotia that good apples are grown, I beg to say that Ontario holds the palm for apples, especially the county which I have the honour to represent, and more particularly the southern part of it. There we grow the choicest and finest apples it is possible to produce. I think it is important that we should have a regular Canadian brand, whether the apples come from Ontario or Nova Scotia, or any other province, and let them be required to come up to a high standard. I cannot see any objection to have included in the brand, in smaller letters, the name of the province from which the apples come, which would serve all practical purposes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know very much about the apple trade, and I do not profess to know anything about the relative merits of Nova Scotia apples and Ontario apples. But I happened to notice in the report of Prof. Robertson of last year or the year before, the statement that apples from Nova Scotia are sold by the name of Nova Scotia apples in London, although they are, of course, just as much Canadian apples as apples from Ontario or Quebec, which are sold as Canadian apples. If the apples from my own province have a reputation by that name, I think it is well that the advantage of that fact, whether it is little or great, should be preserved. Would the Minister of Agriculture

permit me to bring to his attention a matter which does not seem to be very definitely dealt with in his Bill, though I am perhaps mentioning it a little out of its order? By sections 6 and 7 it is provided that the apples of grade A No. 1 Canadian shall have certain characteristics; and then by section 8 it is provided that 'no person shall sell or offer, expose, or have in his possession for sale, any fruit packed in any package upon which is marked any designation of size, grade or variety which falsely represents such fruit.' The difficulty I see about the Bill is this. The hon. gentleman has defined what No. 1 Canadian shall be, but he does not make it necessary that the brand No. 1 Canadian shall be used by any person. Suppose the apple-growers of Ontario see fit to mark their apples No. 1 Ontario, and the Nova Scotia growers No. 1 Nova Scotia, you have not any provision stating what apples so marked shall be. Would it not be desirable to have in this Bill a general definition of No. 1 apples, such as is given of No. 1 Canadian in clause 6? Unless you have such a clause, it will be easy for any one to avoid the provisions of the Act without exposing himself to any penalty.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the Bill introduced last session, it was intended to have a definition of a grade, which should be made compulsory for the export trade. When, however, the scope of the Bill was enlarged, and made to embrace the internal as well as the export trade, it was found difficult to give a definition on account of the number of brands used in the internal trade. Some fruit-growers have brands which they wish to continue using, and which it would be impossible to define. Were the trade and the public to consent to the wiping out of all the present brands, and the adoption of a new standard, which would apply to fruit in the same way as the standard brands apply to grain, that might be a good thing, but the trade at large is determinedly opposed to it. It would be too great an interference with the established usages of the trade to be practicable.

Mr. GOURLEY. Could you not pass a law and make it applicable in two years from now?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think that such a law would be acceptable to the trade. There are certain men in the trade who have to-day established brands worth thousands of dollars to them, because they have been honest in their trading and packing, and the people have confidence in those brands. And it would be absolute robbery to prevent these people from using those brands. It might take years for the traders, who were compelled to give up their established brands, to re-establish their reputation and character under a general brand. Sections 6 and 7 are not compulsory. They are simply suggestions, in the hope that in time—and the sooner the better—our export trade will, as much as possible, be covered by some such brand. I am not particular as to the character of the brand, but I should be glad to see our export trade carried on under brands of which the name 'Canadian' formed an integral and important part. It was in this view that I suggested the word 'Canadian' in preference to 'N.S.,' 'Ont.' or 'Que.' I do not want to enter into any controversy as to the quality of the apples in Ontario and Nova Scotia. My own opinion is, that the province of Quebec, coming between the two, furnishes the best fruit.

I do not think it would be practicable to define what should be first quality grade and second quality grade, but I do think that section 8 covers the point, as far as any general provision possibly can. If there is a designation put upon a closed package, which would indicate superior excellence, and the fruit was found inferior, I believe the packer would be liable to the penalties under section 9 for having violated the provisions of section 8. It is just as necessary that section 8 shall be complied with as section 4. If any of the provisions of these two sections are evaded, the parties guilty would be liable to the penalties in section 9.

This Bill has been in the hands of the Justice Department and been carefully examined, and the impression which I certainly had is, that the penalties under section 9 applied to the provisions of sections 4 and 8.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The difficulty is, that it would be almost impossible to convict any one of an offence against section 8. You would require expert evidence, and would have half a dozen saying a particular barrel was No. 1 and others saying it was not.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman may notice that in the eleventh line of section 8 there is this provision:

> —and it shall be considered a false representation when more than 15 per cent of such fruit is substantially smaller in size than, or inferior in grade to, or different in variety from, the marks on such package or the faced or shown surface of such package.

That does not quite cover the point, but it would be very difficult indeed for a packer to act as my hon. friend thinks he might, and not come under this particular section.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems to me that the Bill is lacking in everything that could make it an efficient Bill. The apple-growers and exporters are not willing to give up their particular brands, and this Bill gives every man a perfect right to export apples under any brand he may chose to give them, and there is absolutely no grade fixed. It will

never do to give the force of law to a measure which would allow the flooding of the British market with all kinds of grades without fixing any standard. One man may grade apples No. 1 which another would grade as No. 3, and no penalty can be imposed. Although that is covered, in a sense, in clause 8, there is nothing in that clause more than this, that there shall be, first the initials of the packer then the variety and words to fix the grade. But no grade is fixed, each individual making a grade to suit himself. It seems to me that until these gentlemen are able to come together, and instead of making a compromise Bill, to have one under which all our apples exported shall have one reasonable uniform grade, we cannot hope to have our apples reach the English market in the best shape to build up this trade. The experience of the Minister of Agriculture, I need hardly point out, has shown that attempts in the other direction have been an absolute failure. There is general complaint that bad fruit is going into the market, which is constantly lessening our chances of building up a trade. A standard should be fixed and a Bill introduced to compel all packers to comply with it.

Mr. ROSS (South Ontario). If we are to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) should be adopted with it, that all the packers should be allowed two or three years for the adoption of this 'A No. 1 Canadian' brand. I was speaking recently with a member of the firm of J. O. Henry & Sons, of Oshawa, who are among the largest shippers of apples, who said—and this view is confirmed by the statement of other shippers with whom I have had correspondence—that they have a registered brand of apples with which they have been doing business in the old country for about a quarter of a century. The brand is well established, the goods are exactly as represented, and they sell on their merits. Hon. members can easily see that this firm have built up a business, and that this brand is a valuable asset which they cannot afford to part with at short notice. I plead for that class of people. If the suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell is taken, time should be allowed to the shippers to accommodate themselves to the new order of things. To take any other course would be to subject individuals to great hardship.

Mr. WADE. There is a good deal of force in what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross, Ontario) says. I do not think that anybody wishes to subject any of the shippers to hardship. In fact, the minister gives that as his reason for not making the suggested change. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Colchester as to not bringing this Bill into force at once but deferring it for three years——

Mr. GOURLEY. I did not refer to the whole Bill, I referred to this part of it.

Mr. WADE. Yes, this part of the Bill. But there has been great clamour for some legislation in this direction; and, while I am opposing this feature of it, I wish to state that the producers and shippers feel themselves under a debt of gratitude to the hon. minister for the interest he has taken in this matter.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) did not understand what I said. What I desired was that if there are people who are ready to co-operate in this matter they should be given three years to put themselves under the general rule.

Mr. WADE. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gourley). I am informed that in Ontario they are using such grades as 'selected,' 'choice selected' and so on. In the province of Nova Scotia, these are not the designations used. We used the terms 'No. 1,' 'A No. 1' and so on. This national grade that we are trying to establish by this Act is really taking our grading and tacking to it the word 'Canadian.' That is the thing we object to, because we have—as I said before for good reasons—kept the name of our apples distinct from the Canadian, because we claim they are better, and the reports of the department shows they are better. It would be a hardship to the producers of Nova Scotia to lose a portion of their distinctive mark, just as it would be in the case of the private shippers of Ontario. These honest packers have used the name honestly and have made it valuable, and I desire to retain for them the distinctive mark which they have thus made valuable. There may be only 1 per cent or half of 1 per cent of the packers dishonest, but their dishonesty will affect the whole trade. To bear out my argument, I might refer to the evidence given before the Agricultural Committee in 1899. I find it there stated that apples were shipped from Ontario by the ss. Castilian, which was wrecked on the shore of Nova Scotia. These apples were purchased in Yarmouth. The packages were marked 'selected' and 'choice selected,' but the purchasers were disgusted at the gross deception practised for the apples were, for the most part, mere windfalls. Three or four layers on top were fair, but the rest were windfalls and nubbins. The man who used this brand 'choice selected' did not make it of much value to himself. The report shows that Nova Scotia apples are better than those from Ontario. I do not care whether they are or not. The people think they are better, and the purchasing public on the other side think so. Therefore, our mark has a distinct value, and if we wish to put the highest

grade on our barrels, we ought not to be compelled to change the distinct mark.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not understand that it is the purpose of the Bill to deprive the Nova Scotians of the use of the word 'Nova Scotia.' There is only one Nova Scotia, and these packers retain the full benefit of the name.

Mr. WADE. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy). If he will look at clause 6, he will see that if we wish to use the highest mark, what is called the national mark, we must put upon the barrel 'A No. 1 Canadian.'

Mr. CLANCY. Then, add 'Nova Scotia.'

Mr. WADE. But that would not be to retain our distinctive grade marking. This is something new and something different. We should be dropping out the prominent feature of our mark which is 'Nova Scotia,' and putting in the place of it 'Canadian.' I would like to see this Bill acceptable to the parties interested so that it might be generally adopted, but, if we change our grade mark to 'Canadian' it would not be generally adopted.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). If the grade called 'Nova Scotia' is so much superior to the grade called 'Canadian,' all you have to do is to brand your barrel with the word 'Nova Scotia' and leave out the other.

Mr. WADE. No, because the mark is 'A No. 1 Canadian.' The purchaser seeing that says: I won't buy that, because it is from Ontario, but I will look for something marked 'Nova Scotia.' If there is any virtue in the fact of apples being grown in Nova Scotia, we have a right to retain that distinctive mark.

Mr. ROSS (South Ontario). I think the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) will see when we come to section 6 that, if these apples are marked 'A No. 1 Canadian' they can be marked also 'Nova Scotia' or 'Quebec' or by any other name underneath.

Mr. WADE. But we want 'Nova Scotia' on top.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). It is entirely unnecessary to put on the word 'Canadian.' The barrels can be branded 'A No. 1 Nova Scotia.'

Mr. WADE. Then, we cannot take advantage of the national brand.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). But the hon. gentleman says that it is of no advantage—that the Nova Scotia apples are better.

Mr. WADE. I say it is an advantage to have a mark on the barrel to show that the apples come under this law and are in accordance with the provision of section 6. But there are two classes of apples going into the English market—the Nova Scotian and the Canadian. You should not ask us to lose the benefit of our distinctive trade mark under which we have been selling.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the apple exporters of Nova Scotia want to retain their distinctive mark, there is nothing in this Bill to prevent it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade), it seems to me, wants to have Nova Scotia apples marked 'A No. 1 Canadian' and so get the benefit of that, and then sell them as Nova Scotian. I got the information from Prof. Robertson in the Agriculture Committee this year that the Nova Scotia apples that they blow about so much were not as good last year as the Ontario apples. The season before last was a very peculiar season for apples in Ontario, and our apples were not up to the usual quality. The hon. gentleman must not think that all the apples grown in Canada are grown in Nova Scotia.

Mr. WADE. I did not hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane).

Mr. COCHRANE. I am not blaming you because you don't hear; the trouble with some men is that they do not want to hear anything, because they are so conceited in their own opinion that it would not make any difference if they did hear. The hon. gentleman's argument is that he wants Nova Scotia apples to go into the British market as such, because they are of better quality than any others in Canada. There is nothing in this Bill to prevent him from doing that if he wants to. I am above the idea of saying that the Ontario apples are better or inferior to the Nova Scotia apples.

Mr. GOURLEY. What we want is the truth.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the hon. gentleman does not know more about law than he does about apples, I would not wish to have him defend me. I might be hung.

Mr. GOURLEY. You might deserve it.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not see why we should pass any paternal legislation here to protect the British consumer. I tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gourlay) that I represent a riding that has more cold storage capacity in it than all Nova Scotia put together. The villages of Brighton and Colborne, in my constituency, can store 300,000 barrels of apples, and therefore I know what I am talking about. Why should we do anything more than put our apples on the British market in a fair shape. The manufacturers of Great Britain do not take us under their paternal legislation, but they make us look out for ourselves when we are buying their wares. The dealers and shippers in my section of the country say that it will protect the trade sufficiently if a man is compelled to put his name and address upon the barrel. That was brought out very forcibly by the shippers and packers of apples in my village. I tell the Minister of Agriculture that I admire him because he has taken the advice of men who know

something about this matter. The apple packers and shippers should have a better idea of what they want than gentlemen in this House, who know nothing but hearsay of the trade. So far as my part of the country is concerned, I repudiate the idea that the farmers are responsible for the frauds perpetrated in that trade. The farmers do not pack the apples. The shippers buy the apples in the orchards, put them up themselves, take them to the storehouse and repack them, and therefore the farmers are not responsible for any frauds on the British consumer. There was a young man who was starting out and he bought some apples from a farmer, and I suppose he got them cheap. The farmer had nothing to do with it, but the buyer found that the apples were not up to the mark, and instead of repacking them and sending them in his own name, he put on a fictitious name and sent them forward. The farmer was not responsible for that. I repeat that the apple-packers and exporters in my section think that all that is required is to compel the shipper to put his name on the barrels.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. After careful investigation, I have found that the practice is quite different in different sections of the country. There are some parts where the farmers do pack the apples; there are some parts where the shippers have agents, and there are other parts where there are local buyers who put the apples in cold storage and pack them afterwards. It is therefore difficult to lay down a definite rule in regard to the practice of the trade. It is as difficult and perhaps as unfair as to make comparisons between the quality of the fruit in different parts of the country. One season the fruit from one section is exceptionally fine, and gets a higher price than from another section, while that condition may be reversed the next year. I may tell my hon. friend (Mr. Wade) that last season the Nova Scotia fruit did not do as well in England as the Ontario fruit did, although the year before the Nova Scotia fruit was far and away ahead of the Ontario fruit.

Mr. WADE. What about the other years ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not gone into that, but the assertion made by my hon. friend was rather sweeping. The 6th and 7th clauses of the Bill are so purely suggestive that I am afraid they have interfered with the discussion of the Bill.

Mr. SCHELL. This Bill establishes a rule by which you shall sell these apples. Who is going to determine that these apples are up to the standard ? For a number of years I was a shipper of apples and along with those interested with me in the western part of Ontario we shipped probably more than any other firm in that part of the country. Are the Canadian people going to ship to the old country, guaranteeing the grade upon opening the barrels in England ? Have we to follow those apples all the way to the old country to establish that grade, or will the grade be finally established here ? I am afraid you will put the apple dealers of this country in the conditon of the lumbermen, who sell lumber as No. 1 and No. 2 in New York, but very often when it arrives there a dishonest dealer will say it is not No. 1 or No. 2, and that you have got to take it away or he will sell it as culls. If we are to establish this grade for apples, will we not have the same conditons prevailing in that trade ? I am afraid that if so it will not only ruin the dealers but it will ruin the apple industry of Canada. I am afraid you will be putting the whole apple trade in a worse conditon than it is at present. I think we should consider that very carefully before we establish a tribunal by which we will try all the apple shippers of this country, and then not have any control whatever over the goods of the shipper when they arrive in England.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman does not quite grasp the intention of the Bill, or else his fears are unfounded. This grade is to be judged in Canada, and the Bill provides regulations for the enforcement of the Act. The intention is that some inspectors shall be appointed. The inspection is not compulsory. It is not intended that every package of fruit marked should be inspected, but at the same time the Bill provides that any package of fruit which is marked in a certain way and does not come up to the definition, will lay the packer open to a penalty. The intention is to appoint as many inspectors as may be necessary to carry out the intentions of the Act, and they will be authorized by the Act and by the rules and regulations laid down by order in council to at any time they see fit inspect the fruit which comes under the operation of this Act, and condemn it or not, according to its quality and packing. So far as the reception of the fruit on the other side is concerned, this Act makes no practical difference. No doubt to-day our Canadian shippers as a rule consign to be sold at auction, their fruit is judged there and is sold on its merits. But unfortunately during the last few years such a large amount of fraudulent packing has been found in Canadian fruit that the simple fact that fruit in closed packages comes from Canada, hurts its market value in the old land unless it is marked by a brand which is known there to the trade to be honest. That being the case, we wish to establish a brand, or grade, or a reputation for the Canadian fruit. I suppose in future as in the past Canadian fruit will go forward by the same trade methods. This Bill does not deal with trade methods at

all, and if it goes forward by the present trade methods, we hope that the people of Canada who pack fraudulently will be so deterred by the provisions of this Act that they will cease to pack fraudulently. I am sorry to say that the condition of affairs is such to-day that it will take some time for our Canadian fruit to recover its reputation. The reputation of an article once destroyed is hard to re-establish, and I regret to say that to-day the reputation of the exported fruit of Canada is destroyed. Therefore, our people will have to submit to the disadvantages which some of them have brought upon the whole country for a time, until the honest and reputable men of the fruit trade have so established its reputation again that it will be popular in the foreign market.

Mr. SCHELL. There is one thing that I think should be put in the Bill more definitely. I agree with the necessity for some legislation in this direction. As to whether the barrels be branded Nova Scotia fruit, or Quebec fruit, or Ontario fruit, is not material. As the minister says, the fruit will be dealt with on its merits in the old country. But I think there should be a declaratory clause in the Bill stating that this Act refers to the branding or the quality, or stating that it does not extend any further than Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No Act of ours could make it extend any further than Canada.

Mr. SCHELL. This is a point that I have noticed. Suppose I am in a section of country where the fruit is not up to the grade, and I may know it, still I may brand that fruit No. 1 Canadian. I may sell that in the old country as No. 1 Canadian, and they may claim that it is not No. 1 Canadian. There should be some way of providing that an impostor would not be able to use that brand for his own benefit at the expense of the honest shipper.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Of course the Bill can only apply to Canada. Take for instance the cheese trade. We have a well-known brand called the 'Finest Canadian cheese,' branded or stencilled on a great many cheese sent out of Canada, and even those that are not stencilled are sold as finest Canadian. It is a well-known grade in the trade, and when a man buys by cable Canadian cheese he expects to get what is known as finest Canadian, and if, when the cheese arrives in England, it is not up to the grade, he complains and cuts on the price. That must obtain in regard to fruit or anything else. Our grain trade is in the same way; what we consign to England has certain brands upon it, and when it arrives in England, if it is not up to the quality which is understood in the trade by that brand or grade, there is a complaint and difficulty about payment. I do not think it is possible to overcome that difficulty. It is the universal law of trade, and I do not believe that we can make any provision in a Bill which can overcome difficulties that may arise in that way. But by creating certain definitions of grades we may facilitate the trade, and prevent misunderstandings which, in the past, have been more frequent than they would be under the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. SCHELL. There is this difference. In this Bill there are penalties provided.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Those only apply to Canada.

Mr. SCHELL. Suppose they do, the fraud cannot be followed back in the old country. Now, in the brand, 'Finest Canadian cheese,' the minister speaks of, there is no government measure in reference to it. These matters are established usages of trade. But in this Bill you propose to impose pains and penalties and create a criminal offence, whereas the other way is the usual custom of trade.

Mr. CLANCY. I was going to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he cannot see his way to fixing some standard. Clause 4, I think, is meaningless as to attaching any penalties to a Canadian who sends fraudulent packages to England. There is no punishment for inferior apples in section 4.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Section 9 provides for punishment.

Mr. CLANCY. For instance, a man puts up apples under section 4, according to the grades which may be marked. But there is something still lacking. When the variety is stated there is no provision that the apples should be a good class belonging to that variety, they may be wanting in size, because the size does not require to be stated. Therefore, no punishment is provided for packing wrongfully apples in any other manner than is provided for in section 4. Section 8 does not provide a penalty, because there is no provision as to the size required. I am told that the majority of the whole bulk of the fruit shipped from Canada must go under section 4.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Section 8 applies to it also.

Mr. CLANCY. Section 8 applies so far as the class of fruit is designated. No size is mentioned in section 4, no standard is fixed. If you fix a standard of one, two or three, then that will mean something.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would say that while there is no definition of grade in section 8, the words 'or in which the faced or shown surface gives a

false representation of the contents of such package,' cover all cases of fraud.

Mr. CLANCY. There may not be fraud at all.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Improper packing ?

Mr. CLANCY. It may not be improper packing according to clause 4.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not agree with my hon. friend. The point of this Bill is to see that in a closed packing the package is marked so as to avoid those cases in which large fine apples are put at the ends of the barrel, while the middle is filled with poor and inferior fruit.

Mr. CLANCY. Suppose the fruit is uniformly of an inferior grade, and is marked X ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is a different case. Then it would be for the inspector to say, or in case of a suit it would be decided by the evidence of witnesses, whether the brand was fairly indicative of the contents of the package. I grant, frankly, that there is a certain looseness in the provision, and that it would be better to have sections 6 and 7 applied to the whole trade ; but, I have felt very strongly the representations of the men engaged in the trade, and I did not feel that it was advisable to insert in this Bill provisions which might operate unjustly, or hamper the trade unfairly. My hon. friend from South Wentworth (Mr. Smith), who was a member of the committee of fruit-growers who were consulted in regard to the drawing of this Bill, and who was present when I met a large representative gathering of fruit-growers and shippers in Toronto, and discussed the whole matter with them, understands why it is that the Bill to-day does not contain the requirements which it contained last year, when I introduced it first, and when I undertook to propose such a law as my hon. friend is now indicating, but which, after further consultation with those engaged in the trade, I believe now, would be unnecessary and inadvisable.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I submit that the supposititious case proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) will never occur. He assumes that a man would ship apples to the old country marked X, representing nothing. No man would ship apples expecting to receive a reasonable price for them, if they had no mark or a mark representing nothing. He would naturally use some mark indicative of the contents of the barrel.

Mr. GILMOUR. If there were any known grades of apples, we could understand that it would be possible to designate those grades. But there are no known grades.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no doubt there is that looseness in the Bill, which is entirely due to the requirements of the trade. If my hon. friend would move that there should be a definite legal grade, and that no other mark should be put on the packages, no doubt the committee would consider that ; but, I am not prepared to move it at this stage.

Mr. GILMOUR. I am speaking of what might be considered a grade, but the use of which would not render a man liable under section 8.

Mr. WADE. Could not a clause be inserted providing that when any brand is put on the barrel indicating that the apples were of the highest character, it should be in accordance with these two sections ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is evident that we cannot pass this Bill through the committee at this sitting ; and as I understand that it is not desired that there should be a sitting of the House this evening, I would suggest that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business is to be taken up on Monday ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We shall take up this Bill again on Monday, and afterwards go into Committee of Supply.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 1, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant) moved that that portion of the 49th rule which limits the time for receiving petitions for private Bills be suspended with reference to the petition of the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters of the Dominion of Canada, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the tenth report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Explain.

Mr. HEYD. A Bill recently went through the House relating to the Independent Order of Foresters. That order had discovered a defect in their legislation whereby the rights

of those who belonged to the order in days gone by were jeopardized, and a Bill was introduced in the House within the last few weeks to remedy that defect. The attention of the Ancient Order of Foresters was directed to their Act of incorporation, and they found that it contained the same defect. In order that those who belonged to the provincial order should have the rights intended under the Bill that passed in 1898, this petition is presented for an amending Bill. It is exactly the same Bill as is contained in the first four clauses of the Independent Order of Foresters' Bill, which has passed the House.

Motion agreed to.

YUKON—CONSTITUTION OF THE COURTS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I understand that an order in council—and in the right direction, I think, If I nay say so—has been passed, constituting the court of the Yukon district an appellate tribunal from the decisions of the Gold Commissioner there. But, in this direction I wish to draw the attention of the government to a point that has been raised, in case there may be something in it. I confess that I have not had an opportunity of examining the order in council in question. The point is this : At present the cases before the court of the Yukon district are subject to an appeal at the option of the appellant, either to the Supreme Court of British Columbia or the Supreme Court of Canada, and from the Supreme Court of British Columbia to the Supreme Court of Canada. As a matter of fact, the litigants bring a great many of their cases before the Supreme Court of British Columbia, and, there they have been, in large part, finally disposed of. Now, the question has been raised by members of the bar, that there seems to be a difference in connection with these cases. That is to say, the decision of the Supreme Court in the district—I have forgotten whether it is called by that name or not—is declared to be final ; that would leave the appeal from that court only to the Supreme Court of Canada. It may be the intention of the government that that should be the case, and there may be reason for making this change. I must say that it seems to me that it would be much better to have the cases in these decisions just as the others, giving the parties the option of going to the Supreme Court of British Columbia or the Supreme Court of Canada, and ultimately to the Supreme Court of Canada in any event. At any rate, that point was mentioned to me, and, if there is anything in it, I hope the government will look into it, and will have it made clear. Or, if the amendment is required, it should not be left to the parties interested to raise technical questions of that kind as to the real significance or effect of this new order in council.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The order in council to which the hon. gentleman refers to, or rather the ordinance——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. —constitutes the two judges of the territorial court, together with the gold commissioner, an appellate court. Heretofore, under the mining regulations, the appeal from the decision of the gold commissioner has been to the Minister of the Interior. The change is, that instead of the decision being appealed from the gold commissioner to the Minister of the Interior, the decision is appealed from the gold commissioner to the appellate court as it is constituted. The ordinance clearly declares that the decision of the appellate court is final ; so, I do not think there will be any question as to what the meaning and intention of the ordinance is. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) desires I will bring down a copy of the ordinance, so that he may have an opportunity of perusing it. The question whether, from the appellate court thus constituted, there should be an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, is a question of policy which is a fair question for discussion.

CANADA NATIONAL RAILWAY AND TRANSPORT COMPANY.

Mr. COWAN moved third reading of Bill (No. 13) to incorporate the Canada National Railway and Transport Company.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood that an arrangement was reached by the Whips the other day that this Bill was not to be read the third time until Wednesday.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. I may say that when the matter was under discussion I intimated that probably an understanding might be reached between the promoters of this Bill and those who opposed it. I have communicated with them and have received a very strong protest against any change. I thought it was only fair to take this the first opportunity of mentioning that my efforts in that direction had not been successful, for fear any member might be misled by the statement I made the other evening.

Mr. DAVIS moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 27) respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.—Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure).

GUELPH JUNCTION RAILWAY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 23) respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

On section 2,

Section 7 of the Act to incorporate the Guelph Junction Railway Company is repealed, and the following section is submitted therefor :

7. No person shall be a director of the company unless he be the holder of at least one share in the stock of the company, and has paid up all calls thereon ; but so long as the city of Guelph shall hold $20,000 of the capital stock of the said company, and shall be the holder of the bonds of said company, any bona fide ratepayer of the city of Guelph who is assessed for $1,000 or upwards on the assessment roll of the city of Guelph shall be eligible to be elected a director of the company.

(a.) The council of the corporation of the city of Guelph may, by by-law empower the mayor or any member of the council or other person to represent the corporation and vote at any meeting of the shareholders of the company, and to vote for such corporation in respect of its shares in the company, and in default of any such by-law the mayor of the city for the time being shall be entitled and authorized to represent the city at any such meeting of shareholders, and vote thereat, in respect of the shares of the company held by the said city.

(b.) The directors of the said company may and shall, upon the request of any of the present shareholders of the company upon whose shares 10 per cent only has been paid, issue a fully paid-up share or shares to such person or persons in exchange for and to the extent of the aggregate amount paid by him or them upon his or their present shares.

(c.) It shall be lawful for the corporation of the city of Guelph, subject to the laws of the province of Ontario, to acquire any fully paid-up share or shares in the said company, and to hold the same as well as those now held by the said city.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I do not feel that I would be justified in allowing this clause to go through the committee at the present time without entering my protest. So far as I am aware, the city of Guelph, as a municipal corporation, has never pronounced upon this amendment. An amendment was introduced by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) to the Bill entitled An Act respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company. That hon. gentleman supported that amendment by a petition from the city council of Guelph purporting to be passed by the city council and attested by their seal. That amendment the hon. gentleman withdrew, and, so far as I am aware, without the consent of the corporation of the city of Guelph, and without the consent of the directors of this railway company, he has submitted another amendment which I contend ought not to receive the sanction of this House until all the parties interested have been heard from. Certainly, we have not heard from the municipal corporation of the city of Guelph. Now, I want to say a few words in respect to this matter further, and I shall endeavour to give the committee something of the history of this legislation. A short time ago a resolution was brought down to the council by the railway committee of the city council of Guelph, in which the matter of a change in regard to the directorate of the Guelph Junction Railway was referred to. I desire to say that that report, when presented to the committee, was vouched for by the chairman of the committee, who informed his colleagues on the committee as to the nature of its contents, but carefully kept back all the salient points contained in the report, leaving them to understand that it was a matter of very minor importance. The members of this railway committee of the city council, having confidence in the chairman of the committee, signed the report of the committee, and allowed it to pass without investigating for themselves. Just to show the truthfulness of this, I desire to refer the committee to a letter which I think fully bears out all I have said upon the matter. The letter is signed by Mr. James Anderson, alderman of the South Ward of the city of Guelph, and it is addressed to the editor of the Guelph Mercury, a paper which supports the hon. gentleman who has introduced this resolution. It says :

Dear Sir,—As I signed the report of the Railway Committee and also voted in the Council authorizing His Worship the mayor and Alderman Dunbar to proceed to Ottawa to look after our interests in the Guelph Junction Railway question, and as I subsequently signed a petition with, I understand, nine other aldermen, requesting the Committee on Railways, etc., to ignore the request of the Council, I think some explanation is necessary to the ratepayers of the Sounth Ward whose interests I represent at the Council board. When Alderman Dunbar called the committee together to consider the question, I, as well as two others of the committee, understood, as he certainly represented to us, that it was to appoint an auditor and other matters regarding the city's interests in the Guelph Junction Railway, but not until I read Col. McCrae's letter and the Guelph Junction Railway directors' statement in the Mercury did I comprehend that the scheme was to oust the old directors of the road and appoint fresh ones in their place. Now, if Alderman Dunbar had the interests of the city and the Guelph Junction Railway at heart, as he says he has, he would have explained things a little better to the committee. I am confident there were not more than two or three in the Council understood the question they were voting on, as subsequent revelations have proved, when ten of the aldermen have since signed a petition to let things remain as they are. Now, Sir, as the poet Burns says, 'The best laid schemes of mice and men gang aft aglee,' I think Alderman Dunbar's little schemes will meet the same fate, which it richly deserves. I spoke to Aldermen Taylor and Hamilton and they said they never understood, when signing the report, the object was to elect directors from the ratepayers of the city and throw the old ones overboard. I, for the future, will sign no report until I

am perfectly satisfied that I understand what I am doing, and will not take Alderman Dunbar's or any man's word for it.

Thanking you for inserting this explanation, I am,

Yours, etc.,
JAS. ANDERSON,
Alderman, S. Ward.

Homewood Cottage, Guelph, Mar. 29.

We endorse the above statement of the facts.

John H. Hamilton,
W. M. Taylor.

Who I understand are also members of the committee. Now, hon. gentlemen can see the value that can be placed upon the report which was presented by the Railway Committee to the city council of Guelph to induce them to pass the resolution that came on here to the Railway Committee of the House of Commons. It was alleged at the meeting of the Railway Committee on Friday last, in support of the contention of the hon. member for South Wellington, that the present shareholders of the Guelph Junction Railway had made an offer, some twelve years ago, to assign their stock to the city of Guelph, or to hold it in trust for the city of Guelph if the city of Guelph would pass a by-law to raise $18,000 to meet the outstanding liabilities of the railway company. I desire to say, first, that a by-law was submitted before this offer was made, and that by-law was rejected, only 511 electors of the city of Guelph voting for it. In order to secure the passage of a by-law and make provision for the outstanding indebtedness of the line, or to pay off the outstanding indebtedness of this railway, a second by-law was submitted. It was on this occasion that the directors, or the shareholders, published the letter that was read in the Railway Committee on Friday last, offering to assign their stock to the city of Guelph or to hold it in trust for the city of Guelph if this by-law was passed. What was the result? Did the electors accept this proposition? Were they satisfied that the directors should step down and out, should assign their stock and relieve themselves of the control of the road? The question went to the people, and the letter having been published, and being in the minds of the electors of the city when the voting occurred, the electors refused to accept the proposition. They refused to accept the offer made by the shareholders of the Guelph Junction Railway Company, they refused to place that road under municipal control, and they rejected the by-law by a large majority, only 484 voting for it. Here we have the direct vote of the people of the city against the municipal control of the road, and if that was the opinion of the people of the city of Guelph at that time, it may be the opinion of the people of Guelph now. We have no evidence whatever that the people of Guelph have changed their minds since 1889. It is true that subsequently, that at the beginning of the following year, at the time when the municipal elections were on, at a time when it was more easy to secure votes for a scheme of this kind, when other issues were pending, that a by-law to raise $18,000 was carried for the purpose of paying off the liabilities of the company, but we have no assurance that the letter signed by the shareholders of this company, in which they offered to assign their stock, or to hold it in trust, formed any factor in the arguments in favour of the third by-law which was passed in the beginning of January. We are rather to suppose that the case was the contrary as the electors in July had pronounced against municipal control by refusing to ratify the by-law to raise $18,000, and hand over the control to the city of Guelph. In the January following, when the by-law was ratified, we have every reason to believe that the letter from the shareholders formed no factor in the arguments placed before the people.

Another evidence that the people of Guelph did not expect, or did not intend that that offer should be considered, after it had been rejected by the people; is the fact that for twelve long years no action has been taken by the city of Guelph. The matter has just been allowed to lie where it was then, showing that without any doubt whatever, the city of Guelph did not intend to accept the offer made by the shareholders, and which the ratepayers of the city had by a large majority at the polls declared emphatically against by rejecting the by-law in the month of July, 1889, previous to the time that they had actually passed the by-law to raise the money. Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of all the facts, I think it is only fair that the promoter of the Bill (Mr. Guthrie) should not press the matter further. As I have said, the corporation of the city of Guelph did send a petition, and as to the value of that petition I have a word to say. They sent a petition here signed by the mayor and attested by the seal of the corporation, asking that certain things be done, but in opposition to that, after members of the city council had fully understood what had been done, ten of the members of the council, which is a majority of the aldermen, also sent a counter petition, and I will place this counter petition on 'Hansard,' in order that hon. gentlemen can study the matter for themselves. It is as follows:

To the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines of the Honourable the House of Commons of Canada.

The petition of the undersigned aldermen and members of the council of the city of Guelph, humbly showeth:—

1. That your petitioners have seen a report of the amendments to the Bill No. 23, intituled 'An Act respecting the Guelph Junction Rail-

way Company,' proposed to your honourable committee on the 20th instant, and are informed that the said Bill has been referred back to have such amendments reconsidered.

2. That such amendments were never presented to or considered by the council of the city of Guelph, and that the undersigned do not approve of such amendments.

Your petitioners, therefore, pray that such amendments be not approved, but that you will be pleased to strike the same out.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

H. H. STULL,
JAMES RYAN,
J. A. SCOTT,
W. W. WHITE,
JAMES ANDERSON,
JOHN H. HAMILTON,
W. E. TAYLOR,
A. B. PETRIE,
WM. SLATER,
SAMUEL CARTER.

Dated March 23, A.D. 1901.

Here we have ten aldermen of the city of Guelph stating emphatically that the petition which was sent on by the mayor did not voice the sentiments of the city council of Guelph, and that these ten aldermen—who are a majority of the city council—did not approve of it. The number of aldermen in the city of Guelph is eighteen, I understand, and possibly the mayor may make nineteen, but these ten aldermen are certainly a majority of the whole city council. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is about all that I have to say in connection with this matter. I have entered my strong protest. I have done my duty, I think, towards the city of Guelph, and my own constituents, who are interested in this mater, inasmuch as the road passes through a portion of the county of Halton. I desire to say here that all the money put into this railway was not contributed by the city of Guelph. The government gave a bonus of $46,000, and surely, people outside the city of Guelph might have something to say in the matter. Apart from this question, there is another principle involved; a principle which has been discussed in this House; namely, the government ownership of railways. At the present time there is a large deputation down here from the province of Manitoba strongly protesting against government ownership of railways in that province; and why? Because they consider it would be financial ruin to the province of Manitoba.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Would the hon. gentleman permit me to say that the deputation is not here to protest against government ownership. They are here to protest against government ownership of railway debts; not of railways.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will accept the hon. gentleman's correction, but it makes very little difference which way it is, because these gentlemen are here from Manitoba to oppose the scheme of government ownership of railways proposed by the province of Manitoba, because they consider it would be financial ruin to that province. Are we, in the face of all these facts, and with such an example as this before us, are we going to place in the hands of the corporation of the city of Guelph a large railway corporation, because although only sixteen miles have been constructed, it is proposed to extend this road seventy miles further. Have we reached that period when we are prepared to endorse municipal ownership of railways. Are we prepared to endorse the principle of allowing municipal corporations throughout this country to engage in extensive railway construction. Are we prepared, I say, to permit the council of any city or county in this country, to invest its funds in the construction of railways, or the extension of railways. I think this is a very important step, and before we adopt it—because we will practically adopt it if we pass this amendment—we ought to pause. Just one other point and it is this: I appeal to the promoter of this Bill not to press this resolution further just now and for this reason; It has been stated, and I see it referred to in the public press, that the municipal council of the city of Guelph is likely to deal with this very matter to-night. Heretofore they have not pronounced upon this amendment. They pronounced in a peculiar way on the former amendment, which has been withdrawn, but they have never been heard on the amendment which is before the House at the present time. The city council of Guelph meets to-night, and in all probability will declare either in favour of this amendment or against it. I say it would be unfair to the ratepayers of the city of Guelph to pass legislation of this kind and force municipal ownership upon them, involving them in liabilities, without their consent. Nothing will be lost by delaying the Bill for the present. There will be abundant time to pass the Bill through both Houses, if it should go that far. The Senate is now taking a recess, so that if the Bill is postponed for a few days, no delay in its final passage will result. I would prefer that the city of Guelph should be heard from, and I have no doubt we will hear from them in the form of a petition either in favour of or against the amendment. If they petition in favour of it, of course the promoter of the Bill will have strong ground upon which to appeal to the House to pass the legislation, and if they are against it, I believe he will take a wise course in asking that the amendment be withdrawn. There was a statement in the Guelph Mercury to the effect that I had stated to the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) a few days ago, after leaving the Railway Committee room, that the city council would pass a resolution on Monday night. I desire to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) is mistaken in reporting that to the Guelph

Mercury. It was not I who made the statement; the statement was made by a ratepayer of the city of Guelph in his presence. I do not wish to be made so prominent in this matter as to have it said that I was going to anticipate what action the city of Guelph would take. When the representatives of the city do take action, and I think their action is in the right direction, I will endeavour to carry out their vews, but I shall not anticipate what they may do. In view of the fact that the city corporation of Guelph is more than likely to deal with the matter to-night, I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) would do well to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question. Vote.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). In view of the circumstances that the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has stated to the House, I do think that the hon. member in charge of the Bill (Mr. Guthrie) should let it stand. While I am desirous of facilitating any reasonable legislation, yet, to my mind, it seems fair that there should be delay for consideration in this matter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) has shown us this is a question between a municipality and certain individuals jointly interested in an arrangement that did not give the city of Guelph the control of the project, and they are proposing to take charge of it by Act of parliament. That being so, surely we do not wish a city or a town or any municipality to take charge until we are satisfied that the council, by a majority, has declared itself in favour of the legislation. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it is a new proposition. At all events, I am within the mark when I say that I know of no case in the province of Ontario in which a city or a town has the exclusive control or ownership of a railway. This legislation will give control to the city of Guelph, and I can well understand that at the time the arrangement was made other gentlemen were associated with it. Even supposing we were willing to go that far in a special case, we have not yet had the approval of the city; because, while it is true that at the beginning a petition was presented to us from the city vouched for by the signature of the mayor and the corporate seal, that petition has been superseded by another one in its place. The Bill that was introduced into this House and was referred to the Railway Committee in the first instance had no legislation of this sort in it, and there was no notice given of it. When the Bill went before the Railway Committee, there was no idea or notice that it was anything more than a single proposition to extend the time for the construction of the road, on which all parties would have agreed without discussion. The Bill passed the Railway Committee on the petition of the city. Now, two things have happened since—two things without which, for my part, I would not be willing, without a protest, to vote for it. First of all, the new amendments have not been confirmed by the city council. More than that, we have from a majority of that council since a petition asking this House to interfere and prevent being passed what the petition of the city council as presented to us asks. That is a very serious state of affairs. Two very serious propositions are involved in this legislation. First, if anybody is entitled to the legislation, it is the city; because, mind you, we are changing an Act of Parliament. We are changing the arrangement under which the road was controlled and managed before. Secondly, there may be a question, and a serious one, whether we have power to pass this Bill, or some clauses of it, authorizing what may be only within the legislative authority of the province of Ontario. But, lastly, on the merits, we have a distinct petition by a majority of the city council. Then, here is the further responsibility: Who is it that ought to speak to us in matters of this kind? Not the city council, but the ratepayers of Guelph. These people could not incur the ownership of this road without the approval of the ratepayers, because, under the law of the province of Ontario, as is well known, the city council cannot incur such liabilities without first submitting the question to the vote of the ratepayers, and we have not heard at all from the ratepayers, the actual owners. There will not be an hour's delay to the legislation by putting the matter off, because the Senate happens to be adjourned, and I think the action of the House and the feeling of all of us would be better for a short stay of proceedings. The hon. gentleman, I think, would do well to satisfy everybody that there was nothing in the suggestion made in the Railway Committee that this legislation was being, to a certain extent, railroaded through in the interest of certain parties. Whatever we may think of the legislation, we shall have a chance of getting a further expression of opinion, and ascertaining whether the city by a majority of the council are in favour of it.

Section agreed to: yeas, 61; nays, 38.

Bill reported.

On the question, that the Bill be now read the third time,

Mr. HENDERSON. I think, Sir, that those who are opposed to this amendment have a very strong case on which to appeal to you to protect the minority in this House. The city council of Guelph, whose interests are very much at stake in this whole matter, meets to-night, and will in all probability pass a resolution either approving or condemning this amendment, and we ask

that the third reading be deferred until we have an opportunity of hearing from the city council.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. In all my recollection of private legislation, unless it could be shown that the session was so near its end that the passage of any measure would be endangered by delay, a request for the third reading to stand over has never been refused. We do not object to the passing of this Bill, but wish to hear first whether the majority of the city council of Guelph are in its favour or not. The hon. gentleman who is promoting this measure was no doubt within his rights in pressing it through its various stages, but I am surprised that he should wish to railroad the third reading through in this manner.

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. I hardly think my hon. friends are fair in charging any want of courtesy to the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). This Bill has been dealt with in a very unusual way. It was before the committee twice, and each time had a full and long discussion, and I appeal to my hon. friend from Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) whether in his recollection any Bill of so little importance has taken up so much of the time of parliament. On both occasions when this Bill was before the committee the ablest advocates and counsel on both sides were present and laid their views before the committee.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I do not think I made any charge of discourtesy against the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill. I said that he was quite within his rights in pressing the measure through this far, but in view of the fact that came out at the last hearing before the committee, namely, that ten aldermen were against the measure, I think we ought to let the third reading stand until we hear from the council.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. This Bill was passed by the committee, but when it came before the House, the Minister of Railways suggested that, as the statement was made that there were some matters in connection with the measure perhaps not fully known, the Bill should be referred back to the committee. It went before the committee again and both sides were heard, and by an overwhelming majority the Bill was adopted in its present shape. I do not think therefore it is fair to suggest that it has not had the fullest consideration. We are simply putting the city of Guelph in the position in which it wishes to be placed. There is a little local squabble, but having heard both sides I do not think any hon. member can say this is legislation we ought not to pass in the general public interest.

Mr. HENRY CARGILL (East Bruce). The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) who has just taken his seat said that if one single good reason were given why this Bill should be postponed, he would willingly consent to the postponement. I rise for the purpose of giving him that reason—and I think it is a very good one. In the first place, this Bill was passed through the committee because of a petition presented signed by a minority of the city council of Guelph, but purporting to be signed by a majority. At the next meeting of the committee a petition was presented, signed by a majority of the city council, protesting against the passing of the Bill. Now, it has been alleged here, and by good authority, that the city council of the city of Guelph meets to-night, and it is proposed to discuss this matter on its merits. If the city council of Guelph declare themselves in favour of the passing of this Bill, I would be quite willing to vote for it; if they decide against it, I should feel it my duty to oppose it. I may say that I do not believe that the city of Guelph would have had the Guelph unction Railway, had not these ten men who are protesting against the passing of this Bill, come to the front at the time the raiload was proposed to be built. They were prominent business men in the city of Guelph, all of whom were anxious for a connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purpose of getting competing rates. The city of Guelph alone could not have undertaken the construction of that railroad without the assistance of these men, who voluntarily came forward and subscribed stock and enabled the city to secure the construction of the line. Now, I do think—and I believe the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) thinks with me—that it is an injustice to the city of Guelph, to take away from these ten men who assisted in the construction of that road the rights which they have in it. I do think that, in justice to these men, the city of Guelph should have their consent to the passage of this Bill—they should not be ignored. In consequence of the adjournment of the Senate for ten or twelve days and the pending meeting of the Guelph city council tonight at which they will, no doubt, reach a decision on this subject, we should not press forward the third reading of this Bill, but should leave the matter over until tomorrow. To do so will not retard the passage of the measure, as it must go through the Senate, and it will be two weeks before that can be effected. I hope that not only in the interest of the city of Guelph, but in the interest of these directors who are protesting against the passage of the Bill, the hon. member for South Wellington will not press the third reading until to-morrow. It is not an enviable position for the hon. member to put himself in—that of hostility toward these ten prominent men in his own city. I cannot believe that he desires to take that position. I think that in the interest of all concerned the hon. member should not press the third reading now.

Mr. ROBERT HOLMES (West Huron). All these points have been threshed out very fully before the Railway Committee. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) is himself a resident of Guelph, and ought to know whether the people are hostile to this Bill or not as well as anybody else. I fail to see where there is any object to be gained by allowing this Bill to stand over. This House has no evidence that the city of Guelph is hostile to the measure. We have the statement of members of the council, but nothing has been offered, although there has been plenty of time, to show that the city council is hostile to the Bill. It seems to me to be plainly in the interests of the people of Guelph that the Bill should pass.

Mr. SPEAKER. The contention has bee made that it should remain, to a certain extent in my hands to decide whether this Bill should receive its third reading today or be left over for some future day. On reading the rules, I cannot easily reach that conclusion. Rule 47 says :

All amendments made in committee shall be reported by the chairman to the House, which shall receive the same forthwith. After report, the Bill shall be open to debate and amendment, before it is ordered for a third reading. But when a Bill is reported without amendment, it is forthwith ordered to be read a third time at such time as may be appointed by the House.

As hon. gentlemen will see, when the Bill is reported without amendment, the question as to the third reading is left entirely to the discretion of the House and not to the decision of the Speaker.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, what has been the practice ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The practice has been in accordance with the rule that I have laid down just now. You will find that in 1898, I think, Sir James Edgar decided a case similar to this one. Objection was raised to the third reading of a Bill, and he decided that the matter was to be left in the hands of the House. The motion that was then moved was as follows : 'Whether the Bill should be ordered for a third reading forthwith.' The motion in that instance, perhaps, is not in form similar to this, but it is the same idea. It is for the House to decide whether the Bill shall receive its third reading forthwith or whether it shall be deferred to a future day.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it not a fact that the precedent you have read is the only one on record ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I have looked over the decisions in England, and find that they are similar to those rendered by Sir James Edgar in 1898. Therefore, the House will be called upon to vote on the motion in my hands.

House divided on motion of Mr. Guthrie :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Logan,
Archambault,	Lovell,
Bazinet,	Loy,
Bernier,	Macdonald,
Blair,	Mackie,
Bureau,	Maclaren (Huntingdon),
Calvert,	McCarthy,
Champagne,	McCool,
Charlton,	McCreary,
Christie,	McEwen,
Copp,	McGugan,
Costigan,	McIsaac,
Cowan,	McLennan,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Martineau,
Davis,	Matheson,
Delisle,	Maxwell,
Emmerson,	Mignault,
Ethier,	Oliver.
Fielding,	Parmelee,
Fisher,	Paterson,
Fitzpatrick,	Proulx,
Flint,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fortier,	Roche (Halifax),
Fraser,	Ross (Ontario),
Gibson,	Ross (Victoria),
Girard,	Scott,
Guthrie,	Sifton,
Heyd,	Smith (Vancouver),
Holmes,	Stephens,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Sutherland (Oxford),
Hyman,	Talbot,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Tarte,
Johnston (Lambton),	Thompson,
Kendall,	Tolmie,
Lang,	Tucker,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turgeon,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Wade, and
Lewis,	Wright.—76.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Kidd,
Barker,	Lancaster,
Bell (Addington),	LaRivière,
Bennett,	Lavell,
Birkett,	Lennox,
Blain,	Maclean,
Borden (Halifax),	McGowan,
Broder,	Morin,
Cargill,	Prior,
Clancy,	Puttee,
Clarke,	Richardson (Grey),
Cochrane,	Richardson (Lisgar),
Earle,	Robinson (Elgin),
Fowler,	Sherritt,
Gilmour,	Simmons,
Gourley,	Tisdale,
Hackett,	Tolton,
Henderson,	Vrooman,
Hughes (Victoria),	Wallace, and
Johnston (Cardwell),	Wilmot.—41.
Kaulbach,	

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I understand the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) entered the House after the motion was put, and therefore cannot vote.

Mr. KENDALL. That is a mistake. I had entered, and was speaking to an hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. gentleman hear the question put ?

Mr. KENDALL. I did.

Mr. SPEAKER. I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 71) an Act respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 89) respecting the Grand Falls Water Power and Boom Company.—Mr. Costigan.

Bill (No. 95) respecting the Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Railways Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 97) to incorporate the Manufacturers and Temperance and General Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 98) incorporating the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

QUESTIONS.

SHIPMENT OF GRAIN FROM DEPOT HARBOUR.

Mr. BELL (Pictou)—by Mr. Clarke—asked:

1. What number of tons of grain was transported from Depot Harbour to each of the ports of St. John and Halifax in each of the months of November and December, 1900, and January and February, 1901?

2. What was the number of miles hauled on each of the several roads over which freight was carried?

3. What was the total amount accruing to each road as its share of the freight?

4. What was the rate per ton mile accruing to each road?

5. What was the amount accruing to the Intercolonial Railway for elevator charges at St. John and Halifax in addition to the freight rate for transportation?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I suggest that the hon. member might move for a return. I am getting the information he desires, it is very voluminous, and I will hand in the return at once.

ROUND BAY, N.S., PUBLIC WORK.

Mr. BELL (Pictou)—by Mr. Kaulbach—asked:

1. Was a canal excavated at Round Bay, Shelburne county, N.S., during the year 1900?

2. Were tenders asked for the work or for materials or for transport of materials?

3. From whom was material purchased?

4. What price was paid for timber?

5. What freight was paid on timber?

6. Is the canal now completed?

7. For what purpose was it intended?

8. Has it been found suited to that purpose?

9. Did any government engineer recommend the construction of the work?

10. If so, what was the name of such engineer?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies):

1. No canal was excavated; but certain obstructions to the ascent of fish at Round Bay Brook were removed by blasting a rock.
2. No.
3. The whole amount expended was $85, which included labour and materials.
6. The passage has been cleared.
7. To enable fish to ascend.
8. Yes.
9. No.

BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL.

Mr. LANCASTER asked:

1. Who was appointed clerk of works to superintend the construction of the drill hall at Brockville?

2. Has he been dismissed, and if so, when?

3. Were any complaints made against him?

4. Who has since been appointed in his place, and when?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte):

1 and 2. Mr. Dillon was appointed clerk of works on 2nd of July, 1900, and employed until date of suspension of work on 10th November. When work was resumed later he was not re-employed.

3. No.

4. J. S. Mix.

MAIL CARRIAGE FROM ASHCROFT.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR asked:

1. What amounts were paid by the Post Office Department to the contractors for carrying the mails from Ashcroft, B.C., to the Cariboo district, in the years 1895-6-7-8-9, giving each year separately?

2. To whom were these sums paid?

3. Was the contract satisfactorily carried out by the company who had the contract previous to the contractors of 1897?

4. Did the present contractors ever put in a bid for the contract they now hold? If so, when, and for what amount?

5. Were the contractors of 1895 ever asked to put in a bid for the present contract? If not, why not?

6. Did not the contractors of 1895 offer in 1896 to take the contract for $22,600 per annum?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND:

1 and 2.

Name of Service.	To whom payments were made.	Amounts paid.
	1895.	$ cts.
Ashcroft Station, Barkerville, &c.	British Columbia Express Co.	24,000 00
Alexis Creek and Soda Creek	T. McAllister	1,100 00
Alkali Lake and Clinton	P. Grinder	1,000 00
Keithley Creek and 150 Mile House	Estate of James Ford	890 00
	1896.	
Ashcroft Station, Barkerville, &c	British Columbia Express Co	24,000 00
Alexis Creek and Soda Creek	T. McAllister	1,100 00
Alkali Lake and Clinton	P. Grinder (9 mos.)	750 00
" "	G. Hadley (3 ")	250 00
Keithley Creek and 150 Mile House	Estate of J. Ford (6 ")	445 00
" "	British Columbia Express Co. (6 ")	400 00
Horsefly and 150 Mile House	C. H. Tingley. (6 mos. & 12 days)	334 70
	1897.	
Ashcroft Station, Barkerville, &c	British Columbia Express Co. (10 mos.)	24,000 00
Alexis Creek and Soda Creek	T. McAllister	1,100 00
Alkali Lake and Clinton	G. Hadley	1,000 00
Keithley Creek and 150 Mile House	British Columbia Express Co	800 00
Horsefly and 108 Mile House	S. H. Tingley	545 00
	1898.	
Ashcroft Station, Barkerville, &c		
Alkali Lake and Clinton		
Alexis Creek and Soda Creek	Kilgour & Millar	23,187 46
Keithley Creek and 150 Mile House		
Horsefly and 108 Mile House		
	1899.	
Ashcroft Station, Barkerville, &c		
Alkali Lake and Clinton		
Alexis Creek and Soda Creek	Kilgour & Millar	23,249 99
Keithley Creek and 150 Mile House		
Horsefly and 150 Mile House		

3. Yes.
4. Yes, in 1897, $23,000.
5. The present contract is a renewal of the contract entered into in 1897, for which the contractors of 1895 contracted for with others.
6. No.

TICKET AGENTS FOR INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. DECHENE asked :

What are the names of the agents who sell passenger tickets for the Intercolonial Railway in the several cities of Montreal, Quebec, Lévis, Moncton, St. John, N.B., Halifax, &c., and their respective salaries?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

Names of agents who sell passenger tickets for the Intercolonial Railway in the following cities, and their respective salaries:

	Per month.
J. W. Bryson, Montreal	$ 75 00
D. R. McDonald, Quebec	85 00
V. Pelletier, Quebec	45 00
D. McDonald, Levis	$70 00
J. E. Henderson, Moncton	100 00
(For assistance), Moncton	30 00
Geo. Carvill, St. John City	80 00
T. E. Hannington, St. John Station	85 00
R. F. Armstrong, Halifax City	85 00
C. Rennels, Halifax Station	70 83

PAN-AMERICAN EXHIBITION—CANADIAN SECTION.

Mr. BRODER asked :

Is it the intention of the government to close the Canadian exhibit at the Pan-American Exposition on the Sabbath during the continuance of such exposition?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). The Canadian section of the Pan-American exhibition will be closed during the Sabbath.

POSTMASTER AT WINONA, ONT.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth)—by Mr. Lavell—asked :

Has a postmaster been appointed at Winona in place of Mr. Secord? If so, whom?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. No appointment has been made.

PAN-AMERICAN EXHIBITION, CANADIAN SECTION.

Mr. CHARLTON asked :

Does the government intend to close the Canadian section of the Pan-American exhibition on Sunday, in case the American portion of the exhibition is opened upon that day?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). That is a question which was practically answered by the answer to question No. 10. The government do intend to close the Canadian section of the Pan-American exhibition on Sundays.

JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF PRIVY COUNCIL.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

1. Has the government been invited by the Imperial authorities to send a representative to England to consult with them in reference to a change in the constitution of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council?
2. If so, who has been appointed as the Canadian delegate?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Yes, the government has been invited to send a representative, but no representative has yet been appointed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT TORONTO JUNCTION.

Mr. WALLACE asked :

1. Whether the government have yet selected a site for public building in Toronto Junction?
2. If so, at what cost, where located, and what are the dimensions of the lot?
3. How much money was voted by parliament for said building or site?
4. When was it voted?
5. If no site has yet been selected, what steps have been taken to do so?
6. If nothing has been done, why not?
7. Is it the intention of the government to place a sum in the estimates for 1901-2 for the construction of said building?
8. Has the government abandoned its intention, declared last year, of proceeding with its construction?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte) :

1 and 2. No site has yet been obtained.
3. $5,000.
4. Last session.
5, 6, 7 and 8. I am glad to say that the matter is now engaging the earnest attention of the government.

EXPORTATION OF SPECKLED TROUT.

Mr. PREFONTAINE asked :

Whether the government, or any members thereof, have been in communication with the provincial authorities of Quebec, in relation to the adoption of legislative measures to prevent the exportation of speckled trout?

If so, what was the conclusion arrived at?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) :

1. Yes.
2. No conclusion will be arrived at until the views of the other provinces are obtained. They have been asked their views in order that a uniform regulation can be framed if it is decided to do so.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT TORONTO JUNCTION.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that the statement made by the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is not an answer to question No. 8, asked by me.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order ; there can be no discussion on the answer that has been given.

Mr. WALLACE. I shall move the adjournment of the House to put myself in order.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). It has been answered ; it is engaging the attention of the government.

Mr. WALLACE. The question is :

Has the government abandoned its intention, declared last year, of proceeding with its construction?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the answer.

Mr. WALLACE. No, it is not the answer. It is not a satisfactory answer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WALLACE. I am quite in order. I move the adjournment of the House. The government have not dealt fairly with me. In the English parliament and in this parliament, up to a recent period, the government have recognized the right of private members to ask proper and pertinent questions and to receive answers for the information of the House and the public. This way of disposing of a question, is not, I am sure, satisfactory to the House, or to the country. It is not an answer at all. The government, last year, in their estimates, proposed a vote of $5,000 for the purpose of procuring land and proceeding with the erection of a public building in Toronto Junction. I asked a question in the early part of the session, and was informed by the hon. Minister of Public Works just what I am informed to-day, that the matter was engaging the attention of the government. Nearly a year has elapsed, and nothing has been done according to the answer given to the first question on the Order paper. Nothing whatever has been done. Now, I want to know, whether anything is going to be done,

whether the money that was voted is going to be used, or whether a single thing has been done towards supplementing their proposal last year, or whether there simply was a vote of money made in order to influence the electors of the town of Toronto Junction, immediately before an election, or whether, because the town of Toronto Junction did not choose to vote confidence in the government, they are going to be punished now, and that the government after pledging themselves in that way, are not going to erect that public building. The hon. Minister of Public Works, when he is asked, the question :

Has the government abandoned its intention, declared last year, of proceeding with its construction?

Says the question is engaging the attention of the government. It cannot engage the attention of the government unless the government say : We made a pledge last year to the citizens of Toronto Junction, and we are considering to-day whether we will violate that solemn pledge that we made. That is the position, and that is the statement made by the hon. Minister of Public Works. I do not believe in that kind of way of doing business. I believe in a straightforward way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. If the government have made up their minds that they are going to abandon the project of putting up a public building in Toronto Junction let them get up and say so like men in answer to this question of mine. Instead of saying, when asked a question, it is still receiving the attention of the government. That is not the way to do business, and it is not the way that parliament should be treated in these matters.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fair to the House that when an hon. member asks a question he should not be treated in the cavalier manner in which the Minister of Public Works takes it upon himself to treat the House. It was, in the last parliament, a matter of comment and complaint that that parliament, as compared with former parliaments, was a very cheap one, but, if the last parliament was a cheap one compared with former parliaments, I would like to ask what the present parliament is compared with the last one. It is going lower and lower every day, and this is because of such action as the action of the hon. Minister of Public Works. When questions are asked in the House, and when they are allowed to stand over day after day owing to the fact that ministers are not in their places, when the House is almost deserted, when out of 130 government representatives there are rarely ever more than twenty-five or thirty in their places, public business is being treated in a most flippant manner, and so long as ministers will treat it as flippantly as the hon. Minister of Public Works treats it, by refusing point blank to answer questions, so long must this cheapening of the House go on. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is surprised. I am not at all surprised at the way in which the government treated him. Prior to the last general election in East Simcoe, the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) was asked to do what ? In a part of the country where there was no necessity whatever of granting a daily mail, and where there had never been a daily mail before, a daily mail, on the eve of the election, was granted.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Order, order.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) says order. No doubt the hon. gentleman does not like me to speak of such things. It was a most shamefaced thing, and when the election was over the daily mail service was withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) has only a right to refer to the point raised by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who moved the adjournment.

Mr. BENNETT. I was just referring to this incident, Mr. Speaker, by way of illustration. All I can say is that if hon. gentlemen wish to expedite the business of the House it would be much better that ministers should answer questions when they are placed upon the Order paper, and if they are not answered, the only course left open will be to move the adjournment, and in that way to provoke discussion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, it is undesirable that we should have any difficulty over this question. When we come to look at the questions which the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) answered in a general way, we shall see that they were capable of a distinct answer. They do not seem to be questions which were improper or offensive in any respect whatever.

If no site has yet been selected, what steps have been taken to do so.

That is a definite question, a perfectly proper question and an answer to it, it seems to me, would furnish information which the House is entitled to receive.

If nothing has been done, why not?

Is it the intention of the government to place a sum in the estimates for 1901-2 for the construction of said building ?

Unless there is some technical objection to that, I do not see any reason why it should not be answered.

Has the government abandoned its intention, declared last year, of proceeding with its construction?

Surely the House is entitled to know what the intention of the government is with regard to that. Their intention was announced last year, and when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) inquires whether or not the government has abandoned that intention, the only answer received to that and to all these questions, is, that these matters are engaging the attention of the government. That is an extremely vague answer; it is, in fact, no answer at all. I would suggest to the right hon. gentleman who leads the House that it is desirable in the interest of expediting public business, that answers of a somewhat more definite nature, in cases of this kind, might very well be given by ministers having charge of the departments.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) knows that very great latitude is given ministers in answering questions, and when a minister states his judgment it is not open to any hon. gentleman to criticise it. If the answer is deemed insufficient the question might be repeated at another date.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the good of asking the question again, if the answer is not given?

The PRIME MINISTER. Sometimes there is a disagreement between the hon. gentleman who asks the question and the minister, and an understanding may perhaps be come to and the answer given.

Mr. WALLACE. I might mention to the right hon. gentleman that this is virtually the second time that I have put this question on the Order paper; at the beginning of the session, and now.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very good; and the answer given is that the matter is under consideration. We are asked if it is the intention of the government to place a sum in the estimates for 1901, and the hon. leader of the opposition knows that the answer to such a question always is: You will have to wait until the estimates are brought down. The question again is put: If the government has abandoned its intention, and the minister very frankly says that the matter is under consideration. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) does not see an item in the estimates for this, it will be open for him to take any recourse he thinks proper.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Surely there should be some definite answer given to question No. 5.

The PRIME MINISTER. The answer to questions 5, 6, 7 and 8 is, that the whole matter is under consideration. The minister is considering as to the site and as to the policy and everything else, and the question is as fully answered as it should be.

Mr. WALLACE. The policy was declared last year.

The PRIME MINISTER. The policy to have a site was declared last year. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) knows that when he was a member of the government the same item was put in the estimates year after year, and yet nothing was done. Does the hon. gentleman remember the case of Peterborough, where the item was in the estimates for five consecutive years and no action was taken.

Mr. WALLACE. The action taken was that the member resigned his seat in parliament on the head of it, because there was a difference about the selection of a site.

The PRIME MINISTER. If this case has the same ending and if it should drive my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) from parliament, I would be very sorry indeed, but I would try to console myself.

Mr. WALLACE. It was the other chap who ran against me who got out of parliament.

The PRIME MINISTER. I submit that it is abusing the privilege to move the adjournment of the House on a matter like this.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Question No. 5 relates to something that is supposed to have taken place in the past, and with all due deference to the right hon. gentleman, the answer, that the matter is under the consideration of the government, does not seem to me to be a sufficient answer.

The PRIME MINISTER. It seems to me that the minister is considering about the site.

Motion to adjourn the House (Mr. Wallace) negatived.

A MINISTER OF MINES.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR asked:

1. Did the government receive a copy of a resolution passed at a numerously attended meeting of the British Columbia Mining Association, held at Nelson, B.C., praying for the creation and establishment by the government of a portfolio or bureau of mines with a responsible minister of the Crown in charge of such department?

2. If so, is it the intention of the government to make such an appointment forthwith?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The government has received the resolution, I think, from the association mentioned in the question, and several representations on the same subject. The government has come to no conclusion yet upon this matter.

LIGHTHOUSE ON GREEN ISLET, B.C.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to erect a lighthouse this season on Green Islet, Chatham Sound, B.C.?

2. Is it not a fact that this island is considered one of the most dangerous points in the navigation of northern waters on the Pacific coast?

3. Is it the intention of the government to place a fog signal on Brotchie's Ledge; also distinguishing lights on Sehl Point and Hospital Point, Victoria Harbour?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) :

1. A petition asking for such a lighthouse was received in my department on the 22nd of March, 1901. This is the first request made for a lighthouse at that point, and is now receiving consideration.

2. No.

3. A fog signal was put in operation on Brotchie's Ledge on the 19th of March, 1901. The question of placing lights on Sehl Point and Hospital Point will be considered, there are harbour lights already maintained near both points.

STRAITS OF JUAN DE FUCA—SAILING DIRECTIONS.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Has the government received a letter from the British Columbia Board of Trade inclosing copy of a letter from Capt. Chas. E. Clarke, harbour master of the port of Victoria, B.C., to Capt. J. G. Cox, chairman of the committee on harbours and navigation of that board of trade, setting forth sundry alterations necessary to be made in the sailing directions, &c., for ships entering the Straits of Juan de Fuca, as contained in the 'British Columbia Pilot'?

2. If so, is it the intention of the government to have Capt. Clarke's suggestions carried out at once?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) :

1. The letter referred to was received in this department on the 22nd of March, 1901.

2. The sailing directions referred to are a publication of the Imperial Admiralty. Captain Clarke's letter has, consequently, been forwarded to the Hydrographers of the Admiralty.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That from this date to the end of the session, Government Orders have precedence immediately after questions put by members on Wednesdays.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). This will leave no opportunity for making any motions, and that might result very awkwardly. For example, the Minister of Railways did not answer the first question on the Order paper to-day, but suggested that the hon. member should give notice of motion. If this motion is passed there will be no opportunity to get the information. There are some notices on the Order paper which have not been moved, owing to the necessary absence of members. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has a motion to which he would have spoken were it not for his absence on account of domestic affliction. I would suggest to my right hon. friend that perhaps it might be as well not to include the first Wednesday in this motion, but to make it apply after that.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no objection.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT FOR EASTER HOLIDAYS.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That when the House adjourns on Thursday next, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, the 9th of April.

He said : Several members on both sides of the House have conveyed to me their view that it would be more convenient if the House were to adjourn from Wednesday.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then, if that be the wish of the House, the government has no objection to meet it.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I would enter a protest on behalf of the members from the west, who never get home. I protest against lengthening the session by even a day.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry I cannot accommodate my hon. friend——

Mr. LaRIVIERE. To make up for it, I will protest against the protest.

The PRIME MINISTER. That settles it.

Mr. HACKETT. Will the adjournment be at six o'clock ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think it may be considered at six o'clock, for the last two Wednesdays we did nothing after six o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

INSPECTION OF FRUIT PACKAGES.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 32) to provide for the marking and inspection of packages containing fruit for sale.—The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Sydney Fisher).

On section 4,

Mr. CLARKE. I may say, for the information of the minister, that I took the liberty of sending several copies of this Bill to gentlemen engaged in the fruit export business ; and, as I have received no ac-

knowledgment even of the receipt of those copies of the Bill, I take it that it must be reasonably satisfactory to them. I think it due to the minister to say that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say, for the hon. gentleman's information, that after having introduced a somewhat similar Bill last session, I was in constant communication, not only with fruit-growers, but with fruit shippers and packers, and last winter I had a meeting with a large number of them in the city of Toronto, and went over the Bill with them, and there was a pretty general concurrence in its details, although there was a slight difference of opinion among themselves. The Bill, as it stands to-day, is a pretty close adherence to the consensus of opinion at that meeting. I may tell the hon. gentleman, however, that in consequence of the discussion here on Friday afternoon, I propose to submit one or two slight amendments, which we will discuss when we come to the different clauses.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has considered the advisability of adopting some uniform standard ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have an amendment which I think will cover that, and which I think will satisfy the hon. gentleman.

On section 6.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would like to insert in this clause certain words, in deference to the objections which were raised by certain members of the House from the province of Nova Scotia. It was pointed out that in the English market to-day 'Canadian apples' is a well-known phrase or brand, and means apples which come from the central part of this Dominion, and not from the maritime provinces, while Nova Scotia apples are known there, and are branded as such. I appreciate that to oblige Nova Scotia apples to be marked with a designation in that market which would be not a national designation, but a designation of apples from a certain part of Canada, might be a hardship to the Nova Scotia shipper. I, therefore, suggest inserting after the words 'A No. 1 Canadian,' the following : '(or A No. 1, followed by the name of the province in which the fruit was grown)'. That is, instead of using 'A No. 1 Canadian,' packers can use 'A No. 1 Ontario,' 'A No. 1, Nova Scotia,' 'A No. 1 Quebec,' or 'A No. 1 British Columbia.'

Mr. CLANCY. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman proposes to retain 'A No. 1 Canadian' as well ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Shippers can use either 'A No. 1 Canadian,' or 'A No. 1 Nova Scotia,' or 'A No. 1 Ontario.'

Mr. CLANCY. It seems to me that will lead to extreme confusion. I have no disposition, nor do I think the committee has any, to deprive Nova Scotia of the enjoyment of any advantages which it may have earned in the past ; but, I think it would be quite confusing if we adopted the plan proposed without doing away with the brand 'A No. 1 Canadian.' We are practically adopting two standards. Suppose the other provinces adopted 'A No. 1 Canadian,' while Nova Scotia refused to adopt that and used 'A No. 1 Nova Scotia'? I think the simplest way would be to abandon 'A No. 1 Canadian,' and brand with the names of the different provinces. I think that would meet the views of the gentlemen from Nova Scotia.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I agree with my hon. friend, who suggests that we should drop 'A No. 1 Canadian'; but, I would suggest that we say 'A No. 1 Nova Scotia, Canada,' 'A No. 1 Ontario, Canada,' 'A No. 1 Quebec, Canada,' &c. With the word 'Canada' added, everybody would know that those are Canadian apples, and would also know from what particular province of Canada each package came. But, if simply the name of the province is marked on the package, for instance Nova Scotia, people might not know that Nova Scotia was a part of Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I quite sympathize with hon. gentlemen in their desire to have the word 'Canadian' added, but we cannot ignore certain facts. There are to-day two known brands of apples from this Dominion on the English market—one is Canadian and the other is Nova Scotian. If we were to insist that all apples from the Dominion, should be branded 'Canadian,' we would destroy the Nova Scotian brand, which is as well known on the market as the Tasmanian or any other. If we were to follow the suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), we would destroy the distinctive character of the Canadian brand—which to-day is understood to mean the apples from Ontario and Quebec. The English people well understand that the different provinces are Canadian. So much is this the case that the English law, which provides that all articles of food coming from a foreign country must be marked with the name of that country, is so administered that the English officials accept the names 'Nova Scotia,' 'British Columbia,' 'Quebec' and so on as sufficient compliance with the law and sufficiently indicating that the apples are from Canada.

Mr. CLANCY. I protest against any province setting up a standard at the expense of all Canada. While not at all disposed to deprive Nova Scotia or any other province of any particular reputation it may have earned for the quality of its fruit, I think

there ought to be no objection to our adding the word 'Canada' to the provincial brand. Surely no one would propose to exclude the word 'Canada' for fear of injuring the reputation of any fruit. Nova Scotia sometimes sends bad apples.

Mr. WADE. No.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows well that the Commissioner of Agriculture stated a few days ago in the committee that the worst apples sent from Canada to the English market came from Nova Scotia.

Mr. KAULBACH. That is a mistake.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, the statement was made, whether well-founded or not. While we are all agreed that Nova Scotia should not lose any advantage which she may have gained by sending a superior class of fruit, it would not be advisable, when making a standard brand, not to make one which would apply to all the provinces.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would suggest that if Nova Scotia wishes to add its name below the brand, that could very easily be done. For instance, 'Brand No. 1 Canadian' might be shown to indicate Nova Scotia by adding 'Nova Scotia' to the brand. Let it be 'No. 1 Canadian,' and, if a Nova Scotia dealer likes to put the name of his province below that, he is free to do so. In that way he retains his brand. That will meet the view of the hon. member for Bothwell, it should satisfy the Nova Scotia dealer, and it will retain the word 'Canadian.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman does not understand the present market brands.

Mr. MACLEAN. The object is to protect the Nova Scotia apples.

Mr. WADE. But 'No. 1 Canadian' is a special brand.

Mr. MACLEAN. But, if the Nova Scotians wish to keep the name 'Nova Scotia' before the public they can put it below the other.

Mr. WADE. It is not a matter of keeping Nova Scotia before the public. The brand 'No. 1 Nova Scotia' or 'A No. 1 Nova Scotia has a special significance. There are two brands of apples, as I understand it, going to the English market. One is known as 'Nova Scotia,' and the other as 'Canadian.' And what we in Nova Scotia wish is the right to retain our distinctive brand. We are not taking anything from Ontario or any other province by doing that.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, you are.

Mr. WADE. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain in what way we are taking anything from any other province. This clause provides that no person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale, any apples or pears packed in a closed package and intended for export upon which is marked the grade 'A No. 1 Canadian,' unless such fruit consists of well-grown specimens of one variety—and so on. That would cover the case of the Ontario or Quebec apples as they are shipped to-day, and the minister proposes to add in parenthesis the words 'A No. 1 Nova Scotia.' or the name of any other province in which the fruit is produced. In other words, it will enable us to put upon our barrels 'A No. 1 Nova Scotia,' the same as we are doing to-day. Ontario shippers can brand their barrels 'A No. 1 Canadian,' or 'A No. 1 Ontario.' We do Ontario no injury, we are only seeking to retain our distinctive brand. If you put upon one barrel both 'Canadian,' and 'Nova Scotia,' it would signify nothing to the purchaser upon the London market except that the barrel contained a mixture of two kinds. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) raise a question as to the superiority of Nova Scotia fruit, for that has been admitted long ago.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) was present and heard the statement made——

Mr. WADE. I heard the statement made, which was in accordance with the fact, that the fruit from Nova Scotia last season was inferior.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then what are you grumbling about?

Mr. WADE. Your fruit is always inferior to ours, and, though we suffered once, we do not want to lower our reputation for all time. Why, here is the proof of our superiority—if our fruit is not superior, why is it that these gentlemen are so anxious not to allow us to use our own brand? All we want is to get credit for our honest packing and superior quality of fruit. We do not want to disturb their brand but to retain our own. I think that the fruit-growers and shippers of Nova Scotia will be most grateful to the minister for being willing to insert in this measure provision that will prevent their trade mark being taken away, thus securing them the just reward of their carefulness in producing and honesty in packing.

Mr. STEPHENS. I think that if the packers have the privilege of using 'Nova Scotia' or 'Canadian,' they might use it to the disadvantage of other provinces than Nova Scotia—that is, they would ship their best fruit as 'Nova Scotia,' and the poorer quality as 'Canadian.'

Mr. WADE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stephens) allow me a word?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WADE. I will await another opportunity, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stephens) objects to my speaking now. This Bill pro-

vides that the fruit must be branded, if with the name of a province, with the name of a province in which it is produced—we cannot ship apples in the name of another province.

Mr. MACLEAN. Where does that appear ?

Mr. WADE. That is to be put in.

Mr. STEPHENS. If, as I understand, they can use the brand 'Nova Scotia' or 'Canadian' they certainly could use it to the disadvantage of other provinces. It would be much better if they were compelled to use the word 'Nova Scotia' only. If they are restricted to the use of the name of the province, Ontario has nothing to fear, for she can hold her own with any province in the Dominion. The Bill should provide either that the brand 'Canadian' is to be used or else the name of the province, no choice being allowed.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I am opposed to taking the word 'Canadian' out of that Bill. The people of Europe, those of Great Britain particularly, know us as Canadians. I do not think they know as much about Nova Scotia. But, if the people of Nova Scotia are allowed to put the name of their province upon their package of fruit, the people of England will soon find out which is the best fruit and, if Nova Scotia should have an inferior crop as she had last year the people there might be glad to ship their fruit under the name 'Canadian.' But I for one, would object to the word 'Canadian' being taken out of the Bill in favour of the name of any province. If I am allowed to discuss other clauses of the Bill——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would like the hon. gentleman to stick to this clause until we get it through.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I have no province to defend in this matter, because my province does not produce apples to such an extent that we can export them. On the other hand, we are the victims of those provinces that do export them. We have to buy their apples and pay pretty high prices for them too. The other day, I drew the attention of the hon. minister to the frauds that had been practised in packing apples. If I understand the clause as proposed to be amended, it will be optional with the packers to use 'Canadian' or 'Nova Scotia.' In that case, the frauds suggested by my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Stephens) will be practised.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it will not be possible. The clause provides that :

No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale, any apples or pears packed in a closed package and intended for export upon which is marked the grade 'A No. 1 Canadian,' unless such fruit consists of well-grown specimens of one variety, sound, of nearly uniform size, of good colour for the variety, of normal shape and not less than 90 per cent free from scab, worm holes, bruises and other defects, properly packed.

They cannot put this brand upon inferior fruit.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. But, if it is optional you will find that when Nova Scotia has a bad year they will be careful not to brand their fruit as Nova Scotian, but as Canadian.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But they cannot put the brand on at all unless the fruit comes up to the standard provided.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Where is the inspector to prevent them from doing so ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The clause here provides penalties for doing so. This whole Act is for the purpose of preventing people putting this brand upon the barrel unless the fruit comes up to a certain standard of quality. They can put Nova Scotia upon it as easy as they can Canadian, but they cannot put Canadian upon anything they would not desire to put Nova Scotia upon. The danger the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Stephens) fears is impossible under the provisions of the Act.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am particularly anxious that the well-earned reputation of the fruit of Nova Scotia should be retained, and I cannot see any better way of retaining it than the proposal that has been made by the Minister of Agriculture. We then have the option if we wish to compete with them, and the Ontario people have the same option to compete with Nova Scotia. We claim that we rival any other province in the Dominion in fruit-growing.

Mr. CLANCY. And other things too.

Mr. KAULBACH. I concede that readily. This spirit of rivalry as to who is growing the best fruit is to be encouraged. Let them try and compete with us if they can. If they can do so we will be well satisfied. If we grow a better description of fruit than they do, then we are entitled to have the brand Nova Scotia put on the barrel in the way suggested by the Minister of Agriculture, that is, A No. 1 Nova Scotia. And if it is thought proper to put the word Canadian after that, I do not see any objection.

Mr. CLANCY. I cannot learn that there is any distinctive brand that leads all others in Canada as Canadian No. 1. I understand there are individual shippers whose apples bear a better reputation than Canadian No. 1.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It happens that in the province of Ontario there are a large number of individual shippers who have individual brands which have a fixed value for those people. Nova

Scotia shippers have another brand called Nova Scotia which has a fixed value to them. It sometimes happens, as in Nova Scotia, that a whole locality use the same brand and that brand has a fixed value to them. The Bill as it stands to-day cuts Nova Scotia people out of that brand. It asks them to put on their apples a brand which is known in another sense, and in a limited sense, in the English market. But under the proposal that I have made in the amendment I would allow these people to put Nova Scotia on and also to put Canadian on if they choose. But in any case, no matter what the brand, whether Canadian, Nova Scotia, Ontario or any other province, the apples branded in that way must come up to a certain character or standard. It is idle to pretend that the Nova Scotia people can put the brand of Nova Scotia on some of their apples and put the brand Canadian on other and inferior apples. It is only the very highest quality which can have this brand put upon them.

Mr. COCHRANE. My hon. friend's point was that 'No. 1 Nova Scotia' may be up to the mark, and they might pack the balance of the apples that was not up to the mark and mark them Canadian.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They cannot mark them 'No. 1 Canadian,' but they are welcome to mark them 'No. 2.'

Mr. COCHRANE. If they put Nova Scotia on any of their apples they should put it on all their apples, and not be allowed to mark 'No. 2 Nova Scotia,' because that would be just bearing out the point my hon. friend raised.

Mr. WADE. The word Canadian can only be used in this Bill in conjunction with A. No. 1.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not see that there is any objection to be raised to people placing Nova Scotia, or Ontario, or any other province on their own brand of apples. We in the trade know full well that when we get prunes coming from California they are stamped California, and when they come from Oregon they are stamped Oregon, and every dealer knows that the Oregon prunes have an entirely different flavour from prunes coming from California. It is a desirable thing to know where they come from. Customers get acquainted with a certain brand of tea and they want that brand continually. When they get acquainted with a certain brand of prunes they want that continually. When they get Valencia raisins from Spain, the district from which they come is marked on the box. Every dealer knows that a certain brand coming from one section of Spain is better than the same brand coming from another section of Spain. Dealers get to know this very readily. I cannot see where there is any objection at all; if any section of the country, or any province, wishes to stamp the name of that section or province on that particular brand, it should be stamped there.

Mr. BRODER. It seems to me that the difficulty being brought into this proposition is, that you are having two standards instead of one. You are having a standard of No. 1 apples, in Nova Scotia, separate from No. 1 from anywhere else. Why do you want to put a Nova Scotian brand on? If the standard is exactly the same, why designate it differently? Are you taking as the standard of the Nova Scotia No. 1 your present standard?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The standard is defined in the section.

Mr. BRODER. I know that. Why do you accept No. 1 Nova Scotia as a certain brand of apple, and provide for a different brand for every other part of the country? The difficulty of this is, that you are having two brands for a No. 1 apple, one of which is called 'Nova Scotia No. 1.' Are you pretending to say that an apple branded 'Nova Scotia No. 1' would be exactly the same in standard as an apple branded 'Canadian No. 1'?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

Mr. BRODER. Then, why do you not use the word 'Canadian' and stop there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because Nova Scotia happens to be known in the market of Great Britain.

Mr. BRODER. That is no reason at all. If the standard is exactly the same, how can they suffer?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because the markets know what the standard is.

Mr. BRODER. If you put that on for one province, every other province has the right to its own standard.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

Mr. BRODER. Then, you are dealing with a federal question in a provincial way.

Mr. STEPHENS. If these gentlemen want to have their apples branded 'Nova Scotia,' why not brand them in this way: 'A No. 1, Nova Scotia, Canadian'; 'A No. 1, Ontario, Canadian'; or 'A No. 1, Quebec, Canadian'? If they want to keep their apples separate, let them put their own names on them, while having one standard instead of putting on one barrel of apples 'A No. 1 Canadian,' and on another barrel of apples of a better quality 'A No. 1, Nova Scotia'? I am sure that the Ontario people are perfectly satisfied to have their Ontario brands. I know that we can compete with every other part of the Dominion in raising apples, but we do not want to be

placed at a disadvantage in the old country market. If the people of Nova Scotia think so much of their apples, let them be branded 'A No. 1, Nova Scotia, Canadian.' Let us brand ours 'A No. 1, Ontario, Canadian,' and then, I am sure, no one can be hurt. This would be fair to all the provinces.

Mr. WADE. Nova Scotia does not wish to use the mark that is provided for here. We have been asking not to be compelled to use that mark, but, on the contrary, to be allowed to use the mark that is used to-day. We are not asking to use that mark, but we are being forced to use it. Our apples have a reputation on the other side, and there are certain people who prefer to buy Nova Scotian fruit rather than to buy Canadian fruit. There are some people on the other side who are not aware of the fact that Nova Scotia is within Canada. When they see the word 'Canadian' on a barrel of apples, they will naturally conclude that this is Canadian fruit as distinguished from Nova Scotia fruit. The hon. gentleman at my left (Mr. Stephens) proposes that apples shall be branded 'A No. 1, Nova Scotia, Canadian,' or 'A No. 1, Ontario, Canadian,' or 'A No. 1, Quebec, Canadian,' but if we do not wish to adopt the word 'Canadian,' why should we be forced to use it any more than Ontario should be forced to use it? It does not seem to me to be a very strong argument, to say that if a shipper had good fruit he would brand it 'Nova Scotian,' while if he had bad fruit he would call it 'Canadian.' I do not think we should be required to use the word 'Canadian,' because it would be dangerous to our trade.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture if there is anything in this Bill to prevent a man in New Brunswick branding his apples 'A No. 1, Nova Scotia,' or is it to be left exclusively to people living in the province of Nova Scotia?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The amendment is, that instead of 'A No. 1, Canadian' following 'A No. 1,' the name of the province in which the fruit is produced may be put in. That would prevent such a circumstance as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) alludes to. I would like to say that we have found that the markets are very jealous, and that they are slow to take up new brands. It is one of the greatest difficulties that merchants or shippers have to contend with. In the English fruit market, the brands which are well known are 'Canadian,' Nova Scotian,' 'American' and 'Tasmanian' in apples. Now, the word 'Canadian' put upon any fruit going into that market will be taken to mean the present Canadian brand, which is applied only to fruit coming from the St. Lawrence ports, and from Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. CLANCY. How many prominent shippers are using the brand 'Canadian No. 1.'?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think they use it at all, but the Canadian brand is known there, and if that brand is put on an apple barrel, it will be supposed to be that kind of fruit and no other. You cannot have a change accepted by the market there until after a long time, and without going through a period of difficulty. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to explain, there is a certain class of fruit on the English market know as Canadian. A great deal of it is not branded as Canadian, but it is known and sold as Canadian, while it may be branded by the packer's name, or by a fancy name.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman say that the fruit known on the British market to-day as 'Canadian No. 1,' stands highest of all fruit coming from Canada, excluding Nova Scotia?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say that. It varies in its reputation. There are some special brands of fruit put upon the market. The fruit that is sold there to-day is Canadian, but a great deal of it is not branded 'Canadian.' I do not know that any of it is branded 'Canadian.' The name of a packer is put on, fancy names are put on, and fancy brands are used, and in some instances it comes from certain sections of Ontario or Quebec, but it all goes to market under the name of Canadian apples, and if it were to go there with the name 'Canadian' branded upon it, it would be taken to mean that kind of fruit, and it would sell as that kind of fruit.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, why use the word 'Canadian' at all, then?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because I wish to have all our fruit go into the English market under our name.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then, stick to it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understand that perfectly well, but, all changes of this kind must necessarily be of the nature of a compromise. I find that you cannot take a market by the throat and force it into new lines which it has not been accustomed to. You may be able to coax it into new lines, especially if those lines are advantageous to it, but, if you undertake to force the market, you will hurt the people in whose behalf you are trying to work. I do not wish to do that. I have just got a note from Professor Robertson, saying that practically all the Ontario and Quebec fruit is advertised at public sales as Canadian, although the brand 'Canadian' is not necessarily on it. The individual shippers have their individual brands, what-

ever that might be. There is no objection under this Bill to individual shippers putting their brand on if they chose. Sections 6 and 7 are permissive. No shipper need use the brands if he does not choose, but if he does choose his fruits must be up to the standard defined by these sections, and that is a safeguard which will enable our Canadian fruit in the future to get a reputation. At present fruit advertised as Canadian fruit in England may be anything and everything, but if we pass this Bill we will be able to prevent any fruit going forward and marked Canadian, except it comes up to the standard.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Is it permissive whether Nova Scotia may use this brand or not ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. If they do not choose to avail themselves of it, they need not use it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Nova Scotia people want to have an established definition of their grade, as well as our grades, and still they do not want to put their fruit under a name which is a different designation from that which they now use. I venture to think that when our brands are used it will enhance the reputation of our fruit in the English market. Commerce is shy, and if we force people to change the brands they are at present using, it will surely be an injury to them.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. We are introducing new brands by this Bill.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But not compulsory.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It is acknowledged by law that if apples are of a certain size and quality they will be branded 'No. 1 Canadian.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That may be.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. That is introducing a new brand in the market.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. To that extent.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. If you do that, why not accept my suggestion that the name of the province and the word 'Canada' should be added. For instance, 'No. 1 Nova Scotia, Canada,' 'No. 1 Ontario, Canada,' 'No. 1 Quebec, Canada,' and then every one would be satisfied and every province would be represented, Under this Bill you simply have the option of branding 'No. 1 Nova Scotia,' or 'No. 1, Canadian,' and that option should not be allowed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the gentlemen who represent the fruit interests of Nova Scotia accept the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. LaRivière) I would be only too glad. What might be done would be to use the words 'No. 1' with the name of the province, and then underneath, in letters of equal size, the word 'Canada.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. That is right.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not want to introduce anything into the Bill which would hurt the Nova Scotia trade, but if they accept that suggestion I would be glad.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. If there is any objection to using the word 'Canadian' in Nova Scotia they can use the word 'Canada.'

Mr. STEPHENS. If they are fair and do not want to get any advantage over any of the other provinces, they should be satisfied with the brand 'Nova Scotia, Canada,' and let the other provinces put on 'Quebec, Canada,' or 'Ontario, Canada.' If the Nova Scotia people do not want to do that, it seems to me that they want an unfair advantage. I do not think that all the rest of Canada should have to submit to Nova Scotia, and give them whatever they ask whether it is in the interests of the other provinces or not.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot acknowledge it is any discrimination against any of the other provinces, because Nova Scotia would be the only province that would be hurt if they were forced to put the word 'Canadian' on, because they happen to be the only province that now have a special designation in the English market.

Mr. STEPHENS. If each province is allowed to put its name on with the word 'Canada' beneath, I do not see how Nova Scotia can be hurt. They will have 'Nova Scotia' on all their fruit, and we will have 'Ontario' on all ours, and the people of Ontario will be perfectly satisfied.

Mr. KAULBACH. How can you detect fraudulent packing if the name of the packer is not put on the package ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The 4th section of the Act provides for that.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WADE. Mr. Chairman, at six o'clock we were discussing the desirability of placing the word 'Canada' after the name of the province in the proposed mark. I

wish to make myself clearly understood in my advocacy of the rights and interests of the people of Nova Scotia. Hon. gentlemen will remember that in the first instance, when this discussion arose, I asked to have the word 'Canadian' struck out, so that the mark would read 'A No. 1' or 'No. 1.' That was objected to. I next asked, in case that should not be agreed to, that the name of the province be put after 'No. 1' or 'A No. 1.' That is the question now under discussion. I believe the shippers of apples in Nova Scotia are so sensitive about the word 'Canada' that if they were not free to use the name of the province, they would not avail themselves of section 6. But I do not wish to prolong the discussion, and I will not say a word more if a grade can be fixed, so that we can enforce a penalty under this Act, by providing something like this—I am not wedded to the particular words; add the following to section 4 or insert it as a new section:

No person shall sell or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale, any fruit packed in a closed package, on which package is marked anything which indicates that the fruit contained in such package is of first or best or extra good quality, unless such fruit consists of well-grown specimens of one variety.

And so forth, the same as we have it now in sections 6 and 7. I am satisfied that if section 6 is left as it is desired to leave it by gentlemen from Ontario, our people in Nova Scotia will not avail themselves of it; but they are anxious to have a clause in the Act which will establish a grade. With this clause, they can call their fruit 'A No. 1' or 'No. 1,' or 'A No. 1, Nova Scotia,' if they like. It is something which will allow them to have a distinctive grade for their fruit, and will not offend their sensitiveness with regard to the use of the word 'Canada.' I suppose we should feel flattered because gentlemen coming from the west are anxious to have that word tacked on to Nova Scotia, so that they can have the advantage of her fair reputation. The fruit-growers of Nova Scotia, while they feel flattered, are more concerned about their own interests.

Mr. CLANCY. I fancy that the hon. gentleman has flattered himself much more than Canada in the expressions to which he has given utterance. We in Ontario are fair enough to recognize what is good in Nova Scotia; but I am sorry I cannot pay that compliment to the hon. gentleman for what he has just said. He took occasion this afternoon to speak of the honesty of the people of Nova Scotia. I have not a doubt that they are honest, but I have less doubt that they are any more honest than other people. I think they would be no less liable than other people to send bad fruit to market. I wish to point out to the Minister of Agriculture that it is important that we should maintain as our first object in the English market the interests of Canada. Any departure from that would be a false step. Any apples packed for the British market should be known as coming from Canada, no matter whether they come from Nova Scotia, from Ontario, or from elsewhere. We in Ontario desire to be perfectly fair to the other provinces. If Nova Scotia is able to send a superior class of fruit to market, let it do so by all means; but let it be understood that the fruit comes from Canada. If the shippers of Nova Scotia have been able to earn a reputation there for their apples, surely they will be able to retain it. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman means a repetition in a sense of sections 6 and 7. If you fix a standard such as the hon. gentleman suggests, let that be a governing one for the whole Dominion. The question comes back to making it permissive for one province to step out and omit the word 'Canada.' If we are going to build up Canada, we must always understand that our fruit must be known as Canadian fruit. If each province desires to designate the fruit from that province, that is a proper thing to do. But anything short of that will not, I think, meet the views of this House.

Mr. FRASER. No person feels aggrieved because in Manitoba they speak of No. 1 Manitoba hard wheat.

Mr. CLANCY. That is not a parallel case.

Mr. FRASER. That is to say, a cereal is not a parallel case with fruit.

Mr. CLANCY. Because we do not grow such wheat anywhere else in Canada.

Mr. FRASER. Therefore, I could understand that the people of Manitoba would feel very much aggrieved if their wheat were marked No. 1 Canadian, because then inferior wheat from Ontario, and still more inferior wheat from Nova Scotia, would be alowed to rank with it. If a particular province excels in a certain product, why should the fact not be indicated by the name of the province from which the product comes? We cannot compete with Ontario in beef, and if all beef were marked as Canadian beef, it would be a great injustice to Ontario. So in a hundred other cases. Nova Scotia apples have made for themselves a reputation in Great Britain before Ontario or Quebec apples had any reputation there, and that reputation will continue; and I think it would be a great injustice to Nova Scotia to enable the apples of the other provinces to rank with its apples. Take another case. In Prince Edward Island they produce the best potatoes grown in this Dominion. Owing to differences of soil and climate, certain articles grow better in one part of the country than they do in another, and it

would be very unfair to grade them all alike. As I understand, all that the hon. member for Annapolis is claiming is that as a reputation has been made for Nova Scotia apples, shippers should have the liberty of taking advantage of that fact.

Mr. CLANCY. Is Nova Scotia Canada ?

Mr. WADE. No.

Mr. FRASER. Nova Scotia was known before Canada was.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does the hon. gentleman say that the word 'Nova Scotia' was known before the word 'Canada'?

Mr. FRASER. No, but I can tell the hon. gentleman that long before the word 'Ontario' was known, the word 'Nova Scotia' was known.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will not go into the history either of names or provinces, but I think my hon. friend from Annapolis has perhaps given a solution of this difficulty which will be satisfactory to him and still leave the Bill very much as it was originally. On Friday last, the hon. member for Bothwell pointed out that section No. 8 was vague, because there was no standard described as in sections 6 and 7. I see the force of his objection, and have drawn up an amendment to cover that point. I would suggest that the following be substituted for section 8 :

No person shall sell or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale any fruit packed in a closed package, upon which package is marked any designation which represents such fruit as of first, best or extra good quality, unless such fruit consists of well-grown specimens of one variety, sound, of nearly uniform size, of good colour for the variety, of normal shape, and not less than 90 per cent free from scab, worm holes, bruises and other defects, and properly packed.

This is practically the same as clause No. 6, the only change being this description in place of the brand there indicated : 'Any designation which represents such fruit as of first, best or extra good quality.'

If any one should brand his fruit 'Nova Scotia No. 1' or 'A No. 1,' that fruit would still come under the definition I have just given. If the insertion of such a clause will prevent any desire to amend clause No. 6, we can leave that clause as it is, in the hope that the people at large will gradually adopt the national brand described in clause 6, with its standard definition or description.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is carrying out the suggestion I made on Friday. I suggested that it would be desirable to have a general definition of No. 1 apple, such as is given to No. 1 Canadian in clause 6. The difficulty I saw in the Bill as originally drafted was that a Nova Scotian need not use the brand 'No. 1 Canadian,' but none the less the apple-growers of that province desire that there should be some standard.

Mr. WADE. If this amendment be adopted, I shall withdraw the objection to clauses 6 and 7.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman willing that there should be one standard for all Canada ? According to the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) the description of a standard as 'Canadian' would discredit Canadian apples.

Mr. WADE. No.

Mr. CLANCY. Then why does the hon. gentleman say that if the Nova Scotians were to adopt a Canadian standard, that would throw discredit on their apples ? Nova Scotia would, in no sense be lost in the word 'Canada.' As Canadians, and legislating for the whole country, it is our duty to do all we can to place the name of Canada in the best light before the purchasers of our goods in England. If there are portions of Canada that are able to stand out and maintain a reputation of their own, I have no objection; but I do object to having an inferior standard for Canada and giving a special standard to Nova Scotia.

Mr. REID. Is there anything in the Bill that would prevent growers in other provinces marking their apples 'N. S.' ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I do not think it is necessary to discuss the merits of the apples in the several provinces. Owing to climatic reasons, the crop may be better in Nova Scotia than in Ontario, but last year it was better in Ontario than in Nova Scotia. But what has been more particularly considered in Nova Scotia than in Ontario is honesty in packing. The Nova Scotia shippers have realized that to obtain a good market there must be honest packing ; and that is the secret of our apple trade. Let the inferior qualities be disposed of for what they will bring, but let the best qualities only be shipped. The packers in Nova Scotia are very anxious to retain the advantage of the good name they have won on the London market, and I think they will not be satisfied unless there is a distinguishing mark by which their apples shall be known in that market.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I object, equally with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) to this Bill passing without the provision that the word 'Canada' shall be on each barrel.

Mr. WADE. I have withdrawn my objection to the word 'Canadian' staying on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As this Bill is not intended to provide compulsory branding for the barrels, it seems to me we are spending more time on it than it is worth.

We have spent two whole afternoons on it, and when it is passed it may not amount to a wave of your hand with respect to the branding of the barrels. The gist of the Bill is to provide that when the barrel is branded 'A No. 1 Canadian,' the apples in the barrel shall conform to a certain standard. So long as the Bill is not compulsory, it seems to me that the use of names such as 'Canadian,' 'Nova Scotia,' 'Ontario,' and others indicating locality will have to be left with the growers and exporters themselves. You do not compel them to put on any one of these words, but the intention is to compel them, if they put the words 'A No. 1' on the barrel, to put a certain class of apples in the barrel. If you leave out these words indicating locality, you will accomplish the result, for when the words 'A No. 1' appear on the barrel, we shall know that the contents of the barrel are up to a certain standard. That being the case, why not confine it to that, and deal with it in that sense in which the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fisher) proposed to deal with it in his amendment? All you need to do is to provide that the words 'A No. 1' or 'extra quality' or certain other words shall indicate a certain standard. If this is provided, you have the gist of the Bill, and you can leave out the consideration of such words as 'Canadian' and 'Nova Scotia.' I make this suggestion to hon. gentlemen who have been discussing the merits of the fruits of the different provinces. There is no objection to Nova Scotians putting the words 'Nova Scotia' on their barrels if they see fit, and the same liberty will be allowed to other provinces. All we need to provide is that a certain mark on the barrel shall mean a certain quality of contents.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has spoken far too strongly in saying that that is the gist of the whole Bill. There are several parts of the Bill to which he has not alluded.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, I was referring to this feature of the Bill.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As to this feature, I stated frankly that sections 6 and 7 were a suggestion of what I hoped would be a national brand of Canadian fruit, which, I trusted, in the course of time would become a well known brand with a reputation which would be a matter of pride for all Canadians. These clauses are not compulsory, for the reasons which I have already given, I shall be sorry, however, to eliminate these two clauses from the Bill, because I think in so doing we should throw away the opportunity we have of establishing that important feature of a national brand. A clause which has been suggested will cover the cases where these words are not used, and, that being the case, I think the whole field is covered. And, if the committee will accept Nos. 6 and 7 I would like to move the insertion of No. 8 which I have proposed.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Before accepting section 6, I would suggest the addition of the words 'for home market and export.' I do not see why we should exclude the home market and provide these amendments for the export trade alone. The home market needs protection as much as does the export market.

Mr. HOLMES. It seems to me there is a good deal of hair-splitting in connection with this Bill in order to adapt it to the peculiar conditions of Nova Scotia. The people of Ontario are as jealous of the reputation of their fruit as are the people of Nova Scotia of theirs. It seems to me that sections 6 and 7, as originally drafted, provide for the export business of the whole Dominion, and that there is no more reason for putting in a special clause to adapt the measure to the peculiar circumstances of Nova Scotia than there is for us to adapt it to the circumstances of Ontario or Quebec.

Mr. GILMOUR. Before sections 6 and 7 and the proposed new clause are carried, I wish to call attention to one feature of the matter. The packer may sell his apples to a second person, and that second person to a third person, who may never have seen them. This occurs often in the trade. Yet the purchaser is held responsible for the packing, though it is the packer who has done wrong in the first place. I think that is severe. I would not like to buy apples in that way. I have bought apples myself, and I have never seen the barrels, and would not like to be called upon and be fined for something that I did not know anything about, to be fined, in fact, for having been duped, as it were. I suggest that these words be added in clause 6: 'No person shall with his knowledge sell or offer.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hardly think it possible to accept that amendment. These clauses were thoroughly discussed by the shippers, packers and fruit-growers, and they asked especially that they should appear in this form in the Bill. No such difficulties were felt to be likely by them. The innocent party would have recourse against the person who had deceived him. It is the packer who is liable, and the packer can be prosecuted by anybody who is aggrieved.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think the suggestion made by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) is a very good one, with reference to inserting the statement that they are for export and home consumption. When we buy apples from the west we have great difficulty in getting as good fruit as the fruit which is exported. The fruit-growers wish to send their finest fruit to

the old country, and they think anything is good enough for the rest of us Canadians. Now, we think we are entitled to have just as good fruit as people in the old country.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). There is one point which I think has been overlooked by the Minister of Agriculture. Apples grown in Nova Scotia, or in Ontario, or in any other part of Canada, will have to find, the majority of them, a foreign market. We have been told that the North-west will become a great market for apples grown in Ontario. Now, the person who purchases the apples either in England or the North-west will discover, in opening the barrels, that they are not up to the standard. The person discovering this will perhaps be a thousand miles distant from the packer, and in order to lodge an information and bring the packer to justice it seems to me he will be labouring under great difficulties. I think a clause should be added in the Bill something like this :

> Whenever any barrel or package of apples shall be found to be in violation of this Act or any of its clauses, on information being laid before a justice of the peace or a judge in the district in which the apples are found to be bad in any country, an affidavit shall be made by not less than three persons of the fact, when such affidavit shall be forwarded under seal to the judge of the county or district in which the apple-packers reside; and said judge or magistrate shall have power to proceed under this Act, and a conviction may follow.

I think that clause should be introduced in this Bill, because I am satisfied that otherwise you will scarcely ever get a conviction. No man will come from Manitoba here to prosecute these gentlemen, it will cost him more than a cart-load of apples : and no one will come from England. So the law will be a dead letter unless you make some arrangement to prosecute these men.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not wish to take exception to clause 6 as standing by itself, but it needs to be considered along with other clauses. Now, there is nothing compulsory in the Bill, as I understand it, but the fourth clause. Clause 4 makes it imperative that the initials of the Christian name and surname and the address of the packer be put on the package, with the name and variety, and with the designation of the grade of fruit. That designation of the grade is also optional as I understand it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Section 4 is imperative.

Mr. CLANCY. I am now discussing that part of clause 4 which is entirely optional, namely, with regard to the grade. With regard to the grade, any person may fix his own grade, because there is no grade fixed in the Bill. It is therefore optional, and every person may fix just such grade by way of mark as he thinks proper. Then clause 6 and 7 are optional. Then we come to clause 8, which provides the penalties, It seems to me there is not much encouragement for a national standard, because a national standard is entirely optional. I think the Minister of Agriculture will concede that if we are to attempt a national standard we ought to adopt some moderate means of enforcing it. If we cannot hope to enforce a reasonable national standard, let us not deceive ourselves, and abandon the attempt. Otherwise I think it is mere child's play to put that in an Act of parliament when we know perfectly well that whenever it suits any person to abandon it they will do so. Now, we are putting a standard upon the statute-book with which nobody is compelled to comply. I still think that before we pass this clause 6 we should understand what the purpose of this Bill is. If the word 'Canadian' is to be maintained at all, let it be maintained for all of the provinces, each being compelled to use that to designate the national standard. 'Nova Scotia No. 1, Canada,' would comply with the national standard, but it shows that the fruit came from a particular province. Fruit that is branded 'No. 1 Quebec, Canada,' is also of national standard. I mention this because it seems to be so necessary if we ever hope to maintain the Canadian position that we ought to take that course. It does seem to leave it optional and fix the standard as easily as one could well imagine. I hope the hon. Minister of Agriculture will insist on not multiplying clauses to overcome the difficulty, because, although I am not a lawyer, and therefore perhaps unable to clearly grasp the meaning of the section, it does seem to me that a multiplication of sections simply has a tendency to confuse matters. I would be willing to adopt the suggestion made by the hon. leader of the opposition, namely, that if it were necessary to mark apples 'No. 1,' let each province mark their own apples under the standard of No. 1, and make it compulsory to live up to that standard. I think that would meet the difficulty to a large extent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. Minister of Agriculture does not make the use of the word 'Canadian' compulsory, what office does section 6 fill, which is not filled by the section which he proposes to add ? It fills no office at all. If you add that section but do not make the use of the word 'Canadian' compulsory, section 6 fills no office which would not be filled by the section which the hon. gentleman proposes to add, because, having regard to the section, if any person used the word 'Canadian,' which he might or might not, as he saw fit, he would be liable to any penalty under the proposed section, which he would be liable to under section 6. It does not seem to be necessary to have the two sec-

tions in the Bill. You might as well eliminate section 6 and rely on the section which you propose to add.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I simply propose this to encourage the establishment of the national brand. I may say that this section and the words in it were proposed by the fruit-growers and shippers, and they have been asked for by every fruit-growers' association in this Dominion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But it is rather a new idea to make suggestions by legislation. Legislation is supposed to mean something, and the hon. gentleman's legislation will mean something, namely, that the fruit inside a barrel must correspond with the brand on the outside of the barrel. Section 6 adds nothing at all to that beyond suggestion. I do not know whether I make myself clear to the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade).

Mr. WADE. I could not quite hear you.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I say that the hon. Minister of Agriculture proposes to add a section which says that fruit marked 'No. 1,' or designating other marks which he suggests, must be up to a certain standard, namely, the standard set forth in section 6. If you have that section, and do not make the use of the word 'Canadian' compulsory, there is nothing in section 6 which is not carried out by the proposed section. Do I make myself clear to the hon. member for Annapolis ?

Mr. WADE. I understand you.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Therefore, it seems to me that section 6 is absolutely useless except as the hon. Minister of Agriculture says, it may be a suggestion to the fruit-growers throughout the country that they had better proceed to use the word 'Canadian.' Whether it is worth while to insert a section simply to make a suggestion is another question.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that I consider it educational in leading up to a point which we all acknowledge is desirable. If we made it compulsory it would seriously interfere with and hamper trade, and therefore, I do not wish to make it compulsory, although I think it desirable.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does the hon. Minister of Agriculture intend to appoint inspectors to inspect the apples ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Did you take out the words 'intended for export.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Would you propose that ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Yes, I would suggest that the minister erase the words 'intended for export.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, strike out the words 'intended for export.'

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 7,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In respect to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour), I think there is a good deal in it, but its consideration will come up perhaps more properly under section 12. I think it will then require serious consideration.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I would propose that the words 'intended for export' be struck out.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 8,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Section 8 is entirely different. I wish to substitute for this clause the following :

No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale any fruit packed in a closed package, upon which package is marked any designation which represents such fruit as of first, best or extra good quality, unless such fruit consists of well-grown specimens of one variety, sound, of nearly uniform size, of good colour for the variety, of normal shape, and not less than 90 per cent free from scab, worm holes, bruises and other defects, properly packed.

This is the designation of clause No. 6, except in the designation which represents the fruit as being of first, best, or extra good quality.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I wish to insert here another clause which will cover part of clause 8. It is as follows :

No person shall sell, or offer, or expose, or have in his possession for sale any fruit packed in any package in which the face or shown surface gives a false representation of the conditions of such package, and it shall be considered false representation when more than 15 per cent of such fruit is substantially smaller in size than, or inferior in grade to, or different in variety from the face or shown surface of such package.

That is with reference to the portion of clause 8 which does not deal with the grade but applies to the requirements which forces the packer to put his good fruit in the middle of the package as he does at the ends.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. There is a fraud often committed by the middlemen by which barrels are sometimes opened and an inferior fruit is substituted. As it is now, the packer is responsible, but if the middleman interferes the packer should be protected against him and a heavy penalty should be inflicted.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The person who offers it for sale is equally liable with the packer.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. That is if the article is inferior, but suppose he sells it just as he got it from the packer ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He is still apparently liable.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The packer ought to be protected against the middleman who would substitute inferior fruit.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We can deal with that in another clause.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. That will be satisfactory.

On section 9,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the intention of the minister with respect to the suggestion of the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour), who referred to the supposed case of a barrel of apples packed in violation of this Act, they being properly No. 3, whereas they were packed and branded as No. 1, and that barrel passing into the hands of an innocent person who believes it is all right and sells it without any guilty intention. Do you propose by this Act to render him liable to a fine or imprisonment ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Fine.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He could be imprisoned if he did not pay the fine. There are many statutes which are applicable only to persons who wilfully and knowingly violate the law. What is the intention with regard to this Act ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) who is a lawyer and who would know more about it than I do, that the intention was to make the person who sold the package liable. Take the conditions in the province of Manitoba, which my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) has so ably represented here. The merchant in Winnipeg who buys fruit from Ontario would be held responsible by his customers, and he would have recourse against the person from whom he bought in Ontario. The ordinary purchaser would be powerless against the original packer, but the merchant engaged in the trade would be sufficiently interested to follow him up. If we were to make only the original packer responsible we would practically destroy the value of the Act for the protection of the ordinary purchaser.

Mr. GILMOUR. I see a very strong objection to punishing a person under the law for an act which he does not wilfully do, and for which he is not responsible.

Mr. LARIVIERE.

Mr. McEWEN. Grain is sold subject to inspection, and these apples should be inspected before you buy them from the first party. If you buy them subject to inspection you take no risk.

Mr. STEPHENS. If this law makes the second handler of the apples responsible it will drive men out of the business. They cannot look into every barrel of apples they buy to see that it is all right. I do not think it is fair to punish men for what they may not be responsible for.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Some statutes impose a penalty upon persons who have no guilty intention, and some statutes require the guilty intention. You should have it made perfectly plain in this Act as to which is intended. My own view is that the person subject to the provisions of this statute should be a person who wilfully violates the provisions of the Act, and you should not make it applicable to the case suggested by my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour).

Mr. WADE. You might say negligently or wilfully.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If you like you may put the burden of proof on the person who sells the apples to show that he was not guilty of fraud. But to impose a penalty of this character upon a person who is guilty of no intention to violate the Act or of negligence which might amount to an intention, seems to me to be going beyond any necessity in the public interest, and might lead to very grave injustice ; and for my part I would oppose carrying this Act that far. I am prepared to support the framing of the Act so that a person selling such apples must prove that he did so innocently, and that he was not guilty of negligence or recklessness in doing so. Without that the Act might become inoperative ; but to say that a person who was absolutely innocent of any intention or negligence in such a matter, should be liable to this penalty, would be going beyond what is usual in statutes of this kind.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It seems to me that if a man undertakes to buy and sell again, it is his duty to see that the goods which he undertakes to sell are up to the standard of the marks upon them ; and if he sells the goods in ignorance of their quality, it is a dereliction of duty to his customer, for which he should be punished. If the word 'knowingly' or 'intentionally' were inserted in this section, it would nullify the whole Act, and the public whom we are trying to protect would be open to the same frauds as they have been in times past.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Take the case of fish, which are branded No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3. The inspector is held responsible

in every instance; and if the fish turn out, even in the market of the United States, not to be as represented, he is subject to a penalty. If you are going to appoint an inspector, I think he is the man who should be held responsible for the quality of the apples, and no one else.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How can an inspector inspect a hundred barrels of apples? He simply puts his mark on them, and he cannot tell whether they are up to the standard without examining each barrel.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is not intended to attempt to have a universal inspection of fruit. Inspectors will be appointed who may possibly inspect; and should they inspect any apples and find them wrongly marked, it will be their duty to prosecute the people so marking them. But there is going to be no attempt to make a universal inspection.

Mr. STEPHENS. I cannot understand what good the inspector would be at all. In the county of Kent it would take twenty-five inspectors to inspect the fruit shipped out of one township. A thousand barrels are packed in a day.

Mr. MACLEAN. In regard to the inspection of fruit, the system that prevails in California will have to be adopted in this country. You will have to have smaller packages and hand-pack your fruit; and it will have to be packed in boxes in such a way that every single piece of fruit can be seen. The apple barrel will have to go, and the sooner our Canadian fruit shippers understand that the better it will be for the fruit trade. The fruit-growers of California have a market all over the continent, which has been built up by giving the greatest attention to the packing of the fruit and the maintaining of its quality. We shall have to come to the same thing in Canada, whether by law or otherwise. I would like to know how that is secured in California—whether by the interference of the state law or by the people who are engaged in the trade coming to see that it is the only way to get and maintain a market.

Mr. REID (Grenville). When the apples cannot all be inspected, I cannot see of what use the inspection will be. An inspector will brand a lot of barrels without having inspected them at all. I would like to have it provided that every barrel shall be inspected by the inspector before he puts his name on it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no intention that the inspector shall put his name on any of them.

Mr. WRIGHT. With respect to the inspection of fruit in the United States, prunes, for instance, are not inspected by a government inspector, but by the person who packs them. The prunes put up by Giffen & Skelly are put up in packages of uniform size, and marked from 60 to 70, from 70 to 80, from 80 to 90, and from 90 to 100. That means that there are that many prunes in a pound; so that you know exactly what you are buying. In the same way oranges are put up in packages marked 400, 500 or 600, according to the number in each package; and the name of the packer is put on the package, so that the purchaser knows against whom he has recourse.

On section 10,

Mr. CLANCY. I think the House should have some expression from the Minister of Agriculture as to how far he intends to saddle inspectors upon the public service. It seems to me that the inspection will be a farce unless we have some defined limits placed upon it; for it would be utterly impossible to warrant the expense of a complete inspection in a matter of this kind. I would like the minister to state how many inspectors he intends to appoint, where they will be stationed, and generally what will be expected of them. The hon. gentleman increased his difficulties when he assented to the proposition made by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), namely, that all apples packed, whether for export or for domestic use, will come under the same rules and require the same inspection.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. While the Bill permits inspection, there is no expectation or intention that any attempt shall be made to inspect all the fruit packed for trade in Canada or for export. I have investigated that matter pretty fully, I have discussed it with exporters, shippers and fruit-growers in all parts of the country, and I believe it would be a physical impossibility for any number of inspectors who could be appointed by a government or called for by this House to accomplish that result. When a Bill of this kind becomes law, it will be necessary to appoint some inspector. Otherwise we would throw upon the purchaser the necessity for protecting himself. In the interior trade, he can do that very well. If a purchaser finds he is being defrauded, he can, under the provisions of this Act, attack the seller. But in the export trade the case is different, and in order to protect the good name of Canada and improve the reputation of our fruit abroad, I think we should have a few inspectors at the ports of export. This is purely a deterrent provision, and not one which we expect to be exercised in every instance or even in the majority of instances. But the shippers and packers will know that their goods are liable to be inspected at any time. It will be necessary to have

two or three men at Montreal, who will proceed against any shipper whom they may find violating this Act. In Nova Scotia it will also be necessary to have two or three inspectors. There is a large amount of fruit packed in the different parts of Ontario and Quebec which is shipped to Montreal. A good many packers would like to have their fruit inspected before shipping, so that it would not be opened at Montreal, and it may be necessary to have a certain number of men on call who could go to the warehouses of the packers and inspect the fruit and mark it before it leaves. I could not give the exact number of inspectors required, but I suppose there would be ten or a dozen appointed this coming fall, and if necessary to appoint more, they could be appointed later.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not see any objection to having inspectors at the points of shipment because we must protect the good name of Canada as far as possible, but I do see serious objection to appointing emergency inspectors—men who may be called on at any moment to inspect at the warehouses. To give any government the power of appointing as many inspectors as it chooses would be very dangerous and open to abuse. The hon. gentleman knows the pressure that will always be used by shippers and others, who will not want their fruit disturbed at Montreal, to have it inspected before shipment, and this will give ample opportunity for the exercise of favouritism.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). I do not see why inspectors should be appointed all over the Dominion. I would move that clause 10 be amended by adding thereto :

Inspectors may be appointed at the ports of export.

These words will begin the clause and the rest of the clause will be the same as in the Bill.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think that would work. The fruit-growers themselves are very earnestly requesting that all the inspection should not be done at the port of export. There is no danger that the large number of inspectors will be appointed which the hon. member for Bothwell seems to anticipate. It will be physically impossible to meet the view of all shippers, and therefore it is not at all likely that certain favoured ones will be picked out and be given the privilege of having their fruit inspected before shipment to the ports of export. At the same time, there is an internal trade to be more or less watched and guarded, though not to the same extent as the export trade. Further, if the inspectors are to do their work at the port of Montreal only, they cannot do it as effectively as they should. The hon. gentleman may not have been at the port of Montreal during the apple shipping season, but there are sometimes a hundred thousand barrels in the port being shipped and awaiting shipment. It would be quite impossible, under that condition of affairs for even three or four inspectors in the port to do their work in such a way as to be really deterrent to the packer. I think we must count upon occasionally dropping on a shipment of fruit elsewhere than in the port of shipment. And, if we have not inspectors available for that purpose, we would, to a certain extent, not fulfil the expectations of the shippers, the growers or the public.

Mr. MACLEAN. These inspectors are only to be temporarily employed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. During the fruit season, yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There are other ports besides Montreal, such as Halifax, St. John, Toronto and Niagara—for fruit goes by way of New York as well as by Montreal. Even though there were a hundred thousand barrels, additional inspectors could be appointed to meet the case. As to the terminal trade, if the barrels are marked falsely, the person who has them for sale is liable to a fine. Therefore, I cannot see the object of having inspectors in any other place than the points where the apples leave this country. If a Canadian has his barrels marked wrongly, he deserves to suffer the loss of freight or even to have the fruit confiscated at Montreal. The port of export, where the barrels are all collected, is the proper place for inspection, and I cannot see the object of having inspection elsewhere.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot accept the amendment, because I think it can only hamper the working of the Act. I think it is desirable and necessary to have inspectors available to do work at such points as may be desired.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How do you propose to pay the inspectors ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. By salary—monthly payments. As the inspection is permissive, I do not think it would be wise to have a fee, in fact, I think it would be impossible.

Amendment negatived.

On section 15,

Mr. GILMOUR. This section refers to an appeal from conviction under this Act. If, upon appeal, the apples were held during the consideration of the case, damage would naturally result. If the appeal should be sustained is there any provision for indemnifying the man who has thus suffered from damage ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not say whether it is usual for per-

ishable goods to be held during such a trial or not.

Mr. GILMOUR. But I would ask the minister to consider that point.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I should suppose that evidence would be taken as to the condition of the fruit and that evidence would have to be submitted on appeal. But, not being a lawyer I cannot give an opinion on such a matter.

On section 16,

Mr. CLANCY. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will not insist on this clause as it stands. If there is anything more dangerous than another, it is to encourage the class of men who live on blood-money. I am sure the Minister of Agriculture will see how a crop of abuses would arise if you offer inducement to men who inform for the money alone. In order to close the discussion, I move that all the words after the words 'be payable to His Majesty' be struck out, and that the clause should read this way: 'Any fine or penalty imposed under this Act shall, when recovered, be payable to His Majesty.' I am sure the Minister of Agriculture will concur in the statement that to encourage, in matters of that kind, persons to become informers by giving them one-half the fine, is a mistaken policy. The hon. gentleman will find that the Act will be better observed by making it a common interest, than to hold out inducements to a class of persons by offering them a share of the fine. Paying fines to any persons as informers is to my mind an unsound principle.

Mr. GILMOUR. I am in entire accord with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). It is the most objectionable clause in the whole Bill, and I hope the minister will see his way to amend it. I can imagine that much wrong will be done under this clause.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This clause is simply following the principle adopted in many other Acts. For instance, in the license law there is a clause of this kind, in the Scott Act there is a clause of this kind, in the law regarding the seizure of tobacco there is a clause of this kind, as well as in many other laws. I do not think it would be worth while now to change this principle, because it is an admitted principle in our legislation. It may have objectionable features, and in certain instances may be abused; still on the whole it has worked fairly well during a long term of jurisprudence.

Mr. CLANCY. The cases the hon. gentleman has cited are not parallel. The case regarding infractions of the revenue is entirely different. I could picture a man going about the country making case after case. The hon. gentleman knows that under the Scott Act and under our license system we have found the greatest evils arising from men endeavouring to make a living from fines. A class of professional informers has arisen that go about the country. If a man informs for the purpose of getting a fine he is not informing in the public interest, he is bound to hunt up and to trump up some charge for the purpose of making money out of it. I hope the hon. gentleman will not import that objectionable feature into his Bill. If he makes that law, he will find it one of the most objectionable laws that has ever been passed by this House. The Bill has been made wider by adopting the proposal of the hon. member for Provencher, and will expose the whole farming community of Canada to these penalties and to these penalty hunters.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) has pointed out section 25 of the General Inspection Act, which has been in existence for a great many years, over a hundred I think. It is an admitted principle of our jurisprudence.

Mr. CLANCY. I tell the hon. gentleman that when the proper stage arrives I shall divide the House on this feature of the Bill.

On section 3,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We will have to go back to section 3, which I was asked to allow to stand on Friday. My hon. friend from South Wentworth (Mr. Smith) requested me to make some modification in the definition of a closed package. After carefully considering the matter and discussing it with my officers, I have decided to propose this change in the lines of the hon. gentleman's request:

Closed package means a box or barrel, of which the contents cannot be seen or inspected when such package is closed.

It was not intended that this word 'closed package' should apply to small baskets used for selling small fruit, because they are really open packages in the sense that the cover is so easily removed.

Mr. WALLACE. What about a crate?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A crate, I think, would not be a closed package under the definition I have suggested. The hon. member for South Wentworth did not wish a crate to be included.

Section as amended, agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister, perhaps, has forgotten that section 2 has not been passed yet.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think there is no question about the date. I think it would be a great misfortune if we did not put the law into operation for the fruit season of the present year. I must ask that the clause be adopted.

Bill reported.

INLAND WATERS SEAMEN'S ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) moved second reading of Bill (No. 91) to amend the Inland Waters Seamen's Act.

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

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This Bill is one simply to define more accurately the expression 'Inland waters of Canada' which, as the statute now stands, are defined to be the inland waters above the harbour of Quebec. That has been found to be too vague. The intention is to make the definition embrace what are really the inland waters of Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It does not seem that it is quite definite enough in regard to the sea coast. For example, what would the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) think about the Bras d'Or lakes which are arms of the sea really ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are defined clearly in the main Act. There is no doubt about those.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What about the arms of the sea ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are all defined to be the sea coast.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the hon. gentleman the statute there which defines that ? I would like to see it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. BRITTON. While the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is looking that up, I would like to ask him what his views are on this point :

> The expression 'inland waters of Canada' includes all the rivers, lakes and other navigable waters within Canada.

Of course that implies that this section only includes the navigable rivers and lakes. Is that the meaning that the hon. minister puts upon it ? It would hardly be intended to apply to those inland waters and lakes that are now navigable.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Revised Statutes, chap. 75, which relates to the shipping of seamen on inland waters, defines inland waters in subsection f of section 2 as follows :

> The expression 'ship subject to the provisions of this Act' includes every ship registered in Canada propelled by steam and of more than twenty tons registered tonnage, or propelled otherwise than by steam and of more than fifty tons registered tonnage, and employed in navigating the inland waters of Canada above the harbour of Quebec.

Now, the question was, what were the inland waters above the harbour of Quebec ? Did they extend to the great lakes and rivers ? In order to relieve the ambiguity we define the words 'inland waters' to include all the——

> Rivers, lakes and other navigable waters within Canada, except salt water bays and gulfs on the sea coast, and includes the River St. Lawrence so far seaward as a line drawn from Cape Chatte on the south shore to Point des Monts on the north shore.

The reason that point was selected was, that in the reciprocity treaty between Great Britain and the United States, that was the point selected internationally as the mouth of the River St. Lawrence, and so we took that international definition as a reasonable one to import into this Bill, defining all within that point to be inland waters.

Mr. CALVIN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) if this makes any difference in the provisions or working of the Act relating to shipping through the St. Lawrence and on the great lakes ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It only makes clear that the upper waters of the great lakes are the inland waters of Canada, which was in doubt before.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There would be a question about the so-called lakes, Bras d'Or lakes, for instance, which are really arms of the sea. There might also be a question about arms of the sea on the coast of Nova Scotia. They might not technically be called bays or gulfs. Would it not be better to insert 'Salt water arms of the sea.'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I shall be glad to insert 'arms of the sea' if necessary.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

THE SAFETY OF SHIPS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved second reading of Bill (No. 92) further to amend the Act respecting the safety of ships.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time; and House resolved itself into committee thereon.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This Bill simply makes an

alteration in the present law to bring it into conformity with the British statute. I propose to re-enact the whole section, putting in the alteration which is confined to subsection d. Since the original Act was passed large steel steamships having much permanently covered in space have been introduced, and by our statute you are only allowed to place deals in this covered in space to a height of three feet from the deck, the rest of the space remaining vacant. By the Imperial law they are allowed to place a light class of goods in this space which is now left vacant according to our law. The shipping interests are under a disadvantage in this. They consider it is a serious grievance, and it is proposed to amend the Act by permitting the carriage in covered in spaces of :

Any deals, battens or other lightwood goods, of any description to a height not exceeding three feet above the deck in any space where the deck of such ship is closed in.

Mr. KAULBACH. This restricts them from filling in the remaining part of the space with deals.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It does and for this reason. I proposed to allow them to fill in all the covered in space with deals, but I found that would be worse than useless, because on their arrival in England the law was against that, and it would subject the owners to a fine of £200. I am sure the House will agree with me that it is better for us to conform with the English law. I corresponded with the British Board of Trade and urged them to allow the entire space to be filled up with deals, but they would not consent. As soon as they do so we will gladly follow their example.

Mr. KAULBACH. This does not interfere with the shipping of deals to South America or coast wise.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not alter the law in that respect at all. This refers simply to deals going to Great Britain.

Mr. CALVIN. Does it change the law as regards the three-feet limit on the open deck ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not in any respect.

Mr. CALVIN. Has the hon. minister any opinion on that point ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have a very strong opinion. After consulting with the trade and getting the opinion of the best expert officers, I came to the conclusion that it was safer in every respect to allow vessels to fill with deal flush to the bulwark. I urged that very strongly upon the board of trade in England, and the Hon. Mr. Dobell personally urged them to agree to that, but they did not see their way clear to do it, and therefore there is no use in our doing it. I pointed out to the board of trade the reasons why our shippers thought it would be better not to limit it to three feet from the deck, because a kind of well was formed in which the water moved backward and forward, whereas if the cargo was flush with the deck it would wash off. The English Board of Trade is very slow and conservative, and they did not see their way to adopt the suggestion. My hon. friend (Mr. Calvin) will see that it is absolutely essential we should bring our law into exact conformity with the English law.

Mr. CALVIN. I quite see that. I would like to read a statement I received from a firm of very long standing with regard to this matter. The letter is of considerable length, but I shall only read a short extract from it which is in line with what the hon. minister has said. It is from Messrs. Henry Fry & Co. of Quebec. They say :

Having been connected with the management of ships for over forty years, we are aware that when the deck-load law was inaugurated it principally applied to sailing vessels carrying such cargo on open decks; but we were always of opinion that limiting the deck-load to a height of three feet was a mistake, when connected with sailing vessels or steamers having bulwarks. These should be allowed to carry deck-load level with their rail, as this would constitute equal to a flush deck, over which the sea would readily pass, whereas with only three feet deck cargo, it is frequently below the level of rail and forms a well for the reception of seas, which float and dislodge the cargo at great risk of life and property.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I thoroughly agree with that, and in point of fact I drafted a Bill in that sense, and intimated to the Board of Trade of England that I wished to bring in a Bill in that sense; but they did not see their way to agree to it, and there is no use of our doing it until they do agree.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the word 'enacted' in the third line of section 1 must be meant for the word 'amended.' Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell me what his idea is of the office of these words in the section as it originally appears in the revised statutes : 'and during the voyage while within Canadian jurisdiction.' Taking these words in connection with the context, either I do not understand them, or else there should be a change.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course, I am not responsible for the phraseology; and, as the Act has been a long time on the statute-book, I did not care to amend it. The object is this. A vessel sailing from a port in Canada might have the cargo all right when she started; but before she left the jurisdiction of Canada, she might alter it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That was my own idea of the meaning, and it seemed to me that the word 'or' should be used instead of the word 'and.'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will be glad to accept those suggestions of the hon. gentleman.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think the word 'and' is correct.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Suppose a vessel started from Montreal all right, and put on some more cargo at Quebec. If the word 'and' was there, she would not necessarily break the law, because she did not do it from the port of starting. It seems to me that the word 'or' carries out the intention of the Act—that a vessel shall not do it either at the port from which she starts, or at any time after she starts and while she is in Canadian jurisdiction.

Mr. BARKER. I think the language is quite correct as it is. The intention of the section is, while a ship sailing from one place to another and while within Canadian jurisdiction. Therefore the word 'and' is the only proper word.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As there is a difference among lawyers, we will stand by the old law.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

INVESTIGATIONS INTO SHIPPING CASUALTIES.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved second reading of Bill (No. 93) respecting inquiries and investigations into shipping casualties.

He said: The object of this Bill is to meet a number of objections to the present system raised by the British government. At present the inquiries are undertaken at the request of merchants, shippers or others, and there are two kinds of inquiry. One is a preliminary inquiry to find out the cause of the disaster, and I do not propose to alter the character of that inquiry at all. Then a formal inquiry may be made, either after a preliminary inquiry or without one. In the old statute, the formal investigation is made at the instance of the Minister of Marine, who appoints a commissioner to investigate. The commissioner need not be a judicial officer, and generally is a sea captain supposed to be an expert on nautical matters. But it by no means follows that such an expert is a good judicial officer capable of holding legal investigation. Our law enables us to hold investigations into casualties and punish officers holding certificates who are found guilty of laches or neglect, whether they hold British or Canadian certificates. Such certificates may be taken from the officers convicted, either for a term or entirely cancelled. The construction placed on the old statute by the Department of Justice was that the reports of these investigations could be revised on appeal by the Minister of Marine himself, who might lengthen the term of suspension of the certificate or entirely cancel the certificate. The British government, however, held that the Minister of Marine here had no power to cancel any certificate granted to a British officer. My predecessor and myself have always exercised that power and consequently there was a clash of jurisdiction. After a good deal of correspondence, I advised my colleagues that I thought it better to yield to the representations of the British government and not attempt to cancel the certificate of a British officer, even though the casualty happened to the ship in Canadian waters. An investigation is held by an officer appointed by us, and the evidence and the report of that officer are forwarded to the British Board of Trade.

Mr. MACLEAN. Would the British authorities try and punish a Canadian captain for a casualty that happened in British waters?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They claim jurisdiction in that regard over all officers.

Mr. MACLEAN. There ought to be reciprocity.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are some things you cannot help. For instance, in the case of a ship lost in the Bay of Fundy, I cancelled, sitting as a court of appeal, the certificate of the captain, in conformity with the opinion of the Minister of Justice that I had the power to do so. But the British Crown officers held I had not.

Mr. MACLEAN. Could you not argue that before the Privy Council?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not see how I could. They contended strongly that our investigations should be made to partake of a judicial character the same as the British investigation, and where a man's position was at stake, they should be held as far as possible by a judicial officer. I propose to make a change in the selection of persons to hold such investigation by declaring that 'The minister may appoint any officer of the government of Canada, or any judge of the county court, or any judge of the superior court of the province of Quebec, or any stipendiary magistrate, to be a commissioner for the purpose of such investigation, and such commissioner shall be deemed a court for such purpose.' Along with the commissioner two nautical experts will be appointed to advise him. I will

point out in each section where the amendments are made. This Bill is the outcome of consultation with the British Board of Trade and the Department of Justice. It is satisfactory to the British Board of Trade and approved by the Department of Justice; and sections are inserted to provide for the recovery of penalties under the code. With this general information I would suggest that we go through the sections in committee, and as we come to each one, I will explain what the proposed changes are.

Mr. KAULBACH. Should not the cancellation of a master's certificate here be under the jurisdiction or judgment of a nautical expert instead of the department itself ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would suggest that we should deal with that point in committee. I can explain more fully when we come to the section covering that point.

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

On section 1,

Mr. GOURLEY. Just one question, and if that is all right, I have no objection to the Bill. Supposing that we conform to the English practice and procedure, and appoint a judicial officer, will they acknowledge our right to cancel their certificates or not ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. I do not like the indication from what the minister has said that he has surrendered a Canadian right without making a fight for it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I did not.

Mr. MACLEAN. Practicaly, that is what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. COWAN. Wrong again.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, I am not wrong. The hon. minister has surrendered a Canadian right without any proper effort to maintain it. This government has claimed that on several occasions they have vindicated Canadian rights, and they have claimed credit for it. Here is a very important matter affecting our shipping. I have known, in an off-hand kind of way, that the British authorities claimed jurisdiction over our shipping, and that we had not full control of it. I should be sorry if that is the case. But I would not be a party to surrendering any right possessed by Canada without fighting to the last ditch to retain it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN. The Solicitor General evidently approves what I say. I have been trying to find out in what respect we come under their jurisdiction and law and are not in supreme control of our own affairs. If this is one of those cases, I, as a Canadian, object to a surrender being made until after every means has been exhausted to vindicate our rights in this matter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is merely a construction of the old statute. We held that that statute gave the minister power to deal with matter coming on appeal to him and relating to the certificates of the officers of vessels on which a casuality has occurred, and to deal with the officer holding a British certificate as well as with the officer holding a Canadian certificate. The Department of Justice held the view held by myself and my predecessor. But the Board of Trade of Great Britain decided that they would not hold our Act valid, and the British Crown law officers supported them in that. So, what could I do ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Has Canada no head of appeal from an arbitrary action of the British Board of Trade ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not suppose that we were desirous of doing it.

Mr. MACLEAN. We do not want to surrender anything.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But here is the position—we grant certificates to officers on ships, as captains, as first officers, second officers and engineers. Nobody questions our right to cancel the certificate of any officer holding our certificate who commits an offence or is guilty of negligence. But if a British officer comes here and a casualty occurs to his ship, our statutes allows us to hold an investigation. We hold it, the court recommend that the captain's certificate be cancelled. Then you must send the evidence home, with a report of the court, and they say : If we concur in it, we will cancel the certificate.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Is not that reasonable ?

Mr. MACLEAN. But take the converse of that. Suppose a Canadian officer is sailing in British waters and an accident happened, and the matter is tried by the officers of the British Admiralty—do they take away his certificate ? Or do they send back their finding for the confirmation or revision of the minister—have they admitted that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then, they have put Canada in an inferior position.

Mr. COWAN. What clause is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) discussing ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I am discussing the principle of the Bill.

Mr. COWAN. I rise to a point of order—no clause of the Bill has been read.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am perfectly in order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COWAN. I want a ruling on that point.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Flint). I think that on the first clause the hon. gentleman can discuss that.

Mr. MACLEAN. From what I gathered from the hon. minister's statement a Canadian officer can be disciplined in British waters, but a British officer cannot be disciplined in Canadian waters. Is that a fact or not ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to point out to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that it would be well to make subsection e conform to the definition of 'inland waters' in the Bill already passed, would it not ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

On section 2,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me that the word 'coast' should be defined in a manner to conform to the Act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The phraseology is not the same, and if the hon. gentleman thinks we have expressions that are not equivalent we may change it. But I think the expression will be found all right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was going to suggest that the word should be added 'as defined by——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would rather make it complete in that Act. The question is : Have we embraced in the two expressions 'inland waters' and 'coast' all the waters in which a casualty might take place.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think it is important only except for conformity.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am willing to consider any suggestion, but it struck me that the two definitions in the Bill covered all that was necessary :

(e) The expression 'inland waters' includes all the rivers, lakes and other navigable waters within Canada ;

(f) The expression 'coasts' includes the sea coast and the salt water bays, gulfs and harbours on the sea coast.

On section 3,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In this section the new part is in subsections e and f.

(e) When any loss of life occurs by reason of any casualty happening to or on board any boat belonging to a fishing or other vessel registered in Canada;

(f) When any British ship is lost or supposed to have been lost and any evidence is obtainable in Canada as to the circumstances under which she proceeded to sea or was last heard of.

It does not matter where the casualty has occurred, if the evidence is obtainable in Canada by the Merchant's Shipping Act of 1894, they have power to investigate. But they suggest that we should take it up here, the evidence being obtainable here.

Mr. CALVIN. I would like to know whether, in this list of casualties is included damage to the canals of the Dominion. I think that the method employed at present of dealing with that sort of damage is most unfair to those using the canals. Now, the canals are built by the government. They may be good canals like the Soulanges canal, which was built by our friend Mr. Munro, or it may be a work with glaring defects, such as the Welland canal. I need not go into particulars, they may be shown by competent men who are using the canals. That is the condition as regards the construction of the works. Now as to the craft that use them. A steamer that goes through that canal, before she is allowed to turn a wheel, must have her hull inspected and her machinery inspected, and the same government that builds those canals makes her owners pay for the inspection. Then before she is allowed to proceed on her voyage she must be manned by a captain who has to receive and pay for a certificate of competency from this government, by a mate, who likewise has to obtain a certificate from the government and to pay for it, by an engineer and an assistant engineer who likewise have to receive certificates from the government and to pay for them; though indirectly it is, the owner of the vessel that has to pay for all that expense. The employees of the canal are the servants of the government. I do not know that they have to pass any examination or to pay any fee before they are appointed, I do not think they do. Those are the circumstances. Now a vessel damages a lock, or bridge, or some other portion of the government's property in the canal, the owner of that vessel is obliged to pay every dollar of expense at such prices as the government may name. He has nothing to do with the naming of the prices, he cannot go on and repair the work himself. He has to pay the government for every dollar of that work at their own prices, and without having an investigation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I dare say the hon. gentleman may have some ground of complaint as to the stringency of the law in that respect; but the present Act does not touch those cases at all.

Mr. CALVIN. It ought to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That may be, but it does not come within the scope of the Marine Inquiries Act at all. The hon. gentleman speaks of a case where a ship going through the canal does some damage. I do not know what takes place there. An investigation is held in a court of law, I suppose. That does not come up here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose if a vessel happened to be damaged in passing through the canal, that would be another thing.

On section 8,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Under the old law you could appoint any commissioner or body corporate to hold an investigation. Now the minister may appoint any officer of the government of Canada, or any judge of the county court, or any judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec, or any stipendiary magistrate, to be commissioner. The object is to make the commissioner a judicial officer instead of a merely nautical expert. Subsection 2 of this section is new. It has been suggested by the Board of Trade so as to be in accord with the Merchant's Shipping Act. These are the exact words of the Merchant's Shipping Act which they advise us to incorporate in our own.

Mr. BARKER. The minister has omitted the new offence that he has put in section 8, that is, 'or has failed to render assistance and to give information.' That is not carried into subsection 2.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Subsection 1 gives authority to the minister to authorize this investigation to be held where he believes that any master, mate or engineer is from incompetency or misconduct unfit to discharge his duties, or has failed to render assistance, and to give any information in case of collision. Then the court so appointed is authorized to hold a formal investigation.

Mr. BARKER. In section 2 is there any power to inquire into a failure to render assistance and to give information ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In order to make it conform with section 1, it would be better to add the words 'where the minister has reason to believe.'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Subsection (e) meets the first suggestion my hon. friend made as to failing to render assistance or to give information. The first part of the section states the conditions under which you are authorized to initiate the inquiry, where you have reason to believe so and so. The other part follows the Merchant's Shipping Act, I would not like to alter that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not see why the hon. minister uses the same expression in one case and an entirely different expression in another case. In subsection 2 you say :

> A court so appointed as aforesaid is authorized to hold a formal investigation.

Where a master has been charged with incompetency or misconduct. When you come down to subsections d and e you do not say where he is charged, but you say where he 'fails.' You do not say where he is charged with failing, but where he does fail.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would suggest that I do not think this is so important as to desire a change, inasmuch as it follows the exact phraseology of the British Act.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to understand from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, what would be the meaning of the word 'incompetency.' For instance, if an engineer were to make a mistake in the bell and if the vessel ran ashore that would be incompetency and his certificate would be taken away. Am I right in that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would not like to enter upon a judicial interpretation of these words. The object of the Bill is to appoint a judicial officer to listen to the evidence and to decide such points after being advised by two experts.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Would the provisions of the Bill not apply to an accident in a canal as well as to one elsewhere ? If the engineer takes the wrong bell and an accident happens in a canal, or, if the captain is not doing his duty, or is under the influence of liquor, and an accident happens in the Welland, or in some other canal, would there be an investigation held and the certificate of the engineer or captain be taken away ? Why should the Bill not apply to this case ? You have never had any investigation yet into any accident that has happened on the Welland canal, and there are more accidents happening in the Welland canal than on any of the inland waters.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It may be a subject-matter deserving of consideration whether these merchant shipping inquiries should not apply to the navigation of the canals as well as to the navigable waters of Canada. So far it has not been deemed advisable to apply the provisions of the law to the canals. However, I shall take note of what the hon. gentleman suggests and talk it over with my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair).

Mr. REID (Grenville). If these accidents were included it would perhaps make——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Perhaps it might get us into more difficulties ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). No, no—it might make captains more careful, and in addition it would result in putting the blame where it really belongs.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will consider that point.

Mr. KAULBACH. The owners of ships are placed in a peculiar position. When an investigation takes place there should be a marine expert appointed who is thoroughly versed in marine matters, and in that way the owner of the ship would have justice which he would not have otherwise.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach) will wait until the next section is read he will see that the point which he mentions is covered.

On section 9,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is a new section taken from the Imperial Act, and it meets the views of my hon. friend, that there should be skilled assessors to advise the court.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are these sections from the Merchant's Shipping Act, 1894 ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

On section 10,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The first part of section 10, down to line 21, ending with the word 'publicity,' is old, and the words added are new :

And such court shall have all the powers conferred by section 478 of the (Imperial) Merchant's Shipping Act, 1894, on any court authorized by the legislature of any British possession to make inquiries as to shipwrecks or other casualties affecting ships or as to charges of incompetency or misconduct on the part of masters, mates or engineers of ships.

Subsection 4, relating to penalties is new. The others are old.

On section 12,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is new and in conformity with the Merchant's Shipping Act, 1894.

On section 13,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is based on the Merchant's Shipping Act, 1894, and is at the suggestion of the Imperial Board of Trade.

On section 14,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is suggested by the board of trade and is in conformity with the Merchant's Shipping Act, 1894.

On section 15,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the same.

On section 16,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is from the Merchant's Shipping Act, 1894.

On section 17,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Section 17 is old, excepting the three lines relating to the penalties which are new.

On section 18,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is substantially the old law, but more concisely stated. There is really no change. That has reference to cancelling or suspending the certificate. Complaints were made by the captains, mates and others implicated that when the court held an investigation it did not render its decision in open court but perhaps delivered it in Halifax or some other place a fortnight afterwards. The captain or mate was not present and had no means of knowing what the decision was. It is claimed that the decision should be rendered in open court so that they may know what the decision is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where a certificate has been issued by the Dominion of Canada it may be dealt with by the minister, where it has been issued by the board of trade, it has to be forwarded with a report of the evidence to the board of trade, and where it has been issued by any British possession other than Canada it shall be sent to the Governor of such British possession. I suppose that other British possessions have similar enactments. What is the practice between ourselves and other British possessions in respect to the cancellation of such certificates ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Other British possesions are governed by the provisions of the Imperial Act. That is most of them are—the Crown colonies. I do not remember that we have ever had any cases from Australia or the Cape. The British government will not accept our Canadian certificates unless we give them control over them, and as it is of greater importance that our certificates should be accepted than that we should retain exclusive control, we give them control.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The information I desire to obtain is : When an inquiry of this kind takes place in Australia for instance, does Australia send the evidence to the Governor General of Canada to be dealt

with by this government, or does Australia send it to the Imperial government to be dealt with by them? I am speaking of course of a certificate granted by this government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Magee tells me that he is not able to state positively what the practice is in Australia, but he believes from the correspondence that he has had with the Imperial Board of Trade that that is the form of practice laid down here. They would send it to us. As stated in the correspondence that is the practice.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I agree entirely with the hon. gentleman that it is most desirable for us to have our certificates recognized by the board of trade, but I would like to know, if, in such a case, the evidence would be sent here to be dealt with by us instead of to the Imperial government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is believed by my officers to be the practice and it is so stated in the correspondence with the Imperial government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give us that information at a later stage.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I shall look into it.

Mr. MACLEAN. And insist on our rights.

On section 24,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This section was suggested by the board of trade. It is copied from the Imperial statute.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is not the section rather too comprehensive in its terms. An investigation may be commenced in the United Kingdom and may prove to be absolutely inoperative, because the witnesses may have come to Canada. Under this section you could not proceed with the inquiry in Canada.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not like to interfere with the phraseology of the Merchant's Shipping Act of which this is an exact copy.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me to be very loosely drawn.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Do you mean the language of the Imperial Act?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, I do, because it seems to preclude an inquiry in Canada in the case I suggested, and where it may be proper to hold an inquiry. Take the case of a steamer which sinks another steamer and afterwards arrives in Great Britain. She then leaves the United Kingdom and she comes to Canada. It might be possible to hold this inquiry in Canada as the witnesses are here, but this section would preclude that. The hon. gentleman will remember the case of the steamer La Bourgogne. She was sunk by another steamer, which came to Halifax. An inquiry was directed by the hon. gentleman. If we had to depend, as we might have had to depend upon the evidence of the sailors who were saved from that ship, no inquiry could have been held in Canada, but as it turned out there were persons within Canada who belonged to the other colliding ship, which had not been sunk. That might happen in the United Kingdom. It seems to me that we should have an opportunity to hold the inquiry here.

Mr. GOURLEY. I should like to agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax), but I think he misconceives the force of the word 'seized.' It means that if the courts in England becomes possessed of the case they hold it. If they abandon it, any other jurisdiction can assume it. The first magistrate who is seized with the jurisdiction in a criminal case excludes all others, but in case he abandons it all other jurisdictions are open to deal with. It is the same in this?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gourley) is right. The idea is to prevent two conflicting inquiries going on at the same time. What my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) would suggest is: to add the words 'unless and until such investigation or inquiry in the United Kingdom has been abandoned or proved inoperative.'

Mr. GOURLEY. That is the common law.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think the section means that without some such words as the minister suggests.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The section might be allowed to pass as it is now and before the third reading we will consider it.

Mr. BRITTON. Is it conceded that in the case of a vessel damaged in a canal it may properly be a case of inquiry? That is rather important. In many cases, while the lock or the wall of the canal has been damaged the vessel herself has been very seriously damaged, and in one case that I know of, there was loss of life. These two points make it a casualty within the meaning of the Act; and in that case an inquiry should be made.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the question—whether a canal is a navigable water within the meaning of the Act?

Mr. BRITTON. I understand that a canal is a navigable water. A vessel may be damaged in a canal, and in one case there was loss of life resulting from a collision.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I see no reason why the Act should not apply in such a case.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would be inclined to think that if a vessel took ground in a canal, this Act would apply. I think it would also apply if she struck the side of a canal, and were damaged in that way.

Bill reported.

CANADA EVIDENCE ACT.

Bill (No. 66) further to amend the Canada Evidence Act, 1893 (the Solicitor General), read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the proviso in this section that the answer of a witness may not be used against him ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The statute now makes provision that the answer of a witness shall not be available against him in inquiries over which this parliament has jurisdiction. The intention is to extend this proviso to inquiries under a statute of a province.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should think it a very proper amendment.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business may we expect to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There may be a few of the Bills on the Order paper taken first, after which we will go into supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What supply ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Public Works, if my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is well enough, as he is to-day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And if not. what ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If he is not well, we will go on with justice.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 2, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENTS.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 115) to amend the General Inspection Act. He said : There are two changes which I propose to make in the present Act. They are suggested, or rather, recommended by the Winnipeg Grain and Produce Exchange, with the view of bringing the grades more within the composition of those of Manitoba and Dakota.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CULLING OF LUMBER AND INSPECTION OF STAPLES.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 116) respecting the culling of lumber and the inspection of staples. He said : This measure contains no new enactment. Its object is to transfer the inspection to the Department of Trade and Commerce by a separate Act. Inspection which is established for the protection of the public and for the security of trade, has plainly nothing to do with the collection of the revenue, and should be under the supervision of the Department of Commerce.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PACKING OR SALE OF STAPLE COMMODITIES.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 117) respecting the packing or sale of certain staple commodities. He said : This measure contains no new enactment. Its object is to remove from the Weights and Measures Act a number of amendments which should not have been incorporated therein, and which, in fact, have nothing to do with the Weights and Measures Act and the administration thereof. As originally drafted, the Weights and Measures Act was fairly scientific and clear. The amendments now eliminated rendered it unscientific and self-contradictory. All these amendments, which deal severally with the sale of cereals, hay, fruit, eggs, salt, binder twine, soft coal, &c., are incorporated in the present Act.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 47) to amend the Act to restrict

the importation and employment of aliens. He said : There are three principal ideas in this amendment which I now offer to the House. The first is in connection with the penalties. By the Act of 1897 it is made an offence to import alien labour from a foreign country, practically from the United States, under contract. The penalty attached to this offence is $1,000, neither more nor less. There was no elasticity in the penalty, and if a party was convicted under the Act, the judge had no option but to impose a penalty of $1,000. This has been found in practice to be inconvenient, and not unnaturally, because it has been found better in all matters of this kind to leave some discretion to the judge and to graduate the penalty to the nature and character of the offence. So the first object we have is to modify that penalty and to make it not more than $1,000, but not less than $50, to give a margin to the judge to impose a penalty at his discretion from $50 up to $1,000. The second point relates to the recovery of this penalty. Under the law passed in 1897 no suits can be brought for the recovery of this penalty, or practically, for the enforcement of the Act, except upon the authority of the Minister of Justice, or the Attorney General of Canada. In practice it has been found very inconvenient, and after a good deal of observation and consideration of this subject, it was thought advisable to amend the law in this particular, that suits could be authorized, not by the Attorney General of Canada, but by the Attorney General of any province in which the offence is committed, or by a judge of a court which has jurisdiction in the matter.

Mr. WALLACE. Not by the Minister of Justice at all ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, only on the authority, either of the Attorney General of a province or of a judge of a court which has jurisdiction in the matter. The third amendment is an addition of a pretty sweeping character, but which we thought advisable to bring to the attention of the House. It is to prevent employers of labour from advertising for labour in the United States so as to be able at any moment to flood the labour market with importations from the neighbouring country. Since this measure has been introduced representations have been made to the government by several manufacturers and employers of labour generally, to the effect that this clause is too drastic, that some exception should be made, and that the employer should be permitted in certain cases to import labour from the United States, that is, labour of a certain kind which cannot be found here, special labour, or labour of a very high class, and even sometimes when there is a scarcity of that kind of labour in Canada. We have had conferences with the labour organizations and I must say that we have found them very reasonable. So far as I understand them, and I think that I do understand them, they have no objection whatever that there should be a provision in the Bill introduced so as to make it possible for an employer in Canada, if he cannot get the kind of labour he must have in this country, to bring it from a foreign country, or from the United States, without any violation of the Act, but, they would insist, and this is a proposition which I think is perfectly reasonable, that the Act should be so framed, so construed and so interpreted, as to make it impossible, when there is a dispute between employers of labour and their employees, when there is a strike on, for instance, or any difficulty of that kind, to advertise in the United States and thereby get a supply of labour for the market here while the dispute is going on. That is a position which, I think, is very reasonable. I understand that some amendment may be proposed to the last clause of the Bill when the Bill comes before the committee. Of course, the government would be prepared to consider any such amendment as may be offered. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

On section 1,

Mr. SPROULE. If this clause is not amended will it permit what the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says he desires to leave within the provisions of the law, that is to leave it open to any person to bring in labour of a technical sort, persons specially fitted for doing some particular kind of work, fitting up machinery, or running certain kinds of machinery ? If this clause is left as it is, the importation of labour of any kind will be prohibited. I take it that if this clause is left as it is and if a new clause is put in, it would be in conflict with this one.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Chairman, there may be something in the objection of the hon. member for East Gray (Mr. Sproule). If that clause is allowed to stand we may come back to it when we have passed the other sections of the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Chairman, perhaps the right hon. Prime Minister would state the principle upon which he leaves the question of taking action under this Act to the Attorneys General of the different provinces. I do not quite see the principle of that myself inasmuch as the provincial government, or the Attorney General, as the executive law officer, may entertain entirely different views from those of this government in respect to the enforcement of this statute. It is true that it does throw the responsibility on the Attorney General of the province, but I would rather be inclined to think that a responsibility of that kind which deals, to a certain extent, with matters of an international import, in so far as it is confided to an Attorney General in this country, should rather be confided to the

Attorney General of Canada. It is with this government that responsibility of that kind usually rests. It seems to me that it is with the Attorney General of this government that such responsibility should rest if it is to be committed to an officer of that kind at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. The criticism of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) would not, I think, apply. Of course, the principle of our confederation is that the administration of justice lies with the provinces. We pass all criminal laws; that is our jurisdiction, but the application of these laws is within the jurisdiction of the provinces and it is the Attorney General of every province who has to enforce them. When, in 1897, we took the power to ourselves to authorize the enforcement of the Act it was in derogation of the well-known principle which pervades our whole system. We are going back to it now. I see the force of the hon. gentleman's contention that if the troubles which are contemplated are of an international character it should be preferable to leave the law as it is and that the discretion which is vested in an officer of the law should be vested in the Attorney General of Canada rather than in the Attorneys General of the provinces. We have considered all that, but since we propose to make it an offence to import under contract alien labour, we have thought, after the experience we have had, that we had better leave the administration, as far as possible, with the officers of the provinces rather than with the Attorney General of Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as the remarks of the right hon. gentleman are concerned, it seems to me that in respect to the considerations which I have mentioned, the law should be left to its operation without the intervention of the Attorney General or any one else. If certain responsibilities are to be thrown, in the first place, upon the Attorney General, it seems to me, notwithstanding what the right hon. gentleman says, that the Attorney General of Canada is the one who should take that responsibility and not the Attorney General of any province. However, I will not take up any more time with that. There is another matter in connection with this section which I would like to mention. Proceedings can be taken under this section not only with the written consent of the Attorney General of the province, but with the written consent of any judge of the court in which the proposed action as to the penalty is intended to be brought. The penalty is a sum of not less than $50, and not more than $1,000. Has the right hon. gentleman considered the advisability of a proceeding of this kind being brought before two justices of the peace or the small debt courts in the different provinces? It is thought that questions involving responsibility such as I have mentioned may arise in connection with the enforcement of this Act, and it seems to me that it would be better to confer this jurisdiction upon courts of a higher jurisdiction such as the county court or the Supreme Court of the different provinces. To allow proceedings of this kind to be taken before a small debts court or before two justices of the peace will not give us very much safeguard in the way of responsibility, in some cases at least. If it is the intention of the right hon. gentleman to create by this enactment some safeguard against the enforcement of the Act it seems to me that it might very well merit the attention of the First Minister and his government, as to whether he has got the proper courts for enforcing the provisions of this statute.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no departure from the Act of 1897, so far as the court is concerned.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman will remember that then the proceeding could not be taken except by the consent of the Attorney General of Canada.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, but the consent of the Attorney General of Canada had nothing to do with the competence of the court.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am afraid I have not made myself clear. The right hon. gentleman is transferring from the Attorney General of Canada in the first place, to the Attorney General of a province; or, in the alternative to a judge of one of these courts, the responsibility of saying that this Act should be enforced. If that responsibility amounts to anything, I should think it might be better to place it upon the Superior Court instead of upon a small debts court, or upon two justices of the peace.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think the question arises at all. It is a debt of $1,000 which has to be recovered, and, therefore, in most of the provinces it is a matter for the Superior Courts and not for the justices of the peace.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps my right hon. friend has considered it more carefully than I have, but, it seems to me possible that an action might be brought to claim the minimum penalty of $50.

The PRIME MINISTER. The penalty of $1,000 is the maximum, and as the discretion as to the amount is with the judge, a party would have to sue in a court of jurisdiction for $1,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it the intention that any one who desires to enforce the provisions of the Act would have to go to the Attorney General of the province, or to a judge of the Superior Court?

The PRIME MINISTER. A court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. CLARKE. What would be a court of competent jurisdiction within the meaning of this section ?

The PRIME MINISTER. A court of competent jurisdiction is a court that has power to try an action for $1,000.

Mr. CLARKE. That would be a Superior Court.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. In Ontario the county court would have jurisdiction for $200. Now, if you sue for $1,000, and not recover that amount, you would be liable for all the costs, and you would, therefore, run quite a risk. I suppose the intention is that the Act should be enforced, and this would not be a very good means. In Ontario, if you sue in the Superior Court, and do not recover more than the jurisdiction of the inferior court, you have to pay the extra costs unless the judge certified, which he would not be likely to do in this case. It seems to me that this section is very confused. It is not likely any one would seek to enforce the law if he incurred the risk of having to pay the costs of a Superior Court action, when he failed to recover the full amount.

Mr. SPROULE. You put the onus on the party who enforces the Act of proving a prima facie case before the Attorney General, or before some judge, instead of leaving it open to any one to make an allegation on his own affidavit and set the machinery in motion. I think the latter course is the one which should be allowed. It seems to me that the law is just as objectionable now as it was before. Under the Act of 1897, you had to apply to the Attorney General of Canada, and because of the red tape necessary, people did not take advantage of the law. I do not think that the amendment renders the Act any more easy to work.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The question is very clear to my mind. For every violation of this Act, the person who violates it is liable to pay a sum not less than $50 and not more than $1,000. That necessarily confers exclusive jurisdiction upon those courts which are competent to try cases for $1,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Why ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Because the limit of the forfeit is $1,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Suppose the man chooses to sue for $50, surely that action could be tried before the circuit court in the province of Quebec ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If he did, then I think his action would be dismissed on demurrer.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not think so.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend has evidently not read the statute.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes, I have.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The forfeiture is a sum not exceeding $1,000, and the judge trying the case can fix any amount between that and $50.

Mr. CASGRAIN. This section has evidently not been drafted with the ordinary care which the government usually exercises in drafting its measures. In chapter 11, section 3, which it is sought to amend, there could be no doubt at all, because the penalty was fixed at $1,000, and, therefore, within the jurisdiction of the Superior Court in the province of Quebec, and, I fancy, the Superior Courts of the other provinces. But, in the section which we are now discussing, you say, in so many words, that the prosecutor can sue for $1,000, or for any less sum down to $50. It is not essential to the putting of the law in motion that one should sue for the full penalty. If a person thinks he is aggrieved only to a certain extent, and he does not want to take upon himself the risk of paying heavy costs in a court of superior jurisdiction, he will simply take an action for a part of the penalty as the statute authorizes him, and it may be for $50. I think the Solicitor General is a little in error when he says that upon demurrer such an action taken in the circuit court in the province of Quebec would be dismissed. The informer is dominus litius. I cannot see any reason why it would not be competent for him to take recourse in a court which he thought fit to take his action before, and the jurisdiction of that court would be determined by the amount for which he would sue. The Solicitor General knows very well that in a great many instances the whole penalty is not sued for. Under divers other laws, only a part of the penalty is sued for, because the parties who sue under these laws do not want to incur the risk of heavy costs in a court of superior jurisdiction. It seems to me it would be making the law much clearer if it were said in section 1 : That the court in which this action would be brought would be a court of superior jurisdiction, or, on the other hand, you could determine the jurisdiction of the court by the amount which is sued for.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The informer is never dominus litus. The informer had never absolute control over the penalty. All the informer can do is to move the court in a particular direction, and then the court has control over the whole issue between the parties, and the court determines whether or not the penalty shall be $1,000, or any sum down to $50. You cannot separate the penalties. You have simply to do that which the statute em-

powers you to do, and all the informer has to do is to move the court.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the learned Solicitor General, though he is usually right, is not right in this case. He overlooks the fact that the penalty is to be sued for as a private debt. It is not a prosecution on the part of any person acting for the Crown.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Will my hon. friend tell me how he would distinguish between a forfeiture and a penalty ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what I am saying I do not require to make any distinction between them. If this were a proceeding by any person acting for the Crown, I would agree with the hon. Solicitor General, but it is not so. As my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) says, in such a case the person who brings the suit is dominus litius, and it is competent for him to bring an action for the sum of $50. He need not in his action demand more than the smallest penalty, and, if so, I venture to think that the inferior courts to which I have referred would have jurisdiction. But why is it necessary to waste time over this ? We all agree as to what we want, and why not amend the statute and say that any court which has jurisdiction to the extent of $1,000 shall have jurisdiction in this case ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Will my hon. friend allow me to draw his attention to the fact that the person who is to receive the proceeds of the judgment is the Receiver General, and section 7 provides that the Receiver General may pay to any informer a certain share of the penalty, not exceeding 50 per cent ; showing that the informer has absolutely no interest in the matter beyond setting the law in motion. The debt is due to the Receiver General and may be recovered as a result of an action instituted by the informer.

Mr. MONK. The informer is liable for the costs.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. How far would he be liable for the costs in view of the preliminary proceedings which he would be obliged to adopt, such as getting the consent of the judge or the Attorney General, and in view of the fact that the proceeds of the judgment go to the Receiver General ?

Mr. MONK. Surely he would be liable if after evidence adduced the action were dismissed, even if it were taken with the consent of the Attorney General.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What the Solicitor General has suggested is only another illustration of what my hon. friend from Montmorency stated, that this statute was drafted with an absolute disregard of what was the intention at first. It is true, the language which the Solicitor General refers to is here, but there is not the slightest machinery in the statute for carrying it out. It could be carried out by the court directing that the proceeds of the judgment should be paid, not to the informer, but to the Receiver General of Canada ; but no person who is a party to the suit has the slightest control over the suit in the way the section is drafted at present. This incongruity has arisen by reason of the fact that the language which was applicable when the Attorney General of Canada was to bring the action has been left in the statute after it was amended to enable a private individual to bring the action. It is an illustration that the original object of the statute was overlooked when this amendment was made.

Mr. CLARKE. If it is not intended that this amended Alien Labour law shall be just as dead a letter as the one it proposes to amend, it will have to be altered. Just imagine two or three persons who feel aggrieved by reason of being thrown out of employment in consequence of the employment of aliens to take their places, having to go before a judge and get his written consent before they can take any action. The proceeding is too cumbrous and expensive. What is required in the province of Ontario, if the Act is to be worth the paper it is written on, is a more simple and convenient machinery for enforcing it. I would suggest that in cities and towns where there are police magistrates, it should be sufficient for those who feel aggrieved to go before the police magistrate and lay an information, upon which the law would be put in motion by the intervention of the County Crown Attorney or other proper officer. That would be a more simple, efficient and less expensive method than the one under discussion. I appeal to the Prime Minister to take this into consideration, because if the law passes in its present shape, it will be practically a dead letter.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if, when the amendments now proposed are adopted, the Alien Labour law will be a duplicate of the American law ; because he and the House will remember that he stated that if Canada passed an Alien Labour law, it should be word for word and line for line a copy of the American law. I ask him whether that will be the case, and whether it will be as workable as the American law ; because, as the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) says, the law that has been adopted has been unworkable, and will continue to be so if it is left simply to the option of the government to enforce it. Unless power is given to any person who feels himself aggrieved to go before a police magistrate

and set the law in motion, as the American law is put in motion by a private individual, it will to my mind be ineffective and unworkable.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would suggest to my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) that it is not desirable to bring the machinery for putting this law into operation down to such a point that ordinary magistrates can initiate proceedings.

Mr. CLARKE. Why not ?

Mr. CHARLTON. My experience has been that the majority of these complaints are ill founded, vexatious and require careful scrutiny before proceedings are taken. I am cognizant of one case where a person who was establishing a manufacturing industry in Canada and was obliged to import skilled labour, had a complaint entered against him, and among the counts in that complaint was the charge made by one individual that he had applied for and been denied employment and an American had been taken on in his place. When the charge came to be examined, it was found that the individual who made the complaint was a drunkard whom nobody would employ, but whom this manufacturer had employed, and that it had taken three months to get him out of the boarding house where he had implanted himself. These proceedings are liable to be of a most vexatious and damaging character. It is in the interest of Canada to encourage the investment of money in the starting of enterprises and the immigration to Canada of a desirable class of operatives and skilled mechanics, and I do not know of any manufacturer who has attempted to import any labour except that which could not be obtained in Canada, because it would be cheaper for him to employ labour obtainable at home. This law is simply copying a piece of barbarism from the laws of the United States.

Mr. CLARKE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that a manufacturer was establishing a business in Canada and bringing skilled labour from the other side, and that the law was put in motion against the importation of such skilled labour.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am referring to a case of a general character, and am partly supposing a case that might arise and am instancing one that did arise.

Mr. CLARKE. Where is that ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not feel at liberty to mention where, but I state on my own responsibility as a member of this House that such a case did arise and the complaint was made by a common drunkard.

Mr. CLARKE. Under what statute did he lay the complaint ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Under the Alien Labour law, and the complaint was investigated by the Labour Bureau. When the hon. gentleman interrupted me I was proceeding to say that we are seeking, and will be more in the future, to transfer manufacturing operations from the United States to Canada and will find it necessary to bring a certain class of mechanics and skilled operatives to this country to put these enterprises into operation. But wherever this is done, that will lead to the employment of a large amount of Canadian labour of a character that could not be used in initiating the industry but could be utilized after the industry was started.

This law is a copy of one which is a disgrace to the statute-book of any civilized nation and is simply a piece of retaliation, and while I have no objection, for the sake of retaliation, to adopting such a law, yet I say the government are perfectly justified in hedging it with such safeguards as will make its operation not a hardship upon men investing money in Canada and increasing the business of the country. I do not believe that we would be justified in allowing proceedings to be initiated by a complaint made before a police magistrate or justice of the peace, but let some jurist who has sufficient knowledge to enable him to judge justly and correctly between the parties and act with prudence and sagacity, receive the complaint.

Mr. PUTTEE. My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) says that a law—which, by the way, has not been enforced—has proved vexatious and damaging to the parties interested. I am afraid that he takes very little note of the number of vexatious and damaging operations against the very men who are asking for the amendment of this law. During last session I presented over a score of petitions from all parts of Canada calling attention to the operations of some of the mine-owners of British Columbia and the vexatious and damaging practices resorted to in that country against the Canadian miner. I will just read the first clause in one of these petitions so as to give an idea of what was going on at the time :

That aliens and foreigners have within the two months last past been, and are now being, imported in large and small companies from the state of Minnesota to the Slocan district in British Columbia, to work in, and are being employed in, the mines in that district, to the exclusion of the citizens of this country, and that amongst such importations were the following : One on January 14th of twenty-eight men; January the 28th, of twenty-three men; February 4th, of six men; and February 18th, of twenty-five men, to the Payne mine near Slandon, B.C. On February 26th, twenty-five men having lost their way to the Slocan, arrived at Rossland, and none of said named company of men, and the majority of all other such aliens and foreigners, some being imported, cannot speak or read the language, and are, as a rule, undesirable citizens and inferior miners ; and that all of such importations have been, and are being induced, solicited and assisted by

mine-owners of the Slocan district, or their agents in this country and in different parts of the United States, with the definite purpose in view, as your petitioners do believe, or wrongfully forcing from this country the Canadian miners belonging to Canadian organized labour; and that 90 per cent of such miners belong to such organizations.

That is my position exactly on this Bill. If this were moved as an Alien Labour Bill pure and simple, if it were simply a copy of a barbarous law on the United States satutes, I would be against our going any further in this matter. But what is wanted is an anti-contract law, so that any of our own labourers will not be liable to be driven not only from employment but from the country by the importation of contract labour. And these contracts are entered into by foreigners to their own damage. These foreigners are brought in from Minnesota and the Dakotas and Montana, their railway fares are paid, and when they come into this country they are not given work but turned loose at the mouth of the mine, so that they will be forced in a few days to work for lower wages and our men must follow suit or be deprived of employment, and all this is done with the object of breaking up the organized labour unions throughout the country. In my opinion the anti-contract labour law should be put into operation in the ordinary way by the laying of information. I understand there is some force in the contention that it would not do to expose some industries to the caprices of irresponsible persons. But my idea of the amendment that is proposed in this Bill certainly was that it gave a choice of the courts to the person who wished to proceed, that the complaint had not to be laid in a court whose jurisdiction went up to $1,000, but that if it was desired to proceed in order to collect $50, the action could be taken in a minor court. If that is not so, it seems to me the object of this clause has been missed, and I think it should be re-drafted so as to meet that case.

Mr. W. F. McCREARY (Selkirk). I have before me the most recent edition of the United States Alien Labour law, that of 1900. I find that the clause in reference to utilizing the law is this :

That the circuit and district courts of the United States are hereby invested with full and concurrent jurisdiction of all causes, civil and criminal, arising under any of the provisions of this Act; and this Act shall go into effect on the 1st day of April, 1891.

I think that the machinery of our law should be made as simple as possible, if we are going to make the Act operative. I made a few remarks when this subject was up before, and I see that what I said was construed to mean that I thought this Act should remain as at present. My only object in speaking this afternoon is to make my position clear. If this law is put on the statute-book, I want to make it workable, so that the ordinary workingman can get the benefit of it. If a man is going to sue to recover a penalty, he should be allowed to go to the nearest and cheapest court. We should have sufficient confidence in our judiciary to believe that they will administer the law with discretion, and will not allow anybody to conduct a malicious prosecution. Another point is that there is no provision here for deporting aliens who come in in contravention of this Act. That is one of the clauses that should be amended. The United States have amended this part of their law, since 1882, four times, and now they have it in pretty fair shape. Here is the amendment of 1891 :

Any alien immigrant who shall come into the United States in violation of law may be returned, as by law provided, at any time within one year from the date of his arrival, at the expense of the person or persons, vessel, transportation company or corporation bringing in such alien; and any alien immigrant who shall become a public charge within one year after his arrival from causes existing prior to his landing may be returned at the expense of said above-named parties.

It is also provided that they are to have an inspector at each custom-house under the Act. The same machinery for enforcing the law in the United States should be established under this Act. Suppose an alien labourer comes into the city of Winnipeg. At present there are no means of deporting him. But, if we had power to send him back at the expense of the railroad that brought him, there would not be so many of these aliens coming in in contravention of the law. In 1897, when this Act was brought into force, some hon. gentlemen said that it would have no effect. But, as a matter of fact, it had a wonderful effect. But for this law there would have arrived for work on the Crow's Nest Pass road about two thousand Italians. These people were hired by labour agents in Minneapolis, Duluth, Chicago, and some were actually on the train to come to Canada ; but, when it was known that this Act was in force they were stopped. My authority for that is Foley Bros. & Doherty, who said that, not being able to bring these people in, they had lost money on their contract. They were skilled Italian labourers on dump work. There was really nothing to prevent them coming in, because the Act was a dead letter. If we are to make the Act worth anything we must take time to consider and make whatever amendments are necessary.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). In reply to the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), I thought it would be of service to the committee to place before it certain information as to the practical hardships caused by the operation of this Act. I have in my hand a letter from the Michigan Land and Lumber Company, a

firm that are establishing a large industry at Blind River, at the north shore of Lake Huron. They bought the old Blind River property. and are reconstructing it and making out of it a modern mill, and investing in that mill, I understand, some $200,000. A complaint was laid against the company recently, and Mr. Williams the labour agent of the bureau here, visited Blind River, and made investigation. The course pursued by Mr. Williams was very satisfactory. So far as he was able to do so, he carried the law into effect in a way to injure their interests as little as possible. Mr. Fisher, whose respectability is guaranteed by the fact that he was candidate for Governor of the state of Michigan two years ago, writes as follows :—

Our company regrets keenly that we have made any investments in Canada for manufacturing. The scarcity of labour and the high price we had to pay, so increased the cost of our product that no money was made on our last year's business. We have been tearing our mill all to pieces this winter, and when done, will have practically a new mill, the latest and best of its kind. We supposed that we were conducting ourselves properly in building an industry at this point, benefiting the locality by increasing its population, enhancing the value of the property and in every way benefiting our Canadian friends.

It is not possible to go on with this mill and have it ready for business, depending on Canada for the skilled labour, nor is it possible for us to operate the mill when completed if we depend altogether upon Canadian help, as our machinery is different from that in Canada and needs experienced help to operate it.

If this law is to be strictly enforced against us, we may as well abandon it where we are. Our only source for securing labour of any kind is Sudbury, 102 miles east of us, or the Canadian 'Soo,' eighty miles west of us, while to the north is an unbroken wilderness. At the two points mentioned no millmen are to be had, simply woodsmen and common labourers. These we cannot employ without the mill being in operation, and the mill can only be operated by experienced men. The operation of the mill will give employment to a large number of Canadians.

I have another letter from Messrs. Eddy Bros., who have acquired large limits on the Mississagua River, and are transferring their milling operations from Bay City to Canada, building a mill costing $250,000, and digging a canal from the Mississagua River to good logging and booming ground near Blind River—establishing an industry that will turn out 30,000,000 or 40,000,000 feet of lumber a year, and will employ a large number of men. Mr. Eddy was one of the parties against whom charges were preferred. He was the gentleman who ascertained the name of one of the complainants, and it turned out that the man was a drunken scallawag, whom it had taken two months to get out of his boarding house. The charges were explained satisfactorily. Another man felt himself aggrieved and gave notice that he would complain. Mr. Eddy attempted to get an interview with him, and went so far as to follow him to the station to explain the circumstances that was the cause of the grievance and get the man to go back to his work. But he failed to find the man, who went away and afterwards entered a complaint. Complaint was made, nominally by sixty-five persons, but many of the names were afterwards found to be fictitious. Under the operation of the law it is impossible for the party complained against to learn who the complainants are, he cannot get their names, they are kept private. That is a sort of proceeding which, it strikes me, is irregular, that a man cannot confront his accusers and meet the charges. Mr. Eddy writes :

We are situated seventy-seven miles from the Canadian 'Soo,' and 102 miles from Sudbury.

That is a stretch of country, I may say, along the North Shore where the population is very sparse. Large milling industries have been started recently : The two mills already referred to, one at John's Island opposite Cutler, one at Cutler, and another at Little Current. Five new mills have been constructed, besides the old mills that are now standing idle. There is a great scarcity of labour. Mr. Eddy informed me that he had sent a party to Ottawa to attempt to hire men, and after he had been here two weeks he had only been able to find five men, when he needed a couple of hundred. He writes :

We are situated about seventy-seven miles from the Canadian 'Soo,' and 102 miles from Sudbury. In this stretch of 179 miles, the country is very sparsely settled, and there is no place to secure labour. It must be generally understood that one has to go to some thickly populated centre to secure a large crew of men for a large industry to get it once started. On account of the boom at the Canadian 'Soo,' there being no mills in that locality, we have no outlet that way through which to secure a class of men such as we need; and the most easy place for us to get men of this class would be at Ottawa, 420 miles east of Blind river, which you will readily understand is a serious task, as they want all the skilled labour they have at Ottawa themselves. To give you a little more definite idea of the settlements in the neighbourhood of Blind river, there is only one wagon road out of that place, which runs north-westerly, following the Mississaga river, and there are very few settlers on the road. Thessalon, twenty-seven miles west of us, is the only town entitled to the name of a village along the whole Canadian Pacific Railway road between Sudbury and the 'Soo,' and this whole district can scarcely supply any number of men towards our wants. You understand that three years ago there were no saw-mills in that part of the country running; now there are eight mills between there and Little Current, and all the labour these eight mills may need (coming by rail) must come to Blind river, Spargge or Cutler; and we cannot see how we are going to supply skilled labour to run these mills except by getting them there by some inducement. Common labour we can probably secure all right,

but as there are no skilled mill men around there, some inducement must be held out to get them there. Now, there are abandoned mills all along the line from Canadian 'Soo' to Bay City, Michigan (points most convenient for us to reach from there), and experienced labour in this line could be readily obtained from this locality. This applies strictly to skilled labour required in lumber mills.

Under the construction of the Alien Labour Act, I cannot conceive any way for us to get these men to Canada that would not be construed as a violation of the law if strictly enforced, and we do not know where we can secure this class of men in Canada. We have taken this matter up with Mr. Williams, and there are two very essential points in the law that might be amended, and we think the department inclines to recommend them.

Then he goes on to explain the points. The suggestions he makes are:

The clause that refers to a new industry and reads, 'a new manufacturing plant or factory.' Our plant, as it reads now, will not be classed as a new industry; under such an amendment we would get the benefit for at least the first year. The next and probably the most important amendment would be that the officers of the department should have some power to suspend the law in the interests of new factories or mills, as in their judgment it will be to the interest of Canadians to encourage these industries by allowing the importation of skilled labour.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here are two cases where the establishment of industries are matters of great importance to Canada, two establishments that will give employment to probably 450 or 500 men; but a strict construction of the provisions of this law would prevent these industries from being started, because the owners would be unable to procure the skilled labour that would put these establishments in operation, and by that means afford employment for common labour. They can get, as they say, common labour, but they cannot get skilled men for running band saws, and for caring for the delicate machinery in these modern and highly improved mills. To say that they should not by some means be permitted to introduce that class of labour which is absolutely essential to the successful working of their plant, is simply to say that these industries shall not be started, and that employment shall not be furnished to the hundreds of common labourers that would otherwise be employed if they were allowed facilities for putting these establishments into operation. I merely put these facts before the committee in order that it may realize some phases of this matter which are not probably understood, and have not been brought to the attention of the members of the committee generally. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that the introduction into this country of large amounts of capital, the starting in this country of manufacturing establishments of any kind, and the introduction of skilled labour that is necessary to make these investments a success, and would furnish employment to our own people—I cannot conceive in what way this can be looked upon as a class of operations that should be impeded or prevented by the operation of Canadian law.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the law on the other side?

Mr. CHARLTON. It is utterly absurd; and if my hon. friend wants to be an ass because somebody else is, why of course——

Mr. CLARKE. I ask if there is not a similar provision in the Act on the other side?

Mr. CHARLTON. It does not matter whether there is or not.

The PRIME MINISTER. The discussion which has taken place has brought to the front two questions: first of all, the question of jurisdiction which is contemplated under the Bill, and then the suggestion that the jurisdiction itself ought to be vested in some court, and what court it should be. As to the first question, I may say that the intention of the Bill was to place the jurisdiction where it was before, that is to say, in a Superior Court. The hon. leader of the opposition has taken exception to this, not perhaps to the policy, but to the phraseology of the Bill. He is of the opinion that as the Bill is worded the jurisdiction might be in one of the Superior Courts and it might be in inferior courts, division courts, or courts of justices of the peace, which have jurisdiction for debts of $50. That was not the intention of the Bill. The Bill was drafted with some care, and the intention was to vest the jurisdiction in the Superior Court. Such being the intention, is the wording of the Bill sufficient to prevent any possibility of doubt? The section is framed in these terms:

For every violation of any of the provisions of section 1 of this Act, the person, partnership, company or corporation violating it by knowingly, assisting, encouraging or soliciting the immigration or importation of any alien or foreigner into Canada to perform labour or service of any kind under contract or agreement, express or implied, parole or special, with such alien or foreigner, previous to his becoming a resident in or a citizen of Canada, shall forfeit and pay a sum not exceeding $1,000, nor less than $50.

Now, the offence itself carries the penalty with it, and there is a forfeiture of $1,000 imposed by the law itself, and at the discretion, not of the complainant, but of the judge. If it can be contended under this Act that the discretion is left with the complainant, then I can understand the argument of the leader of the opposition; but if it be made clear that the discretion is not with the complainant, but with the court itself, that the judge may say whether the penalty should be $50, $100 or $1,000, it seems to me that the objection of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition falls to the ground.

Mr. MACLEAN. Why not make the jurisdiction clear as it is in the American Bill, as it has been quoted here ?

The PRIME MINISTER. That would serve no purpose, because our Bill differs from the American Bill. At all events I am explaining the objects of the Bill, I am simply answering the criticism of the leader of the opposition, that we do not carry out the intention which was in our minds, and leave a doubt. I think there can be no doubt, at all events, that what we had in our minds was to leave the jurisdiction in the Superior Courts competent to deal with questions affecting a sum of $1,000.

So much for this first point. Now I come to the criticism which has been made by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), that the jurisdiction ought to be, not in the Superior Court, but in the minor courts, the police court, the division court, and so on. His criticism has been taken up by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), and the argument that has been adduced has been this : Why not allow any complainant under this Act to go to the nearest court and have his redress ? The objection to that is this : the experience that I have had in the working of this Act has been, that any complaint as to the violation of the law has been taken up by the labour organizations and not by individuals. If ever there has been cause to invoke the aid of the law, if there has been alien labour imported into this country against the provisions of the Act, invariably the complaint was taken up by the labour organizations themselves, and in no case so far as I know, has it been left to individuals to bring action under this Act. I will say that it is very much to the credit of the labour organizations—and I am proud to say, at this moment, that when drafting the Bill, we drafted it after a conference with the labour organizations—that ever since the Act has been in force since 1897, the labour organizations have been very moderate in their demands, and have never tried to abuse the powers of the law, but have tried simply to have the law faithfully carried out. They have never left it to an individual to rush to the Minister of Justice to ask for the enforcement of the law, but they have investigated the complaints themselves and brought them to the Minister of Justice. In these cases, the labour organizations have never had any intention, so far as I know, beyond the fair enforcement of the law. I know there have been complaints, sometimes, that, perhaps, strictly speaking, the law had been violated ; but, they recognized that there may be some justification for the importation of labour under certain circumstances, and they do not ask for the application of the law to such circumstances. If the enforcement of the law is to be undertaken by the labour organizations themselves, and they want, I think, no violent enforcement of the Act, but simply its enforcement when there is cause for it, there is no harm in proposing that the remedy should be left in the court of highest jurisdiction. If you leave it in the power of any one to rush to the neighbouring court, or to go to the neighbouring justice of the peace, to lay his case before him, very probably you will have a good deal of heartburning somewhere. For instance, take the complaint laid down by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He mentions the case of a man who is a large employer of labour, who has introduced capital into this country, and that man would feel very much aggrieved if it were in the power of any workmen to rush to a neighbouring justice of the peace and commence action against him. We want to preserve for Canadian labour the Canadian market. As to that we are all agreed, and while that is the policy which we want to adopt, and which we are willing to enforce, it is not unfair to ask that the court should deal cautiously with all such matters, and should not interfere except when there is due cause shown ; not the primary court, but the highest court of jurisdiction. That is what has been conceived to be the principle of the law, and in this respect, I understood that the Bill would be acceptable to the labour organizations of the land.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the right hon. gentleman submitted the Bill to the labour organizations, and has it received their assent ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We have submitted the Bill to the labour organizations of the country.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I agree with the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) in the view he has taken on this question. I quite agree with the right hon. Prime Minister that it would be utterly out of the question to have these matters dealt with by the police magistrates in the country, because it would not be expected that the magistrates of the country would be conversant with the law, and would be prepared, owing to local prejudices, to deal fairly with the subject ; but, owing to the fact that you must have some simple method of enforcing the law, I would suggest that some method should be adopted along the lines suggested by the hon. member for West Toronto. In the towns most of the police magistrates are members of the bar, and they bring a legal mind to bear on the adjudication of the cases entrusted to them. But, one might go farther than these police magistrates and have the cases dealt with altogether by the county court judges. Take the statute as it is, and as it is proposed to be amended ; of necessity these cases must be dealt with in the Superior Court. Any man who is possessed

of any property, or who has any standing in the community, would not feel it incumbent upon himself to commence an action of this kind to vindicate a principle, because, in the event of being defeated in his case, his property would be available for the costs, and there would be a deterrent factor against actions being brought. Then, assuming that such a case as that suggested by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should arise ; a person may come over from the United States under contract to fit up a mill, or to erect a mill. That might happen in the spring of the year ; assuming that the Superior Court for the district had held its sittings, because, in the province of Ontario we have a spring and a fall court of assize, and if action were brought against a person after the spring assizes were over, it would not come to trial until late in the fall. Before that the work would all have been completed, and these alien employees might have returned to their homes. Furthermore, the action would be defeated by reason of the fact that the man who was figuring as defendant would have no goods in the country out of which costs could be realized. I quite agree that it would be utterly unfair to have these actions relegated to country magistrates, but I think they should be dealt with either by county court judges, or, in large towns, in towns of over 5,000, by the police magistrates. There are some other things in the Bill that are objectionable. In the event of any damages being recovered, the amount is payable to the Receiver General. Why not make that amount payable to the party instituting the action rather than to the Receiver General ? I trust, before the Bill becomes law, that a change may be made in this direction, and that provision may be made so that some summary proceedings may be taken before a county court judge, or a police magistrate in a town of over 5,000 population. There is a great deal of complaint, since the matter has been introduced by the hon. member for North Norfolk, in reference to the mills on the north shore of the Georgian Bay. The case of Fisher & Co. I have heard mentioned in my own town. Labour was openly advertised for in the newspapers of Bay City, and these men came over. I think that the hon. member for North Norfolk unwittingly did an injustice to the skilled labour employed in the mills. We have in this country just as modern mills as they have in Michigan. We have men who are accustomed to working band saws and all kinds of advanced machinery in the saw-mills, and it is rather humiliating to young men in the country, after working for years in the mills, that, while there are only one or two superior positions in these mills, they cannot obtain them, by reason of the fact that these positions are filled by men coming from the other side. Not only that, but I was assured by a reputable gentleman that this very firm of Fisher & Co., of Blind River, openly advertised in the Bay City newspapers for skilled labour to come over to Canada to work in these very mills. I trust that some less cumbersome measure than this will be passed.

Mr. CHARLTON. It would be well to produce that advertisement so that we may not go on hearsay evidence, because I am informed that nothing of the kind was done.

Mr. MACLEAN. What can be the objection to clearly defining what court shall have jurisdiction in this matter ? It is very easy to say that the jurisdiction shall be in the Superior Court and also in the county courts, and also with magistrates in cities of over 5,000 population.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I wish to add a few words with reference to the necessity of making this Bill as workable as possible, while yet retaining the necessary safeguards. I would urge on the Prime Minister the advisability of allowing the application to be made to the county court judges in Ontario, and to corresponding judges in the other provinces. If parties in Ontario are compelled to apply to the Superior Court judges in all instances, it would be a matter of great expense and difficulty and probably would altogether prevent redress being obtained. The right hon. gentleman spoke of the procedure being conducted by labour organizations, but I am inclined to think that there are many portions of the Dominion where labour organizations do not exist, and where action would have to be taken by an individual, as the section permits. If the application could be made to a judge of the county court it would be an improvement on the clause as now framed. We should also make the question of jurisdiction perfectly clear. It has been argued on both sides of the House that this is simply an action for $1,000, and it has been argued with equal force that under this section an action can be instituted for $50 or any sum up to $1,000. I suggest to the Prime Minister that it is advisable to make that point perfectly clear. I would ask the right hon. gentleman to consider whether it would not be well to provide, that when the application is made to the Attorney General or to one of the judges named in the statute, the official to whom the application is made, being then seized of all the circumstances which would enable him to determine, prima facia, the magnitude of the offence, should be empowered to say whether the action should be taken for $1,000 or any less sum. If a person sues for a large sum in damages or otherwise, and if he recovers a smaller sum, in the end the costs are awarded according to the scale in the court which has jurisdiction over that sum. If the official directs in what court the action should be taken, then we should relieve the party putting the law

in motion from any responsibility for costs in case he does not obtain the full sum sued for. I presume that we are all anxious to make this law workable, and we can all see that should a labouring man sue, in good faith, for a penalty of $1,000 and only recover $50, it would be a great hardship on him if he had to pay the costs of a Superior Court action. If we provide that the officer to whom the application in the first instance is made shall determine in what court the action shall be brought, and relieve the plaintiff of responsibility for costs, a greater measure of justice would be done under this law.

Mr. AULAY MORRISON (New Westminster). The First Minister stated that it was the intention of this clause that the case should be dealt with in the Superior Courts. I presume that the government have been mindful of all the provinces in drafting this measure, and it would be well for them to consider that in the province of British Columbia the jurisdiction of the county court extends to $1,000. In regard to the section as a whole, I am in very great sympathy with the views expressed by the member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) and in some respects by the leader of the opposition. If there is one matter more than another in respect of which there should be the greatest clearness and simplicity it is in a matter of this kind, and, in my opinion, section 3 as it stands is susceptible of very great difference of opinion and controversy. I believe jurisdiction should be given to the county courts and probably also to stipendiary magistrates, who, I presume, are only appointed in towns. The jurisdiction of a stipendiary magistrate, as we all know, is equal to that of two ordinary magistrates, and as the maximum penalty is $1,000, magistrates would have no jurisdiction. It is my opinion that stipendiary magistrates, and county courts, as well as Superior Courts should have jurisdiction in this matter. All reasonable facilities should be given to initiate an action under this section. The very reading of the lines fixing the amount presupposes that more than one court is considered; for this section says: 'With the written consent of any judge of the court in which the proposed action is intended to be brought.' Having regard to these words and the amount involved, one might presuppose the county court to be meant. If it is intended to be the Superior Court, and the section is susceptible of that reading, you have at once a contest. If the action were laid in the county court, the objection might be raised that it should be laid in the Superior Court. I think it is a matter of the greatest ease to make the meaning clear, even if you have to mention a certain court for each province. Moreover, I believe that in Ontario at present the question of extending the jurisdiction of the inferior courts is being considered. Taking merely a casual construction of section 3, and with all respect to the gentleman who drafted it, I think it is somewhat vague and loosely drawn. It should be a little more explicit as to the courts in which these actions are to be brought. I should like to refer to the remarks made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He has given one or two isolated instances in which hardship might be caused to employers of labour. But, as the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) has stated, you must look at the other side of the picture. For instance, in the province of British Columbia, on the Fraser river, where there are probably some 12,000 or 15,000 engaged in connection with the salmon fisheries for a very short time each year, a great many people come from Puget Sound ports—Seattle, Tacoma and Port Townsend—in their scow houses and large boats, and live in British Columbia waters. They are aliens, they have absolutely no interest in the province except to fish there, and many bring their supplies. They take away the fruits of that Canadian industry and go back to American territory, and neither the province nor the Dominion of Canada gets any advantage at all from their advent. If there is any law to prevent that sort of thing, it has not yet been enforced. I could give a number of instances of that kind. Although I will go as far as the hon. member for North Norfolk to safeguard the interests of our manufacturers and manufacturing industries, at the same time we must not be unmindful of the inroads of alien labour, in the western parts of the Dominion in particular. It would not be so bad if those aliens were coming here with a view of remaining permanently; but they come to stay only four or five weeks or two months at the outside, and then they go carrying the fruits of their labours with them. When this Alien Labour Act is being amended, I think it should be amended so as to cover every conceivable case of hardship on the part of the labouring people of this country. At present I do not think it does. If it can be shown to extend to the people I have referred to, then it is not enforced. Who is to blame for that I am not prepared to say. It is well enough for the government to consult labour organizations; but the practice I have spoken of goes on year after year, and I intend to refer to it in the future on every occasion that I have an opportunity, publicly and personally. Now that the Alien Labour Act is being amended, I trust that the government will listen to suggestions made from either side of the House, in regard to restricting in the strongest way these aliens who are coming in and taking the fruits of labour out of the hands and the mouths of our own people.

Mr. ROSS (South Ontario). I think hon. gentlemen have overlooked the fact that

we have under our control at present one of the greatest forces in the country for the enforcement of the Alien Labour Act and the settlement of labour disputes; I refer to the Department of Labour in this government. We had a dispute in the riding which I have the honour to represent, and it was so satisfactorily settled by the Department of Labour that I went to see what sort of an institution it was. There I found an issue of the Labour Gagette for January, 1901, by which I saw that not only had that department settled labour troubles, but it had also enforced the Alien Labour Act. I will read from the Gazette for January, at page 240 :

During the month of December, six complaints were made to the department of alleged infractions of the Alien Labour Act, and five, of six complaints partially inquired into in the month of November, were dealt with. Four of the six complaints laid during December were fully investigated by the special officer of the department for the enforcement of the Act. The evidence was sufficient in one case to warrant the ordering of the deportation of two alien workmen ; in the second and third cases, the alleged aliens proved to be British subjects, and in the fourth case the evidence showed that the Act had not been wilfully or unnecessarily violated. Of the six complaints received during the month, five were in the province of Ontario and one in Quebec, as follows :—three in the city of Hamilton, one in Dundas, one in Bruce Mines, and one in Montreal, Que.

The following is a detailed statement of the complaints made or dealt with during the month, and of the action taken in regard to each :—

Then it goes on to give a list of the complaints made before the month of December, and dealt with during that month. There were several persons deported. Then it gives a list of the complaints made during the month of December. I will just read this, because it has not yet come up in this discussion, and I find that our own government is doing the very thing we are asking to be done :

COMPLAINTS MADE DURING MONTH OF DECEMBER.

Dundas, O....	Machinery and tools ...	Dec.	3..	Alleged employment of alien workman.	Proved to be a British subject, no action taken.
Bruce Mines, O	Copper mining industry.	"	4..	Importing and employing alien workmen.	Act not wilfully violated. Insufficient supply copper miners.
Hamilton, O..	Fire extinguishing plant	"	4..	Employing and importing alien workmen.	Two alien workmen ordered to be deported.
" ..	Jewellery trade.....	"	4..	Importing and employing alien jewellery auctioneer.	Proved to be a British subject.
Montreal, Q...	Electric light plant.....	"	15..	Importing and employing alien workmen.	Under investigation.
Hamilton, O..	Railway transportation.		20..	Importing and employing alien workmen.	"

There you see our government is active in enforcing its own law. Some information was given to me regarding the number of people who were deported under this law, and I find that from the 20th of August, 1900, to the 4th of March, 1901, the Department of Labour has deported forty-five people for infraction of the Alien Labour law.

Mr. CLARKE. Have you got the list ?

Mr. ROSS (South Ontario). I have the list here, and will read it :

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR STATING NUMBER OF ALIENS DEPORTED BETWEEN AUGUST 20TH, 1900, AND MARCH 4TH, 1901.

Locality.	Trade or Industry.	Date of Deportation.	No. Deported.
Hamilton, O.....	Iron and steel manufacturing.....	Sept. 5..	2
Preston, O.....	Furniture "	" 29..	2
Toronto, O.....	Painting and decorating.....	Oct. 12..	5
Hamilton, O	Iron and steel manufacturing.....	Nov. 10..	1
"	Fire extinguishing plant.....	Feb. 2..	2
Ottawa, O.....	Sewer construction.	Jan. 30..	1
Toronto, O	Silver-plating industry.....	" 30..	3
"	Organ manufacturing	Feb. 1..	1
Rossland, B.C.....	Railway construction.....	Mar. 4..	16
Dunnville, O.....	Fruit canning.....	Sept. 6..	*
Total number deported..	.....	.....	33

* Employer deported six persons shortly before arrival of officer at Dunnville, and a similar number deported by employer at St. Catharines during investigation, making the total number of aliens deported during the above dates, forty-five (45).

Mr. CHARLTON. Add to that the eleven deported from Blind river during the week to whom I have referred. That was done by the Department of Labour.

Mr. ROSS (South Ontario). If hon. gentlemen who are interested in the labour question would procure the Gazette they would find much interesting information therein in connection with the labour problem. I visited the Labour Bureau and was very much surprised to find that our government was doing so much for the interests of labour, and I would appeal to hon. members to lay aside their party prejudices, and where they find the government doing good work, encourage that work all they can, and help the labour industry in every possible way. In my opinion, we should have a similar law to that of the United States, in order to properly look after the interests of labour. The government has been active in connection with the enforcement of this law, and I was just wondering whether in discussing the section we have been considering, hon. gentlemen have taken into account the fact that the Department of Labour has assumed the position of undertaking to see that this Act is enforced.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It seems to me that there is unanimity on both sides to make the Act as perfect as possible. Certain considerations suggest themselves. One is that the Act should provide speedy justice as much as possible, and another is that such justice should be as inexpensive as possible. In the province of Ontario, the right hon. gentleman can find a precedent that perhaps would be of use. Under our criminal law, we have provided for speedy trials before county court justices. If we would refer the cases under this law to these courts, we would be met with the same difficulty as in the Superior Court, and that is that they only meet at rare intervals. If there be no provision that the cases may be tried without jury, as our county courts sit only twice a year with juries, the same objection applies to them as to the Superior Courts. But if power were given to have these cases tried by police magistrates in the cities and towns where there are such officials, and by county court judges, in places where there are no police magistrates, and give these officials the same power as is given county court justices in the speedy trial cases under the Criminal Code, a cheap and inexpensive way would be provided for dealing with such cases.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, there is a fact that should not be lost sight of, when dealing with this question, namely, that there are two interested parties to the trial, the defendant as well as the party aggrieved. The hon. gentlemen who have so far taken part in this debate seem to have taken into consideration but the interests of the aggrieved party or the prosecutor; but the interests of the defendants must not be lost sight of. These men are also citizens of this country, and they are entitled to a fair and just treatment at the hands of Parliament. The workingmen of this country are no doubt entitled to protection at our hands, but they cannot fairly claim any exclusive privilege. Now, what is the purport of the Bill now under discussion? This Bill provides for the recovery of certain penalties. Under this Act, the responsibility for taking action should rest with the attorneys general of the provinces. There is no question here of allowing proceedings of this kind to be taken either before the Superior Court or the County Court judges, but this penalty, like any other penalty recoverable under other statutes, shall be recovered in the ordinary way.

In the province of Quebec, under section 16 of our civil code, the case shall have to be dealt with in the Superior Courts, because the penalty to be sued for is $1,000. The party aggrieved brings a suit for $1,000 and may recover any sum from $1,000 down to $50. Therefore, it is an action for $1,000.

I object to referring cases of this kind to a magistrates' court, from which there is no appeal. Besides, you should not forget that there are as many penalties as there are offences, each offence involving a penalty which may amount to $1,000. You could easily ruin a man; it would all depend on the view a judge would take of the case. That man might be ruined, and he would have no right of appeal to a higher court.

As I said, this Bill tends to create a privilege in favour of the working classes; but the workingmen of this country want no such privilege; all they ask for is equal rights and to be put on a footing of equality with the other classes of the community.

I am opposed to the proposed amendment, because it does not involve the right of appeal. When I am sued by a labour organization or by a private citizen, I have the right to be tried before a court of ordinary jurisdiction, and moreover I have the right of appeal from that court to a higher court.

Now, I think there is a very simple way out of the difficulty. Since you provide that summary proceedings shall be taken under this Act, you ought also to decrease the penalty, and make it, say $50.

But as to imposing a penalty of $1,000, as provided by this Bill, with a summary trial, I say that the House should not accept such a proposition. Let us make the maximum of the penalty $50; or if not, allow the case to be tried by a court vested with ordinary jurisdiction.

Mr. GALLIHER. It seems to me that this is one of these Bills which are of a quasi criminal nature, and therefore we should be careful not to cause expense to the labourer or party aggrieved. I have

not looked into the legal aspect very closely, but I would suggest that proceedings should be taken on sworn information laid before a justice of the peace or stipendiary or police magistrate. Such official would, in the first instance, try the case, and then the party deeming himself aggrieved by the decision should have the right of appeal to a Superior Court. In the province of British Columbia the judges of our Superior Court all reside at the coast, and if we had to go before a Superior Court judge to lay our complaint, we would have to travel a long distance in some cases—say from Kootenay or other portions of the interior—which would render it impossible for the persons aggrieved to proceed. I see no reason why we should not treat this as a quasi criminal act and make the burden of expense as light as possible on those who are not the offenders.

Mr. BRITTON. No doubt the fact of the Act being on our statutes has a considerable deterrent effect, and probably the effect will be still greater if this amendment be passed. I agree in the desirability of making the law as workable and simple as possible. But so long as the maximum penalty is made $1,000, I do not see how there can be any difference of opinion as to the courts in which the cases must be brought. They must be brought in the court which has jurisdiction over cases of that amount and cannot be brought in any other. I do not know whether there is any virtue in having the maximum penalty $1,000. Just as much could be accomplished by having a smaller amount, and in that case such cases could be tried by a court of inferior jurisdiction.

There is another point that should receive consideration. If this action for penalty is brought in the high court in the province of Ontario, it may be triable by a jury as well as by a judge. The question arises, whether such an action ought to be tried by a jury or whether it is not something that ought to be tried only by a judge. There is another point. It is true that the action is to be brought by an individual. An individual, perhaps, may not undertake such an action at his own expense, but only when he is backed by a labour organization of the district or when he feels that he is fulfilling, to some extent, a public duty in bringing action of this kind. Still, it is an individual who must bring the action. He would naturally be liable for costs if he failed. But it is provided in Ontario that the individual who brings an action for a penalty must give security for costs. It may be well for the House to consider whether a man should be placed in such a position that before he continues an action under these circumstances he would have to give security for costs, as he does in an ordinary case where suit is brought for a penalty. Then, there are a good many matters of detail that have to be considered. What is true in regard to British Columbia is true—to a less extent, I suppose—in every other province. In the province of Ontario all the high court judges reside in Toronto, and application would have to be made there to get the consent of the Attorney General or a high court judge before bringing an action. The county court judges are local judges of the high court; but they do not come, it seems to me, within this section and would not have power to give consent to bring such an action. This would leave it to the individual to seek the consent of the Attorney General or the judge in Toronto, before he could bring an action. These are points to be considered in order to make the working of the Act as easy and as effective as possible. Under the Customs Act, severe penalties are provided for the infraction of the law, and yet the penalties, to a very considerable amount—certainly to the amount of $200—are recoverable before two justices of the peace or before a stipendiary magistrate or police magistrate, who has the power of two justices of the peace. If the penalty is $1,000, there is no help for it, it must be recoverable in a court having jurisdiction for that amount. If it is thought to be in the interest of the labouring classes that the penalty should be reduced, some simple mode of recovering it and bringing an action to enforce the penalty might be provided, it seems to me, with all the safeguards that are necessarily thrown about it.

Mr. CLARKE. I desire, to propose an amendment to this section 1. The right hon. leader of the House told us that this Bill had been submitted to the labour organizations, and that those bodies approved of it. It would be interesting if the right hon. gentleman would tell us to what organizations it had been submitted. I confess that if those bodies are satisfied that this provision is workable, it might modify my views respecting it and the advisability of making changes. I move in amendment:

That all the words after 'fifty dollars,' in section 1, be omitted and be replaced by the following: 'Recoverable in the name of His Majesty in a summary manner with costs, under the provisions of article 58 of the Criminal Code of 1892, before any police magistrate, stipendiary magistrate, judge of session or county court judge having jurisdiction where the offender is to be found or where the offence was committed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). Just before this amendment was moved, I was about to say that I thought the best course to take was to reduce the amount so as to bring it within the jurisdiction of a county court judge. As I said when this subject was under discussion, this is a law which, under the existing conditions, must be very carefully enforced. For instance, in the city of Windsor, the ferry to Detroit takes over every morning five or six hundred people who cross to their daily occupation in the city of Detroit. Every time we have an

agitation about the enforcing of the Alien Labour law, these people are told—this has been done repeatedly—that the effect will be that they must be given the choice of taking up their residence in Detroit or losing their employment. The result would be that we would not only lose three or four hundred people who are thus employed, but also their families—within a month the city of Windsor might lose a thousand people. Therefore, every time this agitation is raised, we are very much concerned about the matter. I agree, on the other hand, that we should have a speedy and effective remedy under it. I think the proper course is to give jurisdiction for trials and actions of this sort to a county court judge, reducing the penalty from $1,000 to a less sum. I think $400 is the limit of the present jurisdiction of the county court. That may be increased at the present session of the local legislature, as a Bill for that purpose is under discussion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not necessary to decrease the penalty. This parliament can give jurisdiction to the county court without that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). Yes, that is true—this parliament could confer jurisdiction in express terms, leaving the amount as it is. I disagree with another view expressed some time ago, to the effect that the informer should recover the penalty. The obvious objection to that is that a man who has been discharged or who has been refused employment might, out of mere ugliness or to seek revenge, lay information and make a great deal of unnecessary trouble. No doubt, that feature of the Act is commendable which provides that some competent person must pass judgment on the question whether action shall be taken or not. Whether this authority should be the Attorney General or the county court judge, is for us to settle. I would suggest that either the Attorney General or the county court judge should be made competent authority on this matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. There has been a good deal of valuable information imparted by this discussion, and on both sides of the House there is a consensus of opinion that the jurisdiction of the courts should be more definitely settled than it is now. If I understand correctly the sentiment of the committee it is that the jurisdiction should be vested in the county courts. I am not prepared at this moment to accept the amendment nor to reject it, and I would ask that the whole clause be allowed to stand that we may take further advice on the matter.

Mr. CHARLTON. There are one or two points in connection with this matter that have occurred to me, and without unduly detaining the committee I wish to dwell upon them. My hon. friend opposite (Mr. Ross, Ontario) informed the committee that the Labour Bureau was doing efficient service in enforcing this law. I wish to endorse that assertion. He gave us a list of some 45 deportations that had taken place under the operations of the Labour Bureau, and I have added to that a list of eleven more operatives which were deported from Blind River, and were employed by the two firms that I have mentioned. There are 56 deportations that have taken place under the operation of the Labour Bureau. I venture to say that this is ten times as many deportations as have taken place through Mr. De Barry under the American Alien Labour law. I venture to say that the enforcement of this law is more efficient at the present moment, under the supervision of the Labour Bureau, than the operation of the American law is made to be. I do not believe that there is any necessity for changing the provisions of the law or increasing the efficiency of its enforcement above what is being done at the present moment. I believe that the operations of the Labour Bureau are efficient, are simple, are ample, and cover the ground.

I wish to say in addition to this that we want to bear in mind that in this case we are playing with edged tools. The hon. gentleman who spoke last informed us that some 500 residents of Canada find employment in Detroit, and cross the river daily. That is permitted, the fact is well known by the American authorities; no attempt is made to prevent it, no attempt will be made to prevent it until bad feeling is engendered by some act of our own. But some bright morning every one of these men could be stopped, and they would be left with the alternative of staying at home and seeking other employment, or moving with their families into the city of Detroit. On the borders of Lower Canada hundreds of French Canadians have what they call four harvests. They have the sugar harvest at home; then they cross the border into Maine and have the harvest of driving logs on the streams; then they have the oat harvest; then they come back home and have their own harvest. These men go back and forth finding employment in Quebec, and finding employment in Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont, and they are not interfered with. It is a great blessing to these men to be permitted to find this employment. It doubles the amount they receive in the shape of returns for their labour. Rouse a feeling of animosity by the enforcement of this law, and the employment that these men secure in the United States will at once be cut off, and they will have the choice of losing what they make or of emigrating to New England.

Talk about the importation of labour! Why, it is impossible to start many new industries in Canada without importing skilled labour. Here are boot and shoe establishments down in the city of Quebec, and at other points in the province of Quebec; it is necessary to import American

machinery and it is necessary to import American mechanics to put that machinery up, and set it in operation, and learn the French Canadians how to run it. You have got to do it, you cannot start the industry without doing that very thing. With regard to electrical apparatus, we cannot set up establishments with electricity as a motive power for running manufacturing operations without bringing the apparatus from the United States, and the men to set the apparatus up, and to educate skilled labourers in Canada for that business.

Mr. OSLER. I think we have first-class skilled electricians in Canada. We have in the Peterborough factory men who are quite capable of erecting the largest electrical establishments in Canada, and they are now erecting some of the largest electrical works on the continent.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend from Toronto is mistaken in one respect. We may have skilled electricians in Canada, and establishments for making electrical apparatus, but we have not enough of them. My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) told us awhile ago that the saw-mills could find skilled labour in Canada. But for the class of mills that are being built here you cannot find skilled labour, because the mills that are in operation have no skilled labour to spare, and these men have to bring their skilled labour with them, knowing the men, knowing their capabilities, knowing what they can do, knowing that they are making no mistake, and that their mills will be put into operation without any breaks, or without any loss of time, or any proceeding to make up for mistakes. With regard to electrical business, while we may have an establishment at Peterborough and while we may have skilled electricians, yet the business of putting in electrical plants and introducing electricity as a motive power is so extensive that we have not enough of them, and we must introduce American machinery and American men to learn our own people and educate them as skilled electricians. Then with regard to the pulp business, and the paper business, one of the great industries looming up in the future, you cannot establish a pulp business in this country without introducing pulp machinery and without bringing in men to set that machinery up, and run it, and to learn our own people to run that machinery. The same with woollen mills. The trouble with our woollen mills is that their machinery is antiquated, out of date, and it is necessary, if they are to succeed in keen competition, to put in improved machinery, and they must bring the men that can set up that machinery, that can run that machinery until such time as they have educated Canadians to do the work. The whole of this thing is an absurdity. The law is a barbarism, and its operation will be disastrous to ourselves, will be a boomerang that will come back and will hit us on the head, if we desire to grow in this country. I have sat in this House year after year and have heard how Canadians were departing for the United States, we have a million and a half Canadians in that country ; yet here is a law which says that we shall not import men, that while we invite people to come into this country we meet them with a club at the border and say they shall not come in. Of course I am desirous that we should protect our own labourers, and I have nothing to say against adopting a course that will prevent the making of contracts for the importation of common labour. But we have got to guard our own interests carefully in this matter of skilled labour, or we shall inflict upon ourselves a most serious damage in this matter.

Mr. WRIGHT. I wish to correct an impression which I fear will go abroad by what has been stated by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that we have not skilled labour, that we have not skilled electricians, that we have not efficient workshops to turn out the electrical apparatus that we require in Canada without going to the United States. Now I wish to correct that error. We have just as good skilled labour, just as efficient and able electricians in the Dominion of Canada as they have in any country in the world. I wish to inform the hon. gentleman that within one year six of our foremost electricians have been taken from Toronto to England to learn the English people how to put up the apparatus and run their factories. We have factories at Peterborough and at Montreal that turn out just as good material as can be found anywhere in the world. I wish that fact to be thoroughly understood.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 2,

The PRIME MINISTER. Section 5 of the present Act reads as follows :

Provided, that nothing in this Act shall be construed as prohibiting any person from assisting any member of his family, or any relative or personal friend, to migrate from any foreign country to Canada for the purpose of settlement here.

We have found that these words 'personal friend' are very elastic and we have thought it better to strike them out. There will be no objection to that.

On section 3,

Mr. CLARKE. What is the object of that ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The object is simply to make the wording clearer. We can deport at the present time. Section 6 of the Act reads :

The Attorney General of Canada, in case he shall be satisfied that an immigrant has been allowed to land in Canada contrary to the prohibition of this Act, may cause such immigrant, within the period of one year after land-

ing or entry, to be taken into custody and returned to the country whence he came at the expense of the owner of the importing vessel, or, if he entered from an adjoining country, at the expense of the person previously contracting for the services.

We propose to take out these words in order to make the intention of the law more explicit.

On section 4,

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). Mr. Chairman, complaint has been made that in the event of starting certain new industries in this country, skilled labour cannot be obtainable. So far as I am concerned, and I believe so far as the labour unions are concerned, they have no intention of bringing about any embarrassment of that kind. It is not the spirit or intention of the Bill, or of any labour Bill, to interfere with the industries of the country. The workingmen of this country are sensible enough to know that if such a condition of things were brought about by any action of theirs, they would be working against their own best interests. If there is a necessity of providing, after proper precaution has been taken, that men from the other side may be brought in to assist in the establishment of certain new industries, I am certain there will be no objection on the part of organized labour to such provision being made. However, we are anxious that every precaution should be taken to demonstrate that the party desiring to introduce this labour has done everything possible to prove that such labour cannot be obtained in this country. I am sorry if anything that has been said by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has reflected upon the skilled labour of this country. So far as Ontario is concerned I do not know how far this matter may go, but I do know that in British Columbia they have initiated electric works and they have had to bring, for the operation of these works, one, two, or three skilled labouring men from the other side. There is no doubt about that, and I do not think it is casting any reflection upon the skilled labourers of this country, when necessary, for the introduction of a new industry, to bring in new men with the operating machinery. However, generally speaking, I think the hon. member for North Norfolk is wrong. I think the labour of this country is just as efficient as that of the other side. I do see how it might be necessary to bring in one, two or three skilled labourers with certain operating machinery who cannot be obtained in this country. I think this amendment to section 8 would meet the case. I propose to add the following clause to this Act :

Provided that this section shall not apply to skilled labour not obtainable in Canada, as provided by section 5 of this Act.

Hon. members will notice that section 5 provides that when this labour cannot be obtained there is authority to import skilled labour. I propose that this section shall not apply to skilled labour not obtainable in Canada as provided by section 5 of this Act.

Mr. SPROULE. You mean section 5 of the old Act.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). Section 8 of the new Act and section 5 of the old Act. It is supposed by some hon. gentlemen that the present section of the old Act covers the matter entirely. If that is so, I have no disposition to amend the law. I am only trying to bring about a modification that may meet the case mentioned by the hon. member for North Norfolk. I want to make it clear that the provision of this section shall not apply to skilled labour not obtainable in Canada, as provided by section 5 of this Act.

Mr. CLARKE. Who is to determine that point ? The intimation we have had from the hon. member for North Norfolk was the first intimation, I think, since this Alien Labour law was placed upon the statute-book, that any difficulty existed in the direction which he has indicated. There has been no complaint made in the public press of the harsh operation of the Alien Labour law. The first time we have heard of it has been from the lips of the hon. member from North Norfolk to-day, and before we adopt the amendment which has been suggested by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith), we ought to know what steps are to be taken to ascertain whether this skilled labour can be had in the Dominion of Canada or not. Who is to judge as to whether the labour can be obtained ? What precautions are to be taken to ascertain whether this labour can be obtained when advertisements are published in the newspapers of the United States ? Some explanation will be necessary before that amendment should be added.

The PRIME MINISTER. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) is simply a consequence of the amendment which has been made already to this Bill.

Mr. CLARKE. What amendment is that ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I will come to that presently. Let us see how the law is at the present time. Section 5 of the Act reads as follows :

Nothing in this Act shall be so construed as to prevent any citizen or subject of any foreign country, temporarily residing in Canada, either in private or official capacity, from engaging, under contract or otherwise, persons not residents or citizens of Canada, to act as private secretaries, servants or domestics for such foreigner temporarily residing in Canada; nor shall this Act be so construed as to prevent any person, partnership or corporation from engaging, under contract or agreement, skilled workmen in foreign countries to perform labour

in Canada in or upon any new industry not at present established in Canada, provided that skilled labour for that purpose cannot be otherwise obtained.

That is the law and has been the law from the time the Act was passed in 1897. My hon. friend put a question a moment ago. It was: Who is to judge whether or not this skilled labour can be obtained in this country? Why, the court is. That has been the law since 1897, but, under this Bill that we are introducing to-day, we are going a step further even than the American law. We make it an offence to advertise for labour, and the section reads thus:

Section 8 of the said Act is repealed, and the following section is substituted therefor:—

It shall be deemed a violation of this Act for any person, partnership, company or corporation to assist or encourage the importation or immigration of any person who resides in, or is a citizen of, any foreign country to which this Act applies, by promise of employment through advertisements printed or published in such foreign country; and any such person coming to this country in consequence of such an advertisement shall be treated as coming under a contract as contemplated by this Act, and the penalties by this Act imposed shall be applicable in such case.

After this Bill was introduced, and since it has been before the public, the employers of labour have come to us and said: Under the law as it stands, we have the power to bring in skilled workmen to perform labour on a new industry not at present established, provided that skilled labour for that purpose cannot otherwise be obtained; but, under this amendment you prevent us advertising for that labour which we are allowed to import. The question does not arise as to who is to judge whether or not the labour can be obtained in Canada; at all events, it has not arisen for the three years that the law has been in operation. It is now proposed to move in amendment the following words:

Provided, however, that this section shall not apply to skilled labour not obtainable in Canada, as provided by section 5 of this Act.

We make it an offence for an employer of labour to advertise in the United States for labour suppose he has a strike, but if the employer advertises for skilled mechanics whom he has a right to employ under section 5, then, we give him permission under this amendment to advertise for that labour. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) will agree with me that that is reasonable.

Mr. CLARKE. With that explanation, I must say that I see the matter in a different light.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 5,

Mr. CLARKE. Has the government considered the question of applying the provisions of this Act to the citizens of the German Empire. The German tariff is a particularly harsh one in its operation against Canada, and it might be a good idea to enforce the provisions of this law against Germany.

Mr. SPROULE. If the Germans come here they stay.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think the Germans are very good immigrants, and when they come here they come to settle. The idea is to apply this law only to such countries as have an alien labour law against us. The German Empire have a very high tariff against us I admit, but it has no alien labour law. There is only one country in the world that has an alien labour law against us, and this law at present only applies to that country. If any other country were to adopt a similar law to the American law, our law would apply to that country ipso facto. The object is that this section shall apply, not only to the citizens of the United States, but to Italians, Poles, or others, who hapepn to be living in the United States, and who are imported into this country.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—THE CONTRACT WITH THE CANADIAN PACIFC RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the House into Committee of Supply.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Douglas, the following resolution, of which I gave notice some time ago:

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this House, the government should take such steps that may be open to it under the law to obtain authoritative interpretation from the Supreme Court of Canada of the meaning of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in relation to the exemption of lands from taxation; and

That the patenting of lands earned by railroad companies should be proceeded with all practicable speed.

He said: This matter has been so thoroughly discussed in the House by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) and others, that the House must be well seized of the question, so that it is not necessary for me to deal with it at any great length. The question has reference to the interpretation of that portion of the contract between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the government with regard to the time when the lands granted to the company shall become taxable. As to this, a difference of opinion exists. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) last year brought in a Bill on which there was a good deal of discussion; and he took the ground then, as he does this year, that the land was granted to the company at the time the contract was signed. Other members of this House take

a different view, believing, as I do myself, that the land was granted when it was earned. However, in view of the difference of opinion that exists on the question, we would like to have a judicial decision on the subject, so that the people of the west would know exactly where they stand. I need not go into an argument on the merits of the case. We know that the settlers have been suffering in this matter for a good many years, and they have been looking forward to the expiration of the twenty years, on the 15th of February of last year, as the time when the exemption would cease and the lands would became taxable.

I want to say that this is not a motion of hostility to the Canadian Pacific Railway. We entertain no feelings of hostility to the Canadian Pacific Railway whatever. We think that if the company were wise, they would consider this matter and acknowledge that the time has expired and that the lands should be taxable. There is no doubt in my mind that that is the spirit of the contract, and I think they would be acting in the interest of the company as well as in the interest of the people of the Northwest, if they took that view of the matter. The exemption of these lands from taxation has a serious effect on immigration. There are other countries looking for immigration as well as this country; and when the people are coming in to look up locations, no doubt they are told by interested parties, who perhaps meet them at the boundary line, that half the lands in the country are held by railway corporations, and are exempt from taxation and will perhaps continue to be so for thirty years, so that the settlers have to tax themselves to maintain the roads, bridges, and schools, at the same time increasing the value of the lands of the railway corporations, and are not likely to get any relief.

The resolution I have to move asks the government to have the question submitted to the courts, so that we shall know exactly what position we are in. If the meaning of the contract is that the lands were granted when earned, we should know it; if the meaning is that the lands are not granted until the patents are issued, we should know that. In the second part of the resolution I ask the government to issue patents for all those lands, whether granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway or to other railways. There are something like 60,000,000 acres tied up in the hands of different corporations, and we think it is pretty near time that patents should be issued for all these lands, so that they may become taxable. I believe there are large blocks of land belonging to railway corporations that have not even been located. I think the different corporations should be required to locate their lands, and the government should issue the patents for them. With regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, I think the proper place to get it interpreted is the courts, and not this House. I therefore take much pleasure in moving the resolution.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I desire to say just one or two words with regard to issuing patents for the railway land grants, which is referred to in the last clause of my hon. friend's resolution. There has been from time to time a good deal of discussion in regard to the issuing of these patents, and on some occasions statements have been made which have not, I think, been warranted by the facts. For instance, I have seen the statement made that there was an understanding between the railway companies and the late government that these patents should not be issued, for the purpose of delaying the time when the lands should become liable for taxation. It has also been said that the railway companies had brought about a similar understanding with the present government. I desire to say that no information has ever come to me from any officer of the department that there was any understanding of that kind with the late government, and there has certainly not been any understanding of that kind with the present government, nor has any member or officer of any railway company interested in these lands at any time, so far as I am aware, suggested that the issue of patents should be delayed either for that or any other reason. The reasons why the patents have not been issued have simply been these—that the great growth of the work in connection with the Department of the Interior, and the difficulties of overtaking it have simply caused the work to fall behind. Two sessions ago my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) brought this question before the House, and I then stated that the volume of work in the department had been such that I had not been able to give that particular subject the attention I would have liked—that the question of railway land grants was one of the most difficult questions that had to be dealt with by the department; and I then promised that I would endeavour to put the department in such a position that the question could be dealt with as soon as possible. But I explained to the House at the time that there was an enormous amount of detail work connected with putting the department in a position to patent an enormous quantity of land such as we would have to deal with in this case. Members of the House, especially those who have any experience in departmental matters, will recognize the amount of work involved in dealing with questions of land where it has to be dealt with in such enormous quantities, and the danger of difficulty and confusion arising in case of any mistake being made.

Immediately after the session I gave instructions to the officer of the department

most competent to deal with the subject, to take it up and devote his time to it. About the end of last summer he reported that he was in a position to report that the work of patenting might proceed with very little delay. In the early part of the present season, just about the beginning of the year, I was able to take the matter up. A staff of officers was employed and the work of patenting the land grants has been proceeded with as rapidly as possible. We took the most expeditious and satisfactory course of having the land carefully and thoroughly reported upon, the lists carefully checked, so that the work of patenting could be proceeded with rapidly. I expect that before the close of the session all the land in the main line belt of Manitoba will be patented, and inside of six months all the land in the main line belt between the Red river and the Rocky Mountains will be patented, together with probably the lands along the Calgary and Edmonton line and other lands selected. I am speaking of lands selected with regard to which there is no dispute between the department and the different railway companies. These patents can certainly, I think, be issued in the next nine months and will cover the great bulk of the railway land grants.

The position taken by the government is precisely what it was when the question was raised by the hon. member for Alberta two sessions ago. We were not a party in any way to unduly or intentionally delaying the issuing of the patents, but our desire was to issue them as rapidly as possible, and it would be satisfactory to my hon. friends, particularly from the North-west, to know that practically all the railway land patents will be issued in the course of the next nine months.

At different times when the subject has been up before the country, I have stated what I have just now said, namely, that it was the intention of the government to issue the patents as rapidly as possible. The motion of my hon. friend embodies that intention and desire. I think I repeated in response to a motion of my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) for the second reading of a Bill which he had before the House a short time ago, what I had said, when the question of the interpretation of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract upon the subject of exemption was discussed at public meetings, that while I was not able to adopt the view which the hon member for Lisgar had advocated, yet I was willing to ask my colleagues to take this position. As soon as a municipality or school district or statute labour district was in a position to levy a tax on any Canadian Pacific Railway land, and thus bring about a test case before the courts, I was prepared to ask my colleagues to come to the assistance of such municipal body and pay the expense necessary for the purpose of bringing a test case. The motion of my hon friend conveys accurately the idea of the statement I then made, and the government is perfectly willing to adopt that position. So soon as a municipal body is in a position to levy a tax on any lands, we are prepared to come to its financial assistance and bring about the submission of a test case which will give us the opinion of the courts on the meaning of the clause. That is the only way a proper decision can be got on the question at issue. Lawyers will agree that the submission of a question to the court under the Act is not a satisfactory method of getting a final decision on the meaning of the contract, because it might be held that the decision was not of a binding nature, and did not cover the exact question at issue. That has been the experience in similar cases. It is desirable, if a case is to be brought before the court, that it should be brought in such a way that the exact point at issue will be decided. I have no objection to the terms of my hon. friend's motion and am quite willing that a test case should be brought before the courts and to ask parliament to authorize us to spend the necessary money.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). I am not going to discuss the tactics of the hon. gentleman who got the question before the House on the present occasion. But I intend when next the government move to go into supply to bring forward the motion, notice of which I gave before anybody else, in connection with this question. I intend to take quite the contrary view from that expressed by the hon. minister. He is not going the right way to establish the date when the exemption ceases, and I propose to bring forward a motion which will define the rights of the settlers and go directly against the submission of this question to any court of law. The parliament of Canada is the proper tribunal to settle this question, as it has done similar questions in connection with this contract on previous occasions. In 1894 parliament was asked to interpret this contract and did interpret it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What was the occasion ?

Mr. MACLEAN. In 1894 the then government introduced a Bill to construe that contract.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In regard to what particulars ?

Mr. MACLEAN. In regard to the drawback on the iron bridges.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) That was a customs question.

Mr. MACLEAN. That makes no difference. It was settled by this House. I could cite twelve occasions when parliament has modified that contract and the legislation concerning it. I will go a great deal further and say that the only place where jus-

tice can be done is in this parliament. But you will only get a bald decision if you refer it to the courts. In parliament, on the other hand, you have the law as it is, you can discuss the intention of the makers of the laws. You can have all the equities of the case before you. If there is a conflict of interests and if injustice has been done, parliament can rectify it and do justice.

Mr. BRITTON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) does not believe, then, that it takes two to make a bargain ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, I do. I will argue the question fully, and I think I shall have a number of hon. gentlemen on the other side taking my view and standing up with me when I come to divide the House. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) jumped up and addressed the Speaker after I had risen, he did not take the cleverest way, I think, of getting this question before the House, but I can wait, and I will wait for another opportunity on going into Supply. The hon. Minister of the Interior is rushing to get the patents through. This is something new. But there is a steam engine going over his department and patents are being rushed out. Still the question remains as to the date of the patents and when the exemptions cease. I think the term of exemption is up, as I shall prove when the matter comes up again. The only place where you can settle the rights of the settlers of the North-west as against this great corporation the Canadian Pacific Railway is in the parliament of Canada and not in the courts of this country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the amendment is adopted, I would like to understand what the hon. Minister of the Interior meant by saying that he would have a final decision better this way than by a test case referred to the courts. Is it intended to proceed with a test case between a particular municipality and the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What I said upon the subject was that I did not think a satisfactory submission of the question at issue could be got except upon a case arising between the parties. In the North-west we have had similar cases in which railway companies have been involved, and the method we have followed there was this : Where the question of taxation was at issue, the municipality was told to go ahead and levy taxes upon the railway company's land and advertise the land for sale, and put the railway company in the position of either bringing an action to set aside the sale or paying the money under protest, in which case, they would sue to get their money back. In either case, the case would come before the court on the direct question of the liability of the land to taxation. The government would tell the municipality that, as soon as they were ready to proceed, the government would appoint counsel to take charge of the case. That is the only way to get the case before the court and to get a decision.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The plan that the hon. minister suggests may work out in the way he says, or it may not. For example, you get the Canadian Pacific Railway to enter into a stated case, and, if it is carried to the last court of appeal, it will work out as the hon. gentleman says. But, if the last court is not reached the object desired is not attained. Such a case as he suggests may go off on some technicality——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is always that possibility.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It may not be carried beyond the first court. And, of course, a question like this determined between a municipality and the Canadian Pacific Railway would not in any way operate as an estoppel as between the Canadian Pacific Railway and any other municipality. Therefore, its only value would be the decision of the court, which might not be a court of first instance. The case will not necessarily work out as the hon. gentleman suggests.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It generally works out that both parties are willing that there should be a test case, and that the matter should be argued on the ground specified.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I conceded that if you could accomplish that and carry it to the ultimate court of appeal, there could be no further question about it. But if that is not done it would not settle the question at all.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the House do now resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to argue this question, but as it is now six o'clock, I will continue after recess.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). A very unusual thing happened in the House to-night in connection with the proposal to go into Committee of Supply. An amendment to that motion was submitted to the House and it carried ; and while I intended myself to offer an amendment to that motion, I failed to catch the eye of the Speaker, and the amendment carrying, the Minister of Finance had to make his motion to go into Committee of Supply. Therefore, I am now in order in moving an amendment, which I intended to do, and which

deals with the question of the exemption of the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway. To put myself straight before the country, I wish to say that while I claim no privilege, I have been the first to put a notice on the paper of an amendment dealing with this question, but an hon. gentleman from the North-west Territories saw fit, after I had given notice, to put in a similar notice.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that I gave a verbal notice before his notice appeared on the Order paper at all.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I filed my notice early in the morning, long before the House met, and it appears on the journals of the House, though he thought it was a clever thing this afternoon to do as he did, and some friends of his in the House thought it was a clever thing. Well, they are welcome to think so. But I am before the House, and I am going to argue this question, which I think will command some attention in this House, and will certainly receive a good deal of attention from the people of the North-west Territories who have a grievance in connection with this matter. I propose to contend that this parliament is the proper place to interpret the time when the exemption of these lands dates from. It has been contended in the House, and a motion not long ago was passed in this House, that the question ought to be submitted to the courts. My argument to-night will be that it ought not to be submitted to the courts, because justice cannot be obtained in the House.

Mr. DAVIS. This is very hard on the courts.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is not hard on the courts, because the courts are not in a position to be seized of all the facts. My argument here to-night will present all the facts and allow the equities in the case to be fully judged. Now, I say that parliament is the proper place to settle this question, first of all, because parliament is in possession of the law on the question, whatever that is. Parliament is also in possession of the intention of the parliament that made this law. Parliament also is in a position to judge of the equities in the case; and if there are conflicting interests and conflicting claims, parliament is the one place where an adjustment can be effected. If you go to the courts for a settlement of this question you get nothing but a bare interpretation of the law, but in parliament you can get a full consideration, you can bring into play the principle of equity, and you can also, as I said before, get a readjustment of conflicting interests if any should be shown, as between the settler and the company. But in a court of law we can get nothing but a bare interpretation of the letter of the law on a question submitted to the courts.

Now, has parliament ever interpreted its own Act? I have been told here by the Prime Minister and by a number of members, that parliament has never interpreted its own Acts or interfered with any contract it has made; and further, that it should not do so. Now, in connection with this very Canadian Pacific Railway contract, I am prepared to show here to-night that parliament has interpreted that original Act and contract a number of times; I am prepared to show that the rights conferred upon the company and the obligations placed upon the company under that contract have been interfered with in this House from time to time. The Canadian Pacific Railway Act was passed in 1881. That very session an Act was introduced here to provide for drawbacks; and in the next year, that Act dealing with drawbacks, not being clear, a second Act was introduced dealing with the drawbacks and interpreting the contract.

Mr. DAVIS. Interpreting the contract in what way?

Mr. MACLEAN. In connection with the drawbacks. In 1882 another Act was introduced authorizing the road to use a pass other than the Yellowhead Pass, which was defined in the contract, and this interference with the contract begins in these terms: 'Whereas, it may be in the public interest, therefore parliament resolves so and so.'

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). What was the effect? What did it do?

Mr. MACLEAN. It allowed them to use the Yellowhead Pass, though not designated in the contract. Parliament had full charge of the contract, and could then have refused this privilege, and said: No, you shall do something else. True, it gave them a privilege, but it interfered with the contract. In 1884 there was an Act passed to amend the Act of 1881, and this Act is described as for the purpose of the earlier completion of the road, and the preamble begins thus: 'Whereas, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have represented, &c., &c., therefore Her Majesty enacts.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Therefore, it was at the request of the company.

Mr. MACLEAN. I grant it. Now, at the request of the other party to this contract, the people——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It would be much more satisfactory if the hon. gentleman would give us clearly the effect of the different Acts to which he has referred.

Mr. MACLEAN. These are only preliminary, I am coming to the substantial one.

In this Act, section 5, are these words: 'Giving security by way of lien on its property and also upon the land grant of the company earned and to be earned hereafter.' That is in 1884. Then in 1885 there was an Act passed relating to the mortgage bonds, and this Act begins as follows: 'Whereas, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have represented, &c., &c., therefore it is enacted.' In 1888 was passed the Act to remove the restrictions as to competing lines, and this Act begins with these words:

Whereas, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have agreed to relinquish, upon conditions herein, &c.

A readjustment was made upon the terms—I will argue that later on—but there was another amending Act. In 1892 there was a short Act passed, but a very significant Act, and now I am going to quote chapter and verse for the special edification of the Minister of the Interior. 57 and 58 Vic., chap. 34:

An Act to amend the Act to provide for the allowance of a drawback on certain articles manufactured in Canada for use in the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

1. The words 'original construction' in section 1, chapter 7, of the statutes of 1882, intituled: An Act to provide for the allowance of a drawback on certain articles manufactured in Canada, for use in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, shall be construed to extend to and include the first iron or steel bridge erected in a locality, but not to any renewal or repair thereof.

Here is parliament construing the contract, and the very words 'construing' is used.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is that not with the consent of the company?

Mr. MACLEAN. I did not say it was not. The company came here and asked to have the Act construed. There are two parties to an Act, I hope, the people and the company. The settlers of the North-west are coming here to-day for the very same purpose, I am speaking for them, and I ask parliament to construe the meaning of the original charter as to when these exemptions begin.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Has the hon. gentleman any case in which the contract was valid without the consent of the company? If he has, that will help us.

Mr. MACLEAN. I have got so far in my argument, that parliament, in 1894, at the request of the Canadian Pacific Railway, had this Act construed; and there were two parties to the contract, the government representing the people and the company itself. In a word my contention is that if the company can come here and have the Act construed in its interest, the settlers of the North-west Territories, who have a vital interest in the contract, may also come here and have the Act construed. Now, I do not know whether that is bad doctrine, whether it is socialism, whether it is trifling with contracts, or not. I do not think it is, and I think it is all in line with what I said before, that the only place where you can get a full hearing of the case, where you can get the whole Act and the intention and meaning of the Act, and those who were parties to it, where the equities concerned can be taken into consideration, and where, if there are conflicting interests, there may be an adjustment, is here, and we are not far wrong in coming here.

Mr. DAVIS. You would not let the company construe the Act for themselves?

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) is very anxious about the company. I am trying to put in a word for the people of the North-west Territories, and I hope I will have some support from him.

Mr. DAVIS. I am afraid you are not doing them much good.

Mr. MACLEAN. In 1894, hon. gentlemen opposite were very much opposed to the company coming here and asking to have the Act construed. The right hon. leader of the government is on record as opposing it, but he opposed it because he contended, as others contended, that the company were coming here and asking for something additional, something not provided for in the contract. He opposed it in the public interest, as he set out. I state again what I said before, that if the company come here and ask to have the Act construed, why cannot the people come here also and ask to have it construed and have their rights, whatever they may be in the premises, protected? Now, I want to make my argument clear by reading my amendment which I have here. If any hon. gentleman wishes to know what I am driving at, if he will send over, he may get a copy of my amendment. I have reproduced in my amendment those clauses of the Act which deal with this exemption, and I shall read it to the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. What page is it to be found on?

Mr. MACLEAN. I have printed it on a special slip.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not the one on the Notice paper?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, the one on the Notice paper does not hold. That proposes a reference to the courts. I have abandoned that.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) take the pains to tell us how this argument bears on that proposition?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, I am going to deal with that. Now, the contract made by the government contained the following clause —clause 9. I hope I shall have the attention of the House when I read the law on the case :

In consideration of the premises, the government agree to grant to the company a subsidy in money of $25,000,000, and in land of 25,000,000 acres, for which subsidies the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be completed, and the same shall be equipped, maintained and operated, the said subsidies respectively to be paid and granted as the work of construction shall proceed in manner and upon the conditions following, that is to say :—

(a) The said subsidy in money is hereby divided and appropriated as follows, namely:—

* * * * * * * *

And the said subsidy in land is hereby divided and appropriated as follows, subject to the reserve hereinafter provided for :—

* * * * * * * *

(b) Upon the construction of any portion of the railway hereby contracted for, not less than twenty miles in length, and the completion thereof, so as to admit of the running of regular trains thereon, together with such equipment thereof as shall be required for the traffic thereon, the government shall pay and grant to the company the money and land subsidies applicable thereto. . . .

16. The Canadian Pacific Railway and all station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and other property, rolling stock and appurtenances required and used for the construction and working thereof, and the capital stock of the company shall be for ever free from taxation by the Dominion or by any province hereafter to be established, or by any municipal corporation therein; and the lands of the company, in the North-west Territories, until they are either sold or occupied, shall also be free from such taxation for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown.

My conclusion is :

This House is of the opinion that the twenty years' exemption provided for the land subsidy in clause 16, begins as of a date even with the payment of the money subsidy provided for in section 9.

Now, there is the agreement, and throughout the agreement the land subsidy and the cash subsidy come always together. If you will notice in clause 9, it says : In consideration of the premises, the government agree to grant to the company a subsidy in money and in land. They are called the same thing ; they are brought under the word 'subsidies.' The clause proceeds :

The said subsidies respectively to be paid and granted as the work of construction shall proceed.

Then, in b, it says :

Upon the construction of any portion of the railway . . . and the completion thereof . . . the government shall pay and grant to the company the money and land subsidies applicable thereto.

The two things come together ; the payment of the money and the granting of the land subsidy must be performed by this country in the carrying out of its contract with the company. The two things come together, and my contention is, that when the money was earned it was paid, and that as the money was earned, so also was the land earned, and these have been granted. If these were not granted in one patent, it is not the fault of the people, it is not the fault of this parliament, but it is the fault of some one else, and the people should not suffer because of the neglect that occurred, if such did occur. I just cite one legal authority in this matter, and it is a man whose name is respected in this House, the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy. The hon. gentleman who occupies his seat in this House today undertook to lecture me the other evening in reference to this question, but all I have to say to him is, let him turn to his uncle's opinion, as delivered in this House in 1894, when this case was up. The late Mr. Dalton McCarthy said :

I think the House should perfectly understand that this alteration in the contract will mean, before we are done with it, probably up in the millions. I think we had better realize and understand what we are doing. Of course, that ought to make no difference if the railway company were entitled to the change—because change it is—in the contract which is sought to be made now at the instance of the hon. the Minister of Railways. But, for my part, I do not look upon it by any means as a technicality. I look upon it as a substantial change in the contract, and let me tell the committee why.

That is Dalton McCarthy's opinion of this contract, and when the land grant and the money subsidy were earned.

This company were entitled to get certain grants of money and certain subventions in land only upon the completion of the road, as the road was completed from time to time and certified as being completed under the contract.

Mr. McCarthy held in this House, and it was held also in this House by others at the time, that the company had earned certain money subventions and certain land grants, that the two went together, and that they were payable at a certain time. It is my contention, and it is the contention of the settlers of the North-west, that as soon as the road was completed in its various sections, and when the money grant was due, so also was the land grant, and it should have been taken when the money was taken. If the government did not grant these lands it was not the fault of the settlers of the North-west, and, therefore, the settlers should not be made to suffer.

The PRIME MINISTER. On what question did Mr. McCarthy speak ?

Mr. MACLEAN. On the Act which was introduced in 1894, to construe the contract in connection with the drawback on the bridges.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is another question.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is quite clear that these two things go together, the payment of the money and the granting of the land. But hon. gentlemen who raise the company's contention and who take the lawyer's position rely on this thing here : That the twenty year exemption shall date from the grant thereof from the Crown. Sir, I am taking the position of the ordinary man of this country. I am talking to the farmer, to the man in the street, and I ask : What will happen if this exemption is to date from 'the grant thereof' ? We are told to-day that the patents are going through now and that it will be a year before they will be all finished. For some unknown cause they are going through to-day at a threshing machine rate, but according to the contention of the lawyers here, if the matter is referred to the courts all the courts will have to do is to declare that this exemption dates twenty years after the grants are made to-day. Is that justice, is that equity, is that in the interest of the farmers of the North-west ? Because somebody has been negligent in issuing these patents, or because somebody has been negligent in applying for them, these land grants shall be exempt from local taxation for twenty years from this date. Is there any justice in that, is there any equity in it ? We are told that they will get nothing but a cold interpretation of this bargain if we go to the courts. Sir, parliament is higher and greater than the courts. Parliament can do justice. Parliament can be seized of every consideration in connection with the matter, and if there are conflicting interests parliament can make a proper compensation or readjustment. But there is no justice for the settler in the North-west if he goes to the courts and the courts say : When was the patent granted ; when was the grant thereof from the Crown ; and they will send for the Minister of the Interior or one of his officers and find that the grant thereof from the Crown was in the year 1901, sixteen years after the contract was completed. A great deal of this land was grantable in 1883 ; more was grantable when blocks of twenty miles of the road had been completed, and all should have been granted before 1885 ; but because it was not granted the lawyers have come here to tell us that the exemption must date from the time the patents issue. That may be law and that may be cold justice, but I do not think it is equity, and I do not think it is the policy this parliament should pursue, if we ever hope to settle that country.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) to tell the House how his argument bears upon his proposition. He has made an argument in favour of parliament construing the contract and he has also argued against allowing the question to go to the courts. If his proposition is unanimously adopted by this House, will that keep it out of the courts ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes. Parliament can pass an Interpretation Act, and it is to furnish the government with an argument for doing so that I have brought down this resolution. They can even do it in the way they did it before when the Canadian Pacific Railway abandoned its right to the monopoly clause in the North-west for a consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose every member in this House agreed that in our opinion the exemption should be terminated on such a date, and the Canadian Pacific Railway refused to abide by it and appealed to the courts ; does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) think that the opinion of this House would influence the courts ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I do not ; but I propose to give the government an opinion of this House upon which they can found a Bill which will settle this question.

The PRIME MINISTER. How ?

Mr. MACLEAN. You can bring in a Declaratory Act, as was done in 1894, which will read thus : The word so and so shall be construed to mean, &c. Then you have settled it.

The PRIME MINISTER. What is your answer to my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) ? If the Canadian Pacific Railway objects, what will you say ?

Mr. MACLEAN. They can make their objection and that is all there is to it.

Mr. DAVIS. Suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) entered into a contract with the government and a dispute arose as to the wording of the contract, would he like the government to interpret that from their own point of view without a reference to the courts ?

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) is raising a side wind.

Mr. DAVIS. There is no side wind about it.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am talking about things as they are. Suppose I owed the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) a hundred dollars twenty years ago, and I had the hundred dollars in my desk for him, and he never came for it, could he claim interest from me because he never asked for his money ? And if the Canadian Pacific Railway did not get its land grant or did not apply for it are the settlers to be held responsible for the loss they sustained because of that ? If the previous government for ten years failed to do its duty, and if this government and this Minister of the Interior for five

years have failed to do their duty to issue these patents, are the settlers of the Northwest to suffer therefor ? Now, what is the duty of a parliament ; what is the duty of a premier ; what is the duty of a government in connection with the public rights of this country ? That is the most important issue in Canada to-day, and for a few minutes I shall direct the attention of the country and of the House to it. It is the duty of a government ; more especially the duty of the Prime Minister and of the Attorney General of Canada, and of the Attorneys General of the provinces to protect the rights of the people against the aggression of corporations and against the mistakes of officials whether they be ministers of the Crown or otherwise. That is the fundamental duty of the government in this country and of every country in the world. If the public rights suffer through neglect of the officials, it is the duty of a parliament to rectify the wrong. We have premiers and we have Attorneys General in this parliament and in the different provinces of Canada, and the significant thing is the way public rights are being raided, and the way Attorneys General in Quebec and Toronto, and here, are neglecting their duty to protect the public. I shall refer in this connection to what happened in the province of Quebec, and I shall read from the Montreal Herald, a leading Liberal paper, of Saturday last, an article dealing with the legislation obtained by the Water, Heat and Power Company, of Montreal, in the Quebec legislature.

The company has obtained possession of property to which it has no title in justice, whatever it may have in law, and it may depend on having to fight for every step of its corporate progress. The legislature will, no doubt, be asked to revoke the powers conferred on this company, and if the legislators do their duty they will not allow any claim of vested rights to stand in their way. The legislature is practically omnipotent, and if it was within its rights when it voted the property of the citizens of Montreal to the Light, Heat and Power Company, it would be equally within its rights if it undertook to undo the wrong which has been done and withdraw from this company the special privileges of which the people of Montreal complain.

Only in the recent session of the Quebec legislature the city of Montreal was raided of its rights. The Attorney General of that province, who should have been the guardian of the rights of that city and every other municipality, allowed those rights to be invaded in such a way that the leading organ of the Liberal party of Montreal says that the legislature must undo that wrong. The premier of the province is reported in the same paper three or four days before that as having made a deliverance on this question which is worthy of the attention of the people of Canada. Mr. Parent is reported as follows :

Mr. MACLEAN.

The premier, in his answer, took the following grounds :

First, that the protests had been too late. If the citizens of Montreal had taken the question in time and done one-half of what they have accomplished since the Bill passed both Houses, it is very doubtful if the privileges asked for would have been granted to the company. Personally, the premier had opposed the Bill, and was not yet in favour of it, but it is a constitutional principle that the government as a government must not act officially in regard to private Bills unless they are ultra vires. It is also a constitutional principle that the lieut.-governor must be advised by his government as to the disallowance of any Bill that has passed both Houses. It is, therefore, beyond the constitutional rights of the government to advise the disallowance of the Bill in question.

Further, he says :

If by this legislation the company infringes on the rights of the people, or goes too far in the exercise of its privileges, the question would then be taken up by the government, and the legislature would then be called upon to repeal these privileges, which were used unwisely and arbitrarily.

This would be a government measure, and of course would command the support of the Liberal party. If that support was not accorded, why there would be nothing left for the government but to resign.

The premier wished it to be thoroughly understood that the actions of the company will be carefully watched, and if the interests either of the municipalities or of the people in general are endangered in any way, the matter will be carefully looked into by the government, and prompt action will be taken to safeguard those rights, even if it were necessary to call a special session to repeal the company's Bill.

Here the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec says that if the public interest has been injured, he will call a special session of his legislature to repeal the Bill. But I charge the Prime Minister of Quebec and his Attorney General with having been negligent of their duties. If they were there for any purpose, it was to guard the municipal rights of the people of Quebec ; but they allowed those rights to be raided. And his leading newspaper supporter in the province calls upon him to do what he says he will do if a wrong has been committed, call a special meeting of the legislature and rectify the wrong.

What is happening in the province of Ontario to-day ? I come from that province, and we are all cognizant of what is going on there. The Attorney General and the premier of that province are every day allowing the municipal rights of the people of Ontario to be raided, and are not fulfilling their duty as guardians of the rights of the people. The city of Toronto was threatened the other day with having its control of its streets taken away from it by the corporation raiders in the Queen's Park.

My doctrine is—and I am applying it to the government here, as I will apply it to my friends on this side if they are ever in power—that parliament is here to do jus-

tice to everybody ; and if a wrong has been committed or a right has been denied, if somebody has been negligent and the public interest suffers, it is the duty of parliament to rectify the wrong. I do not know whether that is a bad doctrine or not, whether it is a Tory doctrine or not ; but I hope it is based on English constitutional practice, and I believe it is the only doctrine by which progress in government can be achieved. It is a well-known dictum that for every grievance, for every wrong, a legal right or a parliamentary right may be found. Now, these people in the North-west have a grievance ; they say that the company have not patented their lands. They should have patented them fifteen years ago ; but having failed to patent them, there is no reason why parliament should not now say : You should have patented your lands in 1885, and if you claim exemption from taxation, that exemption must date from 1885. It is well within the power of parliament to say that ; and if there is an issue as to whose rights are concerned, as between the poor settler and the rich corporation, which side is parliament going to take ? Is it always going to take the side of the rich corporation, and give it the benefit of the law, and never give the poor settler the benefit of it ? If there are conflicting interests, why not adjust them ? We are told : 'Oh, you are going to do an injustice to the Canadian Pacific Railway.' But the doing of an injustice is not as bad as the continuing of an injustice.

Mr. SCOTT. Is the hon. gentleman not proposing to do an injustice to the people ?

Mr. MACLEAN. In what way ?

Mr. SCOTT. Did he not express the opinion a few nights ago that the exemption period should have commenced on the 15th February, 1881 ?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, I did not express that opinion.

Mr. SCOTT. Did he not vote for a Bill which expressed that ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I voted for the Bill, certainly. I came into this House that night, and heard this question under discussion for the first time. After it had been threshed out—and I think I contributed a little to the merits of the discussion by taking a hand in it—I went away with the idea that the question could probably be settled in the courts. From that day to this I have been reading it up and studying it.

Mr. SCOTT. What is the hon. gentleman's real opinion as to the date of the exemption period ?

Mr. MACLEAN. The period of exemption is twenty years from the day that the land grants were grantable.

Mr. SCOTT. Then he does not stand by the opinion he expressed when he voted for the Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN. Grant that I do not stand by that opinion, where will you stand to-night on this question ? I will take full responsibility for where I stand, and whether I am consistent or not.

Mr. SCOTT. We would like to have that clear—whether the hon. gentleman does stand by it or not.

Mr. DAVIS. He has a license ; he has a privilege.

Mr. MACLEAN. These hon. gentlemen from the North-west do not like what happened this afternoon. I would have liked to have taken no partisan view of this question, but to have helped them to secure the rights of the people of the North-west. But, because I happen to be a Conservative, they want to repudiate me as talking buncombe in this House. I wish now to devote a little attention to the right hon. the First Minister. The right hon. gentleman has laid down the doctrine of vested rights, and proclaims himself a Liberal, and a great admirer of the late Mr. Gladstone. But, when he raised the question of vested rights and the sanctity of contracts, he must have forgotten that the whole record of British constitutional progress is, in a great measure, made up of the abrogation of vested rights and the denial of the sanctity of certain contracts. There is no British constitutional progress that is not based on the opposite of the doctrine laid down by the right hon. gentleman. One after the other, vested rights have had to disappear in favour of the public interest. When the right hon. gentleman says he is such an admirer of William Ewart Gladstone, does he forget the land laws which that hon. gentleman had caused to be passed through the House of Commons ? They were nothing else but confiscation of vested rights.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the Irish land laws ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, introduced by Mr. Gladstone.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How did they do away with vested rights ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I hope the hon. gentleman is not going to argue that they did not. These land laws practically wiped out the Irish landlords.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In what respect ?

Mr. MACLEAN. The landlords were compelled to sell whether they wished or not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. By what law ? Surely the hon. gentleman has not posted himself ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, I have. The whole principle at the bottom of Mr. Gladstone's land law was the interfering with vested rights. All the reforms in the land laws were based on confiscation in one shape or another. Then, there was the Irish Church question. Was there not confiscation in that case ? Take in this country the settlement of the seigniorial tenure in Lower Canada. Was there no confiscation there ? Did not a Canadian parliament secularize the church lands in the interest of the people ? But, these things were nearly all done in this country by the Tories, and we have the Prime Minister telling us that he stands up for vested rights and the sanctity of contracts, no matter how injuriously they may affect the public interest. But, when he takes that stand, he is not a true Liberal, or a student of history, but simply an advocate of the most reactionary proposition ever set before any civilized community.

Should we not do something for the settler ? The settler is the other party to this contract. Is it fair that he should have to pay municipal taxes for roads and school and other improvements, and that this great corporation, the Canadian Pacific Railway, should, through the negligence of the government, go scot free for twenty years to come ? Will such a policy as that build up our country ? I am in favour of giving the settler his right share in the unearned increment, his fair proportion of the increased value which comes to unoccupied lands through the settlement and cultivation of the country, and of not allowing a great corporation like the Canadian Pacific Railway to reap all the advantage. These alternate sections of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which are not paying any taxes, are increasing yearly in value through the labour of the poor settler, who builds the roads and pays for the schools and these lands, which originally were worth a dollar an acre, are to-day worth from five to ten dollars per acre. Where is the equity, where is the justice of making the settler do all the work and giving the Canadian Pacific Railway all the profit ? I maintain that this parliament is bound in duty to come to the rescue of the people and settle this question, and would be derelict in its duty if it were to send the poor settler to the courts, where he will only get cold justice and not the equitable treatment to which he is entitled. This question can only be settled on principles of equity, and not by a cold interpretation of the letter of the contract.

My resolution will enable the government to negotiate with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Hon. gentlemen opposite are on record as having laid down the doctrine that when there is a public grievance in connection with any contract, some effort ought to be made to secure its removal. They admitted that there was a great grievance in the Canadian Pacific Railway contract with regard to freights, and some years ago they gave that company a charter and a large subsidy to build the Crow's Nest Pass line, but upon condition that the company made certain concessions to the people. My resolution is in a line with that precedent, because it will give the government something on which they can negotiate with the Canadian Pacific Railway, just as Sir John A. Macdonald did when he found the monopoly clause would have to be abandoned.

I lay down the doctrine that parliament is supreme and the only competent body to protect the rights of the people and do justice in this matter. Am I saying anything not in accord with English precedent when I declare that it is the duty of the government and of parliament to protect the people's rights, whenever these rights are impeached upon ? That, I do not think is bad doctrine. I do not think it is good doctrine to send the settler to the courts. He will not get justice there, but will simply get an interpretation of the exemption clause. The decision will turn on the wording of the grant from the Crown, and everybody knows that the grant of land from the Crown dates this year, when the machine is at work making out the patents. But the land should have been patented when the money was paid, and if the grant was not then made, that was not the fault of the settler, and the settler should not suffer.

I was reading an item the other day in the Montreal Witness about a remarkable exodus of people from the state of Kansas. People leave countries when they find the conditions are not satisfactory, and county after county, municipal organization after municipal organization has disappeared from the map of Kansas because the people have had to leave.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. On account of dry weather.

Mr. MACLEAN. Partly on account of dry weather and partly on account of the treatment of the railways. But those people are looking for a country to settle in, and some of them are coming to Canada. But if they find out that this is a country where a huge land corporation is exempt from municipal taxation and the poor settler has to bear the whole burden, they are not likely to think it a very desirable place in which to cast their lines.

There has been a good deal of disappointment in this country that our North-west has not been settled so rapidly or so extensively as it ought to have been ; and there is a good class of settlers who are said to be avoiding the North-west who would really like to go there. Now, our Canadian Northwest, at its best, is not a Garden of Eden. It is rather a hard place to live in. And it is the duty of this parliament to make life in the North-west as endurable as possible. It is far away, there are long distances, it has a severe climate. And, if to that you add this curse of municipal exemption from

taxation—which is a curse in other places as well—if you add that to the hardships of the settlers, you are not going to get the best class of settlers in there, and you are not going to get the country rapidly settled. But if these people see that they are coming to a country where there is a government that will protect them in their rights, a government that does justice to every man of the community, you will get that country settled much more rapidly. You are not going to get the settlers to go there if it is given out that all that this parliament will do is to give them mere cold justice, a bare interpretation of the law, but will not give them their rights nor treat them fairly and equitably. If we wish to settle that country, we have no way to gain the public confidence but by this parliament settling the question of these exemptions. And it can be settled, as I said, by negotiation. That is the only way. I am ready to go the whole length of saying that there ought to be no negotiation but the declaration by this parliament that the period for these exemptions dated from the time the land grant was earned. But I am willing that the government should take advantage of my resolution to found negotiation upon it. But I am not going further than I have to go. If hon. gentlemen opposite like to open negotiations they may. But, if they are going to do nothing but refer it to a court, as the hon. member from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) wishes, they will do very little for the settler. What does the settler of the North-west want? Above all, he wants neighbours.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACLEAN. Who is the hon. member who is laughing? How would he like to live out on the prairie and have every alternate block a vacant space growing in value to his own detriment and to the advantage of the Canadian Pacific Railway corporation?

Mr. DAVIS. It is the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Maclean's) own political friends who did that.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Davis') friends have delayed for five years issuing these patents, and have not issued them yet. My political friends are responsible for ten years' neglect of their duty, and I hold them responsible for that. I hope the hon. gentleman will hold his friends responsible for their neglect. But that does not mend the wrong. The wrong has to be mended by legislation in this House, and that is to be gained by men from the North-west standing up in this House and fighting for the rights of the settlers, not by interfering with those who are doing something for the rights of the settlers. I know that my voice is a feeble voice, but it is at the service of the settler. I have never tried to interfere with hon. gentlemen opposite when they have tried here or in committee to uphold the rights of the settler. But they think it a proper thing to sneer at one who is upholding the settlers' rights. And the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) laughed at the clever little ruse by which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) caught your eye, Mr. Speaker, when I tried to speak. There was nothing clever about it; there was nothing in the interest of the public about it—I hope the settler in the North-west will remember it. I am going to see that settler in the North-west—I have said that before—and I am going to tell him who were the men who had something to say when his interests were up before the House for discussion. I am glad that I have the attention of the farmers of Ontario—and there are a lot of them here. The farmers of Ontario had a little lesson read to them the other day, and all the new members had a little lesson read to them by a newspaper called the Weekly Sun. I believe that it is an honest newspaper and that it is trying in its own way to do what it can for the benefit of the farming community of this country. This is the lesson it read to the new members of this House:

> They will find, however, that there are all kinds of influences at work at Ottawa to turn them aside from the path of duty and to enlist their support on behalf of corporate interests and of the raiders of the treasury. Let them be true to their constituents and to their constituents' interests. If they are they will find that the great obstacles which are represented to them as being in the way of just legislation will soon disappear. The voters are watching the course of their members this year, as they have not done for some time, and will soon find out who have been serving them and who have been betraying them.

Now, there is a feeling in Ontario that the corporations have had too much, that they have had everything in the way of legislation in the Ontario legislature and that they are having too much in this parliament. As this paper says, the farmers of Ontario are watching as they never watched before, the conduct of their representatives in relation to these questions where great corporations are concerned, and they will hold those representatives responsible. I hope I have some support from the Liberals of the province of Ontario who are farmers and who take the view that these settlers, these farmers of the North-west must not be left out of consideration because either the past government or the present government have been negligent of their duty or have failed to issue these patents as they should have done.

Now, my contention is—and I am finishing my remarks—that the only place where justice can be done in this matter is in this House; because, this House is seized of the law and the whole law; this House is seiz-

ed of the intention of the men who framed the law ; this House is possessed of jurisdiction that will secure equity as well as law ; this House, if there is a conflict of interests, can secure a readjustment. You cannot get that in a court of law. Hon. gentlemen opposite propose to send the settlers to a court of law for the righting of their grievances. There is only one way to settle these grievances, and it is for that reason I move this amendment to the motion for the House to go into Committee of Supply :

In the contract made between the company and the government for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, are the following clauses :—

Chap. 1, 44 Vic.

9. In consideration of the premises, the government agree to grant to the company a subsidy in money of $25,000,000, and in land of 25,000,000 acres, for which subsidies the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be completed, and the same shall be equipped, maintained and operated, the said subsidies respectively to be paid and granted as the work of construction shall proceed, in manner and upon the conditions following, that is to say :—

(a) The said subsidy in money is hereby divided and appropriated as follows, namely :—

Central Section.

Assumed at 1,350 miles—		
1st. 900 miles at $10,000 per mile	$9,000,000	
2nd. 450 miles at $13,333 per mile	6,000,000	
		$15,000,000

Eastern Section.

Assumed at 650 miles, subsidy equal to $15,384.61 per mile	10,000,000
	$25,000,000

And the said subsidy in land is hereby divided and appropriated as follows, subject to the reserve hereinafter provided for :—

Central Section.

1st. 900 miles at 12,500 acres per mile	11,250,000	
2nd. 450 miles at 16,666·63 acres per mile	7,500,000	
		18,750,000

Eastern Section.

Assumed at 650 miles, subsidy equal to 9,615·35 acres per mile	6,250,000
	25,000,000

(b) Upon the construction of any portion of the railway hereby contracted for, not less than twenty miles in length, and the completion thereof, so as to admit of the running of regular trains thereon, together with such equipment thereof as shall be required for the traffic thereon, the government shall pay and grant to the company the money and land subsidies applicable thereto. . . . .

16. The Canadian Pacific Railway and all station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and other property, rolling stock and appurtenances required and used for the construction and working thereof, and the capital stock of the company shall be for ever free from taxation by the Dominion or by any province hereafter to be established, or by any municipal corporation therein ; and the lands of the company in the North-west Territories, until they are either sold or occupied, shall also be free from such taxation for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown.

This House is of the opinion that the twenty years' exemption provided for the land subsidy in clause 16, begins as of a date even with the payment of the money subsidy provided for in section 9.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). When I learned that my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) was going to make the motion which he has just made, I took particular pains to be back at eight o'clock for the purpose of hearing all that he had to say in support of his proposition. Now, I have followed my hon. friend as closely as I am capable of following anybody, and I have endeavoured to understand and give due weight to the arguments which he has advanced. And I must admit that, considering my hon. friend's ability and the vigour with which he applies himself to questions which he deems worthy of discussion, I am somewhat disappointed with the arguments he has addressed to the House. In almost every case in which he has attempted to make a point he has totally failed, I think, to connect his argument with the proposition upon which he has asked us to vote. We will all admit that my hon. friend displays considerable ability and considerable energy in the discussion of any question he takes up. I think if my hon. friend had been able to find a coherent and valid argument in favour of his proposition he would have put it before the House in such a way that we could have understood it. But when we refer to various points which he attempted to make for the purpose of proving his proposition, it will be seen at once that his arguments utterly failed to prove the conclusion which he is asking the House to draw.

Before touching upon his argument let me refer briefly to the general situation in regard to this important subject. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not find my hon. friend's speech a novel speech, because I think I remember making a speech myself very much to the same effect although not addressed exactly to the same point about twelve or fifteen years ago ; and most of us who have been in the North-west have had occasion to draw attention in public utterances to the disadvantages under which the settlers of Manitoba and the North-west Territories labour as the result of the contract which was made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. My hon. friend will readily admit that when he devotes his attention so vigorously to the representatives of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, he is hardly fair in assigning any portion of blame for this state of affairs to those gentlemen who now represent the western portion of the country, whether they be Liberals or Conservatives. Par-

liament as it was constituted in the year 1881, is responsible for the state of affairs as it now exists. There is no particular object in discussing at the present time the good features or the bad features of that contract. We have enough to do in dealing with the present conditon of affairs without indulging in useless recriminations with regard to the responsibility of this or that political party for this state or that state of affairs. We have before us at the present time a certain position of affairs. Everybody will admit that it is an unfortunte thing that the condition of affairs is such that there is a possibility of the period of exemption being extended to twenty years from the time when the patents are actually issued. Every person will admit everything the hon. gentleman has said in that respect; and therefore, the one-half of his speech which was devoted to lamentations over the position of affairs in the North-west adds nothing to the discussion, because it is devoted to elucidating or emphasizing that which every one of us will admit without any discussion whatever.

Now, I am not prepared to say that the last word has been said, I do not desire that the House should understand me as holding that the last word has been said with regard to this subject; nor even when, as I expect will be the case, having regard to the position which the House took upon the Bill that was before us a short time ago, this resolution meets with a negative voice from the House. I do not think that the last word has been said upon the subject. I think that these subjects, difficult as they are, if we look at the history of legislation, generally find a solution of one kind or another. But I think I will be within the judgment of the House when I say that the solutions of these difficulties that arise from time to time in regard to public affairs, which are sound solutions, and which bear the test of experience and prove to be satisfactory, are not the solutions which are made by taking a short cut through contracts and through national obligations. We may have to deal with such matters in such a manner as to place us under imputations which we feel to be unfair. When my hon. friend suggested the idea that because members of this House may take a certain view in regard to an important matter of this kind, that, therefore, they are taking a mere lawyer's view and are leaning in favour of the interests of corporations as against the interests of the people, I, for my part, think that he is placing an unfair imputation upon members of the House upon one side as well as the other. Now, we hear a good deal in this discussion, particularly in a certain class of newspapers, of which my hon. friend's paper is sometimes a pretty strong example, we hear very broad statements made about the lack of good faith of legislators, members of legislative assemblies and members of parliament, in dealing with the rights of corporations and with the rights of the people as against corporations. Well, I am not a very old man, but I have been some ten or twelve years engaged more or less in drawing and assisting to draw and pass Acts of parliament, and I am bound to say that upon both sides of politics I have generally found that legislators were desirous of doing the fair and right thing by all parties. That has been my experience, and I have not been led to the conclusion that there was any just ground for broad general charges of lack of good faith in dealing with matters of this kind.

Now, so far as the people of the North-west are concerned, no person could be more anxious than I am, no person could be more anxious than the members of this House on both sides who come from the North-west and from Manitoba, to find a solution of this difficulty that would enable this burden to be taken from the people of that section of the country. It would be contrary to all reason that we should not feel in that way. We sympathize with the position of our constituents, we are much more fully and completely aware of all the facts and circumstances of the case than my hon. friend can possibly be. Therefore, feeling as we do upon this subject, surely it is reasonable to suppose that we should be just as anxious, in reality much more anxious, than my hon. friend, to find some solution of this difficulty. I do not say that a solution of it will not be found, I trust that a solution will be found, and I desire, therefore, to make myself clear as by no means saying that there is to be no further consideration of this subject because I find myself unable to support the hon. gentleman's proposition at this particular time.

Now, the hon. gentleman's motion is declaratory, it is declaratory in regard to the effect of a contract that has been entered into by this parliament with a corporation. My hon. friend might perhaps say: It is not an Act of parliament, it does not interpret the contract, and therefore when the contract comes before the court, inasmuch as this is not an Act of parliament and therefore does not modify the contract, but is only the opinion of one branch of parliament, therefore, it may be passed as our opinion in order that the court should have the benefit of our opinion upon the subject. He might present that argument. I think, however, that would not be an argument that would commend itself to the responsible members of this House, because I fancy that we would all feel that if we passed this resolution, and if to-morrow any one of the members of this House brought in an Act of parliament for the purpose of giving effect to the terms of this resolution, every man supporting the resolution would feel bound to vote for the Act of parliament. We are not here for the purpose of merely passing academic resolutions; and when

we assert a principle in a resolution, and we commit ourselves to it, we bind ourselves in so far as we can to follow it out with consistency, to support it when it comes in the shape of legislation before us. Therefore, what my hon. friend argues for to-day, in effect and reality, is to interpret a contract.

Now, my hon. friend said a number of things that seem to me to be inconsequent and if I may presume to criticise his remarks, I would say that his description of what he was going to prove was not generally borne out by what he actually did prove in the course of his remarks. For instance, my hon. friend strayed off just at the last, by departing altogether from the principle of the resolution, if I understood him correctly, which he had placed before us; and he suggested that at the time when disallowance was an active question, and immediately after that when the policy of disallowance respecting western railway charters was abandoned by the Federal government, Sir John A. Macdonald had found a solution for that difficulty. True, Mr. Speaker, Sir John A. Macdonald and parliament did find a solution for that, but how? They went to the company and made a contract with the company——

Mr. MACLEAN. But they did not go to the courts.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Whereby they bought for a valuable consideration a privilege which was in that contract. If my hon. friend has a suggestion to make in that respect, if he places before parliament some proposition whereby parliament would suggest to the government that an amendment of this kind should be made, then, we would be prepared to discuss that on its merits. I do not say that we would be prepared to support it, because I would not consider it wise to support a proposition to buy a privilege before the court had decided that such a privilege existed. But, what he wants is a solution by way of compensation. He is working in favour of something that is directly opposite to the principle of the resolution which is placed before the House.

Mr. MACLEAN. I did not argue that. I said it was open to the government to do that. I said that I took the contrary position myself, but let them pass this resolution or let them negotiate with the company as Sir John Macdonald did.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Well then, I misunderstood what the hon. gentleman said. I prefaced my remarks by saying that I understood the hon. gentleman to say so, and the hon. gentleman did not correct me at the time. I took what I understood him to say, but of course, I accept what the hon. gentleman says as to his intended meaning.

Mr. SIFTON.

The hon. gentleman spoke of the progress of the British constitution, which he says, is simply walking from one attack on vested rights to another. He was well corrected by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies), who pointed out, that when an attack is made by the British parliament upon vested rights, it is provided that by due form of law there shall be compensation. That is a principle which, I fancy, is invariably followed in all British legislatures. It is true that British legislatures have the power, the bare legal power to override contracts, to violate contracts and destroy vested rights without compensation. We have that power, but we have not that right and we cannot rightfully exercise that power. Before I pass from that point, I desire to quote an authority which seems to be absolutely clear in regard to it, and to show in exactly what position we stand in relation to a contract of this kind. Under our constitution as I said, we have the power to violate a contract. We have the power to override vested rights. I say that we have not the right to do that, and we cannot rightfully exercise that power which is vested in us. We strive carefully not to override contracts and vested rights. In the neighbouring states, they have a different kind of constitution, and I think without exception in the constitution of every state in the American union, there is a clause which provides that vested rights, or rights under a contract, cannot without compensation be interfered with by any legislation passed by the state. Therefore, inasmuch as that provision of their constitution which the courts have the power to construe, exists, there are constantly cases arising in which it is clearly and distinctly laid down as to what is a contract which the legislature cannot override. Therefore, when we have in our minds any difficulty as to any legislative Act of the parliament of Canada, or as to a contract which ought not to be interfered with, except in the sense and upon the understanding that it is a private contract and must be dealt with in that way, we can look usefully to the decisions which are given in the courts of the United States, because they have a long line of decisions there upon that very point. Let me quote to the House a short statement founded upon the decisions which have been given upon this point, and which my hon. friend will find in Cooley's 'Constitutional Limitations,' page 147. There I find this statement, which the House will see, and which my hon. friends who are members of the bar especially will see, is directly applicable to the discussion which is taking place at the present time. Speaking of irrepealable laws, the author goes on to say:

There is a modification of the principle, however, by an important provision of the constitution of the United States, forbidding the states

passing any laws impairing the obligation of contracts. Legislative Acts are sometimes, in substance, contracts between the state and the party who is to derive some rights under them.

Exactly what we have in this case.

Mr. MACLEAN. But not under the same constitution.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (reading).

And they are not the less under the protection of the clause quoted——

That is to say that the constitution which prevents the state from deviating from the obligation of a contract is none the less effective because the contract may have assumed the form of a legislative act.

And they are not the less under the protection of the clause quoted because of having assumed this form. Charters of incorporation, except those of a municipal character—and which, as we have already seen, create mere agencies of government—are held to be contracts between the state and the corporators, and not subject to modification or change by the act of the state alone, except as may be authorized by the terms of the charters themselves. And it now seems to be settled, by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, that a state, by a contract to that effect, based upon a consideration, may exempt the property of an individual or corporation from taxation for any specified period, or even permanently. And it is also settled by the same decisions, that where a charter containing an exemption from taxes or an agreement that the taxes shall be to a specified amount only, is accepted by the corporators, the exemption is presumed to be upon sufficient consideration, and consequently binding upon the state.

That deals with a question upon which there is an abundance of legal decisions, and I should perhaps apologize to the lawyers of the House for quoting an authority upon a matter which is elementary to every lawyer. But, the short reference which I have given from this work shows that the decisions have gone in the United States clearly and distinctly upon this very point. It is not a new point by any means that where a state has made a contract there is a clause in the constitution which provides that the state shall not interfere with that contract even by its own acts, and which prevents it from violating any of the provisions of the contract. My hon. friend was unfortunate in some of the precedents which he quoted. He said that parliament had already assumed the right to deal with, to modify and to interpret this contract, and he quoted the opinion of the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy. He said that Mr. Dalton McCarthy adhered to that view, and he rather undertook to lecture the present bearer of that honoured name, for having expressed an opinion contrary to his own opinion a short time ago. But, Mr. Speaker, the statement of Mr. Dalton McCarthy bears no such construction. Mr. McCarthy never expressed any such opinion; at least not here. If he did so anywhere else, my hon. friend ought to quote it, as it is not here. What was said was this: Sir John Thompson was speaking in this House on behalf of the Bill introduced by the government which was for the purpose of extending a privilege to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MACLEAN. To construe the contract.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not fancy that anybody in this House contends that if we wanted to extend the time of the exemption there would be any violation of the contract in that. They might accept the extension or not, if they saw fit. The government in enacting a provision relating to the introduction of material for the construction of Canadian Pacific Railway bridges had some difficulty in regard to the construction, and Mr. McCarthy raised the point that the legislation was giving a privilege to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Sir John Thompson to some extent argued against the view of Mr. McCarthy in respect to that, but only by endeavouring to show that in interpreting the contract they were not giving the Canadian Pacific Railway an undue extension of the contract. There was no suggestion that they were taking away anything that had been given to the Canadian Pacific Railway before. If they did, I can imagine how Mr. Dalton McCarthy and Sir John Thompson would have joined in condemning the proposition as one that could not have been entertained for a moment. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) was not fortunate in that reference. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) referred to the Act itself, 57 and 58 Victoria, chapter 34, in which parliament enacts the interpretation of the words 'original construction.' It interprets the words 'original construction' not in the Canadian Pacific Railway charter, but in another Act.

Mr. MACLEAN. But, another Act which is interpreting the contract. Follow it back and you will see.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It says:

The words 'original construction' in section 1 of chapter 7 of the statutes of 1882—

Mr. MACLEAN. And 1882 is interpreting 1881.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (reading):

—intituled an Act to provide for the allowance of drawbacks on certain articles manufactured in Canada for use in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, shall be construed to extend to and include the first iron or steel bridge erected in a locality, but not to any renewal or repair thereof.

That is not an amendment to the Canadian Pacific Railway charter at all.

Mr. MACLEAN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon ; it is an amendment to the contract.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) listen to what I say. I say that is not an amendment to the Canadian Pacific Railway charter at all. It is an amendment to chap. 7 of 45 Vic., the statutes of 1882. It is a public Act, not a private Act ; not a charter of incorporation, but a public Act, introduced to parliament for the purpose of defining what the duties of the government should be in respect to certain things, and which parliament has the right to change every hour in the day, if it thinks fit. There is nothing of the nature of a contract in it at all, and no lawyer would suggest for a minute that there is. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) produced the Act passed in 1885, and upon being questioned he had to admit that it was for the purpose of extending a privilege to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Another, the Act of 1894, was also for the purpose of extending a privilege to the Canadian Pacific Railway. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has quoted a number of enactments which in no single case would bear the inference of being unfavourable interpretations of the charter of incorporation of the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is not the slightest shadow of a precedent in anything to which the hon. gentleman has referred. I was surprised and somewhat disappointed at the hon. gentleman's argument. He said he had a number of precedents, and I expected he would have something that would at least bear the appearance of being a precedent. I do not know, Sir, that I need to extend my observations very much further. All I intended to do was to answer to some extent what was suggested by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), and in doing so, I desire to say that I sympathize with his idea and his anxiety to do something for the people of the west, who are labouring under a serious disadvantage in that respect. But, I submit with all confidence, that a great majority of members on both sides of the House will find themselves wholly and entirely unable to follow him in his reasoning, and wholly and entirely unable to assent to the proposition that this House should interpret a contract which it has made with a private individual or with a company.

Mr. MONK. Before the minister resumes his seat, I would like to ask him a question upon a matter which I expected he would touch in the course of his remarks. I refer to the issuing of patents. In these two resolutions there is abundant reference to the necessity of issuing the patents. The land grant has been earned a long time ago, and I have heard very often in this House reference to the delay in issuing the patents. That is a point upon which I would like some information from the minister, because it is, perhaps, there that legislation would be of use.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I spoke with reference to that matter for fifteen or twenty minutes this afternoon.

Mr. MONK. I will read what the minister said.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend will see my remarks in 'Hansard' just before six o'clock.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish, Mr. Speaker, to offer a reason for the vote which I intend to give upon this question. While I agree with the aim of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), and with some of his arguments, as well as some of the precedents which he quoted to justify interference by parliament in the direction which he sugegsts, still there are many points of his contention with which I cannot agree. This resolution simply says :

> That the twenty years' exemption provided for the land subsidy in clause 16 begins as of a date even with the payment of the money subsidy provided for in section 9.

The law does not say that it begins when the payment of the money subsidy was made, but, when the payment of the money subsidy was made and the land granted and handed over. It was contingent on the two things. The fulfilment of the one was not a complete fulfilment of the contract, which required the fulfilment of the two. Then, the contract goes on to say :

> The government shall pay and shall grant.

That was the provision of the contract Act, but although the government did pay they did not grant, and until they did both, I cannot see how we could interpret the law as being fulfilled so far as the contract went, because while the government paid the money they did not grant the land by giving a patent for it. If this motion were carried, it seems to me that it could in no way settle the question as to the date from which we should commence to count the twenty years. If we pass the motion it would only at best be the individual opinion of every member of this House who voted for it. I put the question to the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) : that even suppose we did pass the resolution and the Canadian Pacific Railway refused to be bound by it, and went to the courts to secure their rights, even then we would have to be guided by the interpretation put upon the law by the courts. The individual opinion of members of parliament might or might not count for anything in the estimation of the judges. They are charged with the re-

sponsibility, according to their own judgment and wisdom and legal acumen, of properly interpreting the law, and when they come to interpret that law they might differ entirely from what the majority of the members of this House think. While we might express ourselves here as individually being of a certain opinion, it would make no difference to the parties who were claiming their rights under the contract. It might be that the majority of members of this House honestly believe that the correct interpretation of the law is that set out by the hon. member (Mr. Maclean), but that would make no difference in the view which might be entertained by the courts. The contract sets out that when each twenty miles of the road has been built, the company is entitled to land and money, but, although the law says the money shall be paid and the land shall be granted, I am told that the money was not paid in every case, and whether it was or not, the patents of the land were not handed to the company. I take it that one of three things had to be done before the twenty years would commence. The land must be passed over by patent, or it must be sold ; or it must be occupied. It could only be occupied by a sale from the company, or occupied by the company itself. If it was neither patented to the company, nor sold or occupied by the company, I cannot see how we can come to the conclusion that the twenty years can commence to count.

For my part I hold that the twenty years' period could not begin to count until some one of these conditions was fulfilled—either that the land was granted by deed to the company or sold by the company, or occupied by the company. For this reason I shall be obliged to vote against the motion. While saying that, I must confess that I admire the conduct of the hon. member for East York in his desire to relieve the settlers of the North-west of a very onerous burden. I know from experience in my own part of the county what the pioneer settlers had to endure on account of the operations of the Canada Company. There was a great deal of land owned by the Canada Company in the county of Grey, and the pioneer settlers were obliged to make roads, clear up the land, build schools, and tax themselves heavily, while the land owned by the Canada Company went on increasing in value all the time ; and when the company came to sell any of their land, they sold it at a little above the cost of the land around. In other words, they benefited by the labour of the pioneer settlers, who had no redress. It is just the same with the settler in the North-west ; and I thought that while the hon. member for East York was advocating the interest of the settlers, it came with very bad grace from the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), and other North-west members to jeer at him when he was honestly trying to find some way of relieving the settlers of the very onerous burden that rested upon them, in consequence, it may be, of negligence of parliament or the negligence of the government—I mean the Conservative government as well as the Reform government. In the same way, in the past, when the ex-member for Western Assiniboia was working honestly and earnestly as any one could on behalf of the settlers, other members from the North-west tried to thwart and decry and turn into ridicule his efforts, and did everything they could to make it appear that he was not acting honestly. I think the hon. member for East York is entitled to every credit for his efforts to relieve the settler of that burden, even though we cannot agree with what he proposes as a remedy. For the reasons I have stated, I cannot vote for the motion. I think the twenty years should commence to count either when the land is sold by the company, or when it is patented, or when it is occupied by the company itself.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, I would like to vote for the motion of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), who has certainly shown a most energetic interest in the cause of the western settlers. It seems to be the difficulty of the western settlers that this House is full of sympathy for them, but is very scarce of actions in their favour ; and when a member comes forward with a practical proposition favouring those settlers, it certainly is my place to vote for it. My difficulty, however, is that having voted a few days ago that the date of exemption ended on the 14th of February last, I am not able to-night to vote that it does not end till five years from to-night. Therefore, while the hon. member has my fullest sympathy in his efforts, I am in the unfortunate position that I cannot support his motion.

The question I would like to discuss for a moment is as to the right of this House to deal with this question in any way. I will not discuss the date of the termination of the exemption. Other members who voted against the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), and who, I presume, are going to vote against this resolution to-night, have not discussed the date of termination. They have taken what they are pleased to call the broad ground of the sanctity of contracts. I will take that broad ground too. I claim that if a clear contract is shown, that contract must be submitted to. We are not asking to break a contract ; I refuse to be put in that position. I object to the stand taken by the hon. member for East York, that the settlers of the west are afraid of cold justice at the hands of the courts. All we want is justice at the hands of the courts, and at the hands of parliament. Give us a straight contract,

and we abide by that contract. We do not want any interpretation of a contract if the contract does not require any interpretation. But our claim is this: That a contract was made at a certain time, under certain then existing conditions, and in view of certain expected conditions, and that the conditions which were in view at the time that contract was made have not eventuated. It was expected when that contract was made that those lands would have been patented as soon as they were earned. It was not contemplated by parliament when it passed that Act that the patents would not be issued for twenty years. I say, therefore, that because the conditions have changed, a duty is laid on this parliament to interpret that Act before it goes to the courts. This parliament has no right to ask the courts to render a decision on the mere wording of the Act, when the conditions have changed from what they were when the Act was passed, and from what they were expected to be. Those who hold to the sanctity of contracts must show us what that contract means. They have no right to ask us to support the sanctity of a contract if they do not know what the contract means. We know what parliament meant when it passed the Act. We know that that Act is not in a proper condition to be referred to the courts at the present time, and it is the duty of parliament to fit it to the conditions as they now exist before referring it to the courts.

As to the decision which was read to this House by way of precedent, I will only say this, that we live under a certain constitution providing for legislation under certain responsibilities; and if under that constitution no precedent can be found which would prevent us from taking this action, then I say our case stands good and is not to be shaken by a precedent taken from the rulings upon the legislation of another country under a radically different constitution. If that precedent is good, then our constitution is bad. It is because we do not approve of that system of government that we have the government which we have in this country.

As to the precedents cited under our constitution by the hon. member for East York, I am not sufficiently learned in the law to know whether these were precedents in the proper sense of the word or not; but I gather from the discussion that the rule works this way: If a certain interpretation of a contract is in favour of a railway company, this parliament has the power to make it; but if it is an interpretation that is to give justice to the people of the country, then parliament has not the power to make it. Parliament is to be the servitor of the companies, and not the servant of the people. I say that parliament is or ought to be the master of the companies and the servant of the people; and it is the right as it is the duty of parliament to see that substantial justice is done in this case, irrespective of any legal quibble. It is an outrageous proposition that an exemption from taxation to the extent of $100,000 a year should be continued to a single corporation in the Northwest for a period of twenty years beyond the time intended by parliament—to the extent of sixteen years, at any rate. I say it is a monstrous proposition that the company should be allowed to benefit to the extent of $1,600,000, at the lowest calculation, on a quibble as to the meaning of a single word; which is the contention that is put before the House.

My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said that in his view the exemption must commence at the time the land was either sold or occupied or patented. If the word 'patent' is to hold, if we are to stick to the legal, technical meaning of the word 'patent,' how comes it that that exemption ends, without a patent having been issued at all, by the mere fact of that land becoming occupied?

Mr. SPROULE. One of the other conditions under which it would commence to count, have been fulfilled.

Mr. OLIVER. But our hon. friends are contending that there is only one condition, and that is the issue of the patent. Whereas the hon. member himself has said—and the words here bear me out—that the exemption ends when the land is occupied or sold, and it is a notorious fact that the company has sold a million acres of that land without ever a patent being issued. If you admit, on the one hand, that the exemption expires by reason of occupation or sale, you cannot, in the next breath, hold that the exemption can only expire twenty years after the land has been patented.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I certainly did not make myself clear, if my hon. friend understood me to say that I made any contention whatever with regard to the meaning of this clause. I made no argument with respect to its meaning. I took the position taken by the right hon. gentleman the leader of the House, that the interpretation of the contract was a matter for the courts to decide. As to the last point of my hon. friend, he perhaps may not have been familiar with a case in which this contract has been in a way before the courts. The courts have held that there are two conditions which give rise to the power of taxation, one is the issuing of the patent, and the other the sale or occupation of the land. It has been held distinctly that the sale or occupation gives the right to taxation.

Mr. OLIVER. I was not alluding to the position of the hon. minister, but to the position of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). The contention that the

exemption expired on the 15th February last, is the one I desire to maintain before this House and country. I maintain it on the ground that the word 'grant' in the Act was not intended to mean patent, but does mean, and was intended to mean, gift —that the land was given when the Act was passed, and the exemption began at that date, and ceases twenty years from that date. I claim that it is competent for this House to give that interpretation to the contract and thereby do substantial justice to the people.

I will go this far. I will admit that there is enough in what the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has embodied in his motion to make it arguable whether the exemption expired on the 15th February last, or will expire twenty years from the actual completion of the road. That would be a fair matter for reference to the court, I admit, and I would not ask for legislation from this House to prevent that question from going to the courts; but I do ask for legislation to prevent it from going to the courts in such shape as that it may grant an exemption of forty years to the railway company, when only twenty years were intended; and, under circumstances which might—but which I do not think will—exist, to grant to them an interminable exemption on the basis of a quibble as to the meaning of a single word, by importing an improper meaning into that word.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to say a word with respect to the argument of the hon. the Minister of the Interior. It does not require any reference to Cooley or any one else to make us aware in this House that it is not a proper thing, except in very extraordinary circumstances, for parliament to interfere with contracts or vested rights. And in reply to what has been just urged by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), it is, as the Minister of the Interior has pointed out, very much more improper to interfere with such contracts when the country, which parliament represents, is one of the parties to the contract. Therefore, in so far as this resolution of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) purports to declare that this particular contract has a meaning which might not be the meaning assigned to it by the courts, I cannot agree that that is a motion which it was proper for this House to pass. At the same time I entirely concur in what has been said by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) with respect to the credit due our hon. friend for the zeal with which he has advocated the cause of the railway and the settlers in this matter.

I think that the hon. Minister of the Interior was not fair to the hon. member for East York in dealing with the precedent which that hon. gentleman cited. The minister held up this Act, and said it is a public Act, and therefore cannot form any part of the contract of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not think that a more illogical conclusion was ever put forward by any hon. gentleman. A part of the contract between this country and the Canadian Pacific Railway might be contained in a public Act, and it might be absolutely unjustifiable for this country to modify the terms of that Act until the purpose had been accomplished.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not intend by the use of the word 'public' to imply that because an Act was a public Act it was necessarily one that parliament might properly change, but I said that this was a public Act and such an Act as could be changed without violating the contract.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. I think that the second part of his argument was perfectly correct, namely, that it was an Act of which both parties to the contract assented. That was a perfectly good answer to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), but the first part of the suggestion as to this not being a precedent was not an answer at all, because this particular Act deals especially with the Canadian Pacific Railway and with the rates of duty which shall be charged upon machinery and other articles imported for the use of that company. Now, we have heard a great deal about the difficulty that has arisen in the North-west with respect to this taxation. I think that the remedy is entirely in the hands of the government, who, I suppose, have all the necessary information in their hands to enable them to deal with the matter. This difficulty has arisen for one or other, or partly from both of two causes. Possibly it has arisen from the looseness of the language in which the contract was originally couched. It is impossible to construe that language by the speeches of the hon. gentlemen who were in the House at the time. The greatest corporation or the poorest man has a right to have his contract construed in the court according to the words in which it is couched. Whether that question comes up as between this country and the greatest corporation in it, or as between this country and the poorest man in it, we should all stand by that—that the contract must be dealt with according to the words and not according to the intention one or other of the parties has in his mind in so far as it differs from these words. I say, the difficulty may have arisen from the looseness of the language in this respect—the words did not express the idea in the minds of the gentlemen who dealt with the question in this House. Or that it may have arisen from faults of administration. I do not say that that is the case, but it has been suggested that it has arisen in that way—through the administration not seeing

that the grants were made at the proper time. If the difficulty has arisen from one or other of these causes, it may be that there is a grievance in the North-west. Hon. gentlemen in that portion of the country tell us that there is, because of this, a burden resting upon the people there with which they should not be saddled. If that is so, it is perfectly simple for the government to deal with it, if they think it a matter worthy of redress—and that is a question upon which the government, having the information as to its importance in their possession, should have a policy. It is competent for this parliament to declare by an Act that the period of exemption from taxation accorded to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall cease at a particular time—say twenty years from the completion of the road. I would not concur in the passing of that Act if it went no further than that. But it would be competent for this parliament, in the same Act, to say that the government should indemnify the Canadian Pacific Railway Company against any additional taxation which should be imposed upon them by reason of the passing of such an Act.

Mr. McCREARY. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) please explain that a little more fully.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is very simple. I do not know at present what it would involve, and I do not say I would advocate it; but I say that I would give it fair consideration. It is a matter upon which the government should have a policy. Let the government, if the circumstances justify it, bring in a statute and pass it in this parliament, declaring that the exemption from taxation accorded to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by the contract referred to shall cease at a particular day—let us say, twenty years from the completion of the road or at some other convenient day—and by the same Act let the government undertake to indemnify the Canadian Pacific Railway Company against any increased taxation which shall be imposed upon them by reason of the passing of such an Act. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), speaking on this subject the other evening, said it would amount to some $50,000 a year. I do not know whether or not the circumstances are such as to justify the government in undertaking to pay that sum for a certain number of years for the future. If we are to believe representations of hon. gentlemen from the North-west, the circumstances would seem to justify it. I do certainly claim that it would be infinitely better for the government to pay $50,000 or $100,000, or any other sum of money, than to violate a contract entered into by parliament, and, in that way, to violate what I would regard as the national faith and honour.

Mr. OLIVER. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax), what are the terms of the contract?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The terms of the contract which are referred to are that the lands of the company shall be exempt from taxation for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown.

Mr. OLIVER. From when?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). From the time of the grant of the lands from the Crown. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) evidently does not understand me. I am not giving an opinion as to the legal effect of the contract in that respect. But I say that it would be competent for the government to make it perfectly plain that the exemption from taxation should cease in twenty years from a certain date, and, at the same time to indemnify the company for any increased taxation put upon them by the passing of that Act. Then, in so far as the meaning of this clause is in doubt, they can do as they proposed to do this afternoon, leave it to be determined by the court. When it is once determined by the court, it would be a matter of little difficulty to ascertain what the amount of taxation is that would be imposed on the company in consequence of the Act. The government of this country, if the circumstances justify such an Act, would, by such an Act, undertake to indemnify the company against the consequences of such legislation, and so preserve inviolate the contract we made with the company and so preserve inviolate the national honour.

Mr. DAVIS. Would it not be as well, in the first instance, to submit it to the courts as to go at it in this roundabout way?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) was very anxious about this matter, but, apparently he is not anxious. I suggest that we can do this thing at once, if the circumstances and the information in possession of the government justify it, and then let the court determine it afterwards. If the court determines that the clause means what some hon. gentlemen in this House think it means, there will be no burden upon the country at all. If the court determines that it means something, which, under the legislation, would impose a burden upon the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, this country would assume the burden. I am suggesting something in the interest of my hon. friend's constituents—that is, immediate relief. But he desires, apparently, to have it postponed and dealt with in the courts for a couple of years before it is dealt with by the government and by this parliament. I do not suppose that the right hon. leader of the House (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would be pepared to say 'Yes' or 'No' to this to-night. I am not making a suggestion with a view to embarrassing him, but because I think the suggestion is one that he might well take into consideration. It is possible that he has not the in-

formation in his possession and is not sufficiently aware of the circumstances to be able to give a decided opinion on the matter. I throw it out as a suggestion which I think fairly deserves consideration by the government, and which, if it is brought down to this House by the government, will certainly receive fair and careful consideration on my part.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sure that a moment of reflection will convince the House, and will certainly convince the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that the proposition which he makes at this moment is altogether unacceptable, because it assumes the whole point at issue. My hon. friend proceeds upon the assumption that the exemptions exist at this moment, which is really the point to determine. The hon. gentleman who has brought this matter to the attention of the House on more than one occasion, and again this afternoon, and those who have brought the question up before him, all contended that the settlers of the North-west were labouring under a great grievance. There are no two ways of looking at that fact. We are all agreed that the settlers of the North-west are, at this moment, and have been for many years past, labouring under a great grievance by reason of the lands which were granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company having been exempted from taxation for a period of twenty years. Without going into recrimination, my hon. friend knows that if this burden has been, and is still, lying upon the settlers of the North-west, it is not the fault of those who sit on this side of the House. When the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was introduced into this parliament, most serious exception was taken by us to that feature of the contract. Our views did not prevail at that time, and the consequence has been this grievance from which the people are now suffering. But, the contract was passed by a majority of the representatives of the people, and it is now binding upon the whole country. The grievance exists in the fact that all the lands granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the 25,000,000 acres, were exempted from taxation during a period of twenty years; but the question has ever since been, at what period was this exemption to date from ? What is the limit of it ? Twenty years was the limit, but the question to be determined is, when did this period of twenty years begin to run ? Some parties in this House hold that it began upon the 15th of February, 1881, the date upon which the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway was ratified ; and my hon. friend some time ago supported and voted in favour of a resolution which asserted that it ran from the 15th of February, when the contract was ratified. He has changed his views since that time, he has changed his views in the space of three weeks. Three weeks ago he was of opinion that the period from which the exemption should run was the 15th of February, 1881 ; now he comes to the conclusion that he was all wrong then.

Mr. MACLEAN. Not necessarily.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then, why did he vote for it ? If he did not believe in the proposition that the exemption should run from the 15th of February, why did he vote for it, and thereby do a great injustice to those whose cause he champions ? Now, however, he wants us to affirm that the date of the exemption should run, not from the 15th of February, 1881, but from the date of the payment of the money subsidy as provided in section 9, that is to say, when the road was completed. As a certain section of the road was completed, the money was paid thereon, when another section was completed another payment was made, and so on ; and his argumnt to-day is, that the period of exemption shall proceed from time to time as the land subsidy was earned. That may be the case, I do not say it is not the case, but that was his view. Well, here is one construction. My hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), who is not here, and my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) who is here, contended that the period should run from the 15th of February, 1881. This may be the correct view, I do not offer an opinion, but, if it be correct, the leader of the opposition will admit at once that nothing could be more detrimental to the interests of the people at large than to pay compensation to the Canadian Pacific Railway for an exemption that no longer exists.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My right hon. friend surely does not desire to misrepresent me. What I said distinctly was that we should declare that this exemption ceased at a certain period, leaving the meaning of the contract to the courts, and that we should pay to the company any taxation which was increased by reason of the interpretation which we put upon the statute.

The PRIME MINISTER. Why pay them anything if there is no exemption existing ? As I understand the proposition of my hon. friend, he wants us to say that the exemption shall date from the time the patents are issued, and then the exemption shall run twenty years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We would not pay them anything if no exemption exists, because the courts would so decide.

The PRIME MINISTER. That only shows the need of referring the matter to the courts before we legislate at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I admit it.

The PRIME MINISTER. When the courts have decided that point, then we shall be

able to decide what to do. If the courts decide that the contention of the hon. member for Lisgar and the hon. member for Alberta is correct, that the exemption should date from the 15th of February, 1881, then the exemption is already at an end, and there is no indemnity to be paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but, if on the contrary, the courts decide that the exemption should run from the date the patents are issued, and patents were issued in 1901, then the exemption would run to that extent to the year 1921. In that case parliament would have to determine whether an indemnity is to be given to the settlers, or whether an indemnity is to be given to the Canadian Pacific Railway. But, all this shows how absolutely essential it is that the question should be referred to the courts, that we should have an authoritative decision as to the meaning of the law before we can take any public action in the way of giving relief to the settlers of the North-west. The matter is so plain, so obvious, that I am surprised there is any difference of opinion with regard to it. For my part, I am rather pleased with the suggestion made by the leader of the opposition. He sees himself that if legislation is to be passed by the parliament of Canada to relieve the settlers of the North-west, the only basis upon which we can act is a judicial determination as to what rights of the Canadian Pacific Railway now exist under this section of the law.

My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) rather taunted me a moment ago about precedents, both in this parliament and in the British parliament. I had to speak upon this question some time ago, and I took occasion to remonstrate against any attempt in this parliament to invade vested rights. My hon. friend pooh-poohed the idea of vested rights. He is prepared to deal with vested rights, not in the manner in which they are dealt with by the British parliament, but in the manner with which they are dealt with in France, simply to wipe them away without regard to whom the legislation may injure. That is not the policy we have followed in this parliament. I might refer to Mr. Gladstone, the great Liberal of whom I claim to be a follower. My hon. friend will remember that Mr. Gladstone was always very careful of vested rights. He was reminded a moment ago by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that Mr. Gladstone never introduced any legislation of any kind which interfered with vested rights, unless at the same time he provided ample compensation for those who were deprived of their rights. My hon. friend shakes his head, he is a sceptic on this matter. Well, I have here the legislation of Mr. Gladstone with regard to the Irish Church, and if my hon. friend will examine it he will find that in every case where his legislation interfered with a clergyman whose living was taken away from him, Mr. Gladstone took good care that every incumbent so affected should have ample compensation to the extent that he was injured. That is the policy which has been followed in every British parliament; and I am shocked and horrified that an historical truth so notorious should be controverted by anybody in this House, and especially by my hon. friend from East York, whose origin should have taught him better; I am surprised that it should have fallen to my lot to teach him a lesson upon this question. I adhere to the principle that if we have vested the Canadian Pacific Railway with any rights which we are compelled to interfere with or take away, the Canadian Pacific Railway must receive compensation. But, we must know previously exactly what those rights are, let us know at what period they began and at what period they terminate, let us know if they are terminated now, and when we know this from a competent judicial authority, then we will have a basis upon which to take action.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. MONK. I do not think the right hon. gentleman has clearly understood the proposition of the leader of the opposition, and I would appeal to any laywer in this House to maintain that he has represented it correctly. As I understand the proposition of my hon. friend here, that proposition was one, that, if adopted, would immediately put a stop to the state of affairs, of which have been told year in and year out since we have come into this parliament as existing in the North-west Territories. It puts that interpretation upon the contract, which I submit respectfully it surely bears, that the exemption ceased when the road was completed, and having done that, the grievance, so ably set forth by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) this evening, stops at once, because, taxation begins upon these lands. I was surprised to hear that hon. gentleman state to-night that these lands had been actually occupied by the Canadian Pacific Railway for a time, that they were afterwards sold and that upon the lands which the company occupied they never paid a cent in taxes. The remedy is in the proposition of my hon. friend here—pass an Act declaring that the exemption ceased at a certain time say twenty years, or say when the road was completed. When we propose that we are met by the argument of the hon. Minister of the Interior who says that we are interfering with vested rights. That is not the case, because my hon. friend added a proviso safeguarding the vested rights of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. In one clause he puts an end to the grievance. He puts the people of the North-west Territories upon a footing which I think every hon. member of this House

believes the people of that country should occupy. In one clause he puts them on a proper footing, and in another clause he safeguards the rights of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The right hon. leader of the government says this is a matter that can only be determined by a court of law. That is exactly the proposition of my hon. friend in the indemnity clause which is inserted, decreeing—and my hon. friend is very right, because he has had experience, as other hon. gentlemen have, that it will take a long time for that point to be decided and in the meantime the people will suffer from that grievance—that when the courts have decided at what period the payment of taxation should have begun under the terms of the contract, it will be the duty of the government to indemnify the company. Where is the contradiction in that? The Prime Minister says that the proposition of my hon. friend interferes with vested rights and it is evident from what he stated here to-night, that it is only by submission to the courts that we can obtain a solution of this difficulty. But, the solution, as was contended by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), and by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), is in our own hands, and it is our duty to the people of the North-west Territories to give them relief from the grievances under which they suffer. It seems to me with this proposition which was so clearly put before the House, and which is not approved of by the government, we should know what they intend to do to relieve the grievances of these people. I do not pretend to know the circumstances under which they suffer, but I have been in this House since 1896, and I have heard this question brought up year after year. I have heard from members representing the North-west Territories a full statement of the inequality and injustice which prevail in the North-west Territories, and I have not yet heard in all these five years any statement from the government beyond a general statement that it would be good to know what the courts think about it. What have they done to find out what the courts think about it? Nothing at all.

Mr. LEIGHTON G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt it will be pleasing for us to hear the way in which the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Monk) and his leader (Mr. Borden, Halifax) have spoken on behalf of the western country, but, as one to whom his suggestion appealed as a way out of this difficulty, I was very much disappointed to find that the hon. leader of the opposition said that he would not be prepared to advocate it. What position, therefore, does he take? Is it a suggestion merely which is to be thrown out to catch those whom it may appeal to and not hurt the feelings of those whom it would otherwise hurt? If it was a suggestion which was to be brought into effect it could easily have been moved on a previous occasion, or it could be advanced upon an occasion upon which we could give the matter full and complete consideration. This is a discussion of a resolution which the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has moved and with which the hon. leader of the opposition is not in sympathy. He says that the trouble may have been caused by either of two things, or partly by one, or party by both, first, by the looseness of the language in which the contract is couched, secondly by reason of the careless way in which the government have administered its affairs in connection with the contract. Which it is he is not prepared to say; nor is he prepared to express an opinion as to when the period of exemption ceased, or as to when it began to run. If that is all the light we have thrown upon it by the hon. gentleman, I do not think that the hon. member for East York should complain on account of my not being prepared to express an opinion upon this subject because his leader is not prepared to express an opinion as to when this exemption started or when it ceased. If his honoured leader takes that position, I think my humble position is not so difficult. I rose more to reply to the hon. member for East York than for any other purpose, because I believe he said, while I was not in the House, that I was not following an example which I should follow in this House. He made that statement before, and I think he knows that he treads on the tail of my coat. I am an Irishman. If Dalton McCarthy ever expressed an opinion whereby he was prepared to construe a contract made between two parties in the absence of one, I entirely repudiate it as being beyond the conception of any one who ever knew him as a lawyer. We are asked to say in the absence of one party what a contract means. It is not as the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) says construing, or altering, or varying a statute, because the statute is merely a confirmatory statute, one which ratifies an agreement, and if it does it refers to the agreement. The agreement is one which was entered into between two parties and no lawyer, or layman, can come to the conclusion that in the absence of one party we would be justified in altering that contract. I entirely agree with what the hon. leader of the opposition said upon that point. If the proposition were feasible, and if he would advocate the suggestion which he has so gratuitously thrown out, which appeals to me and other hon. members on this side of the House, that the government or parliament should say to the people: We will stand between the two

parties to the contract and ask the courts to say that the company should have paid or they should not have paid, we would be in a different position. Unless some such enactment is provided whereby the party who is not present upon this discussion is afforded protection, I cannot see how one can consent to the resolution of the hon. member for East York.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). Mr. Speaker, I think it is very unfortunate that whenever the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) rises in his place in this House he cannot refrain from giving us a little of what was called by the former hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) 'graveyard politics.' I think it is about time that was stopped. As to the merits of the question I have been waiting to hear from the members from the North-west Territories. It is true that we had a speech from the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). It is left to the member for East York (Mr. Maclean) and to the leader of the opposition and to other members on this side to advocate the claims of the settlers who are undergoing the hardships of pioneer life in the North-west, while those members who are supposed to represent the settlers neglect the interests of their people. I have the greatest sympathy with the settler in the North-west who finds himself suffering under this burden.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Why did you fasten the burden upon the settler ?

Mr. WALLACE. We did not fasten any burden upon the settler. My interpretation is that the lands are taxable to-day and that the government should so declare. But the government have done nothing. They have made promises but they have neglected to carry their promises out as in a hundred other cases. This government has been in power for six sessions of parliament and although they have often been warned about this matter they folded their arms. In hundreds of other cases they have referred matters to the Department of Justice to get an opinion, but why have they not got an opinion from their law officers in this case ? Why did they not ask their Minister of Justice to give an interpretation and stand by it, and if the Canadian Pacific Railway or anybody else was dissatisfied with it let them go to the courts. The government knew that the twenty years expired on the 15th of February last, but nothing was done by them. Do not we remember the case of the colonization companies. About the same time the Canadian Pacific Railway was undertaken the government asked the citizens of Canada to assist them in colonizing the North-west, and they gave them grants of land on payment of money and services rendered. The lands were granted to the colonization companies in proportion to what they had earned under the government regulations, and immediately the bargain was concluded the government handed the patents to the colonization companies, and those who occupied the lands have been paying municipal taxes ever since. And, if the colonization companies held the lands they have been liable for municipal taxes ever since, and the same rule should have applied to the Canadian Pacific Railway, because in that regard they stand on all fours with the colonization companies. To-day the leader of the opposition has made a proposal which I think is an admirable one.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, hear, hear. I say it is an admirable proposition.

The PRIME MINISTER. But you have just told us that the exemption is at an end.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is not inconsistent.

Mr. WALLACE. That is not inconsistent with the statement made by the leader of the opposition, and the leader of the government has either not understood the proposal of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) or he has deliberately misrepresented it. However, I do not believe he would intentionally or deliberately misrepresent it. My own opinion is that the Canadian Pacific Railway lands were probably amenable to taxation years ago, but at all events they are amenable to taxation to-day.

Mr. McCARTHY. From what date would the first payment be made under the suggestion of the leader of the opposition.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is quite clear as to what he is talking about. The proposal of the leader of the opposition is, that if the courts should decide that the Canadian Pacific Railway was liable for taxes, then the government should step in and free the Canadian Pacific Railway from any liability in that regard. I do not propose to say when the date commences, but I do say that in my opinion the date of the exemption has expired now. I again appeal to the government to do something in the matter and to get a move on. They are getting the name in the country of being a slip-shod government. They fail to recognize that they are the servants and not the masters of the people. They seem to think that because times have been good by reason of circumstances over which they have no control, that the good times excused them from doing their duty. They have neglected the interests of Canada from the day they came to power until the present and it is time for them to wake up to a sense of their duties to the people.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I am pleased to know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) takes such an interest in the North-west members and that he proposes to take the whole of the North-west Territories under his wing.

Mr. WALLACE. I am pleased to know that I have brought two western members to their feet already.

Mr. DAVIS. There are occasions when the members for the North-west are fighting the battles of the people, and when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) is to be found on the other side advocating the interests of corporations and of the Canadian Pacific Railway particularly.

Mr. WALLACE. When ?

Mr. DAVIS. In the Railway Committee every day.

Mr. WALLACE. When ?

Mr. DAVIS. Go upstairs to the Railway Committee.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) cannot mention one instance of such a thing. I have always been on the side of the people as against the corporations.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) cannot refer to what takes place in the Railway Committee unless a report is made to the House.

Mr. DAVIS. Then I go further and say that I have heard the hon. gentleman advocate the cause of monopolies and corporations in this House day in and day out during the four years that I have been here.

Mr. WALLACE. I challenge the hon. member to cite one instance.

Mr. DAVIS. When the hon. gentleman advocates high protection, he is advocating the interests of the trusts and combines.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He supported this very contract.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, the hon. gentleman supported this contract, whereas if he had been looking after the interests of the people of the North-west at the time, as he appears to be since he got into opposition, this state of affairs would never have been brought about, and this discussion would not have been necessary. But the hon. gentleman at that time was quite willing that all the public lands of the country should be given away. The hon. gentleman was a member of a government which gave away millions of acres of land, and tied them up and left them exempt from taxation ; and I never knew him to raise his voice then against this iniquity that he talked of to-night. But it makes a great deal of difference whose ox is being gored. The hon. gentleman has changed his mind since he took a seat on the other side of the House. I want to inform the hon. gentleman that the members representing the North-west Territories are looking after the interests of the people in this matter. We differ as to what should be done, but there is a right way and a wrong way. I am not prepared to say that hon. gentlemen opposite, when they drafted the contract, did not draft it in such a way, and with their eyes open, as to leave a loophole for the Canadian Pacific Railway to crawl out of. I do not suppose this House is prepared to interpret that contract. The right place to have it interpreted is in the courts. I myself am of opinion that the lands were granted when they were earned. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has another opinion ; the leader of the opposition has another ; and the hon. member for East York has another.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, I agree with you.

Mr. DAVIS. It all goes to prove that the only way out of the difficulty is to submit the matter to the courts for a decision. We did something this afternoon in passing the motion which I proposed, and which I think will meet the views of the people of the North-west Territories. The lands are there ; any assessor can assess them ; but the difficulty has been that no school district or municipality has felt itself wealthy enough to start a lawsuit against a great corporation like the Canadian Pacific Railway. They feared that the case would be carried from court to court until they would not be able to meet the expenses and the school district or municipality would be ruined. But the government have announced this afternoon that they are prepared to assist any municiality which will institute proceedings on this line, and they will carry the case along and find out the rights of this matter. I do not think the government could do anything more than that ; but there are gentlemen in this House posing as champions of the people of the North-west Territories, and trying to make a little cheap political capital for themselves. The hon. member for East York says he is going to the North-west Territories. I hope he is. He is not the first of the gentlemen on the other side who have gone there. We have met them and sent them back ; and if the gentleman comes, we will treat him exactly as we treated his leaders—one who was the apostle of free trade in the Territories, while the other leaders were preaching the gospel of protection in the east. These gentlemen have four or five policies, or if they have any policy at all, it is like the Yankee's suit of clothes—big enough for any man or small enough for any boy. The leader of the opposition has a policy in regard to this matter, but we never heard a word of it until the resolution was passed this afternoon, which, to my mind, definitely settles the question. The leader of the opposition might have enlightened us on this question

when the discussion was going on this afternoon, or on other occasions when we had before us the Bill of the hon. member for Lisgar, who, I am sorry to see, is not in his place to-night. He was a bold champion of the people of the North-west Territories, too; and yet his seat is vacant to-day. I have heard it rumoured that he has arrived at some kind of understanding with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and on this occasion has taken to the woods. I am sorry he has left his desk-mate, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), alone to-night. They have been hunting the library together, and have had pages running for them, but very little has come of it. The hon. member for East York has fired his cannon to-night, and what does it amount to? He got up and said he had two propositions. He said the government could buy the Canadian Pacific Railway off, and in the next breath he said there was nothing at all to buy. His resolution is nothing but an expression of the opinion of this House. I would rather have the question submitted to the courts, so that we shall have an interpretation from them and know exactly what position we are in. I believe the exemption is practically up now, but I only give that as my own personal opinion.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, after the very warm invitation given to members from the North-west Territories by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), I wish to take a minute or two for further reference to this subject. I may say that I agree with that hon. gentleman entirely in the inference to be drawn from the remark he directed against the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that it is well for gentlemen in this House to have some knowledge of the subject which they attempt to discuss, and I am pleased to have to-night gained a little more knowledge of this subject. I have lived in the North-west for a considerable time, and I have heard a good deal of discussion on this subject; but to-night from the lips of the hon. member for West York I heard a new phase of the matter suggested; namely, that this period of exemption may have terminated some years ago. Up to the present time I have been limited to the thought that it was not possible that the period could have terminated before the 15th of February last. That is the contention which was put forward in this House two or three weeks ago in the Bill proposed by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). That was put forward as one extreme interpretation. But the hon. gentleman from West York (Mr. Wallace) suggests that the period may have terminated years ago, and I am pleased to have been here to gain further light on the subject.

Some aspersions were thrown by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), and some other hon. gentlemen opposite, on members from the North-west in connection with this discussion, which were entirely uncalled for. People in the country, who might read alone the speech of the hon. gentleman, would conclude that members from the Territories considered this discussion a laughing matter, and were endeavouring to thwart the hon. gentleman in his efforts on behalf of the people. I entirely resent that imputation. I did put some questions to the hon. member for East York, but solely with the idea of obtaining information and leading to a better discussion of the subject, and not at all with the idea of thwarting any effort anybody might make on behalf of our western people. But, I may tell the hon. gentleman that the people of the North-west are not going to be hoodwinked by buncombe resolutions, such as the one before the House. This resolution, even if adopted unanimously, would have no practical effect whatever. If the House were to unanimously express its opinion as to the interpretation to be placed on the contract, that would not have any more effect than the individual opinion of any hon. member. The proposition of the hon. member for East York, and his elaborate argument, were that this question should not be referred to the courts. This proposal if adopted unanimously would not keep it out of the courts, and would have very little effect, even if adopted, on the decision of the court.

The hon. gentleman himself who proposed this resolution has exhibited several changes of attitude. Three weeks ago he voted for a Bill providing that the period of exemption should be held to have commenced on the 15th of February, 1881.

Mr. MACLEAN. Are the two positions contradictory? Do they not both move along the same line?

Mr. SCOTT. Well, if the interpretation which he wishes the House to express by his resolution should be adopted, and it should then turn out that the other intrepretation, expressed in the Bill of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), to which I have referred, were the proper one, he would be, by this resolution, submitting the people of the North-west Territories to the injustice of labouring under this exemption some four or five years longer than they should. The other night he expressed his opinion, in the most practical manner in which an hon. member can express it, that the period of exemption should be held to have commenced on the 15th of February, 1881. To-night, however, he seeks to impress on the House the opinion that the period of exemption did not commence then but at some later day—anywhere from five to six years later—and then again, in his argument he seemed prepared to accept another opinion, namely, that perhaps the contention of the Canadian Pacific Railway was the right one after all, and that parliament should start and negotiate with the

Canadian Pacific Railway in order to buy out the rights of that company, whatever they might be.

For my part, I have long held the opinion that the period of exemption began from the date the company had completed its line, by twenty mile sections, and earned its subsidy in money and lands. And that is, I believe, the opinion which will prevail in the courts. I have not very much fear that the people of the North-west Territories will not be given justice in the courts, and if the common sense view be taken, there can be no two opinions but that the contention which ought to prevail is, that the Canadian Pacific Railway were entitled to twenty years exemption on their lands, and no more. If that view should prevail, it will be impossible for the courts to decide that the period of exemption only dates from the issue of the patents.

If it be not presumptious, I would like to offer a word of advice to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I was struck by a remark made some days ago by the Minister of Railways, who said that he did not very much fear that in a conflict between a railway corporation and the people, the corporation was going to get the best of it. In his opinion, the corporations should be the last people to desire to bring about such a conflict. I am of that opinion. I think that in a conflict between the corporations and the people, the people are very certain to get the best of it, but I am not so very sure whether some of our railway corporations have been careful to abstain from bringing about such a conflict, or from creating in the public mind a certain amount of hostility that might lead to one. The recent occurences in Manitoba ought to bring the Canadian Pacific Railway to a recognition of the fact that out in the country west of Lake Superior there is a certain amount of feeling against the policy pursued up to the present by that corporation. In the very question before the House, there is proof that the people are not entirely unjustified in entertaining certain feelings against the policy pursued by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Any man can see that the contention put forward that the Canadian Pacific Railway should only be allowed twenty years exemption, and not forty years, is an entirely proper contention, but we are given to understand that the Canadian Pacific Railway are going to claim the full pound of flesh, and take advantage of any technicality in the language of the Act, in order to obtain forty years exemption if they can. That may be pointed to as one of the reasons why, in the country west of Lake Superior, there is a certain amount of feeling against this great corporation, which feeling is pretty well justified by conduct of which this claim on behalf of the company is a very striking example.

If I thought this resolution would do the slightest good, I would vote for it.

Mr. MACLEAN. It will not do any harm if you vote for it.

Mr. SCOTT. It might not directly, but indirectly it would be an encouragement to hon. gentlemen to come forward with demagogic and buncombe resolutions, and I do not propose to encourage anything of the kind. I do not think there will be any practical value in the House declaring for this resolution, and shall, therefore, vote against it.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Maclean) :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Blain,
Boyd,
Broder,
Cargill,
Maclean,
McGowan, and
Wallace.—7.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Angers,
Archambault,
Barker,
Bazinet,
Bell (Addington),
Bickerdike,
Borden (Halifax),
Borden (King's, N.S.),
Britton,
Brown,
Bruce,
Bruneau,
Bureau,
Carroll,
Clancy,
Copp,
Cowan,
Davies (Sir Louis),
Davis,
Dèchene,
Delisle,
Demers (Lévis),
Demers (St. John),
Dugas,
Earle,
Edwards,
Emmerson,
Erb
Ethier,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fitzpatrick,
Flint,
Fortier,
Fortin,
Fowler,
Galliher,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gilmour,
Girard,
Gould,
Gourley,
Guthrie,
Hackett,
Henderson,
Holmes,
Hughes (Victoria),
Hyman,
Johnston (Lambton),
Kaulbach,
Lancaster,
Lang,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne,
Legris,
Lemieux,
Lennox,
Logan,
Loy,
Mackie,
Maclaren (Huntingdon),
McCarthy,
McColl,
McCormick,
McCreary,
McEwen,
McIsaac,
McLennan,
Madore,
Malouin,
Marcil (Bagot),
Maxwell,
Meigs,
Mignault,
Monk,
Morin,
Oliver.
Paterson,
Pringle,
Prior,
Proulx,
Puttee,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richardson (Grey),
Ross (Ontario),
Ross (Victoria),
Rousseau,
Russell,
Scott,
Sifton,
Simmons,
Smith (Vancouver),
Sproule,
Stephens,
Sutherland (Essex),
Talbot,
Tarte,
Taylor,
Thompson,
Tolton,
Tucker,
Turcot,
Turgeon,
Wade,
Wilson, and
Wright.—109.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Before we go on with the next Public Works estimates, I would ask the House to take up item 152, one sub-item of which was reserved, as some hon. gentleman asked that it should not be finally disposed of at the time.

Public Works, chargeable to income—Quebec—Victoriaville public building, $4,000.

Mr. MONK. What will be the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). This amount will complete the work.

Public Works, chargeable to income—Ontario—Deseronto public building, site donated by city corporation, $20,000.

Mr. WILSON. How much has been spent on this public building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Work has been done to the value of about $2,000, but this has not yet been paid. Tenders were asked for the foundation only, and the contract was awarded, but the contractor died before completing his work.

Mr. WILSON. Will the amount here asked for finish the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. The site was given by the corporation ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Public Works, chargeable to income—Ontario—Kingston Royal Military College, additional buildings, gymnasium and hospital, $5,000.

Mr. BRITTON. I notice that there is a decrease in this item, as compared with last year, of $3,000. Is that because the original plan of the building calls for less expenditure, or is there to be a further expenditure this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid we will have to ask for an additional sum of money to complete the work.

London drill hall and armoury, $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How much has been spent on this already ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work of construction has not yet been commenced. We have only purchased a part of the site.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the property to cost when it is purchased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand we have bought land to the extent of $5,000 so far.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. SPROULE. How much will the site itself cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is difficult to say, because negotiations for the purchase are still going on. My deputy tells me that he hopes we will not be obliged to spend more than $11,000 for the site. But I will not pledge myself to any figures now.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that is a very loose way of proposing a vote to this House. We have spent $5,000 already, and we expect to spend a considerable larger sum, and we are going it blind. I think the minister ought to be able to give the committee some definite information to justify us voting upon it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It depends upon whether the Department of Militia will ask for additional ground around the building. If there is no additional ground asked for by the military authorities than is necessary for the building itself, we expect the site will not cost more than $11,000. But my hon. friend knows that London is a very important place, it is the centre of a military district, and perhaps it may be found good policy to buy more ground and to have a larger area.

Mr. SPROULE. The government are not able to tell us whether they are going to buy a certain definite extent of ground or not. It appears the hon. gentleman has been buying it piecemeal. I understand the minister to say they had already paid out $5,000, but he does not tell us how much ground they have purchased for that sum.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We had to buy by piecemeal because all the properties were small and belonged to different parties. I remember we had to conduct a good many negotiations. The properties belonged to small owners of land, and we had to buy by piecemeal. We do not yet know whether the Militia Department will find it necessary to buy more. If it is found necessary to buy more it will cost more than $5,000 or $6,000. But the site which is contemplated to-day will cost about $11,000 more, and we have already paid $5,000 so far.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister has not told us whether the ground they intend to purchase is half an acre, or one acre, or twenty acres, or fifty acres, on one thousand acres. We ought to have some information as to the size of the ground.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What we have purchased already is 66 feet wide by 165 feet long, for which we have paid $5,000. We are negotiating for the purchase of a piece 72 feet wide and of the same length, from two different

owners, with one of whom we have nearly concluded a bargain.

Mr. SPROULE. How much will the building cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The plans are not yet completed, and I am not yet in a position to say how much it will cost. But I am given to understand it will probably cost between $80,000 and $100,000. London is the centre of military activity, and it will be found good policy to erect a fine building and a fine armoury.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I understand the hon. minister to say they have nothing but guess-work of what it is going to cost. $100,000 is a large sum of money, but the minister does not seem to have any idea of how it is going to be spent. It seems to me that is very imperfect information to submit to the House upon which to ask us to vote money and to begin a work that will cost $100,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is difficult to follow any other policy than the one that has always been followed by the Department of Public Works under all ministers. No minister can bind himself to exact figures. I say that the plans so far as they are made contemplate a work costing between $80,000 and $100,000. I give these figures because of the information I am receiving from my officers. I am not an engineer myself, and I cannot give detailed information except what is conveyed to me by my officers.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. gentleman tell us what the size of the building is to be and whether it is to be of brick, stone or mud ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The plans are not altogether completed and I would not bind myself as to the exact size.

Mr. SPROULE. Approximately, what size ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that the armoury is going to be about 200 feet long by 75 feet wide.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says that the building is to be 200 feet long when he has told us that the lot is only 105 feet by 138 feet. How is he going to put up such a building on that lot ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not completed the purchase of the site yet.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman told us that his ground was 66 feet by 105 feet and that he proposed to purchase 72 feet more so that the lot would be 105 x 138 feet on which he is going to erect a building 200 feet long.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have two pieces of land which would make a total of 327 feet long by 138 feet wide and I am going to have a little more. I will have plenty of ground upon which to put the building.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Does not the hon. minister think that $100,000 is a very large sum for a building of that sort ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I do not think it is.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Well, I do, comparing it with other buildings which I know have been built. The building at Victoria, 160 feet by 75 feet, only cost $43,000. It is a stone and brick building with armouries and everything that you want.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am spending a large sum of money in Vancouver.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. That is very different.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Still I am spending a very large sum of money there for a similar armoury. The contract is $66,000 at Vancouver.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I do not wonder that the armoury is costing a great deal because it is being built by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this building to be of brick or stone ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Brick and stone.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister has no estimate of the cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Public tenders will be asked and certainly the lowest tender will be accepted.

Mr. SPROULE. But that is not the feature that interests us. We are asked to commence an expenditure that means ultimately a large sum of money. Suppose we were asked to justify that expenditure and we could give no more information than the hon. gentleman gives, I do not think we could justify it before the country. If the hon. gentleman's friends were on this side of this House they would be most unlikely to allow an item of that nature to go through without very much more information than the hon. gentleman has given us regarding it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, I verily believe that I have given all the information that the hon. gentleman should be entitled to have. We have bought the land, paid so much for it, we are going to erect a very fine building. There is a strong military spirit in that district and we want to give that military spirit a new impetus by giving the district a new drill hall.

Mr. SPROULE. I do think that towns and cities in which large buildings of this

character are erected, should do something towards furnishing a portion of the land. I know that in several districts that has been done and in some instances the Minister of Public Works has insisted that they shall give a portion of the land. If one town or city does it, why not apply the same principle all round ? It is unfair to those towns and cities that have given either a free site or supplied a portion of the cost to exempt others and ask parliament to put up all the money.

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. minister say that no plans have been completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No plans are completed.

Mr. MONK. And no estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Except the office estimates.

Mr. HENDERSON. As we are practically just beginning the estimates of the hon. Minister of Public Works, I think that in matters of this kind it would be just as well if the minister could tell us how he arrives at the amount of money he is going to expend on a particular building. I understood him to say that he knew nothing about this one except what he got from the officers of the department. It seems to me it is not the minister who runs the department but his officers. I wonder who is responsible. We generally think that the minister is responsible but he absolves himself from all responsibility for a proposed expenditure of $100,000 and places it upon the officers of his department. The minister should have some definite, fixed principle in his mind as to what he is going to do at London. If he is going to put up a building costing $100,000, let him instruct his officers to draw specifications which will not exceed $100,000, including the land, and confine it to that. Then, we would know that the minister has some definite policy, but as far as I can see he has no policy at all in this matter. I do not know whether he intends to be guided by the political exigencies of the case or by what circumstances he intends to be guided. He does not know what the building is to cost. When he asks for a certain amount of money he says : It will cost somewhere between $80,000 and $100,000. That is very indefinite. If the minister has decided to spend $100,000 he should inform the committee that that is all he wants for this building, that it will be completed for that amount, that nothing more will be asked, and that he will assume the responsibility himself and not leave it for the officers of the department. Let him instruct his officers to put up a building that will not exceed that sum, including the land. I think the minister should give us some definite information as to the system he is pursuing. We are moving in the dark because we know nothing about what the cost of this building will be when it is completed. Probably it will cost $150,000. The minister knows nothing about it and any information he has, he gets from his officers. If one of his officers thinks it would be a nice thing to put up a building costing $150,000 the minister will come down and ask for another estimate to supply the necessary funds. If we are to have responsible government the minister must assume the responsibility of telling this committee just exactly what money he is going to spend, and he must be held responsible for the expenditure that he instructs his officers to incur.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have instructed my officers in the way which has been suggested to me by my experienced friend. I thought I had made myself clearly understood. I told the committee that the probable cost would be between $80,000 and $100,000. My hopes are, that we will spend not more than $80,000, but at any rate we will not spend more than $100,000. I cannot say that I am an expert architect, but like every other Minister of Public Works, I must trust my officers. Of course I am fully responsible for what I say here.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. This is a sample of the ridiculous arrangement there is between the Militia Department and the Public Works Department with regard to militia buildings. I do not blame the minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) because the system is the same now as it was years ago. Time and again I have seen the folly of it. As it is now, the Minister of Militia makes up his mind to erect a military building and his architect gives a rough idea of what is wanted, then the Minister of Public Works proceeds to draw his plans and before they are half finished the Minister of Militia wants something else done. There is constant conflict between the two departments. To my mind the militia buildings should be built by the Militia Department, and then they would know exactly what they wanted. I suppose the Minister of Public Works wants to have all the buildings under his own control, but it would be far better and cheaper that each department should look after its own buildings. It is a perfect farce as it is now.

Mr. GILMOUR. I hope nothing said here will deter the minister from carrying out his plans with regard to London. He may not have his plans fully formulated now, but I do not doubt but that in time he will. I would remind the House that since I have been a member there has not been a dollar voted to London except for this armoury, and I would point out that for militia purposes there is no better centre than is that city. There has not only not been a dollar expended in London during the time I have been a member of the House, but there has not been a dollar of government money

expended within twenty miles of London. I have no doubt that the minister will be able to formulate his plans and to know exactly what he is going to do, and I hope the House will not deter him from making the expenditure.

Mr. HENDERSON. I want to know exactly what this building is going to cost. It is a simple matter for the minister to instruct his officers to draw plans of a building that will cost with the purchase of the land not more than $100,000, and then parliament will know what we are expected to vote in the future. It is a bad plan to allow this matter to remain open, to be dangled before the electors year after year so that if the political exigencies demand a further $30,000 or $40,000, the minister will have a free hand. Let the minister tell us exactly what the expenditure will be and then let him cut his gown according to the cloth.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Tenders will be asked and I will be very much surprised if there is not a difference of perhaps $10,000 or $15,000 between them. How can I say what the exact cost will be. All I can say is that we will not spend more than $100,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, we have got that statement now.

Ottawa Public Buildings—Renovating, painting, &c., outside work, including Eastern Block iron work and re-leading windows of parliament buildings and library, $7,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There was some discussion in the early part of the session as to the accommodation for members of the House, and there was complaint of rooms having been taken from members of the opposition. The minister then said he thought he would be able to provide additional rooms in this building. Has that idea been abandoned, or is it intended to proceed with it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The only room available is that occupied by the Committee on Agriculture in the tower, and that room will be arranged so that gentlemen on the other side will have the exclusive use of it when the committee does not sit. Next year I hope we will be in a position to have better accommodation. I know that members on both sides of the House have a large amount of work to do, and they have not the accommodation they should have. The chief architect has been instructed to prepare a plan which I will submit to hon. gentlemen opposite so that they may give their views on it. I think my hon. friend will find when the supplementary estimates come down, that I have not forgotten this matter.

Mr. SPROULE. Do these improvements refer to the tower room only ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is only for this session.

Mr. SPROULE. The session is getting pretty well over now. There was a suggestion to build on the vacant space outside the Chamber here, because we not only require additional rooms for the members but larger committee rooms.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The plan of the chief architect will give six additional rooms and a large room for committee meetings.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. The minister should ask for a vote for renovating the interior of the eastern and western blocks, because these buildings are in a disgraceful condition at the present time. Any man who compares the legislative buildings at Quebec, Toronto and Victoria with the buildings here, will say that the Ottawa buildings are no credit to Canada. The oilcloth is worn out and the passages are dirty, and want painting and plastering. I think the government should take the matter in hand at once.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Prior) is quite right. Every time I pass through the corridors I am ashamed of the condition they are in. But it is very hard at times to get money from parliament, and in making their estimates, the ministers have been afraid to ask parliament for the necessary amount. These buildings cost a vast amount of money to keep up. There is no man who will not be obliged, however careful he may be, to spend a large amount of money for that purpose. Up to 1893 or 1894 parliament used to vote larger sums of money ; but the late Minister of Finance cut down the expenditure, and the appropriation was starved out. When I took office I raised it a little, but was scarified a good deal for doing so ; and now, after having given my careful attention to this point, I say that the money placed at my disposal is not sufficient.

Pictou Public Building, $7,000.

Mr. ALCORN. Will this complete the building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, this will complete it.

Mr. ALCORN. I understand that it is for a post office and custom-house ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. ALCORN. Are there any vaults in the building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. In these buildings of small size, instead of building vaults, which cost a large amount of money, the policy of the department is to buy safes.

Mr. WILSON. Was the whole $13,000 spent last year, and will the $8,000 now voted complete the building ? I understand the $21,000 is for the building without the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost of the building and the site will be $25,000. The amount paid for the site was $4,600, which was voted three or four years ago. This vote will complete the building.

St. Thomas drill hall and armoury, $24,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the work on this been commenced yet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract has been awarded about a month ago. I do not think the work has yet begun.

Mr. BENNETT. From whom was the site purchased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot really say. The site was purchased by the Militia Department for $8,000. My department had nothing to do with the purchase of the site. It was placed at our disposal.

Mr. SPROULE. How much is the building to cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $45,000, including the site.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. minister know what the size of the site is ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site is known as the Wilson property, being the south part of lot No. 3, concession 8, in the township of Yarmouth, at the corner of Wilson street and Chester street. The size of the lot is 660 feet on Wilson street and 198 feet on Chester street. It comprises thirty-two lots, including the street called East Avenue, and covers 8⅔ acres.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the Wilson referred to Dr. Wilson. the defeated Liberal candidate in the Liberal interest there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Upon my honour, I do not know.

Mr. WILSON. You do not know officially.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know officially or unofficially.

Sarnia public building, $30,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to ask how this building is progressing, and how much money has been expended out of the vote of last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that the foundations are ready, and that the work is progressing favourably. The contract was awarded on September 17, 1900, at $62,000, to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. HENDERSON. Could the minister tell us the name of the contractor ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. G. A. Proctor.

Mr. WILSON.

Mr. HENDERSON. Last year the hon. Postmaster General, who was then acting for the Minister of Public Works, informed the committee that the intention was to erect a lighthouse on the top of this building, the site being most favourable for that purpose, as the light would be seen for a long distance up Lake Huron, and also down the river. I would ask the minister if he has in contemplation the erection of that light ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that this is the first time I have heard of that lighthouse. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will have to give me some more light on the question. If my hon. friend asks me for permission to erect a light on the roof of the building, I shall be glad to give it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I hope the hon. minister is not going back on the good town of Sarnia after it has sent him so respectable a representative, and after promising $62,000 for the purpose of beautifying the town by putting up a handsome building opposite the city of Port Huron. He also promised that on the top of this very fine post office, an additional structure was to be erected which would attract attention to Sarnia, up the lake and down the river. I hope the hon. gentleman is not going back on his promises now. I thought the idea a most excellent one, and have no hesitation in saying that the hon. minister would be wise to give effect to it, even though the promise was made by another gentleman who was acting in his place.

Mr. BENNETT. Three years ago the hon. gentleman removed the caretaker from the public building at Orillia, although there was no complaint against him. He assured the House that he had decided on a new line of conduct, and that was to dispense with the expense of caretakers in public buildings, and give the postmasters charge of the work of looking after the building for a nominal consideration. I presume the hon. gentleman will see that no caretaker is appointed for the building at Picton or Woodstock or Sarnia.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think I declared myself to the policy my hon. friend alludes to. I may have said that in as many cases as possible, our policy would be to give lodgings to the postmaster, and we are doing that at Picton now. But it would be out of the question to try and do that everywhere. We will have to be guided by the circumstance. The difficulty is that these public buildings are used for customs as well as post offices, and the postmaster would not always like to live in a couple of small rooms which might be sufficient for the caretaker.

Mr. BENNETT. But the postmaster did not live in the building at all at Orillia,

from which the hon. gentleman removed the caretaker.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is an old case. Let us not reopen old sores.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think this is a very opportune time to consider the whole question of the erection of public buildings throughout the country. For several years I have brought to the attention of the committee a system under which the country could be provided with suitable buildings for post offices in the smaller towns. I have the honour of representing a county which does not possess a large town; and in which, not having an incorporated town or village of more than fifteen hundred or eighteen hundred population, the Minister of Public Works is not likely to give a public building of any kind. But what I would suggest to the minister is that instead of expending some $30,000 in the construction of public buildings in a county town, that money should be divided so as to allow $6,000 for a building in each town or village of from 1,500 to 1,800 inhabitants. It is well known that you can purchase a site for about $1,000 and have $5,000 left with which to erect a substantial brick building, that will give all the accommodation necessary for a post office in a village or town from 1,500 to 2,000 population. The department will then be able to supply room sufficiently large for the post office so as to prevent the overcrowding which now takes place every morning and evening at the distribution of the mails.

Last year I drew the attention of the Postmaster General, who was representing the Minister of Public Works then in Paris, to this plan, and he seemed to treat it with a great deal of favour. Not only was it received with favour by him, but also by the then hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), and other hon. members.

These buildings will be a great improvement on the improvised post offices now in use, both as regards the security of the mails and the accommodation to the public.

The minister told us that he did not construct vaults in public buildings because it was cheaper to purchase safes. I do not know whether he got that advice from his officers, but I feel confident that a vault can be constructed cheaper than a safe can be purchased. A safe would be of very little value, which cost less than $400 or $500, and a good vault can be constructed at less than that. Apart from that, there would be in these buildings abundance of room for a residence for a postmaster.

I know something of the character of a building that can be put up for $5,000. You can erect for that amount a substantial brick building large enough for the accommodation of any postmaster, and also for those having business with the post office. The postmaster will be the caretaker of the building, or if he did not choose to reside in it, he could place it in the hands of his deputy or rent it to some other responsible person who could take care of it. And the government would be saved entirely the expense of a caretaker. More than that, the government would save the rent which they now pay. When money can be got at 2½ per cent, a saving would be effected every year, even if we did increase the national debt a certain extent.

I think this is an opportune time to draw attention to this matter, and I hope that my statement will not be made in vain. Last year, the acting minister assured me that the matter was worthy of consideration, and promised to look into it. I would like the minister to take a note of this matter and see if he cannot come to the rescue of such counties as Halton and others that have no public buildings and that cannot hope, under present circumstances, to have a building for twenty-five years, because they have no towns sufficiently large to justify an expenditure of from $25,000 to $40,000. It would only be dividing the moneys of the country fairly and distributing them through the different counties. I am sure the scheme is one that would commend itself to the minister. I fail to see any other plan by which the counties to which I have referred can receive an expenditure except that which I have marked out. Therefore, I trust that the hon. minister will bear it in mind, and that when he comes down with his estimates next year he will have, if not the county of Halton—though I hope it will be Halton—some county in whose case he will undertake an expenditure of this kind, to show how the money can be spent so as to give additional accommodation to people and save the money of the Dominion.

Mr. HOLMES. I had the pleasure of endorsing the plan of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) last year, and I am glad to see that he is consistent in advocating it now. It seems to me that this is a sound and feasible plan for establishing post offices in the smaller towns. I hope that the ideas that he has advanced will be taken up by the other hon. gentlemen opposite, because I am going to try to prevail upon the Minister of Public Works to locate a post office in the town of Clinton. The plan of the hon. gentleman from Halton seems to me a good one, and one that might be followed with profit to the Dominion, because the construction of a public building stimulates a spirit of emulation that, perhaps, could not be stimulated in any other way. I do not wish to take up

time at this hour of the night, but I am sure that the Minister of Public Works will give this plan the consideration to which it is entitled. There are small towns of from 2,500 to 4,000 inhabitants that would be well satisfied with a public building costing not more than $5,000, which would accommodate not only the post-office, but also the custom-house, if one is located in the town.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). If the Minister of Public Works is going to inaugurate a plan of this kind, of course, he is not going to forget West Elgin. There are four towns in that constituency similarly situated to those that have been spoken of, and that are deserving of his consideration. There is the town of Ridgetown, with about three or four thousand inhabitants. I do not know if there is a public building there or not, but I am satisfied that if a public building were put up there it would be greatly appreciated. West Lorne, Rodney, Highgate, Shedden and Dutton are other prosperous villages on the Michigan Central Railway. These buildings could not only contain the post office, but an excellent reading-room could be established in each, where the young people could meet and——

An hon. MEMBER. Dance.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). A building of that kind would make the people feel an interest in the government. A reading-room, above all things, should be established, and the postmaster could see that it was properly kept, and the right kind of literature was there. The young people could spend their evenings there. The great trouble of the young people in our villages is that, except the store, to say nothing of the tavern, they have no place to spend their evening. This want would be supplied if a building of this kind were erected. If you are going to establish a building of that kind, I hope you will not forget West Elgin.

Mr. ROSS (South Ontario). I wish to support the proposition of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), and endorse what has been said by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes). I think the plan is a good one, and one that could be made feasible. Towns of from fifteen hundred to two thousand inhabitants would greatly appreciate a public building such as one that has been mentioned by the hon. member for Halton, even if it did not cost $6,000, even if it cost only $3,000. It would enable our post offices to be kept in proper order. As it is now, in many towns, the post office is a disgrace to the country. I am quite in sympathy with the proposal, and ask the Minister of Public Works to take note of it. Perhaps some day I shall appeal to him privately on this particular line. While speaking of this matter, I would like to say that I agree with the hon. member for Halton that vaults are better for these buildings than safes. The idea is to keep the public records safe from fire rather than from burglars, and vaults are safer and can be built more cheaply. In buildings costing from $3,000 to $5,000, you can get a very good vault for $300. You can buy the vault doors for $150, and the mason work will not cost more than $150—built solid from the bottom, with an arched top. I have one in my own building, which serves the purpose very well. We know that it is fireproof and we feel safe.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hear a great deal about public buildings. There are few members of parliament who do not give me the pleasure of informing me of the need of public buildings in their constituencies. The great difficulty is that when we come to the House to ask for money, there are pretty large sums——

An hon. MEMBER. Increase the public debt.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Speaking for myself, I sympathize with the idea that has been expressed. I think we should have a good many public buildings—not too expensive, but decent small public buildings. There is this difficulty, however—that when you have erected a public building you have not done everything. It costs money to keep it up, repairs, lighting, heating—all these cost money. Something has been said as to vaults and safes. We pay for a safe, if I remember aright, about $250, and we cannot possibly build a good vault for less than $500 or $600. The door alone will cost about $250. I grant that a vault, in some ways, is better, but it takes more room. If you have to take for a small public building the space necessary for a vault, it takes off a considerable portion of the space that might be used for ordinary purposes. The reason why we have bought the safes is because they will take less room. I was asked the question by my hon. friend as to the total cost of the public works at Sarnia. The figures that have been placed before me are $83,375.19.

Mr. ALCORN. Do I correctly understand the minister to say that the postmaster was to reside in the building at Picton, and also the collector of customs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not both of them, the postmaster will reside there.

Mr. ALCORN. Is the postmaster the defeated candidate in the last election ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. I think all will admit that he was a capable man when he was on this side of the House, and that he will be a very good postmaster.

Mr. BENNETT. I think in this connection the House should emphasize its con-

demnation of the Minister of Public Works. I will mention again a case that I have already referred to. In the town of Orillia a man was caretaker of that public building, and although there was no charge against him, and no investigation, the Minister of Public Works threw him out by the crop of the neck, and assured me and assured the House solemnly that the caretaker should be in the future the postmaster. Now, the minister has never kept his word in that respect, because he has installed a new caretaker. Here the minister finds that a political hack is going to be postmaster in that place—because that is what the late independent member was, a political hack—but instead of being the caretaker of that building, I am bound to say that we will see this gentleman will have a comfortable residence. It is well for the people to know that the Minister of Public Works is always ready to yield to party exigencies.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not very well remember the facts that took place two years ago.

Mr. BENNETT. When the minister has laid down a principle in his own mind, surely he should have respect for it. But I can recall this fact to his mind. I have forgotten exactly where the town was, but it was somewhere in Ontario, where the minister did exactly the same thing. Without investigation and without charge, without the common decency of inquiring into the case, he put a man out of his position, and within a few months after installed a new man. If my recollection serves me right it was in Napanee.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no use in employing strong words in discussing this question, I will not get mad at all.

Mr. BENNETT. I should not either. But I wanted to show that in the town of Orillia the minister was a party to the disgraceful act of turning out a man without giving him an investigation, when there was no charge against him, and then solemnly pledging his word, when he was acting on the principle of saving public expense, and almost before he had time to turn round he had installed another man in the position. Let it be understood by the country, because in that part of the country it is well understood, that the Minister of Public Works is obedient to every political exigency. I admire the Minister of Public Works in that he is not hypocritical about it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not believe I have ever broken my word willingly. I have a good many failings, but I do not believe any man in parliament can tell me that I have broken my word. I do not remember the circumstances clearly, but I think I dispensed with the services of a gentleman in Orillia who was caretaker. The caretaker of a public building is a temporary employee that any minister can dispense with without any inquiry. I believe his salary was $15 a month. I replaced him by the postmaster. Something happened, I do not remember what, the postmaster's services were dispensed with, and then a caretaker was appointed. As to my having erected to the dignity of a principle the policy that a caretaker should always be postmaster, I never was guilty of that, though I have said, and still say, that it would be better as often as possible that the postmaster should act as caretaker.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am grateful to the minister for the kind manner in which he listened to the appeal which I made to him, also to the other hon. gentlemen who spoke in support of the plan I suggested. Now, I had hoped that the minister would give us some assurance that he would at any rate try an experiment along the line I indicated. The minister told us that nearly every county had put in applications for public buildings, but he seemed to drift away from the subject, and did not touch the salient point. What we want to know is whether he is going to give this scheme his consideration, whether we may expect that the counties which have not large towns are to receive the same favour as the counties which have large towns.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is trying to draw me out on dangerous ground. The Minister of Finance is by my side, and if I were to make promises to-night, I would have a hard time to-morrow. Much has been said about my bossing the whole thing, unfortunately it is not the case. I would not dare to make any promises when the Minister of Finance is so near me.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the Minister of Finance had last year a surplus of $8,000,000. I think there would be no difficulty at all in drawing upon him for a small portion of that surplus.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did think we had a very satisfactory surplus last year, but after listening to my hon. friend opposite, it seemed the whole thing was a delusion, and there was no surplus at all.

Mr. HENDERSON. That seems to be the opinion of the Minister of Public Works also.

Toronto Dominion Buildings—Improvements, renewals, repairs, &c., $4,000.

Mr. CLARKE. The minister, I hope, is not going to turn a deaf ear to the appeals that have been made to him again and again to complete the drill hall.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is not the time to discuss this ques-

tion. The time will be when the supplementary estimates come up.

Mr. CLARKE. If the minister will undertake to say that there will be an item for the completion of the drill hall in the supplementary estimates, we will not discuss it now. We have made no objections at all to the improvements at London and St. Thomas. I would like to remind the committee that the city of Toronto provided a site for the new drill hall, which cost about $150,000, and it is not unreasonable after eight or ten years, to ask the government to complete that drill hall. Accommodation is lacking there for the artillery and cavalry branches of the service. Representations have been made to the hon. Minister of Militia (Hon. Mr. Borden, King's), and to the Minister of Public Works as to the necessity of completing that building. I am sure it is not unreasonable to draw his attention to the fact that this accommodation is urgently required and should be provided,. He says that in the supplementary estimates a sum will be provided to complete the drill hall. We will take his word for it. I believe that if the minister gives his word he will carry it out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Matters of this kind belong to the Department of Militia and Defence. I am only a builder. If the Department of Militia and Defence asks me to erect an armoury in Toronto, I shall do so with the greatest of pleasure.

Mr. CLARKE. We have a site and the armoury is almost completed. What we have asked the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence to do is to complete the building that was contemplated in the first place. Representations have been made time and again by deputations from the military authorities asking to have this building completed and to provide necessary accommodation for the cavalry and artillery branches. The Department of Militia are quite anxious to have this building completed and I think we have a special claim, in view of the fact that we provided the site for the armoury at a cost of between $140,000 and $150,000. I think it is not unreasonable to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works to give us some assurance that when the supplementary estimates come down there will be an item in those estimates to complete that building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Unfortunately, I am not in a position to give that assurance.

Mr. BRITTON. We are all wondering if the hon. gentleman, who is making this piteous appeal——

Mr. CLARKE. Not piteous at all.

Mr. BRITTON.—Certainly a strong appeal, is the same gentleman who is so often objecting to the lavish expenditure of this government.

Mr. CLARKE. I have never objected to my knowledge to any expenditure that is guaranteed by the government to any municipality, if that municipality carried out its part of the bargain by supplying a site. In this case the municipality provided a site approved of by the military authorities, a site costing between $140,000 and $150,000. The building contemplated provided quarters for the military and cavalry. What we are asking the government to do is to complete the building. Surely, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton), who represents a military city, will not say that it is an unreasonable request. We are not making a piteous appeal at all. We are asking the government to fulfil its part of the contract.

Mr. THOMPSON. It seems to me that the remarks of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) are quite in order. Toronto is the finest garrison city we have in Canada, it should have sufficient accommodation supplied for its needs, and I hope it will be supplied.

Mr. CLARKE. We are waiting to hear from the hon. Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not in a position to give any assurance. The matter does not properly belong to me, but my hon. friend may rest assured that if the Department of Militia and Defence makes up its mind that it is necessary to erect a building there and if parliament gives me the money, I will erect the building all right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In other words, if the government decide to erect the building it will be built.

Windsor drill hall, $50,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Would the hon. Minister of Public Works tell me from whom the site was purchased for the Windsor drill hall, and what was the amount paid for it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site has been given free by the municipality.

Mr. WILSON. What will the building cost, completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will cost, completed, $66,609.78.

Mr. SPROULE. This is another illustration of what I spoke of early in the evening. The hon. minister tells us that Windsor has given this site free. When we come to St. Thomas, a place of about a similar size, we pay $8,000 for a site, and at London we purchase a very small site for $11,000. I think the minister should adopt some principle that would be fair to all. If one

city or town gives a site another city should be expected to do the same, or to give a portion of it. I do not think it is right to compel the city of Toronto, or Windsor, to give a site when you go to London and spend every dollar that is necessary to provide a site.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think what is happening now has happened for the last fifty years. There are towns and cities that have given sites, and there are other places which have not given sites. It is quite impossible to have a definite policy. In other words, the government cannot say that if sites are not given we will not erect public buildings, because there are towns and cities where a site would cost too much. There are other localities where sites can be bought more cheaply and they are given free. There are localities that are so anxious to have public buildings that they give sites. I need not say that we are always glad when these sites are given free, but I cannot pledge myself never to buy any sites. No minister would do it.

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the hon. minister that his predecessor, Sir Hector Langevin, made it a rule generally, to insist upon the town, or city, in which the building was to be erected, giving a site, or a portion of the cost of it. I do not think it would be proper in all cases to compel them to do so, because there are some cases where it would cost a great deal. But, I still hold that it is not fair to one town or city to make it pay every dollar that goes into the site while in other places the government pays for both site and building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is mistaken as to what was done in Sir Hector Langevin's time. The very same policy was pursued then that is followed now. In some cases sites were given free, but not usually.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been a member of this House a great deal longer than the hon. Minister of Public Works and I think my memory is quite as good as his is. I stand by what I have said. When we would apply to Sir Hector Langevin for money for a public building almost his first question would be : How much is the place going to give ? That was the general rule which he followed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do the same thing.

Mr. SPROULE. In regard to public buildings it was the same. The hon. gentleman has spoken from memory, and I think my memory is quite as good as his on this subject.

Mr. CLARKE. I am sure that if the policy of the government is to buy sites in some places and erect buildings when municipalities are sufficiently liberal to vote sums to provide a site, the least the government can be expected to do is to complete the building that is contemplated to be erected on that site.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) has been on that side for such a length of time that he should have used the strong, able arguments he is using to-night. In former days these arguments did not carry weight. Perhaps they will carry more weight with me. All the same during the last twelve or fifteen years my hon. friend and his friends from Toronto have been vainly insisting upon having that armoury completed. Perhaps it may be better now. We may have better times in Toronto now.

Mr. CLARKE. This is not the first site that the city of Toronto has provided the Militia Department for militia purposes. When the original drill shed was found to be inconvenient the city provided a site in the rear of the city hall. That became too small. The armoury did not provide sufficient accommodation. They bought this new site at the suggestion of the militia authorities, and the plans were prepared for the construction of the building. In view of the fact that the municipality went to that large expense, we are not asking anything unreasonable from the Minister of Public Works when we ask to have provided the additional accommodation required for the garrison.

Mr. SPROULE. What will the full cost of this building be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $66,000 in round figures. This vote is to complete.

Woodstock public building, $6,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What stage is this building in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not finished, but it is very well advanced. The total cost will be $54,000, including site.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the contract price ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract price for the bare building was $31,790. The government bought the site.

Mr. SPROULE. What did it cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $6,900.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, House adjourned at 12.50 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 3, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

VACANCY—WEST HASTINGS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that a vacancy has occurred in the representation of the electoral district of the West Riding of the county of Hastings, by the resignation of Henry Corby, Esq. In accordance with chapter 13, section 5, subsection 2, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, I have issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said district.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION—EAST QUEEN'S, P.E.I.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have also the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Donald A. MacKinnon, Esq., for the electoral district of East Queen's, P.E.I.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Donald A. MacKinnon, Esquire, member for the electoral district of East Queen's, P.E.I., introduced by Hon. Sir Louis Davies and Mr. James J. Hughes, King's, P.E.I.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 118) to amend the Yukon Territory Act and to make further provision for the administration of justice in the said territory.—Hon. Clifford Sifton.

Bill (No. 119) to make certain provisions necessitated by the Demise of the Crown.—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

QUESTIONS.

LONG SERVICE MEDALS.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Who is responsible for the continued delay in issuing forms of application and orders as to the granting of the long service decoration and medal to the militia?

2. Will the Minister of Militia state definitely when said orders and forms of application will be issued?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden) :

1. There has been no continued delay. The regulations to govern the issue of long service medals are included in the General Orders for March 1st. These General Orders were approved by His Excellency in Council on March 13th, and a certified copy was received on March 16th, 1901.

2. Steps are being taken to have the necessary forms printed.

Mr. TARTE.

LONG SERVICE MEDALS.

On the question :

1. What is the reason that the long service medals have not been issued by the Militia Department?

2. Is it the intention of the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence to issue them this year?

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. As this is the same question which has just been asked, and as we have the information, I will drop it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Dropped.

LIEUT.-COL. VAN WAGNER.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria)—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

Lieut.-Col. Van Wagner's name is on the list of 'retired officers' in the Militia List. Why is not the name found in the 'Reserve of Officers' list?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). Because he was not transferred to the reserve of officers when retired. In explanation of that further, I have this note :

On the 8th May, 1899, Lt.-Col. Wagner was notified that the general officer commanding the militia refused to recommend an extension of his tenure of command, and he was also informed that it was the intention of the general officer commanding to recommend that he be transferred to the reserve of officers.

Lt.-Col. Wagner did not resign, and afterwards the general officer commanding recommended that he be retired and his name placed on the retired list. No reasons were given for so doing.

BATTALIONS OF ACTIVE MILITIA IN EACH PROVINCE.

Mr. WALLACE asked :

1. What is the number of battalions of active militia in each of the provinces of the Dominion?

2. What is the arm of the service to which each battalion belongs?

3. What is the number of men in each?

4. (a) How many are armed with the Lee-Metford?

(b) How many with the Martini-Henry?

(c) How many with the old Snider rifles?

5. What is the number of rounds of ammunition at present at headquarters of said battalions?

6. What is the number and description of field guns attached to each battery?

7. What is the number of rounds available at headquarters of each battery?

8. (a) What is the number of arsenals in the Dominion?

(b) Where are such arsenals situated?

(c) What is the nature and number of rounds in store at each such arsenal?

9. What is the number of employees engaged and the number of each nationality?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). The hon. gentleman will bear me out in the statement that I discussed this question with him a few days ago and a modification was agreed

upon. I will answer the question as modified. The following is the answer :

1.

Ontario	43
Quebec	30
Nova Scotia	9
New Brunswick	6
Manitoba	2
British Columbia	3
Prince Edward Island	2

2. Cavalry, artillery and infantry.

3.

Cavalry	2,298
Artillery	3,843
Engineers	328
Infantry	29,476
Army service corps	140
Bearer companies	344
Field hospitals	192

4. (a) Sixty-nine corps are armed with the Lee-Enfield rifles and carbines.

(b). None.

(c). The remainder with Snider rifles, but in camps they perform their rifle practice with the Lee-Enfield.

5.

Ontario	6,164,828
Quebec	4,443,826
Nova Scotia	232,850
New Brunswick	318,517
Prince Edward Island	195,540
Manitoba	181,615
British Columbia	479,833

6.

'A' Field Battery, R.C.A.	6
'B' Field Battery, R.C.A.	none
1st Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, Quebec	6
2nd Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, Ottawa	2
3rd Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, Montreal	6
4th Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, Hamilton	6
5th Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, Kingston, guns, &c., transferred to 'A' Battery	
6th Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, London	6
7th Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, St. Catharines	6
8th Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, Gananoque	4
9th Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, Toronto	6
10th Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, Woodstock	6
11th Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, Guelph	6
12th Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, Newcastle	6
13th Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, Winnipeg	6
14th Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, (Port Hope) Durham	6
15th Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, Shefford	6
16th Field Battery, Canadian Artillery, Guelph	6

Two guns of the 8th Field Battery, Gananoque, are on loan to the 2nd Field Battery, Ottawa.

7.

Ontario	2,665
Quebec	708
New Brunswick	567
Manitoba	282

8. (a). One.

(b). Quebec.

(c). Inquiry withdrawn.

9. One hundred and thirty-three, including staff and foremen. I am not able to give the nationalities.

MACAULAY POINT, B.C., CLAIMS.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Is the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence willing to allow the property owners at Macaulay Point, B.C., whose claims for damages owing to the erection of forts at that point were stated by the hon. minister to be inadmissible last session, to take their cases to the Exchequer Court?

2. Will the hon. minister facilitate such reference to the Exchequer Court as much as possible?

3. Is it not a fact that similar claims were paid by the Conservative government when in power?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). This is a matter which must be decided by the Justice Department. On the application of any one of those interested I shall be glad to refer the question to the Justice Department for a decision. There were two claims paid on the 28th May, 1892.

MAIL SERVICE BETWEEN MIDLAND AND VASEY.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

Is there a daily mail service between Midland and Vasey, Ont.?

If not, when was the same discontinued?

If there has been of late a daily mail service, when was the same commenced, and if now discontinued, why was it so discontinued?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND :

1. The mail service between Midland and Vasey was made daily on the 13th October last, and the contractor was called upon to perform the service as increased at the rate which he received for the tri-weekly service, that is, the amount to be paid was to be increased from $119 per annum, which was his contract pay for the tri-weekly service, to $238 per annum.

2. On the 1st February last the post office inspector at Toronto reported that the contractor demanded to be paid at the rate of $1 a day or $313 a year, and as he would not abate his demand, instructions issued from the department to reduce the service back to tri-weekly frequency, and to invite

tenders for a daily service from the 1st July next.

ROCKY POINT, P.E.I., BREAKWATER.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

Is it the intention of the government to extend and improve the breakwater or pier at Rocky Point, Prince county, P.E.I., this year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). I may say that the question is under serious consideration at the present time.

LOBSTER FISHERY REGULATIONS, P.E.I.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

Is it the intention of the government to allow lobster fishermen between West Point and Cape Traverse, Prince county, P.E.I., to run their lines and set their traps a few days before the 20th May, in each year, in order that they may be ready for work when the season opens?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). No. The order in council fixes the day and hour for the placing or setting of lobster lines and traps in each locality and special privileges cannot be granted the fishermen mentioned in the question.

VOTERS' LIST—KING'S COUNTY, N.B.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

Is the government aware that upwards of 400 names were fraudulently added to the voters' list for the year 1901, in the parish of Rothesay, in the electoral district of King's county, N.B., of persons not entitled to vote in said electoral district in either local or federal elections?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The government has no official information of any frauds having taken place in the preparation of the list for King's county. My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) is aware that the preparation of the list is under the jurisdiction of the provincial authorities, and if any frauds have been committed, I presume and have no doubt that a proper investigation will take place and the parties punished, if there are guilty parties. With regard to the last question, I might tell my hon. friend that the complete list of voters of Kings county, N.B., for the year 1901, certified by Geo. O. D. Otty, Esq., county secretary, was received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 24th of December last.

MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for :

Statement showing the receipts and expenditure of the Montreal Turnpike Trust, and a copy of the annual statement furnished the bondholders of the said corporation by the Montreal Turnpike Trust for the past ten years.

He said : I have already had occasion to offer some observations to the House upon this motion. I spoke in French because I wished my remarks to be thoroughly understood by some of the members of this House who come from the part of the country which this motion particularly interests. I am informed that the staff of the French reporters is incomplete to-day, and I shall as briefly as possible finish my observations in English, the more so as I wish particularly to direct the attention of the Minister of Finance to the concluding remarks I have to make on this motion. I mentioned the fact, when this motion was under discussion, that the corporation of the Montreal Turnpike Trust is organized in a way which is altogether repugnant to modern ideas—organized under statutes which date back over half a century, and which are not at all in consonance with such legislation as governs to-day administrative bodies of that description. In fact, as I pointed out the other day, that corporation is entirely administered by certain trustees, a majority of whom represent the creditors of the corporation. These trustees, as the hon. Minister of Finance knows, are elected yearly by the bondholders, that is, the creditors of the corporation. Some officer of the Department of Finance goes down to Montreal in the beginning of February, and there, without taking any cognizance of the state of affairs of the company, or its mode of administration during the past year, but simply representing the Dominion government, the holder of all the bonds of the corporation, names three administrators, who form the majority of the board ; and these names are suggested to him by parties who control the patronage in the district of Montreal. In no sense do they represent the farmers who principally use the roads around Montreal, nor do they represent any other interest than the interest of those who have claims on the corporation.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Did I understand my hon. friend to say that the Dominion government are the sole creditors ?

Mr. MONK. That is, I believe, the case. They have bonds to the extent of $195,000. At any rate, the immense majority of the bonds are owned by the Dominion government, and it is well known that the Dominion government completely control the nomination of the three trustees who form the majority of the board of administration of that corporation. The two remaining trustees are nominated by the Quebec government, and are also, I claim, named irrespective entirely of the interests of the large majority of those who have to use the roads under the control of that corporation. When I tell you thaf of the five trustees who administer the affairs of the corporation, only one, I believe, is identified with the agricultural interests, you will readily realize

that the interests of the farmers, the market gardeners, and all those who largely use those roads, are necessarily neglected. The only trustee who is an agriculturist is Mr. Thomas Trenholme. The others are merchants residing either in the city of Montreal or outside the city, and, consequently, they have neither that special knowledge which is necessary to a good administration of the great public highways around Montreal, nor are they in a position to realize readily the wants of the farmers nor to inspect as often as they should the highways in question.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Can the hon. gentleman give the names of the present trustees?

Mr. MONK. I could not give them all from memory. One is Mr. Gallibere, a well-known merchant of Montreal.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is there one from St. Laurence ?

Mr. MONK. There is Mr. St. Pierre, a wood merchant, of Cartierville. But, I maintain that Mr. Trenholme is the only member representing the farmers. If I am incorrect in that statement, I would like my hon. friend to correct me. Now, this is a body which, I think, of all bodies, ought to be constituted under the elective principle which nowadays rules bodies of this kind. As I have pointed out to you, in this case it is the creditors of the corporation who rule its affairs. I believe that is a great fault ; I believe it is one of the principal causes of the great dissatisfaction which exists in and around Montreal with the administration of that body. I believe it is within the power of this government to correct that fault, and it is advisable that it should be corrected as soon as possible. Another point is this, which it is sufficient for me to indicate to show how very defective this administration is. According to the statutes governing the corporation, they are not obliged in any way to render an account of their administration. This is entirely contrary to all the rules which prevail in the administration of bodies of that kind in the province of Quebec, and, as far as I am aware, in any other province under modern laws. They are not obliged to render an account to the government, nor even to the bondholders, and they are not obliged to publish any statement of their affairs annually. There is no provision in the law which obliges this corporation to call for tenders when executing any of those important public works which, from time to time, become necessary in conection with the improvement of the roads around Montreal. We find at the present moment that the revenues under that system of administration are completely insufficient to enable them to meet their liabilities. As an instance, the government are well aware that since 1896 not one cent has been paid on the indebtedness for interest on the large amount of bonds held by the government ; and what is the reason ? One of the principal reasons, I have no hesitation in saying, is the lack of proper legislation governing the administration. Another reason is the fact that they are obliged, owing to the expansion of the city of Montreal, to establish toll-gates at almost every road corner. At the present moment they are paying, I believe, over $13,000 a year merely for the maintenance of toll gates, for the city of Montreal is stretching out in all directions. New roads are being opened, new municipalities are being created, and cross roads have to be established ; and at every one of these cross roads the Turnpike trustees are obliged to erect what they call a check gate, and place there a toll-keeper, whose office it is to verify the payment of toll by passengers at some other spot. The more it becomes necessary to establish toll-gates and check gates, the greater the expense becomes ; and in spite of that, they are not in a position, with their present system of administration, to give us either good roads, which we very much require, or the necessary roads. They are obliged to confine themselves strictly to those great arteries which were put under their administration over fifty years ago, and they do not open the roads which become necessary by changed circumstances. I could give you instances of a man going along a newly-opened road of a municipality, one which is not at all under their control, and for crossing one of their highways, being compelled to pay toll. Take this instance of the utter inability of this corporation to meet our wants. At present farmers coming along St. Laurent, from the county of Two Mountains, Laval and Jacques Cartier, are obliged to climb Côte des Neiges, and from the top of the mountain come down a most precipitous hill, which has been invaded lately by the Montreal street railway, with its double track. That descent is most dangerous and difficult, and it would be the easiest thing in the world for this corporation to open a road starting from the St. Laurent road at a given point, which would relieve farmers from the necessity of climbing to the top of the mountain, and which would, without any ascent of any importance, fall into the Côte St. Luc road. The proprietors of land along that projected highway have offered the necessary land, and even volunteered to subscribe money, and to furnish a large quantity of road metal ; yet, we find this corporation unable to do anything. What is the reason they allege ? They say that they have no means, that the interests of the bondholders must be safeguarded. Thus, while the interest is never unpaid, the public are entirely deprived of the facilities to which it is entitled.

Let me give another instance to show how the interests of the bondholders interfere

with the public interest. Before the advent of this government to power, the farmers of the counties surrounding Montreal were given the privilege of return toll tickets, good for the space of forty-eight hours. Why was this privilege granted ? Because such is the condition of the central market of Montreal, that farmers living any distance from the city, are under the painful necessity of leaving their farms about eight o'clock in the evening in order to secure any kind of a place on that market the following morning. They arrive in Montreal at two or 2.30 a.m., and even then are not always able to get a place. On this account the Turnpike Trust thought proper to give them the advantage of a return ticket good for forty-eight hours. That privilege was, however, taken away in 1896, on the ground that the revenue of the trust was insufficient to meet the interest on the bonds. Endeavours have since been made to re-establish that most equitable provision, but in vain.

When any one suggests any change which would have the effect of making the Turnpike Trust Act a little more in accordance with modern ideas, the objection is made that any legislation of that kind must necessarily be accepted by the bondholders or otherwise we would be interfering with vested rights. I therefore ask by this motion for a statement of the affairs of the corporation during the past ten years, so that we may know exactly the facts in the case. While there is no provision in the law obliging the corporation to furnish such a statement, I think the Minister of Finance need only to demand one, and it will be promptly forthcoming. That statement will demonstrate most clearly that it is utterly hopeless for the holders of those bonds, under the present conditions of things and with the growing needs for roads, to expect to be at any time reimbursed the amount due. And when the fact is demonstrated—as it will be by this statement—that this is a bad debt which can never be recovered by this government, I venture to suggest to the Minister of Finance, and the minister who has particular charge of the interests of the agricultural classes, that they should see that communication is had between this government and the provincial government, with the view to a proper reorganization of that corporation, and the Dominion government, upon proof positive that there is no hope for the recovery of the indebtedness, should consent to write it off and enable us to have an institution that will have a proper care for the maintenance of the roads.

I remember the late Prime Minister of Quebec, Mr. Mercier, declaring it was desirable that these toll-gates should be abolished. The thing is easy of realization. You will find no city of the size of Montreal which has such a quantity of toll-gates, meeting at every corner in its vicinity. This is an eye-sore and an inconvenience, not only to residents but to strangers, who ask how it is possible in the neighbourhood of such a large city to have impediments to easy circulation, which are not to be found in the vicinity of American cities or of Toronto.

Our situation is such as should invite the earnest consideration of the government. And if the government find that all hope of the recovery of this indebtedness is gone, they should write it off and allow us to reorganize ourselves properly. We have given large amounts to railways and have helped other public enterprises in a variety of ways. This government collects a great amount of revenue from the city of Montreal, and if the statement of facts I have given be true, this is a motion which should commend iteself to the attention of the government.

Mr. THOMAS FORTIN (Laval). I have followed the remarks of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), both when he spoke on the 27th of February last, and to-day, with a great deal of interest. As the representative of the county of Laval, I have taken a great interest in the abolishment of toll-gates and toll-bridges. It is well known that the county of Laval is divided into two portions—the old county of Laval, which comprises Isle Jésu, and the newer portion made up of five parishes in the lower end of the Island of Montreal. The old county of Laval being an island, none of the inhabitants can leave it without crossing a bridge and paying toll, and when they reach the Island of Montreal, they have to pay another toll on the macadamized road. I felt so much interested in this subject, and had for a number of years, that, on two former occasions, when I happened to run as a candidate for the local legislature, this question formed one of the items of my political programme. The first occasion was in 1888. I believe I was the first candidate aspiring to political honours who took up this subject as one of the planks of my political platform. When I ran in 1888, I studied the matter as best I could, and pledged myself, if returned, to do all I could to obtain relief for the inhabitants of that old historic county. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) was then residing not far from Isle Jésu, and he must have been aware that my opponent, Mr. Leblanc, took the opposite view; but, instead of trying to help me upon this question or giving assurance that he would try his best to secure the abolishment of toll-gates, he remained silent. Mr. Leblanc was elected on that issue as much as on any other. I regret that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier did not at that time think as he does now, and come to my rescue——

Mr. MONK. I was not then in politics.

Mr. FORTIN. But, surely, the hon. gentleman was liable to come into politics.

Subsequent events have shown that not only was he an aspirant for political life, but an aspirant for the position of one of the leaders of his party. The second opportunity was in 1890. There again the same issue was presented to the people. I had the good fortune to bring into the county the late Honoré Mercier, who was the Prime Minister of Quebec; and, in the parish of St. Martin, he pledged his government to abolish tolls on all the bridges and macadamized roads the moment the municipality should take the necessary steps to take over these works and maintain them in proper order. There again Mr. Leblanc, who was returned, fought this as well as the chief planks of my platform. And then the hon. gentleman Mr. Monk, who was not in politics, but who must have been aware of what was going on in the vicinity of Montreal, did not come to my assistance—I presume, because at that time he held the same views as Mr. Leblanc. I say this to show what interest I have taken in the subject, and it will show also to what an extent the inhabitants of the old portion of the constituency I represent are interested in the abolishment of these toll-bridges and toll-gates. It is needless for me to say that I still hold the same views. I sincerely desire that all these impediments, which may have arisen through special circumstances, should be removed. I am in favour of liberty in all its forms, and I like to see a man free to go from one portion of the country to another without being obliged to have his purse in his hand to make payments at these toll-gates. But if the hon. member has changed his mind, as I hope he has—for I presume that in 1888 and 1890 he was in accord with his political friends—perhaps he will allow me to congratulate him. And perhaps I may be allowed to ask him if he has any plan for the attainment of the object he desires. He seems to have given the subject a great deal of consideration.

Mr. MONK. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin) asks me the question, I can only say that I have no definite plan. Even if I had studied the matter for a year and had a plan matured, and the government were not ready, my work would be in vain. And we on this side have too much to do watching the government to work out plans on these subjects. But surely what has been done in every other large city we should be able to do in the city of Montreal.

Mr. FORTIN. I accept the statement of the hon. member in the first place, that he has not a plan to suggest. I accept his statement, in the second place, that he has a great deal to do on his side of the House, and that he has not had time to give mature consideration to this subject. I understand that the hon. gentleman has, in fact, undertaken a great task. We have been told by the newspapers representing our opponents that they had resuscitated the dual leadership system, which was introduced in the 50's, when their party took the name of Liberal-Conservative. At that time, as is well known, one of the chiefs was the chief of the Conservative party of Upper Canada, and the other was the chief of the Liberals of Lower Canada. If I understand aright the nature of the task assumed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk), he is now supposed to be the chief of the Liberals of the province of Quebec.

Mr. HENDERSON. I rise to a point of order. I would like to know what this has to do with turnpike roads.

Mr. FORTIN. I think I am perfectly in order. I asked a question of the hon. member, which he answered telling me that he had so much to do that he had no time to consider this subject. I am now dealing with that part of his statement, and it seems to me I may be permitted to say what, to my mind, is the task he has undertaken and what are the obstacles in his way. If I am well informed, the hon. gentleman stands in this peculiar position as regards the work he has undertaken—he is chief of the Liberals of the province of Quebec, as he stands in the place of Sir George Etienne Cartier, when the alliance was formed with himself as chief of the Liberals.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin) undertake to be guided by me, then ?

Mr. FORTIN. We will consider that later on. I wish to point out for the moment how difficult is the hon. gentleman's task. He stands, therefore, as I say, in the position of chief of the Liberals in the province of Quebec with not a single member as a follower. Supposing now the hon. member chooses to say that he stands as chief of the French Conservatives of the province of Quebec. If my impression is correct, there again he has no following, he is not even chief of himself, for he is not a full-bred French Canadian.

Mr. MONK. I rise to a point of order. This is the last day for motions of this kind, and I know many hon. gentlemen have motions they desire to press. I have made my remarks as short as possible, and to the point. I really think, Mr. Speaker, you ought to insist upon the observation of the rule which requires an hon. member to confine his remarks to the subject under discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would advise the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) to confine his remarks as much as possible to the question before the Chair.

Mr. FORTIN. I did not propose to go on at any length in that line, and I will now come back to the subject of the motion. I

fail to see what object the hon. member has in view in making this motion. He is not prepared to suggest any plans by which the abolition of these toll-gates might be made an accomplished fact. The hon. gentleman should be aware that this is no place for discussing any such plans, even though any scheme of that kind was feasible. The hon. gentleman knows very well that this is a local matter falling exclusively within the jurisdiction of the legislature of Quebec. He has alluded to the difficulties that his constituents have to overcome in passing over these roads; he has alluded to the past administration of the Montreal Turnpike Trust and to the present administration. I was unable to gather from the hon. gentleman's remarks whether he had any particular fault to find with the present administration. I understand that he finds fault mainly with the commission itself. He says that this commission is partly elected and partly appointed by the government of the province of Quebec. That is perfectly true; but it was true prior to 1897. The present commission was appointed in February, 1897, therefore the system was in existence prior to 1897. Was there any suggestion made at that time to change the system that has obtained since? No, no suggestion was made when the friends of the hon. member were at the head of that commission. Now that the friends of the present government are entrusted with the powers of that commission, there are, apparently, all kinds of fault to be found. The hon. gentleman has suggested that the present government should abandon its claim as holder of debentures to the extent of $95,000. Well, Sir, knowing what I do of this commission, I join with the hon. member in that advice. I think it is just as well for the government to abandon that claim at once. The interest on it has not been paid since 1895, and is not likely to be paid at any time in the future. But perhaps the statement made by the hon. member on a former occasion needs to be explained. I gathered from his remarks on a former occasion that he said the interest was paid on these bonds up to 1895. Now, as a matter of fact there was no interest paid for quite a number of years; no interest was paid in 1895 or 1896. It was a very exceptional occurrence when interest was paid, and the result has been that the present commission had to face a deficit of some $28,000 when they took control of the commission in trust in 1897.

Mr. MONK. My authority was the answer given by the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), who said that interest had not been paid since 1897.

Mr. FORTIN. I am not finding fault with the statement. I say the hon. member left the House under the impression on a previous occasion that interest had been paid up to 1895.

Mr. MONK. Up to 1897.

Mr. FORTIN. That interest had been paid up to 1897, and none had been paid since?

Mr. MONK. That is what I said.

Mr. FORTIN. Now, let me draw the attention of the House to the fact that in 1895 a statute was passed in the Quebec legislature which speaks of arrears of interest on several issues of bonds amounting to $187,200. Now, the accrued interest upon that amount had reached the bagatelle of $180,000. It is stated in the preamble of that Bill that no interest had been paid on the sum of $120,000 since the 15th of July, 1881, and that no interest had been paid upon $67,200 since the 5th of July, 1871. Therefore, the hon. member will see that his information was inaccurate when he said that up to 1897 interest had been paid. As a matter of fact, no interest had been paid upon these bonds since 1881 in the one case, and since 1871 in the other. As I said before, interest was paid for 1895 and 1896; but still the commission was left face to face with a deficit, which was admitted by Mr. Mondaux, who was then secretary-treasurer, to amount to $18,000, and which was found upon the special report prepared by an auditor to amount to $28,000. Now, this shows conclusively to my mind that the trust is unable to pay interest on these bonds except by neglecting the roads; and to that extent I agree with the hon. member when he suggests that the government should give up these bonds entirely. But this would not remedy the evil in any way. These roads go through twenty-seven or twenty-eight municipalities. There are four or five roads. There are two roads that go as far as Lachine, crossing along the way, all the different municipalities. One road goes through Côte des Nèiges, and goes down to Cartierville, through St.-Laurent. Another road leads from Mile End and goes through several municipalities, the municipality of Villeray and the parish of Sault au Recollet. Another road leaves the eastern portion of the city and goes as far as Point au Trembles, passing through the parish along the way. I think there are altogether twenty-seven or twenty-eight municipalities interested. Now, some of those municipalities have commuted their tolls upon these roads, in other words, have acquired the roads within the limits of their own territory; others have not. Now, I fail to see how it could be possible to maintain these roads if the government were to give up their bonds. I understand from the hon. member that he does not wish the government to give up their bonds and let the toll-gates remain.

Mr. MONK. No.

Mr. FORTIN. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, only wishes the government to do its share and then to see some other authority abolish the tolls. Now, what municipality will undertake the maintenance of these roads? This is a matter that requires a great deal of consideration. I may say that the members who compose the trust to-day are just as anxious as any one for the fulfilment of that trust. They render their services without salary, and have no personal interest in the matter whatever. They have no interest whatever in it. They are just as anxious as anybody to see toll-gates removed from the Island of Montreal. But, the subject is full of difficulties of every kind. I think that nothing short of a royal commission, appointed by a special Act of the parliament of Quebec, and given extraordinary powers, can deal effectively with this subject. As it is, there are several municipalities which would not take over the roads if offered them for nothing. I know that an offer was made to the municipality of Point aux Trembles to give up six miles of the road. The receipts upon that road scarcely paid the amount of the salary of the gate-keeper. The municipality would not take it on any consideration. What is the remedy for the trouble? The hon. member calls for a statement of the receipts and expenditure for the last ten years. What would this amount to? It is very true the government can get such a statement. A similar request was made before the legislature, and a similar request was granted. It is a public corporation of a mixed nature, and it is bound to give information to any interested party. Any interested party may go there and obtain all these figures. But, since the hon. gentleman has thought proper to bring this subject before the House, it seems to me that he does not discharge his full duty merely in the observations he has made. I expected his conclusion would be the suggestion of a bold plan of some kind by which these obnoxious toll-gates could be removed, and I was very much disappointed that he could not suggest anything to that end. The hon. gentleman has alluded to what was known as the 48-hours ticket, which was sold to the farmers and parties interested, just a short time before this new commission assumed control of the affairs of the trust in 1897. The hon. gentleman knows very well that this 48-hours ticket was nothing but an election dodge, in order to secure votes probably for the hon. gentleman himself, or, for some friends of his party. This meant a loss to the commission of somewhere in the neighbourhood of $4,000 a year, and the hon. gentleman must also know that the receipts have been so much decreased by the establishment of the electric railways and by the introduction of bicycles, and so forth, that they can hardly pay the ordinary expenditure of the trust and keep the roads in a proper condition. Now, I do not know that the remarks made by the hon. gentleman call for anything more to be said upon the subject. I repeat that I am very anxious to see these toll-gates and toll-bridges totally disappear. There is no portion of the whole province of Quebec where these are more cumbersome than for the inhabitants of the old county of Laval, wherein I reside myself, but I would like to see somebody coming here with a definite scheme by which a proper end could be attained.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin) has found fault with my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) for introducing a motion to find out and inquire what is the amount due by this trust company on the Island of Montreal to the government.

Mr. FORTIN. That is not the motion.

Mr. HAGGART. He found fault also with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier because, as he said, in some election campaign the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, or his friends, had made an election cry about the abolition of what we look upon in our section of the country as a relic of barbarism—toll-gates. He also found fault with my hon. friend because he has not a practical plan by which these toll-gates can be abolished. It seems to me to be the consensus of opinion on both sides of the House that the claim of the government against this trust which has the duty of keeping these roads in order, is worthless. There is $180,000 of interest and $190,000 of capital due to the government, while, with the receipts of the Turnpike Trust, there is no prospect of receiving anything. The hon. gentleman asks for some plan by which these toll-gates can be abolished. I would suggest a plan to him. If he would look to the conduct of the people of New Brunswick and of Nova Scotia, and in some way or other have the claims of these municipalities referred to the Exchequer Court, which would look into the equities of them without any legal formalities to be gone through, perhaps he would be able to get something for the municipalities down there. After all, here is a claim which the government have against this Turnpike Trust, of which there is no probability and no possibility of getting anything. Would not a simple plan be for the government to say to the parties who own these roads: You gain nothing out of these roads, but you have to make the expenditure for keeping them in repair. If we forego our claim will you abolish the toll-gates altogether? If you do not do it, we will enforce our claim to its utmost. There is a simple plan. Then, the hon. gentleman says, that the municipalities will not take charge of these roads. That is a new doctrine. The municipality has to take charge of every road in every

part of every province in this Dominion. The municipality is responsible for seeing that the roads are kept in order. Let the government forego their claim, let the toll-gates be abolished and then the duty devolves upon every municipality in every part of the Dominion to keep the roads in order. Now, there is a practical p'an which I would suggest to the hon. member for Laval. I propose that the government should do away with this useless asset altogether and say to the owners of these roads : We will forego our claim, abolish the toll-gates and hand the roads over to the municipalities. If we do that we will be accomplishing what the people in these municipalities have a right to ask, and we will be abolishing that which should not be allowed to exist, especially near a large city like Montreal—toll-gates, because they are a nuisance and a relic of barbarism.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) calls for papers which are quite proper, and therefore there is no objection to its passing. I am inclined to think, however, that the remarks that were made by him on this motion were calculated to lead some of us to imagine that the duty of looking after the roads in the province of Quebec belongs to the government of the Dominion. That certainly is not what he would seriously propose, and when he suggests that the government of the Dominion should do this or that in the matter, I am afraid I shall have to remind him that the government of the Dominion are only interested as creditors or bondholders. We have nothing to do with the management of provincial roads. Under the Act of Union, certain securities belonging to the provinces passed to the control of the Dominion. Amongst these were claims against this Turnpike Trust ; they came under the control of the Dominion, and for some years a portion of the interest was paid. Then, there came a period of years, owing, no doubt, to the difficulty of maintaining the roads, when the interest was not paid. About the year 1895, I think it was, the claim of the government for principal and interest amounted to upwards of $400,000. It is only fair to say that half of that was for arrears of interest. The capital sum due was about $200,000. A compromise was then come to, which was deemed at that time to be a fair one, whereby half of this claim for principal and interest against the Turnpike Trust was wiped out, and it was agreed that the Dominion should only be a creditor to the extent of $200,000, and at a reduced rate of interest. The Dominion has practically contributed as a free gift $200,000 to this enterprise, and it is now to be asked to give up the balance. I am not going to offer any emphatic opinion now, but, if the Minister of Finance is to be the watch-dog of the treasury, I think, perhaps, he may have to be on guard, not only against my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), but also against my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin), who seems to be looking in the same direction. I suppose we all agree that it is desirable that toll-gates and toll-roads should be abolished. I had a fad of that kind in my own province, and I take some pride in the fact that the last toll-bridge in Nova Scotia was abolished under my administration, but, it was not abolished by any Dominion grant, but abolished by the municipal and provincial authorities coming to an understanding and paying off the company, and making it a public highway. I have no desire to say what might be done in the end. The motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) calls for information which we shall be glad to furnish. I do not want to admit that the debt is a hopeless one. A Finance Minister never wishes to do that. However, before a proposal is made that the government should give up its claim, I would like to have a clearer understanding as to what is going to happen then. It is well that the House should understand that already the Dominion has given up its claim to the extent, principal and interest, of $200,000 on acount of this trust fund.

Mr. GOURLEY. Has the interest been paid since ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am glad my hon. friend (Mr. Gourley) reminded me of that. After the readjustment took place, it was contemplated that the interest would be paid, and that they would gradually pay off some of the principal. They paid for a year or a year and a half the interest under the rearrangement, and they also paid the sum of $5,000 on the capital. It is represented, however, by the trustees who succeeded the administration of that day, that that amount of $5,000 was not paid out of the earnings of the road, but was paid practically out of the capital, if I may so express it, because it is said that the roads were allowed to run down, and that when the new trustees came into office they were obliged to make good the defects, and that therefore, the earnings of the roads did not justify the payment of the $5,000. Of course, I only give that as a statement of the trustees, for I have no personal knowledge of the matter. After paying interest for a year or two on the readjusted sum, the payment ceased, and for the last couple of years no interest has been received. As to the capacity of the trustees, I have no reason to doubt that they are very estimable gentlemen. I believe that under the late administration, the chairman of the trustees was an excellent newspaper man, and a man who is capable of running a successful newspaper can generally do pretty nearly everything on earth. The gentleman who is now the chairman of the trustees is a merchant of high standing in

the city of Montreal, and I have no doubt that the trustees are doing the best they can to administer the trust. I suppose that the real trouble is that the demands for the maintenance of the road are so great that it is difficult to meet the payments of interest and to maintain the roads.

Mr. MONK. I desire to thank the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) for the statement he has made. I understood from his remarks that the matter was a proper one to bring before this House, and that he would be ready to lend himself to an investigation of the financial ability of this corporation to pay its debt. But, I cannot say as much for my hon. friend for Laval (Mr. Fortin). I thought he would give me a very hearty support; but, he seems to blame me for not coming down to this House—which he admits has no jurisdiction in the matter—and take up an hour and a half explaining about the maintenance of these roads. What has he got to say about that? Why cannot he corroborate what I have said about the financial standing of this corporation? The matter began in 1888, and he has been looking into it for fourteen years, but he has not to-day any plan of any kind whatever to suggest. I think the House will be satisfied with the statements made by the Minister of Finance, and by the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart). It is a thing that is feasible, since it has been done everywhere else, and when we have the assurance of the government, that upon proper proof that this is a worthless asset, they will leave us free to arrange this matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not give any such assurance.

Mr. MONK. I know the Minister of Finance was very guarded, but I understood that from his remarks. When we have that hope, at any rate we are clever enough to find a plan, even if we have not to think fourteen years about it.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MONK. As this is the last day for motions of this kind, I would ask the government to permit the Order paper to be gone through so as to pass the unopposed motions.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is no objection to that.

BUILDINGS RENTED AT OTTAWA BY THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. THOS. BIRKETT (Ottawa). In moving the motion which is in my name, am I to understand that there is no discussion allowed on it?

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no discussion at this stage.

Mr. BIRKETT. Then, I move, without discussion, for:

Copies of all leases, contracts or agreements for the rental of all buildings now occupied, or to be erected for and occupied by the Federal government in the city of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT VESSELS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) moved for:

Copies of all specifications and plans issued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries when calling for tenders for the construction of two government vessels in British Columbia. Also copies of all tenders received for construction of same, together with a statement showing the amount of the deposits made by the several tenderers, &c., names of the successful tenderers, and all correspondence and papers connected with the same, including that in connection with the withdrawal of one of the successful tenders.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Stand.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. This is the second time this has been asked to stand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Marine is absent, but the last information I had was, that the contract had not been awarded.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. That is three weeks ago. Better let the motion drop.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very well.

Motion dropped.

CANAL BRIDGE AT COTE ST. PAUL.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for:

Return showing the cost of construction of the bridge built by the government across the Lachine canal at Côte St. Paul, also estimated cost of strengthening or rebuilding said bridge, if such estimate has been made, and copies of all petitions and correspondence had with the government of Canada upon this subject.

He said: The Minister of Railways and Canals is not present, and I would briefly say that this motion calls for a statement of the cost of rebuilding the bridge at Côte St. Paul in the county of Jacques Cartier. This is an extremely old bridge crossing the canal and it is at present quite insufficient for the wants of the people living in that neighbourhood. I take it, Sir, that it is the duty of the government, while constructing the canal for the general wants of the Dominion, to supply wherever necessary proper means of communication from one bank of the canal to the other. As I have stated, the bridge at Côte St. Paul is too weak to admit of electric cars passing over it; and I understand that it is too narrow when open to admit of the free and easy passage of vessels coming down the canal.

I am informed that the Bohemian, coming down the canal, at that point, touches on both sides. But the chief inconvenience is the want of proper communication between the city of Montreal and the town of Côte St. Paul and the municipality of Verdun. It is impossible for the Montreal Street Railway to cross, because the bridge would require to carry thirteen tons, whereas I believe it has only sufficient strength to carry seven tons. So that the street cars only run as far as the bridge. There is no doubt that if they could cross the bridge and run as far as Verdun, where the line already reaches, and pass by a circuit back to Montreal, the greatest possible advantage would result to Côte St. Paul, Verdun and the city of Montreal itself. I believe that the people of Côte St. Paul and vicinity have communicated with the government on this subject on one or two occasions; and at their request I have called at the canal office at Montreal and solicited from the resident engineer there, Mr. Marceau, the favour of an estimate of what a new and enlarged bridge would cost. I have not been able to obtain that information in time for this motion; but I would invite the earnest consideration of the Minister of Railways to this subject. I believe it is admitted now that a tunnel under the canal would be very much better than a bridge over the canal. I believe that was established in some way at the time the difficulties arose in connection with the construction of the Curran bridge. This is a particularly favourable spot for the building of a tunnel, for the land is low on both sides, and I do not think the tunnelling would be expensive. Under these circumstances I would ask the Minister of Railways to give his earnest attention to this request.

Mr. T. FORTIN (Laval). I happen to know something about the bridge in question, and about the wants of the town of St. Paul in connection with it, and I entirely concur in the demand made by the hon. member who has just taken his seat. The town of St. Paul is a very progressive locality. A few years ago it formed part of the parish of St. Paul; then it became a village, and afterwards a town. There are various industries in operation within its limits, and altogether it is a very considerable and progressive place. To my personal knowledge—for I have been for the last ten or twelve years the legal adviser of the municipality—it has lately made an agreement with the Montreal Street Railway Company, by which for the next thirty years at least it is to have electric communication with the city of Montreal through the town of St. Henri. In order to have that communication, the cars must pass over this bridge; but the bridge is so old and weak that it actually fell down during last winter. It was repaired, and it may be strong enough for ordinary vehicles, but it is certainly not strong enough for electric cars to pass over it. This is a place where the Lachine canal crosses a public highway, and it seems to me that the government are bound to restore communication between the opposite sides of the canal, so that a continuous highway may be there as it was before. Perhaps somebody may say, if the bridge is strong enough for ordinary vehicles, that is all that is required; but I submit that when a government or a railway corporation cuts up a highway, it is bound to replace it with a highway equally strong and solid, whether by a bridge or a tunnel. The arrangement with the Montreal Street Railway Company has just been completed. There is still a small matter of detail to be arranged between the parish of St. Paul and the Montreal Turnpike Trust, for a portion of the road in question is controlled by the Turnpike Trust. All these arrangements are made at considerable sacrifice by the people of the town of St. Paul, and it seems to me that it is only fair and proper that the government should take the necessary steps either to provide a bridge of sufficient solidity to carry electric cars, or to build a tunnel, as suggested by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

Motion agreed to.

THE VALLEYFIELD LABOUR STRIKE.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, telegrams and messages in the Government Labour Bureau between the department and all persons, referring to the labour strike at Valleyfield, in Beauharnois county, province of Quebec, during the month of November last; also copies of all letters, telegrams and messages exchanged between the Militia Department and the municipal authorities at Valleyfield, or any justices of the peace, the military authorities at Montreal or any other persons relating to the said strike, and the calling out or payment of the troops in connection therewith; also a statement showing expenses incurred by the Dominion government in reference to said strike.

He said : In making this motion, I wish to make a brief statement to the House ; and if the facts which I am about to state are found to be true, as I have no doubt they would be on investigation, they reveal a state of affairs which I think calls for public condemnation. Briefly, the facts are these. Last spring an association was formed in the town of Valleyfield bearing the name of 'L'Union Libérale.' The object was to protect workingmen by seeing that their rights were on all occasions properly vindicated. But as the name savoured a little too much of politics, it was changed to that of 'L'Union Ouvrière,' 'the workingmen's union.' Its president was a man by the name of Etienne Leger, the vice-president and treasurer was one Joseph

Dezy—two prominent Liberals of that locality—and the secretary, the deus ex machina, or the principal factor in the work of organization, was Louis Bertrand, who was lockmaster on the Beauharnois canal. All the workingmen of Valleyfield were cordially invited to join such a beneficial association and encourage the work of protecting the labouring man. Assurances were given that there would be no politics in the society, and that its sole object was the obtaining of better wages and the protection of the rights of labour. An initiation fee of one dollar was charged, and a monthly subscription of 25 cents.

The municipal council of Valleyfield is largely composed of Liberals. In fact, I believe that only one or two of its members belong to the true political faith. At that time, this corporation was having some work done, and it was understood that preference would be given to those who belonged to this society. If a Conservative applied for work, he was told that it was a great misfortune, but he must abide the results of his political creed or else join the association and become a Liberal. I am even very credibly informed that this man Deschene was in the habit of swearing men who joined the association that they would join the Liberal party. The municipal corporation was only paying one dollar per day to its workmen ; and as it was deemed necessary to show that this association was existing to some practical purpose, a resolution was passed to the effect that circumstances having changed, an increase of 25 cents should be given to the corporation workmen, and a demand to that effect was made upon the municipal council and at once acceded to—which of course showed what power this society had.

The Montreal Cotton Mills Company, which has very extensive and valuable works at Valleyfield, had purchased some property from the Buntin estate, on which it intended erecting thereon some buildings, and was employing labour deepening the foundations. These men were not cotton mill employees proper, but were simply employed by the day at current prices. This special work was being done when the election campaign began, and the men doing it were all voters. The association urged these special workmen to ask for higher wages. Deschene went to see Mr. Lacey, the manager of the company, and presented him with a demand for increased pay. Mr. Lacey replied that the wages were sufficient, and as the season was pretty far advanced, he suspended this special work. On the other hand, a certain number of men who were employed by the year by the Montreal Cotton Mills Company, were at that moment engaged loading coal or conveying coal to the mills, and the association succeeded in persuading them, and indeed the workmen generally engaged in the mills, to go on strike for an increase. The company has a property there valued at $2,000,000, and fears were entertained that it might suffer damage, and at this juncture, Mr. J. N. Greenshields arrived on the scene and succeeded in obtaining from the mayor of the municipality, Mr. Langevin, a Conservative, and from Mr. St. Onge, the Liberal member of that municipality, the necessary demand for military protection. Having obtained that demand upon the assurance that it was a mere formality, and that these two councillors would not suffer, he applied for military protection on behalf of the company. But when the troops arrived nobody could be found to read the Riot Act. The mayor was confined to his house, and the other councillor denied having taken any part in the summoning of the military force, and the recorder of the place, Mr. Papineau, joined with the rioters.

The House is aware of what happened. Nobody being there to read the Riot Act, a certain number of the soldiers were ill-treated, were stoned, and the minister who has charge of the Department of Labour, the Postmaster General, was asked to send some one down to put an end to this strike, which had been altogether brought about by the action of the three men who conducted the affairs of this so-called society. In answer to the demand which was made upon him, the minister gave as an excuse that his engagements would not allow him to intervene personally; but he sent down an employee of his department connected with the labour bureau, a Mr. King, if I am not mistaken——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, Mr. King, the Deputy Minister of Labour.

Mr. MONK. Mr. King came down to Valleyfield. As I understand it, the function of Mr. King, and his duty under such circumstances, is indicated by a law which we passed last session—63-64 Victoria, chap. 24, section 5 :

> It shall be the duty of the conciliator to promote conditions favourable to a settlement by endeavouring to ally distrust, to remove causes of friction, to promote good feeling, to restore confidence, and to encourage the parties to come together and themselves effect a settlement, and also to promote agreements between employers and employees with a view to the submission of differences to conciliation or arbitration before resorting to strikes or lock-outs.

Though that is the duty of Mr. King under the circumstances, I am credibly informed that he did the very opposite. He became a political agent. He met the leading people in Valleyfield and told them the government were prepared to do a great deal for the success of this strike, but it was all-important that they should support Mr. Loy,

who was the Liberal candidate. So, Mr. King became when there an active canvasser. The information which I have given to the House as briefly as possible has been given to me by reliable people. If this statement as to the state of affairs is true, it is clear that the conduct of the parties I have named in connection with the matter is much to be condemned. I submit also that it goes a long way to maintain the claim which has been put forth by several parties at Valleyfield, that this strike, and what subsequently happened, was organized solely and purely for political purposes. If that is true, it would be extremely unjust that the cost of sending the militia should fall upon the municipality. It should be paid by the government, who allowed this state of affairs to exist——

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has made a serious charge against a very prominent official. Would he give me the name of one or more prominent persons who said that Mr. King, to the slightest extent, took part in politics ?

Mr. MONK. I have that statement from my informants.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. This is a very serious charge. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) must know that, coming from him as a prominent lawyer and a prominent member of the House, it cannot fail to attract attention. He should be prepared to take the responsibility of it or give us the names of his informants.

Mr. MONK. I shall be happy to do more than that, and to give affidavits of perfectly responsible men, to the effect that the facts as I have stated them are true. I shall give those affidavits in the early part of next week. I have no personal knowledge of the facts, but would not have made the statements without having information on which I could rely. As to the effect upon the election, we have the fact that, whereas in 1896, the Conservative candidate in that constituency, Mr. Bergeron, had a majority, if I am not mistaken, of 105 in Valleyfield and Ste. Cecile—both places united, and generally considered as one—in consequence of this movement to obtain his defeat, he was buried there under a minority of 312. I think I am not mistaken in that. Thus, the cause mentioned in the House the other day for the defeat of the Conservative candidate in Beauharnois county—mentioned by my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil)—is not the real cause, but, that cause was in reality the special condition of affairs in the town of Valleyfield. I see that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has taken a great interest in the statement I have made. I believe that this movement was got up, to a very large extent, for the purpose of favouring his own candidature in that county. He will remember that some pressure was brought to bear upon him to go there as candidate, and a strong movement was made to secure his election there. At that time, with parties who were going to Montreal to secure the candidature of Montreal, there was no question of Mr. Loy's candidature. I think it is very important that the facts should be ascertained; and if any official in the department has been guilty of the conduct which I have stated to the House, I think the House should take cognizance of the facts.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte). Mr. Speaker, the town of Valleyfield—I would rather say the city of Valleyfield—has to-day a population of 12,000. In 1896, the town had a population of 5,000 or 6,000. It has become a centre of great industry and activity. The Montreal Cotton Mills Company own, probably, the largest mills in Canada. They are a strong, powerful, enterprising corportion. They bought the Buntin property, and undertook to lay the foundations for a new addition to their mill. It was late in the fall; the weather was cold—in fact, it rained, I suppose, two or three days a week. The men, who were working in the water to the belt, were being paid $1 a day. They thought they were not being paid enough, and I think they were right. I am not here to justify any strike, or any organization for striking purposes; I state the facts as I know them to be. In Valleyfield, as elsewhere in the district of Montreal, the workingmen formed an organization. Now, I am very sorry that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has received so much wrong information. I happen to know what is going on in the county of Beauharnois, and I have followed this very affair with great care. This was not a Liberal association, it was a workingmen's association, and I make bold to say that the majority of its members belonged to the Conservative party. The workingmen of both political parties were members of that association. The men made up their minds that they were not paid enough, and they went on strike. Whether they were right or whether they were wrong, it is not for me to judge. Their associates, the men engaged in the ordinary work of the mill, sympathized strongly with them, and went on strike also.

If my hon. friend knew more about the state of affairs in Valleyfield, he would know very well that nearly every one working in the mills is a Conservative. I am sorry to have to state that the management of the Valleyfield mills have systematically excluded friends of this government from employment. I cannot be accused of any revengeful spirit against the owners of those mills. The hon. gentleman has alluded to my candidature in 1896, when I was defeated by a small majority. Why was I defeated, Mr. Speaker ? Because there was a most shameful pressure brought to bear

upon the workingmen, and I was a witness of it. Electors were even locked up in the mills on the day of polling. I make that statement because I was a witness of what took place. But I forgot and forgave everything. I think, perhaps, if I had been disposed, I could have found means to take revenge. But I forgave everything, because I am not such a small-minded man as to take revenge on a large industry because its management have not done the right thing by me. I make that statement just to show that my hon. friend is wrongly informed. The Liberals have no show in the Valleyfield mills to-day, they are only employed when nobody else can be found.

Mr. MONK. Why did the Liberal candidate have so large a majority ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because the people changed their minds in Valleyfield, as they have done everywhere in the province of Quebec. Now, my hon. friend made some very strong statements. For instance, he stated on his responsibility that the recorder of Valleyfield, Mr. Papineau, joined the rioters. That is a very strong statement to make.

Mr. MONK. I did not say that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, word for word. 'Joined the rioters,' I took down the words.

Mr. MONK. I never said he joined the rioters. I said he sympathized with them, and refused to read the Riot Act.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not want to be unfair to my hon. friend, but he will read those words to-morrow in the 'Hansard,' those very words, 'He joined the rioters.' Now, Sir, if Mr. Papineau or other responsible parties in Valleyfield had read the Riot Act, what would have been the consequence ? The soldiers who had been called there would simply have shot down honest workingmen. But would my hon. friend be ready to stand up in this House and say that the recorder of Valleyfield did not do the right thing ? Soldiers should not be asked on such occasions to shoot down citizens, even though those citizens are not doing what is right. There was no loss of property in Valleyfield, and no riot ; yet under those circumstances my hon. friend would insinuate that the recorder of Valleyfield was wrong in refusing to read an Act, the consequences of which would have been simply the murder of honest citizens, I call it murder.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend will pardon me. I said he sympathized with the rioters and refused to afford sufficient protection to the militia that had been called there. But I did not say that he was bound to cause the murder of honest workingmen.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend knows very well what would have been the consequence if Mr. Papineau, or the mayor, or any other man, had read the Riot Act, the soldiers would have been obliged to fire.

Mr. MONK. No, that is not the law.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It might have meant that, at any rate. But nothing of the kind happened, and peace was restored. Now, my hon. friend should not try to place the responsibility of what took place on any other shoulders than those who were really responsible. I say that if the owners of the Valleyfield mills had not forgotten that they were bound to pay honest wages to honest labourers, nothing of the kind would have happened. Sir, here is a great, powerful, and wealthy corporation which is earning large dividends, larger perhaps than we know, larger than we have been told. Was it fair for them to exact from labouring men, in the month of October to work in water up to their waists, ten hours a day, for the paltry wages of $1 a day ? I say without hesitation, and the country will agree with me, that the workingmen were not being treated fairly at Valleyfield. I do not say they did right in going on strike, I think they could have arranged matters without having recourse to the proceedings that they adopted. But upon that point I am not going to judge. My hon. friend says that the council of Valleyfield is Liberal, but he was immediately obliged to admit that the mayor was one of his political friends, and it was the mayor himself who, without consulting the council, signed the very document by virtue of which the troops were called out.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Was there any destruction of property ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there was no destruction of property, and there was no loss of life, because the Riot Act was not read. Now, I am very much surprised to hear my hon. friend state that he had received information to the effect that Mr. King, the able Deputy Minister of Labour, went there and canvassed for the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Loy). My hon. friend has undertaken to produce the evidence in support of what he says. If he produces such evidence, we will be unanimous in condemning Mr. King ; but before such evidence is produced, I am bound to believe that my hon. friend has been misled in a very serious manner indeed. The name of Mr. Greenshields has been mentioned. Mr. Greenshields is the lawyer of the Dominion Cotton Mills Company, and acting in that capacity he applied for troops. But Mr. Greenshields happens to be a Liberal, and my hon. friend, who is a shrewd man, mentions his name just to associate him with the affair. He mentioned my name in connection with this affair, and said

that he forgot the dates. My hon. friend was far away in his own riding, and he forgot the dates. The candidature of the member for Beauharnois had not been accepted when the trouble took place. I was asked to be a candidate there, but I was better engaged in St. Mary. Well, the electorate was not very inattentive to the explanations that I offered. There was no question of party in this affair, none whatever. I know very well that the late member for Beauharnois tried his level best to make the electors believe that he was the saviour of the workingmen. But he had told them so many things that did not turn out to be true, that they did not take much stock in what he said. He did not defeat me in 1896. I would have been elected by a couple of hundred majority if the electorate had been free as it was last November. On this last occasion the electorate of Valleyfield was free, and it is a great blessing indeed for the electorate to be free, both in civil and religious matters. The Liberal party has at least achieved that great object of giving civil and religious freedom to the electorate of this country. The electors were free in Valleyfield because this year the management of the mills was not altogether the same. Mr. Simpson had gone. He had followed me with the men of the mills in 1896 from polling place to polling place, and these men were yelling against me in every parish and in every corner of the riding. The same state of affairs did not take place this year. The electors voted freely, and it is because they voted freely that my hon. friend (Mr. Loy), and old Conservative like myself—Soit dit en passant—has been elected in that riding. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has alluded to the fact that a change took place in that constituency. My hon. friend (Mr. Loy), who sits in this parliament in place of the old member whom very very few will regret, was a Conservative. He belonged to the great Conservative party of past days. He changed his mind, and with him the thriving and intelligent town of Valleyfield changed its mind also.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). I am glad that these papers have at last been moved for, but I regret that the motion should have been deferred to such a late date in the session. A reference to the Order paper will show that the notice was given nearly six weeks ago, and I was anxious before, and have been anxious ever since, that this matter should be discussed, and that the people of Valleyfield and the people throughout Canada who are interested should get to know the facts of this case. The mover of the resolution (Mr. Monk) has given a version of the case, which, although I am not prepared at this moment to contradict, most certainly disagrees very materialy with my own knowledge of some of the facts, and disagrees with the representations which have been brought before me. I know nothing at all about a political labour organization having been organized in Valleyfield last spring. It may be so and it may not. I do not know. I do know that there is in Valleyfield, and there has been for some time, a duly organized Federal Labour Union chartered by the Trades Congress of Canada. That is an organization that cannot take part in party politics. It is neither their policy nor their business so to do. It is there for purely trade union purposes to look after the interests of the workers as regards their labour, and until this afternoon I had always heard that the Valleyfield Federal Labour Union had kept strictly to the work for which it was chartered. But, Mr. Speaker, I am led to believe that this serious trouble that occurred just before the elections was the result of political machinations. I do not care which party it is that is interested, whether it is both parties or only one, we want to know the facts as to that. The matter was so very serious that if it is true that the strike was the outcome of party politics at that time, in order to influence the election, and if it resulted in the strike and the calling out of the militia on account of which a riot occurred, then some one must be held to account. From information which I think is to hand, if it can be proved that these statements are right, then there are some persons who are guilty of conspiracy in this case, and the matter should be thoroughly inquired into. I would call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that some thirteen or fourteen men were arrested and have been returned for trial, and that their trial is being postponed and held over. I am perfectly sure that if the things that are inferentially charged against other parties were charged against these men, they would have been tried for conspiracy long before this time. As to the right of the men to strike, I do not know that that is a matter that concerns us at the present time. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has told us that the men were working in a cellar digging waist deep in water for a dollar a day, and he will not express any opinion as to whether they were justified in striking or not. Well, Mr. Speaker, for my part, I am glad they did strike. If business was good in Valleyfield at that time, and if these men were working ten hours a day for a dollar under the conditions stated; surely, there was nothing to cause a riot or to call out the militia because they refused to work for that wage.

Now, the Deputy Minister of Labour was called to Valleyfield at that time, and in his report to the department there is this fact brought out: That there was a small strike

there, and that not for any necessary reasons, but on the solicitation practically of the Cotton Company of that town, the militia were called out. There has never been any evidence that there was any need to call the militia out.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUTTEE. The militia were taken to Valleyfield, and we have in the report of the Deputy Minister of Labour the fact stated plainly, that the large strike of the cotton operators of that city ensued because the militia had been called there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUTTEE. Now, I am proud of these men that they did strike when the militia were called out there to intimidate a few other men who had quit work because they were not satisfied with the terms that were offered them. I would remind the House that just before this we had another case in British Columbia where the militia were called out to take a hand in settling a strike. I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to give, not only my endorsation, but my praise to the men of Valleyfield who had no complaint themselves, who were getting the work and wages they contracted for, but who threw up their work, laid down their tools and walked out of the factory and said: We will not work while the militia are in town. I may state, Mr. Speaker—and this, it seems to me, throws the weight a little more on my side than perhaps on the other in the argument, that if there is any one to blame for working this trouble for political purposes, it is not the working people—I may state that the settlement that was made at that time by the Deputy Minister of Labour has not proved satisfactory, because it has not been thoroughly observed. During the last few weeks there has been a deputation to Ottawa, and we have waited on the Deputy Minister of Labour, and we have tried to find out what were the points in that settlement, and why men have not been taken back to work who were included in the settlement at that time. I hope that the government will speedily bring these papers down, that we shall get all the evidence that can be got, and that if necessary we shall have a full investigation into all the facts of the case.

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). I did not happen to be in the House when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) began to speak to his motion, but when I did come in I heard him using some very strong language with regard to the young gentleman who is acting as Deputy Minister of Labour; who is a young man of excellent qualifications, a man of the very highest character, and one who, as a young Canadian, is likely to make his mark in the civil service, or in any position in which he may be placed. I am informed, and have every reason to believe that there is not one iota of foundation for the most serious charges that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has made against that young man. I do hope that for his own credit and for the credit of this House, that when the hon. gentleman finds out that he has been misled and misinformed, he will be the first one to stand up and do justice to a gentleman who has been so improperly dealt with. If, on the other hand, he can produce—as he said, in reply to my question, he could—the affidavit of any responsible person that there is the slightest truth in the statement he made to the House, I will be the first to take action to see that justice is dealt out in the matter, and I believe I will be endorsed by the House in that. I fear that the hon. gentleman has been imposed upon, because I believe there is not the slightest foundation for the charges or for the statements that were made with regard to Mr. King, the Deputy Minister of Labour. In regard to the case that has been discussed, I do not desire to say anything further than that I agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), that, so far as we do know the circumstances, the strike was brought about by the calling out of the militia. There were no party politics in the matter at all so far as we could learn.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There have been strikes before; this was not the first.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes, and the threatened strike at the present time. There is this to be said to the credit of Mr. King, that he did what he could to bring about a better understanding between the employers and the employed, and succeeded. We all know that this is a new department which has arisen out of the desire on the part of the government and on the part of parliament to do what they can towards allaying the difficulties that arise from time to time between the employers and the employed, between what is very often referred to as capital and labour. Whether this establishment of a Bureau of Labour will be altogether successful or not, I do not know, but I believe that hon. members on both sides of the House are actuated by a desire to do what they can to assist this Bureau of Labour in bringing about a better feeling between the employers and employed. In this particular case it must be a source of gratification to the people of this country, and to the members of this House to know, that, at the very moment when bloodshed was almost threatened, when there were so many men out of employment, and when the destruction of property was feared, the intervention of a third

party, of Mr. King, resulted at once in settling the disturbance and allaying the bad feeling which existed. Whatever feeling there may be in regard to that disturbance, this is a result for which everybody must be thankful. In this particular case we have the reward of the effort that was made on behalf of the labouring classes of this country in the fact, that, as a result of the visit of Mr. King, the men at once returned to work and an amicable settlement was brought about between the two parties. Upon reading the news of that day, we did not know at what moment most serious results might occur in Valleyfield. I only got up to draw attention to the very strong statements that the hon. gentleman made, and I think it is due that he should either verify these statements or withdraw them.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Mr. Speaker, I think this discussion will be of considerable benefit if it draws the attention of the country to two phases of the labour question. One is in reference to the Conciliation Bill which was passed by this House last session. I agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), that if the statement is correct, and I presume it is, when it is made by a minister in this House, if these men at Valleyfield were asked to work belt-deep in water for one dollar a day, it is sufficient justification, and the only reason I desire to know, that they should strike, and that the sympathy of the country should be with them. This is a growing time, particularly in the cotton trade of this country. The cotton manufacturers have no reason to complain of the treatment of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), even although he may have been almost justified in wreaking a little vengeance upon them. He used them in a magnanimous way, and it is not to their credit that he is able to make the statement in this House to-day, that after the way they have been used, touching the tariff, they are compelling men to work for the miserable sum of one dollar a day. What I arose particularly to refer to was the Conciliation Bill and the good effect of that Bill. Mr. King went to Valleyfield and the result was that the strike was settled. I have had some experience myself in reference to conciliation measures in my own constituency, and I know that in a place where they had nine or ten strikes in as many years, since the formation of the conciliation board there by their own accord three or four years ago, we have not had friction between capital and labour. I think this Bill will have a good effect if used properly in this country. I regret we cannot have compulsory arbitration, because it is outside of the jurisdiction of this House to pass such legislation. If it were within our jurisdiction, I think we would not be equal to our duty if we did not pass such legislation. But, we must make the best of what we have in this Conciliation Bill. The second point brought out was the calling out of the militia when this labour difficulty commenced. It seems to me that this should be the very last resort. Men who strike for better wages have to consider a number of serious matters before they quit work. They have to consider the question of the maintenance of their wives and children. It must be supposed that when they quit work and demand better wages there are very serious reasons why they should do so, and it should be the last resort that the militia should be called out, because it is nearly always certain to result in bloodshed, in riots, in the destruction of property and in loss of life. I desire to join my testimony to that of the hon. acting Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Sutherland), in reference to Mr. King the Deputy Minister of Labour. Mr. King is one of the leading economical authorities of this country. He is a young man who was taken by the authorities of Harvard University, who know a good man when they find him, and was sent by them to study economical questions on the other side of the water. He had a position waiting him in Harvard University at a large salary as soon as he completed his studies on the other side of the water. He has spent some years on the continent of Europe and in England studying these questions, and he had this position open to him when he desired to return. The hon. Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Mulock) asked him to take charge of the Labour Bureau in this country. He left the position at Harvard to come back to serve his own country, and I am proud to say that we have this young Canadian, who is such a high authority on economical questions, as Deputy Minister of Labour in Canada. With regard to my hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), I feel confident, knowing Mr. King as I do, that he has been misinformed, and I know that the hon. gentleman will be the first, when he finds that he has been misinformed, to express his regret that he has made such statements.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to continue the debate from the point of view from which it has been carried on. I do not understand from the hon. mover (Mr. Monk), or from any other speaker, that any exception has been taken to the manner in which the officers of the Militia Department discharged their duty. My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) has referred to the undesirability of calling out the militia on the occasion of strikes. Without offering any opinion upon that point, I have simply to say what I think is well known to every hon. member of this House, and to everybody in the country, that there is a provision in the Militia Act by which, on a complaint, or on

a request from the civil authorities—in this case it was the mayor of the town—when a requisition is made to call out the militia, the militia must be called out. There is no alternative, the matter is not referred to the Militia Department here. Automatically the militia responds; it is called out upon a requisition made by the civil authorities. That is exactly what has happened in this case, and I do not think any exception is taken to the action of the militia officers or the department. I have only to add that there is no objection to bringing down all the papers so far as I know, and I shall be happy to see that they are laid on the Table of the House at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MONK. I have only a word or two to say in reference to some remarks that have been made here to-day. My hon. friend the acting Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Sutherland), was not in the House when I opened my remarks. I stated that what I was giving to the House had been given to me by a reliable person. I have no personal knowledge of these facts whatever, and when we are having some provisions of the Conciliation Act, which is scarcely a year old, applied, I say that a man who has information which he deems reliable on a matter of public interest is quite justified in calling the attention of the House to that information; and I find that I have been justified by my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), who more particularly represents the labour interests. I have given to the House a plain statement of facts, and from the excitement which the Minister of Public Works displayed, I am inclined to believe there is really more in my statement than I at first thought. The Minister of Public Works has depicted to us men working up to their waists in water; but did he hear me make the statement to the House that a certain number of men were employed digging foundations, that application was made on their behalf by parties I have named for an increase of wages, and that Mr. Lacey, the manager of those cotton works, as I understand, declared that the season was too far advanced to give an increase, and stopped the work? Does the Minister of Public Works deny that? He does not, because he does not know anything about it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do know all about it.

Mr. MONK. Does he deny that the work was stopped by Mr. Lacey on the ground that the season was too far advanced?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The reason assigned by Mr. Lacey was the one my hon. friend has given to the House; but before there was a strike or any demand for an increase of wages, that gentleman never thought of stopping the work.

Mr. MONK. But we have this much admitted, that the strike had not developed. Mr. Lacey returned, he saw trouble in the future, the season was advanced, and he stopped the work. Therefore, the men working in the water up to their waists, referred to so often by the Minister of Public Works, were not the men whose fate was in question in this strike; but it was the ordinary employees of the company who were employed in conveying coal into the mills. It was upon them that pressure was brought to bear.

Mr. PUTTEE. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to explain? I do not think he understands it quite rightly. The strike did occur through the men who were working on the foundation works asking for more wages; and after the strike occurred, when the question of a settlement came up, the manager of the company said he would not settle it, because he would not go on with the work anyway.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. At that time there had been no call for the militia. What I say is that the incident there had been finished when further trouble arose, provoked by the men whom I have named; and it was then that they brought pressure to bear on those working in the coal—not those working up to their waists in water; and it was explained how Mr. Greenshields had the militia called out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Dominion Cotton Mills Company had the militia called out.

Mr. MONK. It was Mr. Greenshields who applied to the government for the militia.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, not to the government.

Mr. MONK. He got this requisition signed under the circumstances I have stated, and conveyed it to the government.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not at all. We never heard of it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To the commanding officer in Montreal.

Mr. MONK. I do not wish to misstate any of the facts. I have no personal knowledge of them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The government had no more to do with it than the hon. member himself.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend must know that the statement made by the Minister of Militia is absolutely correct; the government have no discretion whatever, for once the requisition is in the hands of the

military authorities, the soldiers must go out. The formality was accomplished, and the commanding officer was obliged to go.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. As an act of administration, the Militia Department had nothing whatever to do with this. As a matter of fact, the minister knew nothing whatever about it.

Mr. MONK. I quite understand that. It would be the greatest folly to stand up and condemn the government for having the militia called out, and if I name Mr. Greenshields, it is because he was counsel of the company.

Mr. BRITTON. Why did the hon. gentleman say that somebody carried something to the government ?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend will please excuse me. I know what the Militia Act requires, and I do not suppose that any one in this House will understand me as stating that the government sent the militia. It would be too absurd, and I do not believe anybody in the province of Quebec would accept such a statement. But what happened ? The strike ceased the moment the election was over. My opinion is that the whole bottom dropped out of the thing, and I think the hon. member for Winnipeg is right when he says that they have not been satisfied with the operation of this Conciliation Act. The Minister of Public Works may say what he likes, but in 1896 the vote was very different from what it was in 1900 ; and there is no doubt whatever, whether the Conservative candidate or the Liberal candidate was to blame, that the circumstances of the strike were such that they were responsible for that great change. As regards Mr. King, I gave the information to the House, and I intend seeing that affidavits are put into the hands of the government to the effect that he did use his position to advance the interests of the Liberal candidate. Textually my opinion is this, that he stated to a number of people there that there was justice in the demand for an increase of wages, but that unquestionably the success of that demand would be greatly assured if everybody would vote for Mr. Loy. It is on that fact that I intend producing evidence. Is that true or is it false ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is false.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Who states it ?

Mr. MONK. A number of people in the county.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does the hon. gentleman think it is a fair thing to take a statement like that against a reputable government officer, when he has not the evidence to prove it ?

Mr. MONK. I make the statement, and I intend to procure the proof ; and if I cannot procure the proof of it, I shall be most happy to say that I have been misinformed. I may say I have heard this from a candidate in the local election, or something of the kind ; but I will investigate, and if I find that that statement is not well founded, I will with pleasure withdraw it. I think that under the circumstances, and having received that information from several parties, I was quite justified in moving for this correspondence and calling the attention of the government to the fact that it would be unjust, if any of these statements were true, to call upon the militia to go to the town of Valleyfield. And I find it somewhat singular that the gentleman far more interested in this motion than I—I refer to the representative of that county himself—is not here to bear out the statement made with respect to him by the hon. the Minister of Public Works.

The PRIME MINISTER. The last words of my hon. friend who has just spoken convey an insinuation upon the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Loy) which is absolutely unwarranted, and which the House will resent. It is true that the hon. member for Beauharnois is not here this afternoon, but he has been here on other occasions when this motion was called, and when the mover was not in his seat to move it. Again and again, at least five or six times, was this motion called, and my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) was not in his place, but the hon. member for Beauharnois was, and it is not fair to insinuate, that because he does not happen to be here on this particular afternoon, when the hon. gentleman finds it convenient to be present, that he is in bad faith.

Mr. MONK. I saw him here yesterday.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend saw many members here yesterday who are not here to-day. It was not worthy of him to make such an insinuation against the hon. member for Beauharnois, who, I am sure, would be only too glad to be present to give his version of the facts. And if the hon. member for Beauharnois were here, he would give his opinion on another aspersion which my hon. friend cast on another gentleman, Mr. King, the Deputy Minister of Labour, and who, of course, cannot be present to reply. Mr. King has been Deputy Minister of Labour for the past seven or eight months, and been called, not only to Beauharnois, but to many other places, even as far as British Columbia, to settle labour disputes, and this is the very first time that I have heard the slightest insinuation cast against his character or manner of doing business. I know to my certain knowledge that some time ago he was called on to proceed to Oshawa and Whitby

to settle some labour trouble. An election had taken place shortly before, and political feeling was running pretty high, but Mr. King discharged his duty, not only to the satisfaction of the workingmen, but also of the employers, who, I understand, belong to the Conservative persuasion. So, in British Columbia, and everywhere else he has been, he has discharged his duties in the most satisfactory manner, and been particularly careful not to lay himself open to any charges or aspersions arising out of politics. This is the first accusation made against Mr. King. My hon. friend was within his rights in moving for this return, and I quite approve of his having done so, but, he would have followed a better course if he had not taken the opportunity to assail the character of a man who is not here to defend himself.

Mr. MONK. I do not know whose character I assailed.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. King.

Mr. MONK. I simply made a statement.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Vancouver). I was sorry, Mr. Speaker, not to have been here when the hon. gentleman moved his motion. I agree entirely in the resolution under discussion. There is sufficient evidence in our hands, as representatives of labour, from the men affected by this trouble, to prove the absolute necessity of having all the correspondence put before the House. To that extent I agree entirely with the mover of the resolution.

I can assure the House that the settlement of that dispute has not been by any means satisfactory, but, in saying this, I do not mean to insinuate at all that Mr. King, the Deputy Minister of Labour, was at all to blame. I am happy to be able to say that in all the correspondence I have had on this matter, it has never been insinuated that he used his influence for political purposes. The first time I ever heard such a charge made was this afternoon on the floor of this House. None of the labourers of that district who have written to me—and I have had a good deal of correspondence with them—have insinuated that there was any political connection between the gentleman who went down to effect the settlement and the trouble itself. The settlement itself, however, was anything but satisfactory. I am informed that the employers of labour made certain promises, made practically a certain contract with the Deputy Minister of Labour, and there is no doubt at all that they have not carried out that contract; and if there is one thing which the government ought to see to, it is that both employers and employees should be compelled, as far as possible, to carry out their agreement. I would be just as strict with the employees as with the employers. If the labouring men agreed to certain conditions, or came to a certain understanding with the deputy minister, whose business it is to make a settlement, and did not carry out that understanding, I would be one of the first to censure them, and I take the same position with regard to the employers. There is no doubt at all that the promises made by the employers to Mr. King have not been carried out, and the government should enter into correspondence with these employers, and give them to understand that they have to keep up their bargain, and use every pressure to compel them to live up to it.

With regard to the calling out of the militia, I know that the government legally is not to blame, but it is altogether too easy a thing in this country for the militia to be called out in time of trouble. The very fact of sending the militia to the scene of trouble is sufficient in itself to provoke an extension and aggravation of the difficulty, and, consequently, it ought not to be by any means so easy to have the militia called out as it is at present. If I were working for wages and had trouble with my employers, I would not care for the militia. If my position was a correct one, I do not consider that they could injure it. But what I do say is this, that, generally speaking, the bringing of militia to the ground in troubles of this kind excites provocation, and some change ought to be made which would make the calling out of the militia a more difficult matter, and prevent the recurrence of such scenes as were witnessed at Valleyfield.

It will certainly be more satisfactory to have all the correspondence brought down, so as to put the House in possession of the facts.

Mr. S. E. GOURLEY (Colchester). I have listened, Mr. Speaker, with great pleasure to this discussion, and am glad it has broadened out beyond the mere lines of the order. I come from a county whose people are largely of the working class. The chief town of my county, Truro, is filled with a body of intelligent mechanics. And if I may take the mechanics of my county, as a type of the mechanics of Canada, I can confidently say, that disturbances of this character would never occur, if the men were accorded proper treatment. The question of the position of labour is the great question for Canada to-day. I am not a labour agitator, but I say, that we in this parliament should dignify and ennoble the discussion of these questions and show the workingmen of this country, that they have the true sympathy of the best men of Canada, in an endeavour to secure for themselves fair-play. And if the workingmen feel that they have the sympathy of the parliament of this country, there will be no disgraceful strikes of this kind within our borders. The labour question should be so dealt with here, that the workingmen shall understand that this question is regarded

as among the most important that can come before this parliament. The workingmen and mechanics form the great middle class of this country. The foundations of our manhood and integrity as a nation rest upon this great middle class ; and if they are not well paid and well housed, if they are not satisfied, our country can never have the strength that it ought to have. I hold that the whole labouring population of Canada are underpaid. Let me give one illustration. I have a neighbour living near me in my town. He gets $1.25 a day, and he has six little children. Under the public policy of this country, these children must attend the public schools ; where they meet children who are much better off than they are. They must dress decently, or they are made to feel at the very inception of their lives, that they are scorned and condemned by their better-off neighbours. A mechanic who has but $1.25 per day, cannot maintain, feed and clothe his family as he would like to do ; he cannot maintain his family, in decency, in honour and respect, on such wages. We must make up our minds, to influence the whole public opinion of Canada, and to bring that opinion to bear upon capital, in favour of a general increase of wages. We have our public schools, and these and other institutions have created, I believe, higher ideals among our workmen and mechanics, than characterize a similar class, anywhere else in the world. Then, we must follow out logically and properly this state of affairs which we have established, and furnish these men with wages that will enable them to live as they should.

I wish to say one word to the hon. Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair). He has in my town a staff of workmen and mechanics that would do credit to any employer of labour. I do not wish to be a demagogue—and I think he will understand that—for already I think he has attempted to ameliorate the conditions of these men by increasing their wages, but most inadequately. At the same time, in this growing period of which we have heard so much, and with the increased revenue of the Intercolonial Railway, for I would not have made this application five years ago, recognizing that the Intercolonial was then somewhat of a burden upon the country, but to-day, since that great system has become a source of revenue to the Dominion—the improvement of the condition of these men should engage his serious attention. The workmen and mechanics employed on the Intercolonial Railway—and there are Liberals and Conservatives among them, I speak for all—are a splendid body of men. Cannot the hon. minister scale up the wages of these efficient and trusty men ? There are no more trustworthy men in the world. When the members of this House, leave for Easter recess, the lives of many of them will be in the keeping of these faithful men. I want these men to be remembered, and I hope the minister will find it in his power to increase their wages at an early day. In a number of the associations in my county, and in the province of Nova Scotia, they are passing resolutions and working out figures, to show, that they are not paid, as highly, as are men in similar occupations, in other countries. I have not the data to speak upon that subject myself ; but when the time comes, and this subject is presented to him more in detail by myself and others, I hope the hon. minister will deal generously with the employees of the Intercolonial Railway, and especially with those in the county of Colchester and the town of Truro.

Motion agreed to.

PERMANENT CORPS PENSIONS.

On the motion :

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when the best interests of Canada demand that the government should without further delay introduce a Bill embodying a workable scheme looking to the granting of adequate retiring pensions to the officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the permanent corps of the militia of Canada.

Hon. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) As it is impossible for me to do justice to this matter in the ten minutes between now and the time arranged for adjournment, and as this is the last day when the matter can come up, I ask that the motion be dropped.

Motion dropped.

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF—DIRECT IMPORTATION.

On the motion :

That, in the opinion of this House, the preferential tariff should only apply to goods brought into Canada through Canadian sea-ports.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Like the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Hon. Mr. Prior), I cannot do justice to the subject of my motion in the few minutes remaining before six o'clock. I shall be obliged to let the motion go over, with the intention of bringing it up again at the first opportunity.

The PRIME MINISTER. Stand.

Motion allowed to stand.

FINANCIAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL STATUS OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia) moved for :

Return showing copies of all memorials, replies thereto and correspondence between the government of the North-west Territories and any member thereof, and the government of Canada and any member thereof, on the sub-

ject of the financial and constitutional status of the said North-west Territories.

He said : I placed this notice on the Order paper early in the session, but have had no opportunity to discuss it. But, as it seemed probable that we should not reach this motion I took advantage of the opportunity afforded by the debate on the budget to bring the matter to the attention of the House and to speak upon it at some length. Therefore it will not be necessary for me to go into the subject on this occasion.

Motion agreed to.

WELLAND CANAL—LEASES OF WATER POWER.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland) moved for :

Return showing : The number of leases of water power granted on the Welland canal and feeder; the names of the lessees; the quantity of power granted in each lease, and the location of such power; the consideration named in each lease, and the length of the term granted; the names of the present holders; the amount of consideration in arrears, if any, on each lease, and the number of years during which such arrears have been accumulating .

He said : I would have been glad to have spoken at some length on this motion; but, as the hour is drawing near at which hon. gentlemen desire that the House should adjourn, I shall not speak longer than until six o'clock. The motion is one which I regard as a proper motion, and the information which will be given in the return brought down in response to it will be found very valuable and important information. The water powers of the Welland canal have been used very largely for years by our opponents as a political machine. Leases of water power were granted for years for nominal sums to political partisans. There are perpetual water powers there which are worth from $50,000 to $75,000 which people are not using at all. There is one water power on the Welland canal embracing three locks, giving a maximum of 1,500 horse power, used at a rental of $250 a year; and one lock of about 600 horse power is sold for $300 a year, being $50 a year more than the total price which these people are paying, and they are holding out the balance for a price of $75,000. The Libster Cotton Mills have been offered, I am told, $20,000 to $30,000 for this power. They are not using it themselves and they will not allow anybody else to use it. There are other powers existing on the Welland canal, water is being used which is not being paid for, and water is being used at a price very often far less than the value of the power which is granted. The whole matter should be looked into carefully by the government, either by a commission or in some other way. The whole system of water power on the Welland canal should be so regulated as best to meet the exigencies and needs of the people. Power at the present day is a very valuable asset, and is worth looking after. The whole Welland canal might be a hive of industry, with industries very much larger than those now existing there. Let measures be taken so that this power could be utilized for purposes beneficial to the citizens. I believe that the government should take hold of the matter in a businesslike way and deal with it as business men would deal with an asset that belonged to them. There is here a valuable asset to this country, and I hope the government will take hold of the matter and deal with it as a business concern would deal with it. As it is now six o'clock, I will say no more, but move the resolution.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 9, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the return of James Halliday, Esq., member elect for the electoral district of North Bruce.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Mr. James Halliday, member for the electoral district of North Bruce, introduced by Mr. Borden (Halifax) and Mr. Sproule.

CLAIM OF NOVA SCOTIA AGAINST FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark) moved :

That the papers which have been brought down respecting the claim of the province of Nova Scotia against the government of Canada be forthwith printed, and that for this purpose Rule 94 be suspended.

He said : I wish to draw the attention of the government to the fact that the evidence has not been brought down, and I would wish it to be laid on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). Do you wish the evidence taken by the arbitrators brought down ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

CLAIM OF MACKENZIE & MANN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I call the attention of the government to the statement of the right hon. the Prime Minister, on the 11th of March, with reference to certain papers respecting the claim of Mackenzie & Mann. On that date, in answer to a question, the right hon. gentleman said : That a certain claim had been made, and was being considered by the government, and that the papers would shortly be communicated to the House. Inasmuch as some four weeks have since elapsed, and the papers have not been brought down, I take the liberty of bringing the matter to the attention of the right hon. gentleman.

INSPECTION OF FRUIT PACKAGES.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) moved third reading of Bill (No. 32) to provide for the marking and inspection of packages containing fruit for sale. He said : When this Bill was discussed in the committee the other night, there was a considerable number of alterations made in various sections which will necessitate further alterations to make the Bill intelligent and complete. The proposed changes do not interfere with the principle of the Bill. The Bill as introduced was only intended to apply to apples and pears, but as it has been made to apply to all fruit, we shall have to substitute the word 'fruit' for the words 'apples and pears,' in the sixth and seventh sections. In consequence of the introduction of clause 9, the words which deal with the size of the fruit are not required. In section 8, the word 'first' should read 'finest.' In clause 9, line 20, the words 'The marks on such packages or' are not required. I withdraw my motion for third reading.

Motion for third reading withdrawn.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE moved :

That the order for third reading of Bill (No. 32) be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole.

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

On section 6,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I move that the word 'fruit' be substituted for the words 'apples or pears,' and that all the words after 'package' in the eighth line be struck out.

Mr. MONK. Is this intended to apply to tomatoes ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think tomatoes would come under the definition of fruit, but I would not like to give a legal opinion upon it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would you give us an agricultural opinion upon it ? I think the hon. minister ought to be able to determine whether a tomato is a fruit or a vegetable.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not going to enter upon any such question.

Mr. SPROULE. I think what the hon. gentleman should decide first is what he means by fruit, because there is no definition in the Bill.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would move that section 7 be amended by the substitution of the word 'fruit' for the words 'apples or pears' in the second line, and by striking out all the words after the word 'packed' in the seventh line.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps the minister will insert a clause defining what fruit is to mean, because the word covers a large field. He would not say to my hon. friend whether a tomato is fruit or a vegetable.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I confess that I have not undertaken to define the word 'fruit' in this Bill. I think the practice in the market would pretty thoroughly define it. The differences between a tomato and say a currant and a gooseberry are a little indefinite, if you say that the one is a fruit and the other is not a fruit in a scientific sense, although I think there is no doubt that in the courts a gooseberry would be considered in the market acceptation of the term a fruit, while in most cases a tomato would be called a vegetable. I do not think there is any very clear line of demarcation between a fruit and a vegetable.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where would my hon. friend place a cranberry ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the market definition of a cranberry would be that it is a fruit. To state arbitrarily that certain things are fruits and certain other things are not fruits would load down the Bill with complications ; and in making out such a list, something might be omitted which should not be omitted.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the minister's explanation is the strongest reason why there should be a defining clause. He suggests that it should be left to the courts to determine. It seems to me there is no necessity for that. Why not mention apples, pears, and certain other fruits in the Bill, and then anything outside of those would not be a fruit ?

Mr. HOLMES. To avoid all trouble it seems to me that you should not attempt to define fruit at all. For instance, would you call a banana a fruit ? It seems to me that what is understood in the commercial world as fruit is sufficient. As a rule, tomatoes are not put up in packages, so that this Bill does not apply to them.

Mr. LANCASTER. I submit that the easiest way out of the difficulty would be to enumerate what fruits you are legislating about. Then you do not have to say what things are fruits and what things are not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). At least the hon. Minister of Agriculture might let us know what fruits he has in mind to which this Bill shall apply. When he is making a change from apples and pears to fruit in general, he must have in his mind certain fruits to which the Bill is to apply ; and it would perhaps give us a better idea whether the amendments are proper ones to be made, if he would state what those fruits are.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say to my hon. friend that the amendment does not propose to change the Bill beyond what was accepted in the committee. The provisions relating to apples and pears were originally intended to apply only to the export trade ; but when it was decided that they should apply to internal trade as well as to the export trade, there was no reason why they should not apply to all fruits, as the other sections do. That is the reason why I was obliged to make this change in the wording of this particular section ; and it is only a change of the wording. I must say that I think it would be difficult to make out a list of fruits to which only this Bill should apply. It might be done ; but there would be great danger that some fruits which are sold in the ordinary market might be omitted through inadvertence. I do not think there is any doubt in any case which might arise under the Bill, the courts would be able to decide whether a particular fruit came under this Act or not.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the reason the hon. minister gives us is a sufficient reason to justify us in not amending the Bill at this stage. Even if this defect in the Bill has only now been brought to our attention, it is none the less the part of wisdom to insert a provision to overcome that defect. The minister says that if we inserted a schedule of the fruits to which this Bill should apply, it might be found afterwards that other fruits should have been included. If so, it is an easy matter afterwards to amend the Bill so as to include them. But I think it is the part of wisdom to insert some list, so that the people handling, packing or selling fruit will know to what the Bill does apply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me that the amendment which the hon. minister proposes is a little more important than he seems to imagine. The Bill originally applied, of course, only to apples and pears. These sections which the hon. gentleman is proposing to amend he proposes to make applicable to every variety of fruit. Therefore, as affecting all varieties of fruit except apples and pears this has all the effect and importance of a new Bill. It does not seem to me worth while, then, to speak of this as a mere verbal change, a change of no importance. I do not know what other fruits besides apples and pears are usually sold in closed packages in Canada. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fisher), having experience in his department with regard to such matters, should be able to inform the House on that subject. I would much like if the hon. gentleman would do so before the discussion goes further. It seems to me we are entitled to have that information from the hon. minister.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understand that the change in these words affects other classes of fruit, but the change made proposes simply to carry out what I understood to be the intention of the committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With respect to apples and pears ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. With respect to all fruit. I supposed that these amendments had been made in committee, and it was only when I saw the reprinted Bill and found that these amendments had not been introduced that I proposed this change. As I understood the sense of the committee when the Bill was under discussion before, it was fully understood and intended that these sections should apply to all fruits. That is why I said that this was only a verbal alteration, and not because I did not understand or appreciate that the amendment made a radical change in the application of these two sections. As to the kinds of fruit that are sold in closed packages, peaches are frequently so sold and sometimes also currants, gooseberries and raspberries. Grapes are sold in closed packages, though the wording of the Bill applies only to kegs, barrels, or boxes, and would not apply to baskets. That change was accepted in deference to the representations of the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Smith). When I said that it would be a difficult matter to make a list of fruits packed in closed packages, it was because there may be fruits which to-day are not sold in closed packages but which to-morrow might be so sold, in which case the Bill would apply to them. The Bill applies to every kind of fruit sold in a package which is of such a character as to prevent the buyer seeing and judging of the quality of what he is getting. The object is to assure the buyer of really getting what the seller pretends to sell. That being the general character of the Bill, it seems to me that the question of the kind of fruit is only a detail. The Bill applies to all fruits which are sold in such a way that the package may help the palming off on the purchaser of fruit of a lower quality than that represented by the seller. Fruits that are sold in open packages for home consumption are

frequently packed in closed packages for export. For instance, grapes are sold in open baskets in the local market, but they are sometimes exported in kegs, packed in various kinds of packing, such as buckwheat hulls and other things that are tasteless. This Bill would apply to grapes so packed. These are the reasons why, at the moment it strikes me as being inexpedient to define too closely the exact kinds of fruit to which the Bill should apply.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. minister how the Bill would apply to what we know in Ontario as the huckleberry, or the blueberry, as it is called in the lower provinces. We import this fruit largely from the lower provinces, and it comes packed in an enclosed package—a log hollowed out something like a sap trough and covered with a solid board. Those that come from the west are usually packed in pails. How would section 7 apply to the huckleberry if it were made to read——

No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale, any fruit packed in a closed package, upon which package is marked the grade 'No. 1 Canadian' unless such fruit consists of specimens of one variety, sound, of fairly uniform size, and not less than 80 per cent free from scab, worm holes, bruises and other defects——

—and so on. When we get these berries from Nova Scotia, there is not twenty per cent of them but are bruised. Of course everybody will admit that the blueberry is a fruit, and it cannot be doubted that as we import them they are contained in a closed package. How will this Bill affect the trade in this fruit ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the mark indicated in the section is put upon the package, it will come under the operation of the section. If not, it will not come under the operation of the law. The seller is able to sell the fruit without putting on the packages the mark 'No. 1 Canadian,' and without that it would not come under the section.

Mr. MONK. All this seems to make it more evident that it is important to define the kind of fruit aimed at by this section 7. Does the hon. minister pretend that those who gather blueberries, say, in the Saguenay district of the province of Quebec, are to be brought under the operation of this section ? How can they avoid violating the law——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. By not putting the mark upon them.

Mr. MONK. But they are obliged to put a mark on them. Under section 4, every person who packs fruit in a closed package for sale must mark the package——

—(a) with the initials of the Christian names, and the full surname and address of the packer ;
(b) with the name of the variety or varieties ; and

Mr. FISHER.

(c) with a designation of the grade of the fruit.

And how about the other wild berries picked in Quebec and sent to Montreal in closed packages ? How about the wild grapes that are sent to Montreal in barrels or closed packages in the autumn in very large quantities and are used in the city for different purposes ? How about the fruit known as mûre, or catherinette ? Is my hon. friend going to apply section 7 to them ? It would be a frightful hardship on those who gather these wild fruits.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If a mark is put upon a closed package, indicating that it contains a certain quality of fruit, it ought to contain that quality of fruit. Of course, if one is attempting to sell in closed packages fruit which is not up to the quality represented on the packages, he would be guilty of an infraction of the law. And that is the intention.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the hon. minister explain the difference between 'grade' and 'quality.' If they do not mean the same thing, they mean substantially the same, or they are so intimately connected that it would be difficult to distinguish between them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think there is any distinction.

Mr. CLANCY. Then my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is right in saying that with this change all fruit in closed packages must be marked with the designation of the quality and so on.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Then there would be no escape such as the hon. minister has pointed out.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But the object of the Bill is to prevent persons putting upon closed packages marks indicating that the fruit is of first quality when, as a matter of fact, it is not of first quality. If it is not the intention that the Bill should carry out that idea, these sections are not right.

Mr. CLANCY. Section 8 brings these two together, because it says :

No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale any fruit packed in closed package, upon which package is marked any designation which represents such fruit as of first, best or extra good quality, unless such fruit consist of well-grown specimens of one variety, sound, of nearly uniform size, of good colour for the variety, of normal shape, and not less than 90 per cent free from scab, worm holes, bruises and other defects, and properly packed.

That leaves no possible escape. If there is anything that designates the quality of the fruit, and if the fruit is in an inclosed package, it comes within the operation of the law.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is the intention of the Act.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems to me it may be a very serious matter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As to the operation of the Act, it is very desirable that some such Act should be passed. My hon. friend must not think that we are opposed to the principle of the Act, because we are not; but it is necessary for us to see how it will work out. Take the case which was suggested a moment ago by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), the bringing of blueberries from the maritime provinces to Ontario in closed packages. They might be in such a condition when they started upon their journey as to justify the application of grade No. 1, or A No. 1; and yet when they arrived at their destination they might be bruised, as he mentions. The result of that would seem to be that you would have to open every package and turn out a sample of the fruit before you can sell it, otherwise the vendor would subject himself to a penalty under the interpretation of this Act which the hon. gentleman insisted on the other day. Now that does seem to be a result we would hardly like to bring about, and I would like to have the hon. gentleman's views with regard to it.

Mr. CLANCY. Before the minister makes his explanation, I would like to ask if all the fruit within the meaning of that section is supposed to be absolutely free from every possible defect? If so, it is a very harsh Bill. The hon. gentleman will see that the Bill originally intended to indicate the defects that particularly belong to apples and pears, namely, scab, worm holes and bruises. But there are other defects. I would like to ask the minister if it is the intention that every class of fruit under section 6 must have 90 per cent absolutely free from every defect?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The intention of the section as now amended would be that any fruit marked A No. 1 Canadian should be like that.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman intend that all fruit marked A No. 1 Canadian shall stand first, and the fruit coming under section 8 shall stand second, and the fruit coming under No. 1 Canadian in section 7, stand third? Because that would be the effect of the Bill by reason of 90 per cent being required under section 6 and under section 8, while only 80 per cent is required under section 7.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, No. 8 is a different section altogether from sections 6 and 7. No. 8 is practically the same as No. 6 except that it does not give an absolute grade of a certain character, or brand of a certain character; but it does not define the brand; whereas No. 6 does give a definite brand of A No. 1 Canadian. But there is no comparison, or gradation, or inferiority of the fruit as sold under the definition in section 8, from that under section 6. I may say in reply to the hon. leader of the opposition, that section 6 as applied to a fruit like blueberries, or as applied to certain other small fruits, does not seem to be very clear. I think the description of the defects in them would hardly apply to such small fruit. It seems to me if it is only applied to apples and pears, a number of other fruits which would come legitimately under this section would escape and the section would not apply to them. But section 8 is really the section that would cover most cases. Sections 6 and 7 are those under which only certain specified grades are employed, and anybody selling such fruits as blueberries and other small fruits would not use these particular definitions of A No. 1 Canadian, or No. 1 Canadian, and consequently sections 6 and 7 would not apply to them; while section 8 would apply to them if sold under any qualification, that is to say, if they put any brand upon them which indicated superior excellence. If they did not put a brand on them which indicated superior excellence, then section 9 would apply to them, and it requires that when the fruit is examined, the portion examined shall be a fair representative of the contents of the whole package.

Mr. MONK. I think section 7 will give rise in the province of Quebec to a great deal of useless litigation, because the definition therein is not correct at all as applied to fruit in general. The minister may say that when it is a question of small fruit, you won't turn to sections 6 or 7, but you must. There was a prohibition in section 7 which was limited to apples and pears, and it is now desired to apply it to all fruits, that is a prohibition to sell.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, there is only a prohibition to sell with a certain mark upon them.

Mr. MONK. But does the minister suppose that parties who send blueberries and wild grapes fresh to Montreal will neglect to mark them as No. 1, because they must mark them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Unless they mark them No. 1 Canadian this section would not apply.

Mr. SPROULE. In the first place, you say that all fruit must be marked with the designation or grade, it does not matter whether it is first, second, or extra quality or any quality. That, I take it, applies to all the fruit that is included in this Bill. Therefore you cannot exempt any kind of fruit from sections 6, or 7, or 8. I understood the minister to say that unless it is marked best, or extra good quality, it would not come under section 8; but they have got to mark the quality.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But they need not mark it extra good.

Mr. SPROULE. But there is either, first, best, or extra quality, these are the three qualities. But section 4 says you must mark the package with the grade of the fruit.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but if your fruit is not of extra good quality you can mark it medium, or mark it second, or whatever you like. You must mark the grade, but you may mark it second grade.

Mr. SPROULE. But suppose you do not mark them at all ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But you must.

Mr. SPROULE. Then you are amenable to the law and liable to a fine if you do not mark them ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No doubt.

Mr. SPROULE. Then if you mark it something, it must be first quality or some other quality, and unless it comes up to the standard that is set for first quality, then I think you are liable to a fine.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If you mark it second quality and it comes up to second quality, you would not be liable to a penalty. If you mark it first quality and it is found to be only second quality, then you are liable to a penalty. If you mark it XXX and it is found to be of a quality indicated by X or XX, then you would be liable to a penalty.

Mr. CLANCY. Section 4 provides that all fruit must be designated of some quality. Now, suppose a man marks his apples XX ; according to this Bill it absolutely does not determine anything, because it might be precisely the same quality that is marked X by his neighbour, and the one not knowing at all how the other marked his apples. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how it is possible to carry out the provisions of the Bill under such circumstances unless it is declared that there must be some mark specially indicating the quality. If that be the case then it is quite clear that punishments will be visited upon those who offend against the law. If you must have some mark and that mark means anything in most cases I do not see how it is possible to work that out.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is just the object covered by section 8, and it is thought to be pretty completely covered by it as far as any definition of what we do not know can possibly do it. We do not know what marks different traders may put upon their fruit, but if any one puts a mark upon his fruit which appears to indicate that it is specially good and it is not so, section 8 would cover that : whereas if we define only certain things as marks that were going to be covered by this Bill, then, anybody who did not put these marks upon his fruit, but who put other marks upon it intended to deceive, would not be liable to the penalties of the Bill. We think that section 8 covers that point.

Mr. MONK. I would suggest to the hon. minister to exempt from the operation of this law wild fruits, such as we have in the province of Quebec. There is no doubt that it is intended to apply particularly to garden-grown fruit.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. MONK. The possibility of applying the Bill to fruit grown in the fields or in the woods would be very great, and I would suggest to the hon. minister to exempt wild fruit entirely from the operation of the law.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What words would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) suggest to cover that ?

Mr. MONK. I think the words 'wild fruit' in general would cover it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Would the hon. gentleman's idea be covered by these words : 'Fruit not wild fruit' in sections 6 and 7 ?

Mr. MONK. I think it, perhaps, may be made the subject of a special section, providing that fruit meant to be covered by this Act would not be meant to include wild fruit.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is a new idea, but it is one, I think, well worthy of consideration. I think it would be a fair interpretation of the Bill, as my hon. friend has said. The full intention of the Bill was to deal with cultivated fruit. We can quite understand that wild fruit is much more difficult to grade than is cultivated fruit. I think, perhaps, that would completely cover the difficulty that has been raised this afternoon in regard to the change in these sections. If that is the feeling of the committee, I would be disposed to insert a clause saying that in this Bill the word 'fruit' would not include wild fruit.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the hon. minister should confine the Bill to apples and pears, as was originally intended. I do not see the object he has in introducing now the word 'fruits' to take the place of 'apples and pears.' We do not know what trouble it will lead to. It has been suggested that it might apply to blueberries and cranberries, and he intends to except these, but the same objection will apply, perhaps, to some of the cultivated fruits that we purchase in closed packages. The whole discussion of the Bill was conducted the other

day upon the idea that it would apply to apples and pears. The hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Smith), who takes a deep interest in the Bill, is not present today, and I would suggest, that, if the hon. minister is going on with the Bill, he should ask the committee to rise and report progress, and in the meantime that he should come to a conclusion as to what fruit the Bill should affect.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is entirely wrong in saying that the original intention of the Bill was that it should apply only to apples and pears. Sections 8 and 9, which are now in this reprinted Bill, and which were section 8 of the original Bill, as introduced in the committee the other day, distinctly applied to all kinds of fruit. My hon. friend has quoted the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith). The hon. member for Wentworth was a member of the committee of the Fruit Growers' Association which specially asked that this Bill should apply to other fruit than apples and pears, and that it should apply to the internal trade of the country instead of only to the export trade. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), in saying that the original idea was that the Bill should apply only to apples and pears, is entirely wrong, and the quotation he has made is a misplaced one, inasmuch as he has not understood the views or wishes of the hon. member for Wentworth. The Bill certainly is desired and called for by the consuming public of the country to apply to other fruits besides apples and pears, and I think the advantages of the Bill would be extremely limited and largely minimized were it not to apply to all kinds of fruit. But, I must point out to the hon. gentleman that it is only when these other fruits are sold in closed packages that the Bill does apply to them. If they are sold in open packages, as most of our small fruits are in this country, the Bill does not apply to them at all, and it does not create the difficulties which the hon. gentleman has mentioned. Is the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) writing a clause to cover the point which he mentioned ?

Mr. MONK. No, I am not ; but I will do so if the hon. gentleman wishes it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am quite willing to do it ; I thought the hon. gentleman was doing it.

Mr. SPROULE. The more discussion that takes place the plainer is the need shown that we should define what is fruit. If you say 'wild fruit,' you may refer to an article that would be regarded as tame fruit in some cases. Take cranberries, for instance ; they are being planted in marshes and cultivated. They are wild fruit in one sense and tame fruit in another sense. They are largely gathered in the Georgian Bay district by the Indians. They are usually put up in barrels, and they would undoubtedly come under this Bill, unless you define what is meant by the word 'fruit.' Blueberries are treated in very much the same way. Sometimes they are put up in pails and sometimes in kegs. Apricots and plums are also put up in barrels and kegs, so that all this fruit would come under this Bill. There is no doubt about that, and I think it would be much more workable and much more easily understood if you would insert a clause defining what is the meaning of the word 'fruit' in this Bill, and stating to what fruit the Bill shall apply.

Mr. HOLMES. I think, as I expressed myself before, that if you begin to define the various kinds of cultivated or wild fruits you are going to get into no end of trouble. I do not think that anybody looks upon cranberries as cultivated fruit. They are looked upon simply as wild fruit, and they are so classed commercially. Take blueberries ; they are looked upon as wild fruit also, so that if you begin to enumerate what are wild fruits and what are cultivated fruits, you will get into no end of difficulty. If you accept the common-sense commercial term as to what are wild and what are tame fruits, you will be safe. You cannot begin to define what may be wild or what may be tame or cultivated fruits, and if you take the ordinary commercial acceptation of the term, there will be no difficulty.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Holmes) had been at the Agricultural Committee a few years ago, he would have heard one of the members of the staff giving information as to how they plant and cultivate cranberries in the maritime provinces. People there grow as many as fifty acres in a season, and they make a regular practice of raising them for sale. Would that not be regarded as tame fruit ? They are cultivated the same as tame fruit. If we specify the varieties of fruit that the Bill should apply to, then all others are outside of the operation of the Bill. The hon. gentleman speaks of the ordinary commercial term 'fruit,' but we do not know what it is. There may be the ordinary commercial term for cranberries, but who is to say whether it is tame fruit or wild fruit ? He may say it is wild fruit, and I may say it is tame fruit. Therefore, there is the difficulty to commence with. We can avoid that by specifying what is to be included under the operation of the Bill.

Mr. HOLMES. I understand the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to say that in his section plums are shipped in barrels ?

Mr. SPROULE. Sometimes they are packed in barrels.

Mr. HOLMES. I represent a section of Ontario which produces a large quantity

of plums, and I never knew a barrel of plums to be shipped.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a great deal going on in the world that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Holmes) never knew of. I make the statement which I know to be a fact. It does not necessarily follow that because the hon. gentleman does not know it, nothing of the kind could occur.

Mr. COCHRANE. I cannot see any great difficulty in designating the fruits that this Bill will cover. I cannot see how it is going to lead to such a lot of trouble as the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) anticipates in his imagination. In my mind it would be a very simple thing to designate the fruit intended to be covered by this Bill. It need not take a very long clause to designate what you intend to cover by this Bill, and then all that is not named in this Bill would be outside of it and the Bill would not apply to it. That would be the simplest way out of it. If you name the fruits it will make your Bill workable and there will be no 'if' about it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot see the object of giving a list of the fruits when it is fully intended that all fruit which is packed in closed packages shall be included.

Mr. COCHRANE. You do not include wild fruits.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. With the exception of wild fruits. When cranberries are packed in barrels I do not see why they should not be subject to the provisions of this Bill. It is true there are wild cranberries and cultivated cranberries, just as there are wild strawberries and cultivated strawberries, and in Nova Scotia, for instance, there are more cultivated than wild cranberries put upon the market. The words 'wild fruit' would not cover cultivated cranberries. I think if we make the exception for wild fruit, that is all that will be necessary. I consider that the insertion of a list of fruits in the Bill would lead to difficulty.

Mr. SPROULE. How could the minister tell whether cranberries are wild or cultivated, and that must be determined before this Bill is workable. Sometimes cranberries are frozen for transport, and at other times they are packed in during the warm season. There are high bush and low bush cranberries, both of which are packed in barrels, and sometimes when you open the package they are bruised. When they are bruised they would not come under the definition of a high quality of fruit as provided in this Bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. It seem to me that if you stencil on the package the words 'wild fruit' you would have no trouble in getting over the difficulty, and I believe it to be a wise distinction to make. Every dealer in cranberries knows that when he gets cranberries from Cape Cod he gets cultivated cranberries, because the name of the grower is placed on the package. If you get cultivated cranberries from Nova Scotia the name of the grower is on the package also, and you know that they are cultivated, whereas if they are gathered in the marshes the name is not put on the packages, and you know they are wild. The words 'wild fruit' stencilled on the package would cover the whole ground.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall move an amendment to clause 3 in accordance with the view of the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), but in the meantime we had better proceed with the other clauses of the Bill.

On section 8,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The word 'first' is a misprint here, and I move to substitute for it the word 'finest.'

Mr. CLANCY. I would like the minister to tell us if he can, what is the substantial difference between clause 6 and clause 8. In one clause you put the words 'A No. 1, Canadian,' which I take it includes finest, best or extra good quality, specified in the other clause.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Then why repeat the same thing in section 8?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Section 8 applies to other brands of a similar character which are not included in 'A No. 1, Canadian.' Section 8 would apply to superior or super-excellent or XXX, which a dealer might put upon his packages but not 'A No. 1, Canadian.'

Mr. CLANCY. The minister is quite mistaken. The sections are precisely the same except in one case you put 'A No. 1, Canadian,' which means finest, best or extra good quality, as the hon. gentleman admits. As a layman, I am perfectly amazed at the suggestion of the minister that there is any difference between the two. You simply say the same thing in different words.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Section 6 only applies to 'A No. 1, Canadian,' whereas section 8 applies to any brand which implies super-excellence, and is therefore wider in its scope.

Mr. CLANCY. There is no difference in the clauses except in certain words.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but these certain words make all the difference in the world.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister has evidently not studied the section. The words in both sections are precisely the same except that in

one you say 'A No. 1, Canadian,' which includes the finest and best; and in the other you say 'finest, best or extra good quality.' You can read 'A No. 1, Canadian' into either of the sections and they are precisely the same. I would like any gentleman who is a lawyer in this House to say what is the difference between the two sections.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The leader of the opposition is a lawyer, and I would ask him what the difference is?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The other day I pointed out to the Minister of Agriculture precisely the objection raised by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). If you can convict any person under clause No. 6, you can also convict him of an offence against clause No. 8.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Therefore section 6 has no office which is not fulfilled by section 8; and that is the point my hon. friend made. The hon. gentleman did not make the same reply to me, that he did to my hon. friend. What he said was that he desired to retain section 6 for the purpose of educating the public to use the word 'Canadian'; and I thought it was a remarkable thing to introduce a section into legislation to bring that about, a course which had never been pursued before; for every other office of section 6 seemed to be fulfilled by section 8, which was exactly the point my hon. friend from Bothwell made to-day.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think my hon. friend is mistaken. The point he made the other day was just the reverse of that which the hon. member for Bothwell is making. The point he made was that section 6 was unnecessary, whereas the point the hon. member for Bothwell is making is that section 8 is unnecessary; and as a matter of fact, the reply which I made to the leader of the opposition the other day was not the same as that which I made to the hon. member for Bothwell. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that I wish to retain section 6 as an encouragement or education to the trade to use a Canadian national brand; but if section 6 stood alone, and anybody chose to use another brand which indicated superexcellence or high quality, he would not be subject to the penalties under this Bill; but section 8 brings him under those penalties, and that is its object.

Mr. CLANCY. Surely the hon. gentleman will not recede from the position he took, namely, that 'A No. 1 Canadian' means what is described in section 8.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly it does, but by section 8 these other things are brought within the operation of the Act.

Mr. CLANCY. This is what the hon. leader of the opposition said the other day:

> If the hon. Minister of Agriculture does not make the use of the word 'Canadian' compulsory, what office does section 6 fill which is not filled by the section which he proposes to add? It fills no office at all. If you add that section, but do not make the use of the word 'Canadian' compulsory, section 6 fills no office which would not be filled by the section which the hon. gentleman proposes to add, namely, section 8.

The hon. gentleman pointed out that if you adopted the new section 8, you could then well afford to abandon section 6. It is not worth while contending whether section 6 or section 8 should be retained, because the one or the other might be abandoned, and the Bill have precisely the same effect. I think I catch the hon. gentleman's idea with regard to section 8, but I fail to see that it accomplishes his object, namely, to include punishments for packing all classes of fruit other than those designated in the two sections, because a man may mark his fruit what he pleases without coming within the meaning of the Act.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 9,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would move that in section 9 the words 'the marks on such package or' in the seventh line be struck out. This clause deals entirely with the faced or shown part of the fruit being a fair representation of the fruit contained in the interior of the package; therefore the marks on the package are not necessary.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 3,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would like to go back to section 3, and propose as subsection 'a' the following:

> The word 'fruit,' wherever employed in this Act, shall not be held to include wild fruit.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to again press upon the hon. minister the advisability of reconsidering the proposition to define what fruits are included in the operation of this Bill, because I regard that as very important. Providing simply that wild fruit is not included does not make the Bill as workable as it would be by defining what fruits come under it. Then there would be no mistake.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hope my hon. friend will let the Bill pass as it is, and if in its operation we find it necessary to define the fruit, we can do so.

Mr. SPROULE. Lock the stable after the horse is stolen.

Bill reported, and amendments read the first time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE moved that the amendments be now read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. CLANCY. I had hoped that the hon. minister would have considered the propriety of striking out that part of section 17 which gives a chance to informers to receive a portion of the fine. I am unable to think that any clause of that kind, which may be found in some Acts and under other conditions, because sanctioned by long usage, has ever gained respectability. My own idea is that there is nothing more dangerous, nothing more futile, nothing more disturbing or more dishonourable, than for men to live and profit as informers. This Bill affects a very large class of the people in this country, namely, the farmers, and under the widened sections of the Bill, since it applies to all classes of fruit sold either for domestic purposes or for export, a man could claim a portion of the money imposed as a fine for the most trifling infraction of the law. I hope the hon. gentleman will consent, without my making a motion, to strike out that portion of the clause. I move that all the words in section 17 from 'payable' to 'His Majesty' be struck out.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not possible to put the hon. member's motion now, because the question is on the second reading of the amendments which have been adopted in committee.

Mr. CLANCY. I will move it at a later stage.

Motion agreed to, and amendments read the second time and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. CLANCY moved that section 17 be amended by striking out all the words from 'payable' to 'His Majesty.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think it would be advisable to accept this amendment. The clause here introduced is part of our general inspection Act and is incorporated also in a large number of other laws, giving the informant a share of the penalty. I shall not enter into a discussion of the advisability of this general provision, but shall simply point out that it is a general provision in our legislation, one that has had the sanction of many years, I was almost tempted to say centuries of legislation. I do not consider this a blot upon the Bill. On the whole, the provision has worked satisfactorily in our jurisprudence. It is true that some times people of mean disposition may take advantage of such provision and may thus do themselves as well as their neighbours injustice and harm. But the number of cases in which individuals make their living by informing for the purpose of sharing these fines, is so small that I do not think that we need to allow it to influence us in the passage of such legislation. I must ask the House to reject the amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not rise to discuss the wisdom or otherwise of sending the Bill back to committee to amend this clause, but I rise to object to the third reading at this sitting. The rule we usually follow is that when a Bill passes in committee without amendment, it is read the third time forthwith——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will permit me to interrupt him—it is only by unanimous consent that we can take the third reading now, and I do not wish to press it if he objects. I understood that no objection was taken, or I would not have asked that the Bill be read the third time now.

Mr. SPROULE. My reason for objecting is that important amendments have been made in this Bill, and some of our best fruit men are absent to-day—members who, I am sure, would like to consider the amendment before the Bill is read the third time.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 93) respecting inquiries and investigations into shipping casualties.—Sir Louis Davies.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons further supplementary estimates of sums required for the services of the Dominion for the year ending June 30, 1901, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, April 9, 1901.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved :

That the Message of His Excellency and the estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to Capital—Railways—Intercolonial Railway—Steel rails and fastenings, $500,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. minister give us a full account of the requirements under this head, also the amount expended last year and the policy pursued. Will he please state whether these rails were bought by tender, and what the price was.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I may say that the amount here asked for is not likely to be all that we shall ask for this session, so the hon. gentleman must keep that fact in view. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Haggart's) request is a very reasonable one, and I shall endeavour to give the information. Last year the rails were purchased by tender. They were furnished by two firms, a part by each—the Illinois Company and the Cambria Company. We had offers from these companies lower than those of others, including English manufacturers. The rails procured last year were to re-rail, as far as they would go, the Cape Breton line. We had some difficulty owing to the scarcity of labour last year and did not succeed in getting the whole ninety-four or ninety-five miles from Point Tupper to Sydney laid. I think we laid some seventy odd miles. The balance of the work we expect to complete as soon as the season will permit. The price we paid last year was $32.60 a ton. The arrangement made this year for the rails we propose to lay down during the next year, that is after 1st July, we pay for at the same price, $32.60. These rails we get in accordance with an arrangement entered into by the government, after consideration of the whole question, with the Sault Ste. Marie Power Company. We had a proposition from them to put in a steel rail plant to manufacture these rails in Canada. They satisfied us of their ability to do this work, and that they would be capable of establishing a very efficient plant, using ores of a superior quality. They said the steel which would be made from it would contain a percentage of nickel, which would be found in the rails they would make for us. Although this formed no element in the price, it would add materially to the durability and value of the rails, and we felt that that was an additional inducement for us to make the arrangement with them. The establishment of this industry was contingent upon their securing from the government a fair order, one sufficiently large to guarantee them employment for their factory—a basis, as it were, upon which to invite and encourage the introduction of capital for that purpose. As the government viewed the matter, it was one which we felt would appeal very strongly to the sympathetic consideration of the Canadian people. It would result in the establishment of a permanent industry and would secure to railway companies and others who might require rails, a supply obtainable in this country, while giving employment directly and indirectly to a large number of people. While conferring an enormous benefit upon a very great public work, we would be at the same time conferring additional and important advantages on the country in an industrial sense. We made such an arrangement with them. In the first place the question came up in the form of a proposal. The company offered to undertake the manufacture and delivery of these rails at such a price as similar rails of equal standard could be obtained in the open market. At the time we made these arrangements we instituted inquiries as to the current price of rails, and we found it would be impossible for us to place orders at that time for a delivery earlier than the fall of the present year, and that the prices obtainable would be at all events equal to the prices that we were paying last year, and which we had contracted for the year before. When we had assured ourselves with reference to what would be a reasonable price to pay, we made a contract with this company to deliver 25,000 tons of the quality and standard which we have been placing upon the road, a rail eighty pounds in weight, and we were to pay them $32.50 per ton, the delivery to commence in the first week in August, and to continue at such a rate that we would be able to lay the rails before the snow fell.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Where were they to be delivered ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They were to be delivered to us in Montreal—that is in the present year. We have no permanent and explicit contract with them for the future, although in their proposal they asked us to give them a contract for a term of five years, and to give them an order for 50,000 tons with which to commence their industry. We finally concluded to give them an order for 25,000 tons, and while we have no explicit contract with them for any term beyond the year in which we are now entering, we have an understanding with them under which, if they furnish us, as they engage to do, with rails of the quality and standard we require, and at the current price in the English market, we are prepared to continue to take our rails from them.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand the minister that these rails are to be manufactured at the Soo ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. The plant is now under way. The machinery, Mr. Clergue tells me, is all constructed, they are putting up their buildings rapidly, and I have heard very lately from them to the effect that we will receive, beginning the first week in August, a delivery of 500 tons a day. As to the amount, we have inserted in this estimate the sum of $500,000. After making deduc-

tions for the value of the old rails which we are taking up, we will have to ask parliament in a supplementary estimate for a sum beyond this amount. The exact sum will appear when the estimates are brought down ; but this is only a partial appropriation covering the cost of the 25,000 tons.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Are the proceeds of the old rails you are to sell applied to the purchase of these new rails.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, they go in reduction of the cost of these rails. It may be that none of them will be sold in time to help pay for these new rails, but when sold, they will go to the credit of capital outlay. That has been the course adopted in times past.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When they go into store account, of course it is to the credit of the Intercolonial Railway ? These all go into store account ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, if they are used there, they are charged to working expenses.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I did not understand how many rails were bought from the Illinois company and the Cambria company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Five thousand tons from each.

Mr. KAULBACH. How are the old rails disposed of ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The old rails, when taken up, are placed in storage account. When they are disposed of, it is in one of two ways. A portion of them may be used for our sidings, where we are extending our sidings. When these sidings are put in as renewals, the rails are charged against operating expenses ; when they are put in as new work, new sidings entirely, they are charged as against capital expenditure at the value at which they have been placed in store account.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How do you determine their value when going into store account ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The value usually placed on them is the value of the old rails as nearly as we can ascertain. For instance, these old rails that we have taken up now are placed in store account at $15 per ton. Another way of disposing of old rails, if we have no use for them ourselves, as we have no use for a large proportion of them, is to sell them at public competition, where they are bought either as scrap or for use on other railways.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What do they bring ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. During the last year they have not brought less than $21 to $22.50, delivered.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I want to know on what principle rails are renewed on the Intercolonial Railway, how much does the hon. gentleman renew each year, and how much is required for the purpose. I would also like the hon. gentleman to tell me about this contract that he has made with Mr. Clergue, if it is in writing, and if he will be kind enough to bring it down to the House. Another question : Does the contract provide that these rails should be made out of iron ore smelted upon the premises and rolled, or is it merely a rolling mill, and does the contract provide that a certain percentage of nickel should be used in the manufacture of these rails ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The agreement is in writing, and it will be brought down at once. I may add that it does not contain any provision as to the quantity of nickel the rails should contain ; but all the ore which is taken out by that company from its iron mines does contain nickel varying in proportion from 2 to 4 per cent. We are positively assured by Mr. Clergue upon that point. We hope to be able to relay the road at the rate of 25,000 tons a year. The hon. gentleman can figure it up for himself—it will take six or seven years to complete all our mileage. With an eighty-pound rail, we should require about 118 tons to the mile. We should have between 1,100 and 1,200 miles to relay, beyond what new rails have now been laid down. I am not going to commit myself to the exact number of miles, but it would be in that locality. We hope to do it as rapidly as possible. It is very important that it should be done in view of the increased weight of our locomotives and cars, and we think it would be advantageous to have it done as quickly as possible.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What portion of these renewals is charged to ordinary expenditure and what portion to capital account ? Is any part charged to the ordinary expenditure of the road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Undoubtedly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What part of it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We anticipate charging the cost of laying down the new rails.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I mean of the rail itself.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As I told the hon. gentleman, we estimated upon a value of $15 per ton for the old rail. That is the value at which we put these rails into store, so that all you would have to do would be to deduct that sum from the cost in order to ascertain

how much is being charged for the new rail.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We know the charge for the new rail. The hon. minister does not understand the drift of my question. I want to know if any portion of the cost is charged to the ordinary account of the railway. What part is charged to consolidated fund account and what part to capital account ? I understand the difference between the $15, being the valuation at which the old rails go into storage and the price of the new rails being $32, making a difference of $17, which is charged some way or other against the Intercolonial Railway. I want to know whether that is charged to capital account or to the ordinary expenses of the road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know that I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. I would understand his present statement just as I understood his previous one. I understood the hon. gentleman to ask me how much was charged to capital ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We certainly would not be charging the whole of it to capital account when we were putting into store account the difference between the whole amount and the value of the old rails. That is not charged to capital account. The hon. gentleman has a recollection of the way in which the rail matter was managed during his tenure of office, and it is now done precisely in the same way.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister does not understand me yet. Is the difference between the amount of the old rails to go into store account and the cost of the new rails—one is $15 and the other is $32, which would make $17—charged against the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, certainly it is.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is charged?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that renewals of that kind, before his time, were charged in a similar manner, to capital account ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I am not going to say that. In times past, from time to time, when a large quantity of rails was purchased by the government, the rails were paid for and charged to capital account. They went into store, and when they were taken out of store, they were, as a rule, during the hon. gentleman's administration, charged as a whole against operating.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But, that was not the invariable rule, nor was it the rule when there would be a very large amount of relaying new rails. It is only the case when the quantity of rails laid was over a very limited number of miles. Under existing circumstances it would be altogether impossible to rerail the Intercolonial Railway in five or six years, and do it out of earnings. No matter what reasonable amount of a surplus you might have, you could not hope to do it in that way. It is according to railway law and usage that it should be done exactly as we are doing it.

Mr. KAULBACH. I do not understand the point as to the sale of rails and delivery of the same. What is the exact interpretation in respect to delivery ? Does the hon. minister mean that if he sells me rails in Montreal he will deliver them at Halifax, or at any point on the Intercolonial Railway, or am I to take them from the point where they are found at the time ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman refer now to the case of old rails which are being disposed of ?

Mr. KAULBACH. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Our arrangement in reference to that, and I think it uniformly happens, although there may be some exception—I do not recall any—has been to charge a price for delivery at the point on the Intercolonial Railway nearest to where they are required. Our charge has been $22.50 for delivery at Montreal when the rails have been required west of Montreal, and we have made a calculation as to what would be a fair proportion less than that for hauling whenever delivery has been asked for at any lesser distance from where they happened to be at the time. These matters are taken into consideration by the officers of the department and they control it, or rather their judgment would prevail, and any arrangement which they would recommend would be carried out, because I take it they would be best qualified to judge as to what would be a reasonable proportion to divide as between a longer or a shorter distance. If the hon. gentleman refers to the delivery of rails which we are purchasing, I may say that our arrangement with Mr. Clergue, of the Lake Superior Power Company, or the Sault Ste. Marie Company, whichever is the proper name, is to make delivery of this present year's purchase at Montreal, which is the most convenient point for us to receive them. We have a further understanding, that if we take them they are to be delivered at such other points as we may deem convenient.

Mr. KAULBACH. The information I desired was simply in regard to the sale of old rails. In case I desired to purchase in Nova Scotia, and the rails were in Montreal, would the hon. minister deliver these rails at Halifax, or any other point on the Intercolonial Railway, no matter where they were, at the same figure without the cost of transport ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. The price we get is governed by the condition of the market. We get the best price we can. We found that during the last year rails were in good demand, that the price was quite high, and that we could command $22 or $22.50—I am not just certain which—for delivery at Montreal. We had to haul them from points farther down on the line. They were not there. They were in the neighbourhood of Moncton when these arrangements were made.

Mr. CLANCY. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that the rails which have been sold were rails which they had discarded because they were apparently worn out, or because they were a lighter class of rails than the hon. gentleman is now using ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We would not use any rails ourselves that we have taken up along the line that were not of a first-class character.

Mr. CLANCY. Does that mean 80-pound rails ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, you can have a very excellent rail, of less weight which would do for certain classes of work where there were not the same heavy locomotives and trains in use.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman buying any rails less than 80 pounds in weight ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. CLANCY. Not less ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. I was going on to explain to the hon. gentleman that we have taken up 56-pound rails, but we have not sold any 56-pound rails in sections—

Mr. SPROULE. Were these rails taken up because they were worn out ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, they were taken up and replaced by heavier rails. We have taken up 56-pound rails because they were too light for our purpose. These rails, which are excellent rails, we are putting down on the Prince Edward Island road, where the rail is now in a very dilapidated condition.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the life of such a rail as that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know that you could name any definite term. It depends a good deal on the character of your traffic. The life of a 56-pound rail would not be very considerable on such a road as the Intercolonial Railway, or as it will be when all of its trains and engines will be of greatly increased weight.

Mr. KAULBACH. In reference to the old rails that are worn out and discarded, the hon. minister does not mean to say that he sells them for $22 a ton ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have sold rails for $20 a ton, with carriage added, making $22 or $22.50 a ton. But that is an exceptional thing. I do not imagine that we will have any similar experience in the future. We got the best price we could get for them last year.

Mr. BARKER. How long were these old rails in use ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Most of them, I think I may say all of them, were old rails when they were put down on the Cape Breton branch.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose the minister will admit that if their life had expired he would have to replace them out of income. There is no question but that the weight of 56 pounds should be replaced out of income. The fact that he is putting in a heavier rail makes no difference as to that 56 pounds, and he should replace them to that extent out of income, less the value of the scrap. Has the minister done so ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that would be expected when you are compelled to increase the weight of your rails, not because they are not good themselves but because business interests require it. It would be quite impossible for any railway company because it had to add 15 or 20 pounds a yard to its rails in order to carry its locomotives, to do so out of its earnings on ordinary railway business principles.

Mr. BARKER. It is a mere matter of adjustment. The minister has an old rail, old when it was put down which is now practically out of use. If he did not want to put down a heavier rail he would have to put down a 56-pound rail chargeable to income less the value of the scrap. When he puts down an 80-pound rail he should charge the extra 24 pounds to capital, and the balance, less the value of the scrap, to his working expenses.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The effect of all that would be that it would take half a century to get your road in proper shape.

Mr. BARKER. It would make no difference at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would make all the difference in the world. You would be simply adding to the capital expenditure of the country in an indirect way, but which you are now doing in a direct way.

Mr. BARKER. No. It would be fair to charge your increased weight of rail to capital, but on the principle adopted by the minister he is saving in his working expenses on the railway at the expense of the debt of the country. He should charge the 24 pounds extra weight to capital, because that is added to the company's property ; but the 56 pounds should be replaced out of working expenses just as if there had been no increase in the weight at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Although this question is new to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker), we have threshed out the subject over and over again in the discussion of the estimates. I suppose hon. gentlemen will adhere to their opinion while I will adhere to mine. If I take a commonsense view of the attitude of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) he would say this : Here is the Intercolonial Railway which is a government railway, and if it succeeds in making a narrow margin over its actual running expenses in the year it ought to take a million dollars more, apply it to laying down 100 miles of new rail, and show in the accounts it is doing that, not by adding to the debt but out of its earnings when it did not have any earnings, and thus charge it against the public debt in an indirect manner. As a matter of book-keeping that might be done, but after all it is an inconsequential contention because it does not make one particle of difference to the country.

Mr. BARKER. It makes all the difference in the world.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The only difference it makes is that in the one case the new rails would not be laid, or if they were laid in any proportion at all it would be to a very limited extent, because no government could undertake to relay the whole of its line with new rails from end to end as required by the existing necessities of the railway, and do it without asking parliament to countenance its going into debt for the purpose. It is not as though you were simply renewing a rail which gives out here and there, but, unless you allow the government railway to be a discredit to the country you have to do all this on a large scale and in an expeditious manner.

Mr. BARKER. Nobody disputes that for a moment. I am sure the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) sees clearly that under his system of book-keeping he shows an apparent profit that he has never earned. If the hon. gentleman charged the expense of renewing the old rails to working expenses—not adding to the property, mind you, but renewing and maintaining his track—he would not have had the surplus which he claims during the last three or four years. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) knows that perfectly well. Nobody can be found to dispute the principle that once capital provides a thing, then after that income has to maintain it. In this case capital has provided rails weighing 56 lbs. to the yard, and it is the duty of income to maintain that 56 lbs. afterwards. Under the system adopted by the Minister of Railways he not only escapes the maintenance of that 56-lb. rail, but he is actually getting new rails instead of the old ones out of capital, and that has also the effect that his working expenses in the future are going to be improved at the expense of capital. Instead of being subject to this expense of maintenance year after year he is getting rid of the old rails and getting new ones in their places. He is getting 80-lb. rails as new material, and for several years his working expenses would be cut down by reason of these new rails being charged to the debt of the country. And why does the Minister of Railways do that ? Simply in order that he may make a good showing on his working expenses and on the management of his railway. No railway in the country would ever think of keeping its books in that way. You could never get the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway to make such charges to capital account. If they did, the managers of those companies every few years could add a few pounds to the weight of the rails, and they would never spend a cent for maintenance except the mere cost of relaying. Now, I am not trying to teach the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) anything. He understands the matter perfectly well. I simply point out to the committee that the duty of the Minister of Railways is to maintain that 56 lbs. out of his income, less the value of the scrap, and the only thing he can properly charge to capital is the extra weight of the rail he puts in.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) just follow me for a moment. We have taken up the old Cape Breton rail which was a second-hand rail when put down——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was not the Cape Breton rail used on the Intercolonial Railway before? I thought that only a part of them were taken up and replaced on the Intercolonial Railway by others, and that a great portion of them were new rails?

Mr. WALLACE. What difference would it make if they were used on another part of the Intercolonial Railway and transferred to the Cape Breton Railway. It is all gov-

ernment railway, and they were new rails when originally put down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They were inferior rails when they were put down in Cape Breton, and being old rails when they were put down they were practically of little more value than they were when they were taken up last year and when they are now being taken up, and when there are 80-lb. new rails substituted for them.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman mean that they were old rails when originally purchased and put down, or that they were originally put down as new rails, and afterwards removed from one part to another ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What I state, from information received from my officers, is, that they were old rails when put down on the Cape Breton line. The hon. gentleman would like me to charge them up as new and good rails, of equal quality of new rails of the same weight, although the late government transferred them from one portion of the line to another. I do not think that is a fair or reasonable proposition. We are charging simply the difference between their value as old rails and the value of new 80-pound rails.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand the hon. gentleman to mean that the book-keeping should be affected by the fact that my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) happened to be the Minister of Railways at that time, while the hon. gentleman happens to be Minister of Railways at this time. If my hon. friend from Lanark were the Minister of Railways now, it would hardly be possible to carry out logically the suggestion which the hon. gentleman makes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then, with reference to the 56-pound rails which have been taken up, they are comparatively new rails—as good 56-pound rails as you could probably buy in the market to-day; and on any view that could be taken of the question, I do not think there could be the slightest criticism of the method in which these rails are being treated. They are good rails, and we are treating them as good rails; and they are being put down on the Prince Edward Island road at the same value at which they are being taken up from the main line of the Intercolonial Railway, the difference only being charged.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do all the rails purchased this year, and last year and the year before, go into the store account—the gross quantity purchased or delivered; and is it then charged out ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Deputy Minister tells me that the new rails that have been purchased in times past go into the store account when they are being charged as against revenue. If you buy a large quantity of rails and keep them on hand, and they continue on hand for a term of years, they necessarily go into store account, and are only charged up when laid on the road.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In other words, all the rails you purchased this year and last year and the year before that have not gone into store account at all, but are all charged to capital ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is correct.

Mr. HACKETT. Did I understand the minister to say that second-hand rails which had been placed on the Cape Breton road and used there are now being taken to Prince Edward Island and used for the construction of roads there ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I did not say that. The hon. gentleman quite misunderstood me. I said that we are putting down on the Prince Edward Island road a very superior 59-pound rail, which has been a very short time in use. These rails are taken from the Drummond County Railway, which hon. gentlemen who have followed the discussions with regard to that road know is a road of recent construction. The rails put down on the Prince Edward Island road, if the hon. gentleman has seen them and knows anything about rails, he will say are very excellent rails.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When I had control of the Intercolonial Railway, there were a certain number of miles of railway to be renewed every year, and the rails used for this purpose were always charged to income. These never went into store account. The hon. gentleman has charged the full amount of the renewal of the road to capital account. While on my feet, I would like the hon. minister to tell me what English companies competed for these rails, and the prices they asked. I would also ask him whether he has any assurance that the smelting works will be built at Sault Ste. Marie in time to deliver the rails or any of them next fall ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot from memory tell the hon. gentleman the names of the English companies that tendered, but I will get the information. I remember that the price was $32.75 per ton, and that there were eight or ten firms tendering. I think they must have had a tacit understanding among themselves, for I think, though I would not be positive on the point, that most of the tenders were at the same figure.

Mr. CLANCY. Where was the delivery to take place ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think at Montreal.

Mr. WALLACE. Did the manufacturers pay the duty ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They were not to have paid any duty on the rails. All the tenders we invited on the basis of price free of duty. With regard to the manufacture of rails at Sault Ste. Marie, I can only tell the hon. gentleman that before we placed this sum in the estimates, we had a communication with the company. We asked them not to mislead us in any way, but to let us know with absolute confidence whether we could count on receiving the rails or any portion of them in the time specified.

Mr. WALLACE. When was the contract made ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Last fall or early in the winter. The proposition was laid before us, before the last session of parliament. We were not able to give it consideration while parliament was in session, but immediately after the session and as soon as we could, we opened up negotiations and came to an understanding with the company. Just what that date was I am not at the moment able to say.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman have the contract and those tenders immediately after dinner.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether I correctly understood the hon. minister that these rails, when used for a new siding, were charged to capital account, but when they were put on an old siding they were charged to current account ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If we were simply renewing work which had been done before, that would be charged against current account.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. minister not see that these rails are twice charged to capital account ? When purchased originally, they were charged to capital account, and when put down on a new siding they are again charged to capital account ? It seems to me it demoralizes the bookkeeping badly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How does the hon. gentleman get credit for the $15 old rails that go into the store account, when all the rails that are purchased and laid on the road never enter the store account at all ?

Mr. BARKER. When the hon. gentleman gets old rails into sidings, at what rate does he charge out the rails—at scrap rate, $15 a ton ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Is the hon. gentleman certain about that, because some of the items seem to indicate otherwise ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly. We might let this item stand, Mr. Chairman.

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to Capital—Railways—Intercolonial Railway—To complete highway bridge at Rocky Lake, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This will complete the expenditure of $8,000 for the purposes of diverting the highway and avoiding three existing dangerous level crossings. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) knows the location of this work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is between Windsor Junction and Halifax ? I know that there are dangerous level crossings there.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why do you charge a highway bridge to capital account on a road finished so long ago as that between Windsor and Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is an entirely new bridge. It would be as reasonable not to charge any portion of the Intercolonial Railway to capital account, as to say that when you are going to make the road additionally safe by means of an entirely new structure you cannot properly charge it to capital.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is a new principle.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. Here are three dangerous crossings on the level. It is desirable in the interests of the public that these dangerous crossings should be done away with. We make a diversion of the road and put in a new bridge, and we think we are fairly entitled to charge it to capital.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You do not charge the diversion, but only the bridge to capital.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is as I understand it, but I am not sure. No, I see I was wrong, and that the whole work, including the diversion, is charged to capital.

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to Capital—Railways—Intercolonial Railway—To build new and enlarge old engine houses, $75,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is this ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Last year we appropriated $140,000 for this purpose. We have not yet expended the whole of that amount, but it will be expended by the end of the fiscal year. The works are estimated to cost $215,000, so that we are asking for the balance of what will be needed. This will enlarge some of the existing houses to ac-

commodate the larger engines, and we also propose to build new engine houses at places where they are needed.

Mr. CLANCY. How many new ones ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are building new ones at Chaudiere and Stellarton.

Mr. BARKER. How many new engines does the hon. minister propose to accommodate ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. By the end of the current year we shall have at least eighty-five new engines of the 82-ton size.

Mr. BARKER. But the hon. gentleman has only increased the number by about twenty in the last three or four years.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but I have sixty-six under contract. We are enlarging the buildings at Campbellton, Ste. Flavie and Sydney. We are also lengthening the stalls at other engine houses, concerning which I have not the minute details at hand.

Mr. CLANCY. What do the new engine houses cost ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The engine house at Chaudiere will cost $60,000, and that at Stellarton between $55,000 and $60,000.

Mr. CLANCY. This represents an expenditure of only $120,000, and the balance of this $215,000 will be consumed in repairing other engine houses ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In enlarging and adding to them. For instance, I have seen the work in progress at Campbellton. We are taking out the wall, adding to the building and extending the pits and tracks.

Mr. CLARKE. Is all this work being done by tender ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. How many stalls are being added at each place where enlargement is made ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The number varies from fifteen to twenty-five--perhaps twenty would be the average.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman does not propose to add as many as twenty at each place ? I am asking about those that are to be enlarged.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am speaking of the ones enlarged.

Mr. BARKER. Is it not possible to give the exact number in each case ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That could be given, but I have not the information here.

Mr. GOURLEY. I happened to be in the railway roundhouse at Truro a little while before coming here, and I saw one of these fine new engines, being moved on the turntable, and it looked very much as if the whole thing would break down. The workmen said, that an accident, accompanied with great loss of property, might occur any day ; because the engines were so much larger than the turntable was originally constructed to handle. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give this matter his attention, because if one of these turntables, should break down, the loss of public property would be far greater than the cost of renewing the table. We should have a new roundhouse, with all modern equipments, at Truro. I earnestly call the Ministers attention to this state of affairs.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What the hon. gentleman says is entirely correct, and it is the same all over the line. When we are changing from a forty and forty-five and fifty ton engine to an eighty-two ton engine, you can well imagine there would be risks. The officers of my department and myself are fully sensible of the importance of having our turntables enlarged, and our engine houses enlarged as rapidly as possible. We are doing that as rapidly as we can, and Truro is not being overlooked.

Mr. GOURLEY. Do you contemplate Truro in this present vote ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there will be something in the supplementaries.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister bring down after dinner information in detail of this large expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can give the hon. gentleman the details now, except in respect to the stalls. But I do not think that we have had from the engineers any memo. of the plans of the different engine houses. At Stellarton the engine house is estimated to cost $58,500, and a turntable, $9,500. The Campbellton engine house is costing $25,000; the engine house at St. Flavie is estimated to cost $25,000 ; that at Sydney, $75,000 ; that at Chaudière, $60,000. The enlargement of the stalls in other engine houses is put down at $12,000. I can get the information in respect to the stalls if the hon. gentleman desires it.

Increased accommodation at Sydney, $100,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will remember that I included in the first amount $25,-

000 for the Sydney engine house. When that estimate was sent forward we were providing for six stalls in that engine house; after that came, it was found necessary to increase the number and we are putting in twelve additonal stalls in the Sydney engine house, the cost of which forms a portion of the present amount of $100,000. These additional stalls, boiler, engine house and foundations, will cost $50,000 in addition to the $25,000 that has already been asked for in a previous vote. Then we have to lay out a yard, and prepare grounds and tracks, all of which will cost $50,000 more.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has there been any arrangement made with respect to running passenger trains into Sydney and North Sydney other than that which has hitherto prevailed ? There was a good deal of dissatisfaction in one of the towns, at least, with respect to the delay which took place.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are about getting out time tables, and when the new time table comes out we expect finally to settle that question, which has given rise, I think, to a good deal of unreasonable controversy, though there may be a difference of opinion. It is not to be wondered at that the people of Sydney complained of the delay in the arrival of trains by reason of their being shunted off to North Sydney. I think I stated last year that my own view was that such a condition ought not to continue ; and I think we will be able to give a service to both Sydney and North Sydney which will be satisfactory to all concerned.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Sydney is where the steel works are being erected ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. As it is nearly six o'clock, I will remind the hon. minister of the notice that I put upon the paper some time ago for the purpose of eliciting information from the Railway Department that we would like to get very much for the purpose of discussing the state of affairs on the Intercolonial Railway. Among the payments is a sum of $4,527,807, including railway and canal collections. Now, I want a separate statement of the canal collections from the railways. The notice has been on the paper for ten days, and the minister has been promising to get the information day after day. Then there is a sum here of the receipts and payments of canals, this is the ten-days' statement. There is the railways and canals consolidated fund of $118,972, I would like to know what constitutes that item. I suppose that nothing of capital account appears in this statement at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not able to separate the canal collections from the railway collections this evening, but we will not get through these railway estimates to-night, and my hon. friend will have another opportunity of getting this information placed in his hands, and he will have another chance to discuss it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the hon. gentleman is going to make a statement of his whole management of the Intercolonial Railway, and I would like to have this information before he makes that statement. He will find the question was put on March 29th by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I remember that the question came up, and I was obliged to inform my hon. friend that I had not received the information from Moncton, but the deputy minister informs me that it will be ready to-morrow.

Mr. PUTTEE. Are tenders let for these improvements that are going on under contract ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. PUTTEE. Does the minister include in these contracts the current wage clause as a specification ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, I do not think it has been customary on the Intercolonial Railway. We have not yet met with any difficulty at all except this, that probably the general effect of what has taken place in parliament and out of parliament in regard to wages has added quite a material amount to the cost of labour. I do not say I regret that, nor do I say that it ought not to have been so, but that has been the effect. We have not found it necessary to include any clause in our contracts in order to secure the payment of a proper and reasonable wage.

Mr. PUTTEE. The hon. minister will remember that the resolution passed by this House last year called for its application to all government works, and surely a contract of this kind must be considered a government contract, even although it is on the Intercolonial Railway. It seems to me that it should be included, and as the hon. minister admits that the cost of labour has already been increased it will not further increase the cost.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not a very easy thing, if I may remind the hon. gentleman, with the multiplicity of small contracts we are making on the Intercolonial Railway to carry out his wish. We would have to make a very considerable addition to our working staff in order to pursue these details, and unless there was some good reason for taking on this additional burden we would not feel like doing it. We would not want

to incur that expense. I am quite sure that if there had been any ground for complaint at all in reference to the amount of wages that is being paid we would have heard of it. I do not find that the people are at all slow in making such things known to the department. We have never heard anything of that kind in reference to the contracts we have made. These contracts are small matters, and you would encumber them very much.

Mr. PUTTEE. They may be small matters, although the items are not very small. I do not think this would increase the cost of the Railway Department at all. We have a Labour Department now. We are going to be asked to vote $50,000 for that department, and we should give the department something to do. I think the Labour Department could take hold of this matter.

At six o'clock, the committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Administration of Justice—Miscellaneous expenditure, including North-west Territories, $37,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is this miscellaneous expenditure? I see the amount is exactly the same as last year.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is the customary amount for federal purposes, and includes fees in the North-west Territories for Crown prosecutors, sheriffs, clerks of the court, maintenance and transport of prisoners, coroners' inquests, copies of evidence in applications for executive clemency and general expenditures of that description in the North-west Territories, and also here at headquarters.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was the expenditure last year?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The total amount voted was expended.

Travelling allowances, court of King's Bench and county court judges, Manitoba, $3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase here.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is an increase of $500, because the amount of $2,500 voted last year proved to be inadequate. An increase is asked for because of the increased business in Manitoba.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would this represent the travelling expenses or allowance for judges on circuit?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The judges receive a per diem allowance of $6. This is not an exorbitant charge when you consider expenses in that part of the country.

Circuit allowances to judges ad hoc, $200.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the occasion of payments to judges ad hoc?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In the event of a judge being disqualified in any district, or in the event of not being able to have a judge to send on circuit. They send a judge out specially for the purpose of taking a case in which the judge would be disqualified.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this restricted to any province or is it applicable to the Dominion as a whole?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not able to say where that expenditure was made last year, but I do not anticipate that it is applicable to any particular province. I cannot say whether it was expended last year or whether any portion of it was expended.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know that in my own province sometimes a county court judge is disqualified and a judge from another district comes to take his place, but, I supposed that would be dealt with as a circuit allowance for a county court judge.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In the province of Quebec that is the way it is dealt with. I have no present recollection of that particular item or as to the purposes for which it is expended. It is only a matter of $200.

Mr. SPROULE. Has it been expended?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not able to say whether it was expended last year or not. I am quite willing to allow that item to stand if hon. gentlemen desire it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think the hon. gentleman need let it stand, but he may mention it again.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I find here a memorandum which says that this vote is occasionally required, but it has not been drawn on this year.

To provide for the enforcement of the Alien Labour law, $9,000.

Mr. PUTTEE. How is that vote used?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Up to the present, a very small proportion of this item has been expended. Hitherto the administration of the Alien Labour Act has been in charge of the Department of Justice, but now it has been transferred to the Postmaster General, and it will be for him to explain in the future how this vote is used.

Mr. MONK. Did it cost us $9,000 last year?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It only cost us $966.66.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would rather be inclined to think that a smaller vote would be required than formerly, for the reason that under the new legislation the enforcement of this Act is left to private

individuals in the provinces, under the sanction of the provincial Attorney General, or of a judge. I do not at present quite see the necessity for so large a vote, but I would not feel inclined to say that this amount should not be voted if the Solicitor General will tell us that it reasonably might be required.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I did not understand from the Bill introduced the other day that the law would be left entirely to the initiative of private individuals. They would put the law in motion, but I am not quite sure that to a large extent the government may not be responsible for expenditure connected with the administration of the law as heretofore.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is quite true there is nothing in the Bill to prevent the government from proceeding to enforce the law, but, on the other hand, there is nothing in the Bill which would enable the government to indemnify a private prosecutor who acted on his own responsibility.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Judging from the experience of the past, I do not think it likely all this money will be used, but, at all events, it cannot do any harm to place a sufficient sum at our disposal.

Mr. SPROULE. Unless the government show greater alacrity in enforcing the law in the future than in the past, a couple hundred dollars would be sufficient.

Penitentiaries generally, $3,560.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the increase of $160 for ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is an annual increase of $30 in the salary of the stenographer, and $130 for office contingencies. This is the first increase in this item that has taken place during six years.

Kingston penitentiary, $190,500.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is an increase of $100 to provide for an assistant for the farm instructor, the extent of the farm having been increased by fifty acres last year.

St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, $111,700.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the Solicitor General if he knows whether the two guards who were found guilty of an assault on the ex-warden are still in the employ of the government ? I may mention that during the last election five of these guards, in a premeditated manner, arranged to assault the ex-warden after a political meeting, and pursuant to that arrangement did assault him. The ex-warden was very seriously hurt. They were brought before a magistrate and were found guilty, or pleaded guilty to aggravated assault, and subsequently they withdrew their plea. They were taken before another magistrate, and two of them were found guilty of simple assault. The whole affair was very unsatisfactory, but what I wonder is, if these two guards, who were condemned to a fine, have been dismissed from the service. I may tell the Solicitor General that during the past election many of the employees of the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary were actively engaged in the work of the election. I saw some of them myself at political meetings, but the case of these two guards is one which deserves special attention.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not in a position to say whether the two guards referred to have been dismissed. My present opinion is that they have not been ; that they paid the fine to which they were condemned. With regard to the charge that the people of St. Vincent de Paul took part in the election, I know nothing about it ; but, I would accept the word of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) when he says he knows it of his own knowledge. I am afraid, however, that that is a tradition of long standing at St. Vincent de Paul, and it should be made to disappear.

Mr. MONK. It is quite possible it has existed in the past, but the Solicitor General should see that some kind of check should be put upon it in the future.

Dorchester penitentiary, $54,500.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the explanation of this increase of $900 ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is to provide for a masonry instructor, whose salary will be $700, and the other $200 is for that amount under-estimated last year.

Regina jail, $10,600.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase here of $1,100.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is an increase in salaries of $500, which has become necessary to provide for a night engineer; an increase in the maintenance of prisoners of $300, due to an increase in the price of beef and other provisions; and an increase of $300 in working expenses.

Administration of justice in the Yukon territory—Additional salary of judge, $1,000.

Mr. SPROULE. If you paid the judge $4,000 before, why should he get $5,000 now ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The experience we have had during the last two years has led to the conclusion that the salaries of the officials in the Yukon are too low to enable them to live even in moderate comfort, and it is proposed to allow the judges $5,000 a year each, with $250 a month for living allowance, and the sheriff and clerk of the court $3,000 a year each, with $150 a month for living allowance. My hon. friend will realize that $5,000 a year to a judge of the high court in the Yukon, who is called upon to administer the laws and decide matters of very great importance, is not exorbitant. It is the salary paid to the high

court judges in Ontario and the superior court judges in Quebec.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why do you have the words 'authorized by statute' attached to the vote of the salary of one judge, and not to the other?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Because there is provision made by the statute for only one judge. A vote was taken last year for an additional judge.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Under what authority was the second judge appointed?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Under the authority of the vote in the estimates. If the salary is provided, the judge can be appointed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If a statute creates a court and authorizes one judge, I do not suppose you would appoint another judge simply by voting a salary to him?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The statute provides for the appointment of one or more judges. Therefore the statutory salary is for one, and then we vote an additional salary for the other.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then I understand that the authority for the appointment of the second judge was statutory.

Mr. MONK. I do not wish to complain at all of the increase of salary for the Yukon judges, because I have no doubt that the conditions of life change there; nor do I wish to reopen the question of the salaries of other judges, because that has already been fully treated in the House. But I would like to ask the Solicitor General if the government have under consideration, with the hope of any prompt solution, the question of a readjustment of the salaries of the judges of the province of Quebec. The Solicitor General is well aware that the judges of the city of Montreal are admittedly underpaid; and if changed conditions in the Yukon necessitate an increase, the conditions in the city of Montreal changed long ago, and the present salaries of the judges there are totally insufficient. I understand that the judges in the city of Toronto have grants of some kind from the local legislature, which bring their remuneration up to $1,000 over the remuneration of the judges in the same position in the city of Montreal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They have other advantages also.

Mr. MONK. The members of the bar who know the situation of the judges in the city of Montreal, and the great increase in the cost of living there, know that their position is rapidly becoming intolerable. They cannot move in the matter, and that makes it all the more the duty of those who see what they go through to bring the matter to the attention of the proper authorities.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I may say that speaking in another place, the Minister of Justice stated that he had then under consideration a Bill to provide for increasing the salaries of the judges throughout the country. Speaking for myself, and judging from the work done by the judges in the province of Quebec, they are all undoubtedly underpaid for the services they perform. The comparison with the province of Ontario is to the disadvantage of our judges; but that is a matter over which we have absolutely no control, because the local legislature provides that the judges shall receive $1,000 a year each, in addition to their salaries, until such time as their salaries shall be increased by the Dominion to $6,000, when the allowance of the province shall cease. Personally I think the salaries of the judges throughout the whole Dominion of Canada ought to be increased.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is the salary for the additional judge mentioned here authorized by statute?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The appointment of both judges is provided for by statute.

Salary of sheriff of Yukon territorial court, in addition to such fees of office as may be allowed by the Governor in Council, $3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there no tariff of fees for the sheriff except what is allowed him by the Governor in Council?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Out of the fees they are allowed to take an amount sufficient to bring their net salary up to $4,000 after having paid certain amounts to their deputies.

Mr. SPROULE. There is $1,000 added. Then, will the fees which they are allowed to collect just make up the difference between that and $4,000?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is a tariff of fees established in the Yukon as payable to sheriffs and other deputies, just as in the older provinces—not the same amounts, of course, but fixed. Out of the fees these officers receive, they are entitled to take a sum sufficient to make their salaries $4,000. They account for the balance, paying it over to the Yukon officials entitled to receive, or to the Receiver General.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Apparently, the additional fees have not been enough to make the salaries up to $4,000.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Up to the present time that is the case.

Mr. GOURLEY. As to these living allowances—I thought that the salary of the judge was for him to live on, but I see he has a living allowance in addition to $3,000. Does the judge account for it in any way? If his living expenses were only $500, would he be given the $3,000?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No. He renders an account to the department, which is vouched for by the officials of the department in accordance with the rules of the Auditor General's office. I may say that there is not a great deal left of the living allowance each year.

Mr. GOURLEY. The conditions of the Yukon are greatly changed, are they not? They tell me, that one can go there, in three or four days, from British Columbia. What makes living so expensive there?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have not been there recently, but I understand that it costs considerably more to live in the Yukon than to live in any other part of the Dominion.

Mr. GOURLEY. But going to the Yukon is a mere pleasure trip now. There are a lot of people, in my own Province, who intend going there this summer, for a pleasure trip.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It may be delightful in the summer, but I am not sure that it would be the same in winter.

Mr. GOURLEY. But the supplies are taken in, in the summer, when carriage is least expensive. It is no part of our training, in my part of the country, to haggle about these little matters. But I would rather see the $3,000 added to the judge's salary and be done with it.

Services in the Yukon Territory—Administration of Justice—Living allowances of sheriff and clerk of court, $1,800 each, $3,600.

Mr. SPROULE. Here is an increase of $1,000.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The intention is to allow the sheriff and the clerk a living allowance. This is in accordance with the amount now paid to the officials in the territory, $150 a month.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As the hon. member for Colchester truly observes, we naturally suppose that the cost of living in the Yukon is growing less, becoming more like what it is in the older provinces. But these allowances are being increased. Can the Solicitor General tell us the reason of that?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Originally, when the officials were sent in, in 1897, a certain amount was allowed as living allowance. But it was afterwards found not at all sufficient to maintain them. The necessity for an increase has become apparent from actual experience. I think my hon. friends who are at all familiar with the Auditor General's administration may feel perfectly satisfied that there is nothing allowed to these officials to which they are not entitled. This is not a sum which they may have and dispose of as they please. They have to account for it. They make their claim, which is not allowed unless it is established to the satisfaction of the Auditor General.

Mr. GOURLEY. They seem like princely establishments.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not sure that there is anything princely about them.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the Solicitor General the date of the statute fixing the salaries for officers of the Yukon territorial court?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It must have been 1897—I will send for it.

Mr. FRASER. Anything like a decent house in Dawson City will cost a rental of $2,000 a year.

Mr. GOURLEY. I should like to have been informed of that before.

Services in the Yukon Territory—Administration of Justice—Maintenance of prisoners, $20,000.

Mr. SPROULE. On what system are the prisoners taken care of out there?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Just as in the older provinces. Provision is made to give them what they are fairly entitled to as prisoners.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the Solicitor General any idea what it costs per capita?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I did not think of making inquiry, and have not the information at hand. I could get the information.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that in the past the expenses were very high, but I think no information has been given to the House on this subject on any previous occasion. It seems to me it would be a matter of some importance to have these facts.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am satisfied, if my hon. friend wishes, to give that information on concurrence.

Services in the Yukon Territory—Administration of Justice—Transport of prisoners, $5,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is altogether new, apparently.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is intended to repay to the mounted police appropriation the sums paid for expenses incurred in moving prisoners from place of arrest to place of confinement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, a similar reduction should be made in the mounted police estimates, as this seems to be a matter of book-keeping. Can the Solicitor General tell us whether that appropriation has been reduced?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not know. As I am informed, they return vouchers to the Department of Justice for this particular service, and we pay the amount. That would imply, as I understand

it, that there has been an increase in the expenditure of the mounted police.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But, if there is an increase here to repay an amount to the mounted police, I should think there must be a corresponding reduction somewhere else.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, if there was the same amount of work done.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In previous years, how was this charged ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The work was not done, I presume, until quite recently, until the last year or so. This expenditure, I presume, has become necessary as the result of the settling of the country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But, within the last year or two this must have appeared in the expenditure of the mounted police.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I apprehend that until it became a large amount they would pay it and not seek to be recouped by the Department of Justice. But, when it increased to so large an amount as $5,000, and as it is part of the administration of justice, they wish the Department of Justice to bear it. That is the explanation which suggests itself to my mind at present.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No doubt my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is right. Still, it would seem to me there should be a reduction of some amount of the estimates of the mounted police.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would suggest that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) might hold that question over until the estimates of the mounted police are under discussion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman have charge of those estimates ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I can see the reason why he wished to put it off on some one else. Who has charge of the mounted police ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The Prime Minister.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) could tell us about that ?

Services in the Yukon Territory—Administration of Justice—Witness and jury fees in criminal trials, $15,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is an increase here of $8,000.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, the explanation I have is that last year the vote was $7,000, and it was reported by the judges and the Crown prosecutor as too small. I asked for information to enable me to estimate the amount accurately. I was told that they have not got at the present time in the Department of Justice sufficient data to estimate exactly the amount required. The amount asked for is largely tentative.

Mr. SPROULE. Is Mr. Wade the Crown prosecutor in the Yukon ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot say, but we do not address the Crown prosecutor in a matter of this kind.

Mr. SPROULE. Have the department changed their system, which prevailed some time ago, where the government prosecutor could at the same time do ordinary professional work, as Mr. Wade did, in connection with the vessel where he took a case for the prosecution and the same case for the defence ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think the Crown prosecutor would have the same privilege as in the other provinces. In Quebec the Crown prosecutor takes private practice as well as doing Crown business.

Mr. SPROULE. But the facts were stated in this House, and not denied, and I think they were substantiated. Out of the deposit that the owner of the vessel made as a guarantee that he would stand his trial, the Crown prosecutor took $700. At the same time he was giving the defendant advice, he was being paid a salary by the government.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. The charge, or the suggestion, was made by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) in the House, that Mr. Wade had charged both sides of the case. I stated then I was perfectly satisfied that the statement was made without evidence of any kind. When Mr. Wade saw the report he telegraphed me a denial, and asked me to bring it up in the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What became of the man's money ? My remembrance of the statement made by the member for Pictou is, that out of the $900 deposited by the vessel-owner as a guarantee that he would stand his trial, $700 was retained by Mr. Wade.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think every lawyer in the House will agree with me that the thing is so outrageous as to be incredible. In my experience I never heard of a lawyer even being charged with the offence. If there was the least possible doubt about it, I am sure the Department of Justice would have looked into it. All I remember is that the member for Pictou made the statement, and subsequently a telegram or a letter came from Mr. Wade positively denying it.

Mr. SPROULE. But, the statement was deliberately made in the presence of many members of this House, that the owner of the vessel went to Mr. Wade for advice, and received advice from him, regarding

the very case concerning which Mr. Wade was advising the collector of customs who seized the vessel. That statement is in the 'Hansard.' The charge was made, whether the Minister of the Interior remembers it or not.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I remember the charge, but there was certainly no evidence.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the Solicitor General what position Mr. W. H. P. Clement occupies in the Yukon territory ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. None at the present time. He resigned some time last summer.

Mr. BLAIN. He is not now in the employ of the government ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The criticism which my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) referred to was made in the House last year. It was to the effect that while Mr. Wade was acting as legal adviser he was engaged in private practice. That was a thing that I do not think the Minister of the Interior himself was much inclined to defend, because after the criticism was made upon it or before, he put a stop to it. It was a very bad thing, particularly under the peculiar conditions which existed in the Yukon at the time, that a lawyer should be advising the government and at the same time be at liberty to practice among individuals. However, the Minister of the Interior did stop it, but he should never have permitted it to begin. The other circumstance to which the member for Grey referred had something to do with the customs. According to my remembrance, the criticism was to the effect that Mr. Wade was acting for the collector of Customs and was also acting for one of the persons who had some dispute before that collector.

Mr. SPROULE. A vessel came into port and was seized for violation of the customs law. The vessel-owner desired to take his vessel out within a few days, as otherwise it would be frozen in, and that would be a serious loss to him. He decided, to satisfy the officials that he would stand his trial, to put up a deposit, I think the amount was $900, if they would allow the vessel out so that he might get it away before the river froze over. The vessel was then released, but I believe was afterwards seized again. In the meantime, while Mr. Wade was giving advice to the collector of customs, the vessel-owner was getting advice from Mr. Wade as the defendant in the case ; and out of the deposit which was put up as a guarantee that he would stand his trial, Mr. Wade kept $700. If my memory is correct, Mr. Wade said that that was to pay for his charges in connection with the case, and the vessel-owner did not get it back.

Mr. BLAIN. Could the hon. gentleman tell me if the position Mr. Clement occupied was abolished, or was some person appointed in his stead ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Connolly, of Halifax, was appointed in his stead.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What are the names of the two judges there ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Judge Craig and Judge Dugas. Judge Dugas was appointed in 1897 or 1898, and Judge Craig was appointed last year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not see any provision for their salaries under the Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not quite gather from the Solicitor General the reasons for the increase of $8,000 in this vote, more than 100 per cent.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The reason is based entirely upon the returns made by the judges and the Crown prosecutor of the district, namely, that the amount voted heretofore, $7,000, was entirely inadequate. At the same time, I have to admit to my hon. friend that we have not got sufficiently detailed information to enable us to say that $12,000 or $14,000 will be sufficient, and we are obliged to ask for $15,000 to meet the exigencies of the case.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much was necessary last year ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot say, but we were $3,000 or $4,000 short last year.

Law books, &c., and freight thereon for the use of the bench and bar, and stationery and freight thereon for territorial court, $2,500.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The increase is made up by the enormous expenditure we have been obliged to make for freight. The greater portion of the money was used in paying freight charges. We have asked for $500 additional so that if possible we may have $2,000 free for the purchase of books.

Miscellaneous expenses, including fees and expenses of Crown prosecutor, salaries and living allowances of stenographers for territorial and police courts, and other officials or employees connected with the administration of justice, coroners' inquests, &c., &c., $30,000.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is a very large increase, but it is caused by the fact that last year the amount was entirely insufficient. As a matter of fact last year a portion of the expenditure named in this item was met by the Interior Department. There are four stenographers, two for the high court and two for the police court. Each of these men receive $3,000, making over $10,000 for stenographers alone.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much was expended last year ? The vote was $8,000.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot say.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Can you give us any idea ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, I cannot ; I am not in a position to tell you because the whole amount that was expended in excess was paid by the Interior Department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this designed to cover what was expended by the Justice Department as well as by the Interior Department ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, it is designed to cover what ought to have been expended by the Justice Department, and which was expended in part by the Interior Department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) can give us an idea of what amount in addition to the $8,000 was expended last year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not the particulars here, but I can give them to the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As this is a very large increase, perhaps the hon. Solicitor General would not mind allowing it to stand.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am quite satisfied to allow it to stand.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am not as familiar with the territorial court in the Yukon as I ought to be. I see you have two stenographers for the police court. Is that another name for the territorial court ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You have the high court judges, and then in addition to that you have the police court.

Mr. GOURLEY. Has it just the ordinary jurisdiction of a municipal court ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The ordinary jurisdiction of a police court for the trial of summary cases.

Mr. GOURLEY. What is the need of stenographers ? We do not have any stenographers in the eastern police courts.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We have them in many cases in our province. There are two in Montreal and one in Quebec.

Mr. MONK. Not in the police court.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend will have to allow me to insist. I have been in the police court—not as a defendant—quite recently.

Mr. MONK. There is one in the criminal court and the court of sessions.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Investigations are taken down now in short hand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Mr. MONK. Preliminary investigations.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. All the preliminary investigations are taken down by stenographers ; at least that is when the magistrate desires it for the criminal court. There is one of these stenographers who takes evidence in the criminal court for the benefit of the judge.

Mr. MONK. In preliminary investigations.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It would be for preliminary investigations. There are two in Montreal and one in Quebec.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am very glad to hear that you have all these luxuries. We will endeavour to imitate you.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would like to remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gourley) that when he proceeds to imitate what we do in the Yukon it will be at the expense of his province.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) will find particulars of the amounts paid by the Interior Department last year that he asked for, and which properly should have been paid by the Justice Department at L—46 of the Auditor General's Report. The items are as follows :—

Stenographer, police court	$ 192 46
Clerk	450 00
Stenographer	250 00
Stenographer	1,881 45
Janitor	120 00
Stenographer	337 50
Cook	137 42
Caretaker	400 00
Stenographer	18 00
Stenographer	1,335 47
Stenographer	1,900 00
Stenographer	1,900 00

Altogether we paid out about $11,000 or $12,000.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) have any objection to allowing the item to pass with this explanation ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think not.

Mr. SPROULE. I have now the item to which I referred, and I want to give a little of the information contained in 'Hansard' to satisfy the hon. Minister of the Interior that what I said had some foundation in fact. On a motion to adjourn Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper refers to the matter. He is speaking of Mr. D. W. Davis, collector of customs, and his conduct in connection with the seizure of the vessel called the Yukoner. He says :

He was asked, in compliance with the advice of the Department of Justice, to account for his conduct, to disgorge the money that he had taken out of the hands of a company doing business in the Yukon, instead of which he handed

it over to Mr. F. C. Wade, of exceptional notoriety, the gentleman who holds so many government offices, and in connection with these offices is able to obtain extraordinary treatment for his clients every time he has to deal with the government. A public company, owning the steamer 'Yukoner,' an English company, incorporated in London, sends that ship into Canadian waters. The law is violated time and again, according to the information that I have. The owners of the ship are wronged by Mr. D. W. Davis, and Mr. F. C. Wade is benefited by $750 of hard cash, actually wrung out of that company and put into the pockets of Mr. F. C. Wade. All that is disclosed by the papers.

He was trying to get more information in regard to this matter.

When these London capitalists seek the protection of the Canadian government against an officer of the Canadian government, whose action has been reported upon by the Department of Justice as high-handed and improper.

That is where he refers to the case. He is desiring to get more information in regard to it, he has put his question on the paper, and they have refused to give him the information. He culls this from the report made by a government official to the Department of Justice, or through the Department of Justice, or through Mr. Ogilvie, in which he speaks of the action of Mr. Wade as high-handed and improper. This gentleman admits that he took $750 belonging to this English company, while at the same time he was advising the collector of customs what to do on the other hand. He was the adviser of the Crown as well as the adviser of the defendant in the case.

Mr. McCREARY. I do not know the merits of this discussion or what took place here last year, but, as a gentleman's name has been brought up in this discussion, I would like to say a word or two in regard to the matter. I have known Mr. F. C. Wade as a practitioner in the city of Winnipeg since 1882. There are about eighty lawyers practising in the city of Winnipeg, and I do not think there is one in the city more honourable or straightforward than Mr. Wade. There are two brothers of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), as well as Mr. Hugh John Macdonald practising there, and I do not know that any of these gentlemen will say that in eighteen years one dishonourable act was ever brought before any of the judges in regard to Mr. Wade's manner of carrying on practise. As far as I can hear this was not a matter before a judge but a matter of arbitration. I submit that before the name of a lawyer of the good standing of Mr. Wade is discussed in this way, he should at least have an opportunity of giving an explanation in some manner to this House.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman should know that Mr. Wade was called upon to give an explanation, and that he practically said: 'It is none of your business.' It is a well-known fact that when he was acting as adviser to the collector of customs he advised him to make the seizure of this vessel. The owners of the vessel go to him for advice, he advises them to make a deposit with the collector of customs, they do so, and when the collector of customs is asked for that deposit he says that he paid it over to Mr. Wade as his fee. To say that Mr. Wade enjoyed an honourable reputation in the city of Winnipeg may be all right enough; there is no person calling that in question, but that has no reference to an act that he did in another capacity, or to the fact that an official of this government reported that his conduct was high-handed and improper. Surely one who was sent to look into it ought to know a great deal more about it than the hon. gentleman who deigns to enlighten the House as to the character of Mr. Wade. It would be more becoming if we had some information or defence from either the Minister of the Interior or the Solicitor General, than from an hon. member who knows nothing about it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think there is any defence required in regard to the matter. It was threshed out pretty well last session and the session before. The facts are, as I remember, that the vessel was seized in the Yukon by the collector of customs, because of a complaint made by the seamen that their wages had not been paid. The vessel was tied up to the wharf, and the owners contended the collector had no right to seize her. They laid a caveat against the seizure, and after some time an agreement was come to that the vessel should be allowed to proceed, the dispute to be referred to an arbitrator whose award should be accepted by both sides. The collector then released the vessel and a certain amount was paid by the owners into the hands of the collector to abide the result of the award. The collector handed over the money in pursuance of the award. After the award was made, the parties who represented the vessel attempted to revoke the submission, and the collector ignored their right to do so. That was the matter in controversy. The collector said he had released the vessel on their submission to arbitration, and that he would pay the money in pursuance of the award. Whether or not they had the technical legal right to revoke the submission I do not inquire, but on the justice of the case it did appear that the collector was justified in paying the money over. I speak with diffidence, because I only know the facts as they came out in the debate, but it seems to me that a mountain was made out of a molehill, and that so far as Mr. Wade is concerned he simply received the money from the collector for his services as counsel.

Mr. SPROULE. Counsel for whom ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know which side he was on.

Mr. SPROULE. He was acting for the owners of the vessel, and he was acting for the government as well.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The government had nothing to do with this matter. The sailors filed their proper complaint and got the vessel seized. The Merchants Shipping Act provides that certain proceedings are to be taken, and when the vessel was tied up, rightly or wrongly, an agreement was come to and signed by the parties that the dispute should be referred to arbitration. I shall not discuss the legal right of one of the parties to revoke the submission, but it did seem to me that whatever complaint might be against Mr. D. W. Davis the collector, there was no ground of complaint against Mr. Wade, unless you prove that his charges were excessive, and I have never heard that contended.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know that this has much to do with the item, but since the minister (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) has entered into a discussion, I may say that I do not think that the matter is so clear as he would lead us to believe. If the collector of customs was allowed to act the parts of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, it was a very simple thing indeed. According to the views the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) put forward last year, at one moment he was collector of customs, and Mr. Wade was consulted by him as such; the next moment he was not acting as collector, but as arbitrator.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think he was the arbitrator.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Oh, yes, my recollection is that he was the arbitrator. At one moment he was collector of customs and an officer of the government, and the next moment he was arbitrator, and then as soon as the money came to him—according to the statement of the minister last year—he came back to Dr. Jeykll again, and was collector of customs. It was perfectly absurd that he could be doing his duty in all these different capacities and that Mr. Wade could be advising him in one capacity and then in another and the crew of the ship as well, and be doing his duty to his clients. That was the argument of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries last session. I do not know sufficient of the facts to cast any reflection on Mr. Wade, but I do say that the matter was not explained to my satisfaction last year. I do not say that there is not a reasonable explanation of it, but I was not able to get any explanation last year to satisfy me, although the Minister of Marine and Fisheries exerted to the utmost his well-known powers for the purpose of making it perfectly plain that there was no ground for criticism at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think the charge was against Davis and not against Wade.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The charge was against the collector of customs. The criticism that was made on the collector was that he went as such to Mr. Wade because Mr. Wade was the Crown prosecutor, or the solicitor recognized by the government as having a standing there; and then, when this matter was dealt with by that same collector of customs as an arbitrator, Mr. Wade appeared for one of the parties before him. That was the criticism upon Mr. Wade's position. Whether there is any thing in it or not I do not know.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think that was it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Before you leave the estimates I would like to answer a question which was asked by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) with reference to the residences of the Supreme Court judges of British Columbia. I have the information with me now, and perhaps I might as well read it so that the hon. member may see it in Hansard if he desires to look at it :

Chief Justice McColl : On his appointment as puisne judge the order in council stated : 'and that the county of Westminster be assigned to him as the county in which he shall reside and usually discharge his duties.'

The commission on the above order in council is as follows :—

'We do hereby assign to you, the said Angus John McColl, as such judge, the county of Westminster, in the said province of British Columbia, as the county within which you shall, during our pleasure, reside and usually discharge the duties of the said office of such judge.'

When Judge McColl was appointed chief justice of British Columbia, the order in council said : 'that the Victoria judicial district be assigned to the Honourable Angus John McColl as the district in which he shall reside and usually discharge his duties.'

Judge McColl's commission as chief justice does not mention his place of residence.

Judge Walkem :

Order in council does not mention place of residence.

Commission says : 'and your residence within the said province of British Columbia.'

Mr. Justice Drake :

Order in council does not mention residence.

Commission says : 'hold office during good behaviour, and your residence within the said province of British Columbia.'

Mr. Justice Martin :

Order in council states : 'that the county of New Westminster be assigned to him as the county in which he shall reside and usually discharge his duties.'

No mention in commission of residence.

Mr. Justice Irving :

Order in council says : 'that the county of Vancouver be assigned to him as the county in which he shall reside and usually discharge his duties,' and

Commission, 'and until otherwise ordered by our Governor General in Council, we do hereby assign you the county of Vancouver as the county within which you shall, from and after the date hereof, reside and usually discharge your duties as such judge.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is also a matter which the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) mentioned to me before he left. It is with regard to an appeal from the high court of the Yukon territory. I understood from the Minister of the Interior that that appeal was to be confined to the Supreme Court of the province of British Columbia, and I want to know from the Minister of the Interior whether or not he has taken into consideration the advisability of having an appeal—either a further appeal or an alternative appeal—to the Supreme Court of Canada. Speaking without very much knowledge of the class of litigation which might be dealt with on such an appeal it would seem to me that the magnitude of some of the cases which probably would arise there would justify either an alternative appeal or a further appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. A precedent can be found for that in the statute which deals with the admiralty jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court. From the local judge of the Exchequer Court sitting in admiralty an appeal may be taken either to the judge of the Exchequer Court at Ottawa, or to the Supreme Court of Canada; and if the appeal is taken in the first instance from the local judge to the judge of the Exchequer Court, then a further appeal may be taken from him to the Supreme Court of Canada. It seems to me that the Minister of the Interior may very well take into consideration as to whether some such scheme as that is not necessary in view of the magnitude of causes which probably arise in the Yukon territory. As to whether or not suitors in those courts should not have the benefit of an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, as suitors in other provinces have with respect to litigation involving very trifling amounts, I would be glad to have an expression of opinion from the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not catch the first remarks of my hon. friend, and I thought they applied to appeals in mining cases, but my hon. friend the Solicitor General says the leader of the opposition refers to appeals in ordinary civil cases.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was referring to cases which were dealt with by the Minister of the Interior when he made a statement to the hon. member for Pictou the other day in the House. I am not very familiar with the jurisdiction of the courts in the Yukon. I suppose there is an appeal in ordinary cases to the Supreme Court of Canada, is there not ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. To the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If there is not an appeal from the Yukon court to the Supreme Court of Canada at present, I would extend my remarks to that. I think the magnitude of many mining claims would justify a further appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada—at all events, an alternative appeal.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The jurisdiction which the Minister of the Interior has officially in regard to mining claims arose under the mining regulations, and has gone on for a considerable number of years. As I explained to the House in answer to the hon. member for Pictou, it has now been changed by constituting a court of appeal, consisting of the two judges of the court and the Gold Commissioner. We have not in any ordinance provided for an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. I fully recognize that there is a good deal to be said in favour of a further appeal. A doubt exists whether that could be given by ordinance, in all probability an Act of parliament would be required. That, of course, would not involve any difficulty if it were considered wise as a matter of policy to have such an appeal. The principal difficulty I had in my mind in connection with the question of an appeal arose from the consideration that in deciding appeal cases myself, I found the most serious difficulty in thoroughly understanding the references to the markings on the ground. Although there were in some cases three or four or half a dozen plans made by surveyors on the ground, and although I had for several years given special attention to the mining regulations, and had discussed the conformation of the ground with surveyors and other people familiar with it, yet I had great difficulty in one or two cases in being certain that I understood, from references in the evidence and the decision of the Gold Commissioner, the conformation of the ground. Many cases that came before me practically turned upon some fact to understand which it was absolutely necessary that a judge should know the nature of the country, and something about the conformation of the ground. It is almost impossible to tell this from the words used by witnesses. For instance, as an illustration, I may mention that the question in one case was as to where the base of a hill was. Witnesses on one side said it was at a certain point, and they described the conformation of the ground—how quickly the ground rose at that point

and the growth of grass and timber there—and they got back to the question whether this rising ground had been there 100 years or 200 years. The evidence was of such a character that it was next to impossible to a person who had never seen the country to understand what the evidence meant. I felt, therefore, that for the present at least, it was very doubtful if it would add anything to the probability of a just decision of such cases to take them from a court composed of two judges who are necessarily brought into familiarity with the facts and circumstances, to judges who would be altogether new to the mining regulations and the questions of fact which they would have to decide. I am quite of my hon. friend's opinion, that if on consideration it would seem probable that a more accurate decision would follow from an appeal to a higher court, in some cases we ought to give an appeal, because the value of the property is very great; but, so far as I have been able to give the question any consideration up to the present time, I am inclined to the view that the judges of the appellant court down here would find a serious difficulty in disposing of these appeals. They certainly would have to give an enormous amount of time to the study of the conditions before they could feel that they were giving justice to the suitors.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, where the question was simply one of fact, there would be no advantage in taking a case beyond the Supreme Court of British Columbia to the Supreme Court of Canada; for the Supreme Court of Canada have laid down the rule that where two courts below have dealt with the question of fact in the same way, they will not interfere with the finding; at least, I think that is the usual course pursued by that court. But, I have in mind one case which occurred in the province of Nova Scotia fifteen or sixteen years ago, in which the decision of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia was reversed by the Privy Council with respect to the construction of the mining Act of that province, and on the result of that decision depended the ownership of half a million dollars worth of mining lands. In an important case of that kind, where a question of construction arose, it would seem to be right that there should be an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Consolidation of Dominion statutes, orders in council and proclamations having the force of law, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $20,000.

Mr. SPROULE. In what stage of advancement is the consolidation of the statutes?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is absolutely nothing done.

Mr. SIFTON.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. gentleman give us any information as to when it is expected to have the statutes consolidated?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The intention is, when this vote goes through, to have an order in counil passed immediately, for the purpose of appointing commissioners.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. gentleman give any information as to when they are likely to get through with the work?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The last revision was begun in 1881 and completed in 1887. We hope to do the work more expeditiously, because we intend to utilize the services of some of the permanent officials to help in the work of consolidation.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is the hon. gentleman going to have it done by the job or by the year?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We have not considered that point, but will be glad to consider any suggestions that my hon. friend may have to offer as to adopting one course or the other.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the significance of the expression 'notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act' here?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We intend to take advantage of the services of some permanent officials. There is no reason why the Deputy Minister of Justice should not be employed in important work of this kind. Other officials also should be able to render valuable assistance.

Mr. SPROULE. While that may be well, it may lead to abuse. The officials are paid for their whole time, and if you propose to employ them outside of their regular duties and pay them extra, the minister is left free to employ his own friends and give them any amount he pleases.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The intention is to select the most competent men. I do not wish to commit myself to anything when I say that we may not confine ourselves to the Department of Justice, but may ask the services of others, for instance, the law clerks of the Senate and the House of Commons. It is not expected that these gentlemen should work without additional remuneration. In the last revision, the deputy minister was paid a gratuity of $5,000 in addition to his salary of $4,000. I am not saying now what the intentions of the government are, because I do not know, but I think it proper to have the words, 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act,' so that if it is desired to utilize the services of permanent officials, that may be done.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Permanent officials, of course, are not supposed to work

during all their waking hours. They must have a certain amount of leisure, and there is no reason that I can see why they should not do some work in connection with the revision of the statutes and receive some additional remuneration for their work.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to refer to the possible contingency of the officials in the Department of Justice being employed after hours, but he also indicated that they would be employed during their regular hours. Of course, they could not charge extra for work done during these hours. But, if some of them are employed by the Minister of Justice after hours, the insertion of these words would enable him to pay them for their services.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is what I thought I was saying. Every one, except members of parliament, has certain leisure, and these officials might be employed during a part of that leisure, in doing work of this kind, and there is no reason that I can see why they should not expect remuneration for it.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not object to giving reasonable remuneration. But what I pointed out was the danger of abuse. The case mentioned by the Solicitor General is a case in point. It is supposed that $4,000 is a fair salary for the deputy minister. Yet we paid him $5,000 for his services besides, we make his salary equal to or above that of the premier. Will anybody say that that is not an abuse ? I do not care which government was responsible for it, such an action is not to be upheld. But this would give the minister power to pay some of his officers extra, whether the work is done during the regular working hours or during their spare time. Leaving the money in the hands of the department to use it as they see fit, will lead to pressure being brought to bear by these employees to get as much of it as possible, and I think that very often they get more than they are really entitled to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As I understand it, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) objects to leaving in the words 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' The Solicitor General said that no policy had been announced as to employing anybody. It may possibly be that the services of experts in the Justice Department may be required, and in order to make that possible, these words are put in.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not objecting, because, of course, the Civil Service Act provides that civil servants cannot get more than the amount voted for.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is what we supposed the law to be, though the Supreme Court has held otherwise.

Mr. SPROULE. That is what we regard as the law now. There ought to be some understanding that we are paying them fair compensation for their working time and that we are not to pay them an exorbitant price for extra work that they do. I admit that they can be properly employed in this work and that they should get proper remuneration for what they do. But I do not think that we should give any man $4,000 salary and $5,000 extra for his services during the same year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not minimize the statement made by the Solicitor General. That hon. gentleman said, and I agree with him, that he was going to employ officers in his department and some officers out of other departments. He did not bind himself to the statement that he would not go outside of the department. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries simply says that it is possible that some men in the Department of Justice may be employed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is in error. I made no statement at variance with that made by the Solicitor General. That hon. gentleman did not lay down a policy, but said that putting the vote in this form was to enable the government, if they thought fit, to employ officers of the Justice Department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would suggest that the experience of the gentlemen in the Department of Justice renders them particularly capable of doing work of this kind, and it would be a great pity if their services were not utilized in that way.

Dominion Lands—Chargeable to Income—Protection of timber lands in Manitoba and the North-west Territories and tree culture in the North-west Territories, $15,000.

Mr. WILSON. This is a new item, is it not ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). There was a vote of $10,000 last year.

Mr. WILSON. I understand that the department is going to appoint a commissioner for Manitoba and one for the North-west Territories, and, when persons want to plant tree-breaks, they may write to the commissioner, and the commissioner will go or send some person to view the place and tell the kind of trees that will grow best in that soil, and will also make a rough sketch to be sent to headquarters, where a working plan will be prepared for the planting of the trees. The commissioner or his assistants will have the oversight of the planting of the trees and will visit them from time to time to see that they are properly cared for.

If that is to be done in that vast country, you will need to have a whole host of officials to carry out the law. It does seem to me that it is altogether unnecessary. You might as well undertake to direct and superintend any other part of the work of the farm as to take control of this tree-planting. We had the commissioner (Mr. Stewart) before the Committee on Agriculture, and he explained his plan. He went on to make these statements to us, and I would like to have from the minister a statement of what he intends to do with reference to these matters.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have for a number of years believed that one of the most important needs in Manitoba and the North-west Territories was a plan that would prevent the destruction of timber lands by fire, and coupled with that some means of educating the farmers in an intelligent system of tree planting. A portion of this vote is for the purpose of providing for the protection of forests upon Dominion lands from fire, and that is a large share of the work which is done under the direction of this branch of the department. Another portion of the work is that which has been described by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, as a means of bringing about an intelligent system of tree planting. I am confident that the committee will not begrudge this sum if they believe it can be used effectively for those two purposes. We do not suggest that there should be a system which would extend its ramifications all over the territories, under which we would meet every demand that might be made in this direction for a number of years to come. All we intend to do is to get the work started, feeling confident that if it is fairly and intelligently started, the people themselves will take up and carry it along. It is in a small way much like what the Minister of Agriculture under this government and the Minister of Agriculture under the late government have done in the way of encouraging the dairy industry in the west where, on account of the special circumstances, that industry could not have been successfully started without government assistance. The primary object of this branch of the department was to provide protection for forests upon Dominion lands, with regard to which there has been a great and deplorable loss by fire in former years; and secondly, to institute, if possible, and in an educative way, a system by which the farmers may know the best kind of trees to plant and how to take care of them. If the experiment is successful, and the farmers can be encouraged to go extensively into tree planting, the result will be worth to the country much more than this small sum of money. I may say that I know of my own personal knowledge that efforts have been made for some years past to inaugurate a system of tree planting. I know of individuals who have spent a great deal of money and labour, but to no purpose, in a great many cases, because their efforts were ill directed. I have considerable hope that the result of the efforts that we are making will be to show them a more successful way, and that they will attain more substantial results.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many years has the hon. gentleman been engaged in this scheme ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We took an appropriation for a superintendent two years ago.

Mr. WILSON. I presume in talking about the superintendent, the hon. gentleman refers to Mr. Stewart ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. Do you intend to appoint two more, one for Manitoba and one for the North-west Territories ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We intend to appoint two assistants. We have appointed one gentleman already, but not for any particular portion of the country, his name is Norman M. Ross. He is a gentleman who has made a special study of forestry. He took his course at the Guelph Agricultural College, was engaged for some time at the experimental farm at Indian Head, was subsequently in the employ of the Ontario government in forestry work, and then he went to North Carolina for the purpose of studying forestry under Dr. Schenk, who is one of the greatest authorities upon forestry. Subsequently he went to Europe where he spent a short time. It is my intention, if possible, to procure two forestry experts from Germany or Belgium.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has given the House what may appear to him as a reasonable explanation of this vote, but I venture to say that no sane man in Canada will say they are good reasons. He puts this scheme on a par with encouraging the dairy industry, why, they are as utterly dissimilar as two cases could be. One is a general interest, the other is an individual interest. The hon. gentleman proposes to construct, with the public funds of Canada, wind breaks for each individual who may call upon him. I admit there is great difficulty in that country in getting trees to grow; but does the hon. gentleman mean to say that men there are so devoid of sense that they do not know as well how to plant a tree as Mr. Ross does ? Why, any country boy knows that. The record he has given Mr. Ross is an astounding one. He has made too good a case for Mr. Ross, he is too well trained. He comes here with an outfit for Mr. Ross that

is utterly worthless. I would like to know what training he gets in the agricultural college at Guelph for forestry. Then he has been to South Carolina, and he has been to Europe. I venture to think that if the whole truth were told, Mr. Ross is a gentleman the hon. Minister of the Interior wants to take care of. Now in regard to Mr. Stewart, he never had any important duties to perform. Mr. Stewart appeared before the Agriculture Committee last year, and I am bound to say that he did not make a very creditable showing. He could not tell where the timber was upon the Crown lands that ought to be protected. All he was able to say was that there were considerable belts along the railways in British Columbia where there was valuable timber. Whether that is so or not, does not materially concern the Dominion of Canada. The timber was upon the railway lands, and therefore the railway companies were interested jointly, if not solely, in that matter. Now what timber was there in the North-west Territories and in that whole country that Mr. Stewart was able to say was of such vast importance that you should have fire wardens there to protect it ? It would be utterly impossible to man that country with a sufficient number of men to protect valuable timber if it already existed there. But in the first place it does not exist, so far as we have information; and I say Mr. Stewart was appointed to a place that was a mere sinecure. First of all, Mr. Stewart was appointed, and then the department set about to find duties for him. Now the hon. gentleman proposes to give him two new assistants, he is going to Germany to get experts to do what the common sense of every man in the country would suggest. I tell the hon. gentleman that he has not shown a shadow of justification for spending one copper for performing a service that belongs to each individual instead of to the public of Canada. So far as I am concerned I am going to take the sense of the House, if there are enough gentlemen to demand a vote with me. Where is this going to end ? Is the hon. gentleman going to make this a general service, or make it a special service for a few of his friends ? It is just as the member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) said a moment ago. When a man wants a wind-break about his place, what does he do ? He sends down to the department at Ottawa to make a working plan to put out a few trees. Did any one ever hear of anything more ridiculous than that. And then the inspector is sent there to see whether the trees are well put out——

Mr. COCHRANE. With a watering can.

Mr. CLANCY. With a watering can, my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) says. I have no doubt that will be quite as sensible as the other part of the scheme—and more successful, my hon. friend says. The hon. minister says that this is educational. Is he going to educate the whole country by building a wind-break ? Certainly not. The first thing that must be sought in that country is the class of tree that will grow there. I believe that this plan was suggested to the hon. gentleman by persons who are anxious to fill positions. I think the hon. gentleman has been imposed upon. I am going to give him credit for being sincere and honest enough to have believed in the proposal that has been made to him, but he is the victim of a fraud and a sham.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am afraid I cannot accept unreservedly the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), that this plan is a fraud and a sham, nor can I accept the reasons he has given as good reasons for his belief. In the first place, he says that we had to find a place for Mr. Stewart, and that having appointed him, we had to give him something to do. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that his assumption is entirely incorrect. I think I know more about the workings of that branch of my department than the hon. gentleman does.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman does, he knows more about it than Mr. Stewart does.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There was no officer of the department to give special attention to the question of protection against forest fires, which were a source of great embarrassment before that to the department.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman state to the committee where the valuable timber is in the North-west Territories ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can give the hon. gentleman the information that we have a great deal of valuable timber. There is timber upon the Moose Mountain timber reserve, where the late government made a reserve, and where, I think, in doing so, they acted with the utmost wisdom. They expended money for the purpose of preserving that timber. Most of it is not timber of a character that is fit for building purposes. But, it is timber which supplies fuel for the population for many miles around, and it would be most disastrous if that timber were to be destroyed. In the Turtle Mountain district, and up in the northern portion of Manitoba, on the north slope of the Riding Mountains, and along the streams which flow north-westward, upon the lines of railway going through the Lake Dauphin country to Prince Albert, there are considerable belts of valuable timber. The same can be said practically of the country around Lake Winnipeg, and for many years the department has been reaping quite a considerable revenue from the timber which has been operated in the districts to which I have referred. In addition to that, upon

the mainland of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia, there is a large amount of valuable timber.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows that that is in the railway belt, and as for Manitoba, Mr. Stewart, I do not think, proposes to go there at all.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend made a mistake when he was speaking before, and if he will refrain for a moment, I will explain it so that he will not make the same mistake again. The land in British Columbia, which is known as the railway belt, belongs to the Dominion government and is under our administration. A large amount of the timber comes under the administration of the department, and that is a place where a considerable amount of care is necessary for the purpose of protecting the timber from fire.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if that timber in the railway belt has not entered into the hands of private individuals ? Has it not been sold ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman asks a question which cannot be answered wholly by yes or no. By far the greater portion of the timbered land in the proportion of, I should say, fifty to one, is still in the hands of the government. There are scattered homesteads and settled tracts in that vast tract of land, but the land that has passed from the hands of the government, as far as the soil is concerned, is a mere trifle. A considerable portion of the land has been disposed of in so far as the timber is concerned, and is held upon the same terms as timber berths are always held when they are disposed of by the department. So that, the impression of the hon. gentleman that there is no large amount of timber to be protected in British Columbia, is a mistaken one. There is a vast amount of timber, and if the hon. gentleman looked into the matter and found that there were no steps being taken to protect the timber, he would be the first, and very properly so, to criticise the department for gross neglect of duty. The hon. gentleman says that giving some instructions in regard to tree planting is for the purpose of benefiting individuals. That is perfectly true. But, my hon. friend is too late in the day when he is objecting to expenditures of this class being made, because their special benefit is not distributed equally over the whole community. We have experimental farms established by the late government and continued by this government, and I know that they have done an enormous amount of good throughout the country. But, the results of the experiments are not certainly distributed equally throughout the whole community. The benefits which accrue are more largely derived by the people in the immediate neighbourhood of the farms than by the whole community, but the information and knowledge which are acquired in the operations that take place upon these farms can be made available by the whole community, and so can the information which will accrue in the case of the operations which will be conducted in connection with the plan I have suggested in the committee. My hon. friend, and I do not blame him, because I know a great deal more about the inhabitants of the western country than he does, is quite mistaken in regard to the views the people there take of this matter. The meetings which have been held, and to which the farmers have come for the purpose of discussing this matter with the superintendent of forestry, have been attended by the most intelligent farmers in that country, who have taken a very active interest in the question, and who have been enthusiastically loud in their praises of the department for taking up this plan. It is the most intelligent of the farmers who take an interest in it, because they feel that if it can be shown without too great an expense that the farmer can grow a considerable number of trees upon his farm, his success will be an object lesson to those around him, and the work will then go on itself. One of the main difficulties in regard to tree planting heretofore has been the getting of planting material of a satisfactory kind. In Manitoba and the North-west Territories, the farmers have attempted to plant what is known as the Dakota cottonwood, and it has been in some places a success. Some few other trees have also been tried, but there has been no systematic trial of other kind of trees, which might be available for fire-guards and wind-breaks on the ordinary prairie farm. I have no doubt that the hon. member for Bothwell is perfectly honest in his criticisms. I can assure him that there is no intention on my part of doing anything except to employ the most competent person to give this suggested plan a reasonable trial. I know from experience that in so far as we are expending this money for the purpose of protecting the forests, we are only doing that which the government has always done, and which it is urgently required we should devote a little more attention to. In so far as the question of tree planting is concerned, I am perfectly satisfied that we may fairly expect to see substantial results in a short time.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman says that as an instance of the intelligence of the people in that county they have held meetings and that they were very enthusiastic over the plan. I quite agree with him that it is an evidence of the intelligence of the people that they can conceive that a work they ought to perform for themselves is being performed out of the public purse. I think there is no better evidence of their intelligence that they have the best

of it, and that they should be enthusiastic is not a thing to be wondered at. Let us come back to the protection of timber. Mr. Stewart stated that the principal part of the railway belt was in the hands of private persons who had licenses to cut, and that there was a system of protection in operation with regard to these limits long before this government came into power. It was not necessary to appoint an inspector to rove all over the country, because these lessees were willing to pay a portion of the cost of protecting the timber against fire. Mr. Stewart admitted that it would be impossible to utilize enough labour to protect the scattered timber except in a very general way. The country is very sparsely inhabited and the chances of fire are very remote indeed.

As to the tree planting, I believe that an expenditure of money for the purpose of discovering what kind of trees would grow in that country might be justified, but for the minister to propose that plans of wind-breaks will be sent to Ottawa and all that kind of thing, simply means that he is seeking some excuse to pay out money for unnecessary services. Our country is fast losing its timber. It is marvellous how the province of Ontario has been denuded, and although tree planting and re-foresting is a live question there, no one would propose to take up public funds for that purpose. If the minister would devote his attention to try and find what trees will grow in the North-west, I would be prepared to justify an expenditure of money for that, but it is absurd for him to propose to appoint men to plant trees when he does not know whether these trees will grow or not. The minister tells me that he knows that country and the people better than I do. That may be, but there is a common-sense view of this question which is apparent to every sensible man, and the proposal of the minister is not a common-sense one. What the minister proposes is practically to devote public money to construct wind-breaks for private individuals. I hope he will reconsider that proposal and proceed upon intelligent principles.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) seems to take particular objection to that suggestion which provides for a plan of wind-breaks being sent to Ottawa. I may say that when I looked into the matter myself I thought it would be too cumbersome, but that is a mere detail and not a necessary feature of the scheme at all. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) that there have been experiments carried on at the Experimental Farm with regard to the class of trees that would grow in the North-west Territories. To hand the material to the average prairie farmer would be simply waste. I cast no reflection on my constituents or on my friends in the North-west as regards their industry or their capacity as farmers, but as a rule they have no experience in tree-planting. The great majority of them are young men who have not heretofore made a success of their efforts in that direction, and it is because of this fact that the most intelligent farmers of the country have taken a great interest in this question, and have cordially approved of the proposal of the government. The main object is to furnish farmers with plant material, who are willing to take advantage of this proposition, and then we intend to see that the material is made proper use of so that we may have a few examples of success in the cultivation of trees, which in a short time will lead to general good results. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is unduly pessimistic on the question of forestry, and he is not taking wise ground when he says that the public funds should not be used for this purpose. In some of the European countries public funds have been used in this way with marvellously beneficial results, and in a comparatively short space of time the whole face of one or two European countries has been changed by scientific forestry. If my hon. friend visits us in the North-west in a few years I am in hopes that I will be able to show him that the result of this expenditure has been beneficial.

Mr. WILSON. The position taken by the minister now, is entirely at variance with that taken by Mr. Stewart before the committee. Mr. Stewart laid great stress upon the men who will have charge of the construction of the wind-breaks in that country, and he told us they should be men who had lived there for years, and who are well acquainted with the climate and the kind of trees that would grow in the different districts. He said that if any person applied, a man would be sent out to show him how to plant trees, and to tell him the kind of trees that would be adapted to the nature of the soil. The minister leaves the impression on the committee that this is only a start, as it were, while Mr. Stewart in his evidence laid it down that they would appoint one commissioner in the North-west and one in Manitoba, that these would be sufficient for the present, but that they would need to have assistants in the near future. If, on application to one of these commissioners, he is obliged to send out a man to each farmer to give instruction as to how to construct a wind-break, any one can understand that we would need to have a large number of officials. That is what I object to. I believe that the information gathered from the experimental farms, and the natural common-sense knowledge that a man who has lived in that country for a number of years should acquire, ought to be sufficient, without having to send out a government official to specially instruct him. Besides that, the

minister says that Mr. Ross has been down in North or South Carolina to study the tree business, and now he is going to Germany; which is totally at variance with the statements made by Mr. Stewart to the committee. He laid great stress on the importance of gaining information from actual experience derived from living in the country. I hope the minister has no idea of appointing a whole army of officials to teach the farmers in that country how to plant trees on the prairies.

Mr. McCREARY. This is a matter of so much importance to Manitoba and the North-west Territories that instead of $15,000 being voted for this purpose, I think the sum should be much larger. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken should remember that whereas the older provinces possess their timber and public lands, the timber and public lands in Manitoba and the Territories belongs to the Dominion. The province of Ontario has spent a large amount of money not only in preserving its timber, but in reforesting.

Mr. MONK. Not one cent.

Mr. McCREARY. The province of Ontario has spent a large amount of money for this purpose; I heard of it being discussed the other day in the local House. How many forest rangers are there in Ontario to-day?

Mr. SPROULE. An army of them.

Mr. McCREARY. Yes, and if they had been appointed years ago, the state of affairs mentioned by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) the other day, that the province was almost denuded of timber, would not now exist. If the hon. gentlemen who sat in this House in 1882 and 1883 had taken the precautions to protect the timber about the Pembina Mountains, the farmers of that district would not be in the position they are in to-day, of having to haul coal from Roche Percee or Estevan, and pay $4.75 a ton for it. The amount of money received by the Dominion for stumpage on ties, saw-logs, for cord-wood, and things of that sort must be very large indeed—more than sufficient to pay the $15,000 mentioned here. The county which I have the honour to represent has, I believe, the largest quantities of timber of any county in the province. There are large quantities of spruce west of Lake Winnipeg, and north of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway from East Selkirk to the eastern boundary of the province, and it is of the utmost importance that that timber should be protected. In fact, the city of Winnipeg derives its chief timber supply from that region. In the neighbourhood of the Riding Mountains, the Porcupine Hills, and Duck Hills, there are large quantities of timber, and if some precautions are not taken that timber will be destroyed, as the settlers going in set fire to the scrub for the purpose of clearing their land. If we had fire-breaks sixty-six or ninety-nine feet wide all around these mountains, kept ploughed and harrowed, so that the weeds would be kept down, and if fire did occur, the timber would be protected. With regard to tree-planting, that is a subject I know something about. In the city of Winnipeg eighteen or twenty years ago the people found great difficulty in getting trees to grow. Many men spent hundreds of dollars in the attempt. We tried to start parks in the city, but we did not succeed; very few understood the nature of the soil and the most suitable trees. But a few years ago we appointed a park commissioner and to-day the city of Winnipeg has as fine parks as the city of Ottawa. At first the tree-planting was not a success; but to-day we have fifteen or twenty miles of streets as well planted with trees as any streets in the city of Ottawa. That was not done until we had appointed a man who thoroughly understood the subject. We have fifteen or twenty parks in the city, some two acres in extent and others very large.

Mr. CLANCY. Was it Mr. Ross who made that discovery.

Mr. McCREARY. No, Mr. D. D. England, a gentleman from the old country, who was a gardener there, and who studied the question in this country. I have no knowledge at all of Mr. Ross, the gentleman spoken of; but I submit that it is of the utmost importance to Manitoba and the North-west Territories that this sum, and even a much larger sum, should be spent in the protection of timber and the encouragement of tree-planting.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman say what kind of tree was successful in Winnipeg?

Mr. McCREARY. Those planted on Broadway are elms. The first trees planted were the Red river maple, which in appearance is between the ash and the soft maple; but it was not a success. Where the soil is deep and heavy we have taken sand from Point Douglas and mixed it with the black soil, and where this was done not over 12 per cent of the trees on Broadway failed. It will take some time to study this question, and I think the minister might have gone even further than he has. I submit that the farmers themselves might do something in the way of tree-planting under proper instructions. The country along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway west from Moosejaw, is all barren of trees except the Moose Mountain, and the timber there is all small timber. When a man wants trees planted, the homestead entry, instead of being $10, might be increased to $20 or $25. Many men would gladly pay from $50 to $100 for a homestead with trees planted on it. This matter is one of great importance, and in view of the fact that the province of Manitoba and the Territories are

not the possessors of their own timber, it becomes the duty of this government to protect what they need as much as light and air, that is, timber for fuel.

Mr. WILSON. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if he thinks it necessary to send a special man to every farmer to give him instructions how to plant a wind-break ?

Mr. McCREARY. I do not think that necessary at all ; but if an instructor went and explained to two or three farmers in a municipality, how it should be done, the balance would learn from them.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has done great service. He has completely answered the Minister of the Interior. He has candidly told the House that there is no difficulty in growing certain kinds of trees, for it has been done in the city of Winnipeg. All you have to do is to plant elms, and you will have plenty of growth in the country.

Mr. McCREARY. The hon. gentleman misunderstands me. What will suit the city of Winnipeg may not suit the Pembina Mountains, where the soil is entirely different.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has not helped his case. If he had said that the trees that grew in Winnipeg would not grow elsewhere, he might have a case ; but his argument was the opposite of that. After the speech the hon. gentleman has made, the Minister of the Interior is without any excuse. All he need do is to furnish the kind of tree plants suitable to a locality, and let the people plant the trees for themselves. The hon. gentleman scouts the idea of the people being able to do this. It is a slander on the intelligence of these people, many of whom come from the older provinces, to say that they know nothing about tree-planting. I dare say the Minister of the Interior has brought a class of people to the country, who live by camp fires, and who might require assistance in tree-planting, as well as assistance to keep body and soul together in many cases. But I venture the statement that three-fourths of the people, in fact, every man in Manitoba and the Territories who is worth having there, knows how to plant a tree, because he is guided by common sense, and has had experience in the older provinces, and is acquainted with a great many of the varieties of timber that obtain in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. All these people would require would be to be furnished with the kind of tree plants suitable to their locality. It may be perfectly true that a class of timber that will grow in Winnipeg would not grow elsewhere ; but the business of the government could not reasonably go beyond assisting and furnishing tree plants that are suitable to a locality. This is a service that belongs to individuals and should not be paid for out of the public purse. I still believe that the hon. gentleman has completely answered the Minister of the Interior, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to answer the hon. gentleman who has spoken on his own side.

Mr. DAVIS. I fancy the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has not travelled much in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. It is a very large country. As has just been remarked, though certain classes of trees may grow well in the city of Winnipeg, it does not follow that they will grow in every part of Manitoba and Territories. There are large parts of the Territories in which the people have not yet learned what trees grow to best advantage. As to protecting the timber, that ought to have been done years ago. I have been in the part of the country where I now live for the past twenty years, and I know that there have been immense quantities of timber destroyed by fire. And this occurs not merely where there is settlement, though the hon. member for Bothwell suggested that where there was no settlers there was no danger of fire.

Mr. CLANCY. I said it was remote.

Mr. DAVIS. A certain amount of this timber may belong to private parties, for I think about 15,000,000 acres of it was given away while hon. gentlemen opposite occupied the Treasury benches. Still, I can inform the hon. gentleman that there is a great deal of good timber belonging to the people of this country. The people in the older provinces own the timber lands within the limits of those provinces ; but, the forest lands of the North-west are owned by the people of the Dominion as a whole. And, it is time that something was done to protect the timber there. In my own experience, there is township after township —yes, hundreds of them—where heavy timber grew ten or fifteen years ago and where there is now nothing but blackened stumps.

Mr. CLANCY. That is an important statement, but it is a contradiction of the statement made by Mr. Stewart to the committee. If Mr. Stewart, an official of the government, has made a statement contrary to that of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) who says he knows the facts, that fact is important.

Mr. DAVIS. I was not at the meeting of the committee, and so do not know what Mr. Stewart said. I am merely telling the hon. gentleman that I know places in the North-west Territories where, a few years ago, there were large forests and now there is nothing but prairie with some blackened stumps. That forest was very valuable, and if it had been protected it would have been there yet. One case that I recall is along the line of the Canada Northern Railway. There were immense forests there. I was through them twenty years ago. Two or three years ago I had occasion to go out

to the same place, and found nothing but prairie with a few back sticks. Not only is that timber valuable in itself, but it is particularly valuable as bringing us immigration, because the presence of timber there is very important. Young timber is springing up in those places, and it grows very rapidly. Take the poplar of the North-west Territories and Manitoba, and it does not take more than ten years to grow trees that are fit for rails. There are many instances in the North-west Territories of forests being destroyed by fire.

Mr. CLANCY. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman a question for information. If this country reforests so readily as he states, is it not an easy thing to replant these wind-breaks for farmers without government assistance ?

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman is talking as though he supposed the North-west Territories to be the same in every part. I am speaking of places where there have been trees. But there are millions of acres where there are no trees, but where, I feel prefectly sure, trees can be grown. But the people do not know what kind of trees will grow best. If the hon. gentleman will visit the Indian Head farm, he will see what trees are being grown there. But the trees in use so far do not last. An insect attacks them and kills them. If we could find a tree that would grow and last, we could turn that prairie almost into a garden. Wind-breaks are of the utmost value and enable grain to be grown where otherwise it could not be grown.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) mentioned that there are large forests there. What kind of trees are they chiefly ?

Mr. DAVIS. There is a class of white poplar, some of which grow very large. There is also spruce and what is known as the jack pine or cypress pine and others.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How large an area would these townships of which the hon. gentleman speaks—I do not suppose they are all in one block ?

Mr. DAVIS. I suppose they would cover five or six hundred miles. My own district, I suppose the hon. gentleman knows, is seven hundred miles long. On the north side it was heavily timbered, but a great deal of that timber was destroyed by fires. There is young timber growing up and we feel that it should be protected, because it will make valuabe timber in a few years. Take, for instance, the country from Prince Albert to Green Lake, and there are miles and miles of valuable timber destroyed in the last few years by forest fires, that, with a proper system, might have been saved.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What would the hon. gentleman suggest as the best mode of protection ?

Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. DAVIS. Where there is timber, men should be appointed as fire guardians. I suppose it would not be necessary to pay them very high wages. They should travel about and see that parties going into the woods carefully put out any fires they make, or if not, to prosecute such parties.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A prairie fire may start from any of a hundred different reasons. When it gets a start, is there any protection you can place around the forest in this way to protect the forest ? I am asking for information.

Mr. DAVIS. My hon. friend (Mr. McCreary) pointed out how, by ploughing and keeping the weeds from growing up you can make a perfect protection. At the same time, we should have fire guardians whose business it is at certain seasons—I suppose it would not be necessary to pay them all the year round—say, after the harvest when the grass commences to get dry, to be out all the time to see to it that fires are put out.

Mr. MONK. Would it be possible to make a system of fire guards without a great deal of expense ?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. It is not expensive. Two or three scrapes of a plough, then leave ten or twelve feet, then two or three more scrapes of the plough, and burn the grass between—that will make a protection.

Mr. MONK. But would that be of use in the case of a forest fire ?

Mr. DAVIS. I was referring to little groves such as I supposed my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) was speaking of. For large tracts of valuable timber, we should have fire guardians with duties as I have suggested.

Mr. McCREARY. Frequently a prairie fire can be seen twenty miles off. If a prairie fire was observed that endangered timber, I take it, it would be the duty of fire guardians to go out and burn a piece one or two hundred yards wide, so that the fire could not cross and get at the timber. He would take men with him with wet bags to prevent the fire he made from spreading beyond the desired limit.

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. gentleman think that that is possible as a practical means of protection, in such a wide area ?

Mr. McCREARY. I may mention that on one occasion when I was at a station forty-six miles south of Edmonton, a mounted policeman named Kitchen—there is only one stationed there—looked across the prairie and saw something and said to another party : Is not that smoke ? He went and got his glass, and said it was smoke, and within three minutes that man was on his horse, with his blankets and saddle, and started off for that fire. I afterwards inquired how he got along, and

found that although the fire was nearly seven miles away, he went there and got the neighbours out and they crushed it. A great portion of the duty of the mounted police is in stopping fires.

Mr. WILSON. Does the minister intend to take the suggestion of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) and make experiments in certain localities, or does he intend to send a man to every person that applies to him for wind breaks ?

Mr. MONK. It appears that it is a very difficult matter to prevent fires in the North-west. I understood the aim of this vote was to give instructions to farmers how to plant trees for their own protection. If that is the case, I do not see why an exception should be made in favour of the farmers of the North-west. There is quite as much need of forestry work in the other provinces. There is no money spent in this direction in the province of Quebec, and I think we have as good a claim as the North-west.

Mr. DAVIS. There is a vast difference between Manitoba and the North-western territories and the older provinces. That is a prairie country, and it is to the common interest of the whole Dominion that tree planting should be encouraged there. This is not a sectional question at all. That country has got past the experimental stage, and I think the $15,000 spent in instructing the people to plant trees on the prairie will be spent in the right direction, for it will make the country more valuable and more attractive to settlers. My hon. friend has mentioned the usefulness of the mounted police in putting out fires. But there are many portions of the North-west where there are no mounted police and which require to be protected.

Mr. MONK. I did not speak from a sectional standpoint, but it seemed to me to be an exceptional vote. Is it not possible that in the North-west, at the present stage of advancement, that people know what trees they ought to plant ? If they know what kind of trees to plant, why should we spend money to promote forestry in that section of the country more than in any other ?

Mr. DAVIS. I have said that there was a certain class of trees that the people thought was the proper kind for that country some years ago, but which turned out to be a failure.

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. gentleman not think it would be better to send them the trees and let the people plant them themselves ?

Mr. DAVIS. You would require to consider the climate, the soil and all that sort of thing. You might get trees from the experimental farm, and not one in a hundred of them would grow.

Mr. SPROULE. I remember years ago the director of the experimental farm told us they were carrying on experiments at Brandon, and at the experimental farms at Indian Head, and at Agassiz, to ascertain what kind of trees were best suitable for that country, and that they had acquired a great deal of useful information in that respect. Now whatever work was done then, the people could take advantage of in the several localities. He spoke also of the cultivation of different kinds of trees in different localities. All that was in the proper direction. But this vote, if it is to be of any use, it seems to me, should be much larger than it is. The object is the protection of timber lands in Manitoba and the Territories, and tree culture of the North-west Territories. Now from the information the member for Selkirk has given us, it seems it would require a whole army of fire rangers to keep down these fires. We know that once the fire is started on the prairie, especially if there is any wind, it extends very rapidly. I have seen a belt of fire extending fifteen, twenty or thirty miles in the night. What an immense number of men it would require to put out these fires. Many years ago when Prof. Macoun was before the Agriculture Committee he was asked the question why that country was a prairie country, and not covered with trees. He said it was because extensive fires ran over it almost every year, started by Indians, or half-breeds, or travellers. He was asked if it was possible to prevent these fires from starting, and he answered that it could only be done by employing an army of men. I can imagine that $15,000 will not go far in that direction. But the hon. member for Selkirk reminds us that we have a lot of men in Ontario engaged as fire rangers and timber inspectors, looking after the replanting of forests. I am not aware that there is any replanting going on in Ontario. I can tell him that these are a very valuable class of men to the Ontario government. One of the most important services they render to the government is in connection with the by-elections. They are always available then, always ready to serve their masters from time to time. The fire rangers, timber inspectors and that class of men are very plentiful. Mr. D. F. MacDonald, who has been well known for the last twenty-five years in Ontario, was so actively interested in the preservation of the forests that whenever there was an election he always came to the front. When there was an election in Algoma he went out and corralled the Indians and squaws in one house, he took the Indians out to vote for the government candidate, then took them back into the house, made them undress, and made the squaws put on the pants and coats and go and vote. And so he kept it up all day, and then boasted afterwards that he had put between sixty and seventy-five votes in for his candidate and got him elected. No

doubt he was a very valuable man, and no doubt the present government, especially the Minister of the Interior, very much desires a class of officers of that character under his control. They would be very valuable in carrying on elections. Cap Sullivan is another. I might mention a number of them, because I have been acquainted with their work. They are always available, always on hand whenever there is an election going on. They are more ardent in the discharge of their duties at that time than during any other time of the year. I notice that the present government are closely following the course pursued by their friends in Ontario, that is, they are constantly manufacturing offices for their friends and filling them. They are getting any army of men pensioned on the country, and it requires a large share of the consolidated revenue to pay these pensioners. The government appear anxious to multiply offices in which they can put their friends. Every man who is a defeated candidate, who has been an active election agent, they try to reward by giving him an office, and as offices are becoming scarce they are trying to create new ones. Now it would be possible effectually to control these fires, but I do not believe that can be done without a large army of men. The hon. member for Selkirk will admit that they have men already engaged in the North-west, some paid by salary and some by commission. The expenditure is creeping up all the time, but the results do not compare with the expenditure. I think the expenditure of money is out of all proportion to the benefit that accrues from it. I would be very far from discouraging a reasonable effort to ascertain what trees would be suitable for planting in that country. But, I think that the men who have lived in that country for years ought to know more about that than men coming from other countries that have entirely dissimilar conditions. I do not think that the appointment of a large army of men will ever be for the benefit of the country or even for the benefit of the men who are appointed. It will create a great army of pensioners in that country.

Mr. DAVIS. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) does not believe that a great army of pensioners is going to be appointed with a vote of $15,000. He says this grant is too small, and I think it is too small. I know the picture the hon. gentleman has drawn of the officials in Ontario, but he must not think that the people of the North-west Territories are exactly the same as he represents them. The people of the North-west Territories, from a political standpoint, do not need forest rangers to be placed there at the present time. We have all the majorities we want without the appointment of forest rangers or anything of that kind. In reference to the value of the men who are appointed for the express purpose of putting this plan into force, the hon. gentleman says that if a prairie fire started these men cannot do anything to stamp it out. If you have a forest ranger and he sees smoke five or six miles away, if he starts off when he sees the smoke, he can put the fire out, and in this way he would save probably more than it would cost to pay his salary for ten years. I do not think we require a vast army of politicians for that purpose, and a vast army could not be appointed with a vote of $15,000. I think the vote is too small. The hon. gentleman says that the farmers of the west are sufficiently intelligent to take this work upon themselves, but I would remind him that the men who have been in that country for years most heartily approve of this proposal of the hon. minister. They think it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. SPROULE. I have never yet seen any one who would refuse to accept an expenditure of money in his own locality. What I was drawing attention to was the description given by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), and the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), of the vastness of the country in which this work is to be done. I say that to make it effective it would require a large army, and this sum would not be anything like equivalent to the necessities, if you are to do effective work. This is only the commencement of it, and it will be enlarged very rapidly in the future, just as the need occurs for places for disappointed politicians. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) says that the scheme would be most valuable for putting out prairie fires, and that a ranger would be able to put out a fire if he saw it fifteen or twenty miles away. Does he imagine that during the time he would be travelling fifteen or twenty miles the fire would remain in the same locality? A prairie fire will sometimes travel as fast as a horse.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman is alluding to prairie fires; there are bush fires that could be put out.

Mr. SPROULE. They all commence on the same principle as prairie fires. They lead from the prairie to the bush. I remember very distinctly seeing a prairie fire. We saw it in the evening, and the next morning, when I saw it, it appeared to me to be twenty miles off, but in half an hour we had reached the edge of it, because it had travelled very much faster towards us than we had travelled towards it. People in that country are obliged very often to start a fire where they are to burn the prairie around them, and thus save themselves. Farmers there have had experience when whole districts of the country have been burned over. Notwithstanding the fact that the country is thickly settled, and that they get their teams out and

plough their fields for fire breaks, the fires jump over the ridges, and their crops and barns are burned. This shows how helpless a man would be in the case of a fire spreading like that. When a neighbourhood that is moderately thickly settled cannot stop a fire or keep it under control in a locality, it shows that a very large army of men would be required to do anything like effective work in a country like that.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am more than astonished that there is an intelligent man standing on the floor of this House and saying for one moment that any ordinary farmer thoroughly understands the planting of trees. Now, I would like to see the farmer who knows how to plant trees. There is as large an amount of experience required to plant trees properly as there is in doing any other work, but, after you have learned how to plant out trees, you want to know the trees to plant. I defy any man who has not had a good deal of experience to go into the forest, pick out trees, to plant them on the roadside and have them on the roadside and have them live. That is a thing you do not understand, and it is a thing that you should find out. What we want is to thoroughly understand the kind of trees that are suitable, and then we want to instruct the farmers how to plant them. Let a man under ordinary circumstances go into the woods and take out evergreen trees, and see what kind of work he will make of it. He simply cannot do it. Take some kinds of evergreen trees, and if the roots are planted on a dry or windy day no man can make them live. There is so much resinous matter in the roots of these trees, that unless they are planted on a wet day you cannot make a success of them at all. In reference to the fire rangers, we have fire rangers in my riding of South Renfrew. We have men that we hire to go and put out the fires, and they put them out successfully. They have voted against me as well as for me, and they are not Indians or squaws clothed in men's pants. They are white men, they are intelligent, and they know how to put out fire. Some of them belong to the Conservative ranks. It does not make any difference whether a man is a Conservative or a Reformer. If he knows how to put out fires, that is the kind of a man we want. The Ontario government assists in that work, they pay these men because they know how the work of extinguishing fires can be done. I think that the matter of $15,000 to assist men to plant trees in the North-west Territories is too small, and it is a wonder to me that the department did not make it $50,000 instead of $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wright) pretends to say that it requires an expert knowledge to do this work, and that no farmer understands it. What expert knowledge had Mr. Stewart in that line, who is placed over the whole body of them ? He was only an ordinary surveyor, taken off the farm, and ordinary enough at that. That is all the expert knowledge he has, and yet he is sent out to instruct the farmers.

Mr. WRIGHT. I was not talking about the farmers ; I was talking about planting trees.

Mr. CLANCY. I should judge that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wright) has no farmers in his locality. I am sure that the farmers in his county must be gratified at the certificate of character that the hon. gentleman has given them this evening. He has stamped them with the indelible stamp of stupidity. They know nothing. I did not know that the farmers were any more ordinary than the merchants. I thought they were usually a class of people who were equal in intelligence to any other class. I think their business in life has led them more particularly to the planting of trees than has that of the merchant class. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is an expert tree planter himself or not ; he did not say so, but he has hinted at it. I repudiate the slander placed upon the farmers of this country, that they do not know how to plant trees. There are people who say that the farmers do not know enough to come in out of the rain. But, I tell the hon. gentleman that if there is any class of the community that knows anything about tree planting it is the farmers. There is scarcely a farmer who has not had the ambition, the thrift and the good taste to put trees about his place, notwithstanding that he has a forest surrounding it.

An hon. MEMBER. How many does he plant for one that grows ?

Mr. CLANCY. The farmers put out their trees in the fall. I tell the hon. gentleman who takes exception to that that he does not know anything about tree planting. He should go to the persons who put out trees regularly every fall. Trees are put out in the fall for the simple reason that no growth takes place then. If the earth stays around the roots of the trees and it retains its moisture, the chances are ninety-nine to one that the trees will grow. The hon. gentleman said he had nothing to say about Mr. Stewart, and to that extent he repudiated Mr. Stewart's qualifications. I know Mr. Stewart from a boy. He is a gentleman of great respectability ; he belongs to a good family. There is nothing to be said against Mr. Stewart personally only what is very much to his credit, and it would be a cowardly thing to say anything against Mr. Stewart in a place where he could not defend himself. But Mr. Stewart was a provincial land surveyor, and while he is a gentleman of great respectability, I do not suppose he ever planted half a dozen trees in his life, if he ever planted one. He left his home on the farm when he was a small boy and

therefore had not any experience in that direction. Mr. Stewart is possessed of common sense like other people, but he has no more common sense or experience than other people in tree planting. Surely, farmers who are brought up on the farm, although their experience in tree planting be limited, ought at least have as much knowledge as other individuals in this direction.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not for a moment think that it is an accusation against any farmer to say that he does not understand the planting of trees, any more than it would be to say that he cannot make a wagon wheel, although he uses wagons every day in the year. It is ridiculous for the hon. member (Mr. Clancy) to say that a man can plant trees in this section of the country in the fall, and expect them to grow. I have had some experience in this matter and I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) that any man who would undertake to plant trees in the fall and make a success of the business, would deserve a leather medal from the hon. gentleman. There is just as much skill required in planting trees as there is in growing a good crop of wheat, and it is not every man who knows anything about that. Some of the settlers in the North-west come from all parts of the world. They often come from large cities, where they perhaps never as much as even saw a tree, and you might as well expect the wives of these men to make good butter as to expect that the men themselves can successfully plant trees. That branch of farming requires more skill than a man who has never had anything to do with it thinks. A great many people think that all they have to do is to dig a hole and put a tree in it, and stamp the earth around it, and that the tree will grow. That is not the case by any means. It wants a good deal of experience to make a successful tree planter, and a man should almost serve his apprenticeship to it. You want to know what kind of tree you are going to plant, and whether or not it will thrive in that particular soil, and in that locality. Many a tree that will grow in the woods will not grow in the open. As to Mr. Stewart, I have no doubt that he is a good and amiable man, and if he comes from the same section of the country as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy), why should he not be amiable and intelligent, and know a good deal about planting trees, the same as the hon. gentleman himself does.

Mr. DAVIS. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) inform us why the experimental farms were started. The Conservative government get credit for starting the experimental farms, and it certainly is no reflection upon the farmers of Canada that these experimental farms were inaugurated. Neither is it a reflection on the farmers that this government has undertaken to find out what kind of trees would be suitable for certain portions of the country.

Mr. CLANCY. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) the object of starting the experimental farms. One object of the experimental farm in the North-west was to do the very work which the minister now proposes to put his hand in the public purse for. Why not leave that business to the experimental farm. It is no reflection on the farmers of Canada that experimental farms were started, but I can tell the hon. gentleman that the the young men who have studied at the experimental farms have never been able to carry their teaching into practical effect when they went to work on their own farms. I defy any one to point to half a dozen men who attended the Ontario Agricultural College who have followed out the methods they were taught there when they cultivated their own farms. In that respect it has been a dismal failure. The conditions of the land in different localities vary so much that it is impossible to lay down any general scientific principle which can govern. There are two or three principles which the common sense farmer has at his command which are applicable all over, and the best farmers in the country are those who mastered these principles without ever seeing an agricultural college. I admit the value of the agricultural college for the purpose of testing seeds and so on, but for the purpose of training men to farm, it has been a dismal failure in the greatest province of the whole Dominion, notwithstanding that there have been hundreds of thousands of dollars expended on it. I repeat that the best farmers we have in Canada are not the young men who went to the Agricultural College, but they are the men who mastered the conditions of their own farms and who by their industry and sturdy common sense were able to make their way without knowing anything of any real or affected science about farming.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). How many forest rangers has the minister in his employ in the province of Manitoba, and what are their duties ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think I gave the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche, Marquette) the answer to that on a former occasion. The homestead inspectors are required to act as forest rangers whenever they are instructed by the Crown timber agent. The head timber inspector at Winnipeg is authorized to instruct the homestead inspectors in their duties as forest rangers. In addition to the homestead inspectors, there is a forest ranger, Mr. Trudel, having his headquarters at Regina ; one at Edmonton and one at Turtle Mountain. The plan which it is proposed to work out under this vote is that the homestead inspectors or the forest rangers, as the case may be, will

be instructed at a particular season of the year to employ such men as they think necessary for thirty or forty days temporarily. These men have printed instructions in the form of a book, and they have printed forms containing the clauses of the law which provide penalties for starting fires and that sort of thing, and they post these notices and warn the people of the district. Last year we did not require to employ any, because just at the dangerous season of the year, which lasts about six weeks, very heavy rains came on and it was not necessary to make appointments, so that the money voted for that purpose was saved. Under ordinary circumstances a very great deal of work can be done for three or four thousand dollars, at $3 a day, for the men and the conveyance, and when these men are only employed temporarily. The intention in regard to the whole plan is that we have a superintendent and an assistant superintendent, who has given special attention to forestry, and we expect to employ in the west a couple of supervisors who are thoroughly familiar with, and will be specialists in that class of work. I shall not discuss at length the points raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy), because I do not think that I need take seriously a great many things that he said. Most of his protests were directed against work which has been done by the Department of the Interior since it was instituted, namely, the taking of reasonable precautions against the destruction of timber, and that work must always be done by any department of government having timber lands under its charge. The argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) would go against doing anything at all. So far as this particular vote is concerned, it is simply an enlargement to the extent of two or three thousand dollars of a vote which has heretofore been always paid out of the Dominion lands appropriation.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Does the minister intend to utilize the present forest rangers for this work. He has only told us of three forest rangers who are homestead inspectors in the Territories. He has told us that he has some forest rangers in Manitoba who are not homestead inspectors.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My deputy says there are two.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Are their services going to be utilized for this work ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are at work the whole time.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). At the present time are they supposed to devote their whole time to the duties of their office ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Certainly.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Then how is it that one is a member of the local legislature ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no permanent officer a member of the local legislature.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Is not Mr. Jerome in the employ of the government as forest ranger ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am told that the gentleman to whom my hon. friend refers was formerly a member of the civil service, but he resigned his position when he became a candidate for the local legislature. He has been employed temporarily, but he is not a permanent officer of the department.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). What salary does he get now, and what did he get before ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He does not get any salary now.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). What amount of money per annum does he draw from the public treasury ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When temporarily employed at special work he gets $4 a day.

Mr. MONK. I understand the minister to say that out of this vote of $15,000 there are employed for about forty days every year the several inspectors of homesteads on account of the danger of fire ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. What I meant to say was that the homestead inspectors are salaried officers paid out of another vote ; but they are employed by the Crown timber agent for the purpose of protecting the forests from fire when so instructed. Then it is intended to employ some farmers in the neighbourhood for a short time.

Mr. MONK. Are both of these parties to be paid out of this $15,000 ? The minister mentioned that a permanent instructor with two assistants would be employed. Do their salaries come out of the $15,000 vote ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. I will give the hon. gentleman the figures : The superintendent, $2,500 ; the assistant superintendent, $1,000 ; two supervisors, $1,500 ; traveling expenses for all the officers of the department, $2,000 ; printing notices and directions such as I have mentioned, $1,500 ; plant material, $1,500 ; building fire guards, $1,000 ; and the payment of men who may be employed temporarily in the fall, $4,000.

Mr. MONK. These persons specially employed would not be inspectors of homesteads ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, the homestead inspectors are not paid out of this vote at all.

Mr. MONK. Those would be special employees for six weeks ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, special employees.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand that the mounted police, the homestead inspectors and the timber inspectors, all join in protecting the timber in that country from fire, and also that they have a right to employ other persons for a short period for the same purpose, and that they are paid out of another vote. Now, the hon. gentleman is asking $15,000 to supplement that service.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend is not taking into account the size of the district of the homestead inspector. I venture to say it is on the average from 200 to 400 miles, certainly from 200 to 300 miles. There are only four special timber inspectors engaged for a distance of 1,200 or 1,400 miles ; and they are employed in certain localities where their time is almost wholly taken up. The homestead inspectors' time is fully taken up. They simply act for a short time, because we do not want to go to the expense of employing special men when we have these men who are familiar with the country and the people. The object is to utilize for this work the staff we have.

Mr. CLANCY. Quite so ; but these gentlemen are covering the territory in that limit, and they are also in a position to call out farmers or others who must obey them, and these farmers are reasonably paid for assisting to protect their own property. Therefore, the machinery may be put in motion entirely irrespective of the chief inspector or those under him. The hon. gentleman will not say that the service has become more efficient by appointing one or two inspectors for the whole country. I am unable to see that by employing this new service the hon. gentleman has greatly remedied the difficulties that existed before. Mr. Stewart went over that country for the purpose of learning the extent of the timber in it, and he was appointed in the session of 1897 for a service unheard of before, and now it has developed into tree planting, because outside of that he has nothing to do. The hon. gentleman's statement has made it pretty clear that only about 10 per cent of this $15,000 is to be devoted to tree planting, whereas 90 per cent of it practically goes into the pockets of his own officials.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is surely carrying his argument to an unfair length. I must say that I think the hon. gentleman's argument absurd. I never said that this was altogether for the encouragement of tree planting. The vote states specifically that it is for two purposes; and I stated that it was for the two purposes of protecting the forests and tree planting. The superintendent of forestry has been in office for two years, and his salary has been voted by the House after discussion; and the animus displayed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) and other hon. gentlemen at that time is enough to account for the unnecessary length of this discussion. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) understands that this work cannot be carried on without officers, and I venture to say that no hon. gentleman will say that, for carrying out the plan outlined the officers are too many. I agree with my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) that the vote is a very modest one, considering the work that we are expected to do. We anticipate being able to show good results by carrying on systematic work on these lines for a few years. My hon. friend attempted to leave the impression with the House that this vote of $15,000 except $3,000 would go into the pockets of officials. Having heard the statements and the arguments, he ought not to have tried to leave that misleading impression with the House. The arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite have undergone an entire change during this discussion. At first they said we would require a complete army of men. That was repeated several times. And now the hon. gentleman gets up and says we have too many men. I think that the simple plan that I have explained to the committee a dozen times must commend itself to every man of common sense who has a knowledge of the circumstance as the only plan that can be carried out. We are making use of the ordinary officials of the department, the homestead inspectors, who are familiar with the country and who will take charge of the work. If it is necessary to hire men to protect the forests, these officers are authorized to hire them. Anybody familiar with the country will say that an enormous amount of work in the protection of forests can be done for $4,000. A reasonable explanation having been given and these hon. gentlemen having expressed their views, I do not know how they can justify taking up the time of the House with further discussion.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure the committee will be obliged to the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sifton) for his lecture. He says that the animus shown on the appointment of Mr. Stewart justified him in the position he takes. Objection was taken to the appointment of Mr. Stewart, not because it was Mr. Stewart, but because Mr. Stewart or any other person would be a useless official. The hon. gentleman has said that we have veered around during

this discussion. That is not the case. It was said that to give a service that would cover that country would mean the employment of an army of men, but it was stated at the same time that there might be an efficient service made up, of the mounted police, timber agents and homesteads inspectors who are on the ground, assisted by the settlers whose services could be enlisted. If the hon. gentleman thinks he defends himself by declaring that there was objection to the appointment of Mr. Stewart or anybody else on personal grounds, he is welcome to that opinion. Why, the minister had hardly warmed the seat he now occupies before he appointed Mr. Stewart. Nobody doubts the hon. gentleman's industry or ability in mastering the details of his department; but, knowing how little time he had, we may well doubt his knowledge at the time he appointed Mr. Stewart. I have nothing to say against Mr. Stewart except that he has been pensioned upon the service of this country for many years. He was employed by the province of Ontario, and when his work ceased there, he had to be taken care of, and the hon. minister took care of him. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) who is whispering to the Minister of the Interior now is telling him Mr. Stewart's history. Mr. Stewart was the Liberal candidate in North Simcoe against the uncle of the hon. gentleman who is coaching the Minister of the Interior. He was defeated there, and a place had to be found for him. And a place was found which was as worthless then as the one he occupies now is. He could never make it important——

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is making it very important.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) is the last one that should have anything to say on this subject. He did not welcome Mr. Stewart as a candidate in North Simcoe, and I am sure that he is satisfied that Mr. Stewart should be appointed to office that he might be taken care of when he did not succeed in carrying a constituency. The Minister of the Interior says that hon. gentlemen on this side in criticising the appointment of Mr. Stewart are moved by personal animus. I appeal to the minister himself that that is not very high politics. He should be able to give better arguments than that. I do not propose to detain the committee with further discussion——

Some hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure that the hon. gentleman who says 'hear, hear,' would say exactly the same if thousands of new officials were being fastened upon the service of this country. But see what this multiplication of officials leads to. The country to be covered by this service is a vast country. The hon. minister, in his supplementary estimates, is asking for more money for the outside service in connection with Dominion lands. I do not discuss that now, but I merely refer to the fact that this is not all the money that will be required. It only shows that when you multiply officials you are in the hands of these officials, you lose control of your expenditures and must increase them to serve these officials rather than to serve the interests of the country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That item being passed, we will take up No. 246.

Mr. CLANCY. But the hon. gentleman should take this up item by item. That is the custom.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. But all the other items were passed, this one being held over in order to give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) an opportunity to express his views.

Expenses of government in district of Keewatin, $2,190.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Of this sum, $600 goes towards the salary of the lieutenant-governor, $480 is for stenographer, and the balance of the money is taken up for the travelling expenses of the lieutenant-governor, who goes out about once a year, and some small expenses for printing and stationery.

Maintenance of lunatics from Keewatin, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The district of Keewatin is a sort of no-man's land, which, for administrative purposes, comes under the jurisdiction of the lieutenant-governor of Manitoba. The lunatics are brought down from that region to the asylum in Manitoba, and their maintenance is paid for by the Federal government to the provincial authorities. We have generally taken a vote of $3,000; but we think this year $2,000 is likely to be sufficient.

For the relief of distressed Canadians in foreign countries other than the United States, $500.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This vote is always taken for cases of emergency, where a British consul in foreign countries advances small sums to send home persons who become stranded and in distressed circumstances in foreign countries; and the British government look to us for repayment.

Maintenance and construction of roads, bridges and other necessary works in connection with the Hot Spring reservation near Banff station, North-west Territories, $14,420.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is the same vote as last year, and is made up as follows: Salaries, of the superintendent, $1,200; caretaker, $740; caretaker

of the waterworks, $300 ; caretaker of the museum, $200 ; estimate for repairs of road east of the bridge, $1,500 ; repairs to other park roads, $1,000 ; new road, $3,000 ; small house for the caretaker of the herd of buffalos, $500 ; care of buffalos and other animals, including $600 for caretaker, $1,500. Then, it is necessary to put in a pipe for the distribution of the hot water, which is one of the attractions of the park, $500 ; clearing land, $500 ; miscellaneous, $1,500 ; general contingencies in superintendent's office, $1,000. We ask for a vote of $2,000 for the puchase of animals. We have now about twenty-six head of buffalo, and a number of elk. I am satisfied the experiment we have inaugurated of starting a herd of buffalo will be a great success. They are breeding very satisfactorily.

Cost of litigation (Department of the Interior), $1,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have always taken that vote, or ever since I have been in charge of the department, to meet any odd case that might turn up where legal expenses are incurred. Cases arise where small costs have to be incurred in connection with the administration of timber lands. It is altogether a provisional vote. We expended last year $170 on two cases.

To provide for the survey of the boundary between the Yukon territory and British Columbia from Teslin lake to Alsek river, $20,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is for the purpose of sending a survey party to survey the boundary line between the Yukon territory and the province of British Columbia. The boundary is the 60th parallel of north latitude, and the operations of the survey party are set forth in some notes made by the Surveyor General.

Mr. GOURLEY. Is the Mr. White-Fraser on that survey party the inspector of mounted police who has lately been in South Africa ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. Mr. White-Fraser is a surveyor. My deputy tells me that he has a brother in the Mounted Police.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this a joint survey on behalf of this government and the province ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any arrangement by which the line established will be binding ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not yet. We undertook it at first at the request of the provincial authorities, and as my hon. friend will see, knowing what the parallel is. I presume it would be advisable, as my hon. friend suggested, before going on with that work, to have an arrangement with the British Columbia authorities, so that there may be no question about it. I do not anticipate there will be the least difficulty, because we are doing the work practically at their request.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). At the same time I think it would be desirable that an arrangement should be made.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that the work will only cost $12,000 for the present season, and the minister has asked for $20,000. What does he want the other $8,000 for ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are two parties : Mr. White-Fraser's party is estimated to cost $8,000, and Mr. St. Cyr's is estimated to cost $12,000.

Mr. GOURLEY. How was this boundary fixed ? Was it fixed by Imperial statute ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. GOURLEY. Originally creating the province ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When British Columbia came into confederation she came in with her boundaries.

Mr. GOURLEY. Which were fixed by Imperial Act ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. GOURLEY. Has the boundary never been ascertained on the ground until now ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. GOURLEY. How have you got along in regard to jurisdiction ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Until the last year or two there was nobody there, and it is only for the purpose of meeting the actual necessities of the case that we are going over it now.

Mr. GOURLEY. Will the hon. gentleman have some more of those maps sent to me? The people of my county are very much infatuated with them, and they have been writing to me about them.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business shall we expect to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. A few Bills may be taken up, and we will go on with supply. If the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is

well enough, he will go on with his estimates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And if not?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If not, we will take up some of the Interior estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 10, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ANCIENT ORDER OF FORESTERS.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth) moved:

That that portion of the 49th rule which limits the time for presenting private Bills be suspended in reference to the Bill respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters of the Dominion of Canada, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the 11th report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Before that motion is put, I wish to draw to the attention of the right hon. First Minister the frequency with which the rule with regard to private Bills is asked to be suspended. Earlier this session I drew his attention to the same thing, and I understood him to say that the first session of the new parliament was the proper time for the House to put its foot down on this growing practice, which tends to lengthen the session. Although we must be drawing measurably near the end of the session, the same disposition to suspend the rule continues. It is an evil that should be stopped, and I hope the government will exercise some reasonable control in the matter.

Mr. FLINT. I wish to state that the urgency of this particular Bill was mentioned at the time permission was given to present the preliminary petition. It is the only Bill at all likely to infringe the rule of the House. It is of great importance that it should be passed this session. It is exactly similar in its terms to another Bill in regard to another society which was passed a week or two ago, and I trust the hon. gentleman will not insist on his objection.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I agree altogether with the sentiments expressed by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule); but, we considered this particular case a few days ago, and came to the conclusion that the rule ought to be allowed to stand aside with respect to this Bill, but with respect to this Bill alone—nothing else.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 120) respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters of the Dominion of Canada.—Mr. Heyd.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

On motion of the Prime Minister, the names of Messrs. McKinnon and Halliday were added to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines; the names of Messrs. McKinnon and Henderson to the Committee on Public Accounts; and the name of Mr. Halliday to the Committee on Agriculture.

QUESTIONS.

EMPLOYMENT OF WILLIAM L. PRINCE.

Mr. HACKETT asked:

1. Is Mr. William L. Prince employed as clerk in the railway offices at Moncton?
2. If so, what is the amount of his salary?
3. How many days during the year 1900 was he at work?
4. What amount of salary was he paid for his services during the year 1900?
5. On what dates during the year 1900 was he absent from his duties?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair):

1. Mr. William L. Prince has been in the government railway service for many years, and is now employed as clerk in the audit office at Moncton.
2. His salary is $58.33 a month.
3. He worked twelve days in 1900.
4. Mr. Prince is 83 years of age, and in consideration of his great age, his long and faithful service, and the fact that he was in ill-health, he was paid his full salary in 1900 of $699.96.
5. He was absent from duty in 1900 except on January 4th, 10th, 14th and 15th; February 5th, 7th, 10th, 12th and 20th; March 5th and 12th.

I may add that I, as minister, had no knowledge of this matter whatever, not even being aware of such a person being in the employ, or of such having been a usage in the department at Moncton as respects any of the employees.

EXPENDITURE ON GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. BARKER—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What are the amounts of the payments made from 1st July, 1900, to the 20th March, 1901, chargeable to consolidated fund:—

(a) In respect of the Intercolonial Railway.
(b) The Windsor Branch Railway.
(c) The Prince Edward Island Railway.

2. What are the amounts of the payments made from the 1st July, 1900, to 20th March, 1901, chargeable under the head of collections as set forth in the ten days' statement of receipts and payments of Canada (item 41) :
(d) In respect of the Intercolonial Railway.
(e) The Windsor Branch Railway.
(f) The Prince Edward Island Railway.

3. What are the amounts of all expenditure on capital account, between the dates above mentioned, on the respective railways aforesaid?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I assume that the first question has reference to expenditures chargeable to income. The answer to the question is : nothing.

2. (d) Intercolonial Railway	$3,516,789 24
(e) Windsor Branch Railway	11,393 78
(f) Prince Edward Island Railway	181,458 35
Total	$3,709,641 37
3. Intercolonial Railway—capital	$1,561,578 11
Prince Edward Island Railway—capital	78,741 42
Windsor Branch Railway,	nil.
Total	$1,640,319 53

MR. JOHN MACINNIS'S DISMISSAL.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER—by Hon. Mr. Prior—asked :

1. Has John MacInnis, sub-collector at West Bay, Cape Breton, been dismissed?

2. If so, for what reason?

3. Was any inquiry made? If so, of what character, and by whom?

4. Was Mr. MacInnis given a hearing before dismissal?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) :

1. Yes.

2. For offensive political partisanship.

3. No formal inquiry or hearing was deemed necessary.

4. The information before the department being considered sufficient.

POULTRY FATTENING STATIONS.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. How many stations for poultry fattening had the government in Prince Edward Island last year?

2. Were the results satisfactory, and is it the intention of the government to continue the experiment ?

3. Who was the person employed at the chicken fattening station at Alberton, West Prince?

4. Who recommended him, what qualifications had he for the work, and was it satisfactory ?

5. How long was he employed, and what was the amount of his wages?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

1. The government had four poultry fattening stations in Prince Edward Island, namely, at Charlottetown, Eldon, Mount Stewart and Alberton.

2. The results were satisfactory, and it is the intention of the government to continue such poultry fattening stations.

3. Mr. H. J. Matthews was the person employed at the chicken fattening station at Alberton.

4. His work was satisfactory.

5. He was employed for about two and a half months, and received remuneration amounting to $92.50.

MAIL CONTRACT, GANANOQUE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Who had the contract for gathering the mail from the street letter-boxes at the town of Gananoque, previous to the 1st April, 1901?

2. Has a new contract been made? If so, with whom?

3. Were tenders called for?

4. What was the price paid for year previous to 1st April, 1901?

5. What is the present contract price?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND :

1. Wm. Gray.

2. New contract has not been completed. Service performed by D. E. Jackson since 1st April, 1901.

3. No.

4. One hundred and fifty dollars.

5. One hundred and forty-five dollars.

NEW POST OFFICES.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked :

How many new post offices have been established in each of the provinces since 1st August, 1896?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND. From the 1st of August, 1896, to the 1st of March, 1901, 1,071 new post offices were established in Canada, distributed according to provinces, as follows :

Ontario	226
Quebec	227
Nova Scotia	167
New Brunswick	85
Prince Edward Island	28
Manitoba and the North-west Territories	215
British Columbia	123
Total	1,071

ST. ANNE'S LOCK SUPERINTENDENT.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked :

1. Who is the superintendent of St. Anne's lock?
2. What is his salary?
3. Was the appointment made by an order in council?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Mr. S. D. Hamilton is the overseer of St. Anne's lock ; there is no superintendent of this lock.
2. Fifty dollars per month.
3. No.

SOREL POST OFFICE REVENUE.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked :

1. What is the total revenue of the Sorel post office for the last fiscal year?
2. What was the amount in 1896?
3. What is the present salary of the postmaster?
4. Is he bound to pay his assistants out of his salary?
5. If so, does the department know how much the postmaster of Sorel has to pay them, and what is his net salary?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND :

1. Two thousand one hundred and twenty-two dollars and forty-three cents.
2. Two thousand three hundred and fifty dollars and twenty-seven cents.
3. Nine hundred and fifty dollars, including $200 for forward duty.
4. Yes.
5. No.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM REPORT.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked :

1. What are the respective dates on which the English and the French editions of the Experimental Farm Report of December 1, 1899, were printed and distributed ?
2. Is it true that the French edition of the report was printed and distributed one year and more later than the English edition?
3. If so, is it the intention of the Department of Agriculture, with a view to the interests of the French-speaking agricultural class in the country to adopt suitable means to ensure the printing and distribution of the French edition of the report of the Experimental Farm simultaneously with the English edition?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). The Department of Agriculture has not full control of the printing and distribution of these reports.

LABOUR ORGANIZATIONS.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. What labour organizations in the Dominion of Canada was Bill No. 47, now before the parliament of Canada, submitted to by the government?
2. What labour organizations approve of the Bill as it is now printed?
3. What labour organizations, if any, opposed the provisions of the Bill?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Bill No. 47 was submitted to the president of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, Mr. Smith, M.P., for Vancouver, and also to Mr. Puttee, M.P., for Winnipeg. Both these gentlemen approve of the Bill as far as it goes, but reserve the right of moving amendments and making suggestions.

THIRD READING.

Bill No. 32 to provide for the marking and inspection of packages containing fruit for sale.—The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Sydney Fisher).

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I think that when my estimates were last under consideration we left off at the discussion of the item for increased accommodation at Halifax.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister will remember also that the first item, that relating to steel rails and fastenings, stood over. He was to furnish me the tenders from the different parties who have tendered for the work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My deputy took a memo. of the matter, and he will bring the information that the hon. gentleman asked for. We may go on with the other item, that of increased accommodation at Halifax.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to Capital—Railways—Intercolonial Railway—To increase the accommodation at Halifax, $60,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This amount is being asked for because the traffic at Halifax has been increasing to such an enormous extent that our present accommodation is entirely inadequate. Besides the other work to be done, there is a cribwork retaining wall required at Richmond.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The amount voted last year was $16,200, and this with the amount now asked for will make a total of $76,200. What is to be done for this amount ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The works we have undertaken are in addition to the improvements at North street, and the cribwork that I have

referred to. We have to extend the yard at Richmond. There is a grading and filling at that point that is a very expensive item. It involves, if my memory is correct, a good deal of rock excavation and is estimated to cost not less than $60,000. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), will probably be able to verify my impressions as to the character of the work to be done there. The improvements altogether will necessitate an expenditure of $120,000 in round figures. We expended, during the year ended 30th June, 1900, $22,000, and, up to the 1st of January last, $3,000. We propose to expend $60,000 this year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There was a report of the Committee on Railways and Transportation adopted by the council of the Halifax Board of Trade on the 10th of December, 1899, which probably dealt with some of the matters that the Minister of Railways and Canals has brought to the attention of this committee. I would like to read that report in the hearing of the minister in order that he may have an opportunity to explain to what extent the difficulties and defects that are referred to in it will probably be removed by the expenditure of this money. The first paragraph says :

1. The business in the railway yard, both at Richmond and Deep Water Terminus, has largely increased, and, unfortunately, the capacity for transacting the business has not only not increased in corresponding ratio, but it has actually diminished. Inquiry and experience have satisfied the committee that the present yardmaster is unequal to the task which is imposed upon him, and they would respectfully suggest that he be transferred to some other sphere of duty, and some active and thoroughly competent man substituted for him.

So far as that is concerned, I do not know the yardmaster, and have no opinion as to his fitness or capacity for the place.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The man referred to has been displaced, and another man, believed to be competent, has been appointed in his stead.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The second paragraph of the report reads :

The committee are further of opinion that the yard has not the equipment in the way of shunting engines which is needed to deal satisfactorily with the traffic.

I will send this report over to the hon. minister.

3. The committee are satisfied that some rearrangement and enlargement of the track accommodation in the yard is desirable, and that, in order to deal satisfactorily with freight shipped or landed at Deep Water, an additional track connecting that terminus with Richmond cannot well be longer dispensed with.

I will presently read the resolution of the council of the city of Halifax pointing out the desirability of expropriating certain properties on Upper Water street, which would meet the difficulty suggested by this paragraph.

4. The committee express their regret that the dredging beside pier No. 4 at deep water was not done during the past season, and would recommend that as the carrying on of the work after this date would seriously interfere with the docking, loading and unloading of transatlantic steamers, it be postponed until after the opening of navigation in the St. Lawrence in the spring of 1901.

So, according to the views of the committee, some work of that kind that remains undone should be performed during this present spring.

5. The committee are impressed by the evidence which has been submitted to them of the great delay which occurs in the transportation of freight between western points and Halifax, and between Halifax and Sydney, and trust that while the increased delay may be due largely to an increased business of the Intercolonial Railway, means may be found by the Railway Department to improve the present unsatisfactory condition of things.

This report was made more than a year ago, and possibly the inconvenience in this respect may have been remedied by the department since.

6. It has been felt for some time by the public, as well as by the officers of the Intercolonial Railway and Dominion Atlantic Railway, that the state of business called for the laying of a second track on the Intercolonial Railway between Halifax and Windsor Junction, and the committee trust that an item for the doing of this work may be placed in the railway estimates for the coming year.

They were referring then to 1900. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has taken that into consideration. There is a large amount of business over that portion of the line, 14 miles, between Halifax and Windsor Junction, and that has to bear not only all the business of the Intercolonial Railway which comes into Halifax, either from the north or from the east, but it has also to accommodate all the business of the Dominion Atlantic Railway, which is by no means small, and which is increasing from year to year.

7. The committee cannot conclude without an expression of regret that on more than one occasion their communications to the Railway Department have not been acknowledged, and venture to express the hope that similar oversights will not occur in the future.

The eighth paragraph is a recommendation that the attention of the department be drawn to the necessity of a more adequate accommodation for the passenger traffic at North street station.

I observe there is a note at the end of this resolution stating that since then the yardmaster has been removed to another sphere of duty and that his successor has been

appointed. Now, in order not to take up the time of the committee unnecessarily, I will submit to the hon. gentleman at the same time a resolution which was passed by the city council with respect to the expropriation of land on Upper Water street. The hon. gentleman, of course, is familiar with the line which connects the main line of the Intercolonial Railway with the deep water terminus; he knows that part of Upper Water street in the city of Halifax is occupied by that line. It has been there for a great many years, I believe it was originally put there on account of the desire of the city to secure a terminus at deep water. They passed a resolution, as I understand, authorizing the laying of the railway on that portion, or a portion, of the street. The result of placing the railway there has been to narrow the street, of course, to a great extent, rendering it much less useful as a public highway than it was before. But that has not been the only result. A further result has been that the property immediately adjoining that on the west has been almost entirely destroyed for the purpose for which it was formerly used. It has deteriorated in value to an enormous extent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is that deterioration of recent occurrence?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it has been going on ever since the railway has been placed on the street, and the proprietors at one time commenced an action against the government for the purpose of recovering damages. The hon. gentleman knows the difficulty that arises where no portion of the proprietors' land has been taken. No portion of the land of any of these proprietors had been taken, and upon commencing litigation they found that there were great difficulties in succeeding, and eventually I think the petitions of right were not successful. Nevertheless, no one can doubt that these people have sustained great damage, and it would seem an equitable thing at least that some compensation should be made to them. Neither the former government nor this government could ever see their way clear to do anything, thinking that as there was no legal liability it was not an occasion that called for interference. Now, what the city council suggests in their resolution, which I will read, is that increased accommodation is required for the Intercolonial Railway at Halifax, both at the deep water terminus at North street, and at Richmond, and that the increased accommodation could be best provided by expropriating land between Water street and Lockman street, as far south as the deep water terminus. I believe the property could be acquired at a very reasonable rate, and I venture to think that the suggestion made by the city council in this resolution is worthy of very careful and earnest consideration on the part of the Minister of Railways and Canals and of the government. The matter arose in the city of Halifax recently in this way: It was proposed to erect a cold storage plant in the northern part of the city, and there was necessity in that connection to obtain a siding or some right of way over that portion of the Intercolonial Railway which runs along this street, and an application was made to the city council. In dealing with that, the city council passed this resolution:

> With reference to the granting of permission for the laying of a railway siding on Upper Water street, that such permission could not be granted. Your committee would recommend, however, that immediate steps should be taken by the council to impress upon the Dominion government, not only the great desirability, from a commercial standpoint, but the utter necessity of the taking over of the land by the government in order to furnish anything like adequate facilities for the handling of freight.

That has since been followed up by another resolution of the council in the month of March, which is of the same purport, and I will not trouble the committee by reading it. I think the minister has already had this matter under consideration to some extent. I desire to press its importance upon him, not because it is a matter affecting my own city and my own constituency, but because it is a matter affecting the entire business of the Intercolonial Railway which comes into the city of Halifax. I think we may look for some development of that business, and I believe the minister himself looks for great development of business over the Intercolonial Railway into that city; but as long as we do not have first-class accommodation and proper facilities for handling freight it would be impossible for that business to develop to any great degree. At the present time those who are more capable of forming an opinion upon this matter than I am, think that the facilities are not adequate to a proper development within a few years; indeed they say the facilities are not sufficient for the business now. If that be so, it is necessary to provide increased facilities, and I see no better way in which the minister could do it than by taking that portion of land. In saying that, of course, I speak with great diffidence, because I am well aware that I have no practical knowledge of the subject which will entitle my opinion to much respect. But it does seem to me that the land lying immediately beside the track of the Intercolonial Railway, extending from the North street station down to the deep water terminus, is land that could be more useful to the Intercolonial Railway for the purpose referred to than any other land that I am aware of in that vicinity.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Chairman, having reference, in the first place, to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has stated, particularly in regard to taking over the property on Water street, I may say to my hon. friend that that subject has received a good deal of consideration from the department and from myself personally. I have not, however, I am free to confess, up to the present moment, felt that the interest of the railway or the public service was so much involved in the question as the interest of the private land-owners themselves. They naturally have a desire to dispose of this property, property which I agree, has been, to some extent, possibly to a considerable extent, depréciated in value by reason of the railway line running along that street. But, this is not, by any means, a recent grievance, it is one of very long standing. The condition which exists today has prevailed for many years. I do not think that things are much worse at this moment than they were ten, or fifteen, or twenty years ago ; so that, while I think that if we had plenty of money, if things were easy with us, it would be rather an advantage for the railway to own this particular property, we have not thought that, in the pressure under which we were to afford the accommodation to the public, we ought to defer doing what is altogether and entirely necessary in the public interest, doing what is more for a private than a public interest, or which is as much a private as it is a public interest. My hon. friend, when he suggested that this property would be a good property for us to acquire in order to improve our facilities, did not have in his mind the consideration that it is not always best that a railway should acquire property for such a purpose in the heart of the city or necessarily very close to the city. The object of railway policy in that direction at the present time is rather to get out of a city, to go where you can get land as cheaply as possible, and where you can lay down your yards at the least possible expense. We are endeavouring to do that, and that is why we are doing what we are at Richmond and in the neighbourhood of the North street station, rather than in the more settled part nearer the centre of the city. We have endeavoured to meet the urgent demands of the business people of Halifax in our present proposals. I do not say that we have covered all the ground that we would desire to cover, but we are approaching the question with a full appreciation of the necessity of more and improved accommodation being provided for the business of Halifax. It is unquestionably growing, it has grown of late, there is a congestion at the present time, and business men have good reason to complain that they have not the facilities provided for them that they need. We think that what we are now proposing to do will very largely meet the present needs at all events, and meet the needs of the immediate future as well. I think if my hon. friend understands, as I am quite sure he does, what our scheme of improvement is, he will admit that we are responding reasonably, at all events, to the demand which the business men of Halifax have made upon us ; at all events, in an equal degree with any other portion of the country through which the line runs. My hon. friend read in the resolutions that it was the opinion of the Board of Trade and the city council of Halifax that the line should be double tracked between Halifax and Windsor Junction. That question has been looked into. We have not come to a final decision in respect to it. It will be an expensive work when it is undertaken, and my own desire has been rather that we should see whether or not, for the present, and for some few years to come, we might not extend our sidings. We might lay a double track for a few miles of the distance between these two points, laying it down where it could be built less expensively and thereby answer the purposes of the relief to traffic. To double track the whole line between Halifax and Windsor Junction would be an expensive work, because there are points where a good deal of heavy rock cutting would have to be done. I think we can have six or eight miles of track in one continuous line on a portion of the road which would be comparatively inexpensive, and which would afford very great relief and sufficient relief to answer for some time. It is to that point that we are now directing attention. I think I would like, before deciding upon it in my own mind and before dealing with the conflicting views which may obtain upon it, to look over that section of the road myself, which I think I will be able to do at the close of the session. During this session, at all events, I would not be in a position to ask my colleagues to make any appropriation for the purpose of laying down either all or any portion of the double track between these two points.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) perhaps, misunderstood the ground upon which I was putting forth the suggestion that the property on Upper Water street should be acquired by the government for the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway. My reference to the depreciation of the property of the land-owners there, was more with the view of pointing out to the minister that the property could be acquired at a very cheap rate. I did not intend to suggest, that, because these gentlemen had certainly what one might call a moral grievance on account of the depreciation, therefore, we should acquire the property. I was not suggesting

that, but I was pointing out that it could be acquired at a very low figure. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says that this is not necessary, and that what is being done at Richmond will answer the purpose for the present. Of course, he knows a great deal more about the actual working of the railway than I can pretend to know, but I do understand that at deep water itself there is a very great deal of difficulty on account of the lack of room for sending cars there, loading and unloading them, and a lack of facilities for the purpose of handling the business of the Intercolonial Railway. I do not know to what extent that can be remedied by having a yard at Richmond a mile off or more. It did seem to me that this land which is immediately adjoining would improve the accommodation which needs to be improved at deep water, and I have no doubt it would. Of course, the question remains as to whether the necessity is great enough to justify the hon. minister in going to the expense of acquiring the land. The hon. gentleman is responsible for any opinion in regard to it, and of course he is in a better position than I am to form an opinion in regard to it. But, I do know that a great many people and the leading business men of Halifax think it is absolutely necessary now, or in the immediate future, to increase the room at the deep water terminus itself, or in its immediate vicinity. I trust, that, although the hon. minister may not see his way clear to take that into consideration now, he will bear it in mind and that if the accommodation is necessary for the proper development of the business of the Intercolonial Railway at Halifax it may not be delayed to a too distant future.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How is the removal of that rock connected with the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is connected with the improvement of the deep water terminus.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. To what extent is the elevator at Halifax used by the public ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think the hon. gentleman would expect me to remember all these details. He would oblige me if he would refer to the public statement which is taken from the records and he will find it there.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total expenditure on terminal facilities and accommodation at Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Up to the end of December last it was $2,168,143.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is that all ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, I made a mistake. I included an amount which did not belong to it. It is $1,997,553.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If the minister has not the report from his officer recommending this work under his hand now, would he bring it after dinner ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman knows the way these matters reach us. They come in the form of estimates from the department at Moncton. This matter has been the subject of representation by the city council of Halifax, and by the board of trade, and I do not know that we would have any departmental recommendation further than that involved in the estimates. If there is any such I shall bring it down.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister must have a recommendation from his department for this expenditure.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think the estimates contain any formal recommendation.

Mr. MACLEAN. In connection with these appropriations for the Railway Department, I wish for a moment to again direct the attention of the minister and of the government to the fact that the time has come when the government system of railways should be administered absolutely independent of politics. If we ever are to have a national system of railways in this country, we must begin by taking our present system out of politics. I trust that before this parliament meets again the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) and the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) will be able to announce with the sanction of the government that hereafter the railways and the post office are to be conducted irrespective of all kinds of political influences; that the administration of the railway will be in the hands of the best officials that can be obtained, that they will be well paid, and that they can do their work unhampered by political interference. The idea of national railways is growing in Canada, and I want to see it grow. I want to see the Intercolonial Railway extended from ocean to ocean. I am prepared to see the Intercolonial Railway extended to the Georgian Bay to-day if a reasonable proposition for that purpose can be secured. To begin with, let us do as they do in England, and take the administration of our railways outside of politics. No member of parliament should have a word to say in the appointment of postmasters or brakesmen or anything of that kind.

Mr. COWAN. You used to have a lot to say about it.

Mr. MACLEAN. The gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House think this is an absurd doctrine. They like to be dabbling in this kind of business, and they like to be trafficking in senatorships. If that kind of traffic has obtained in the past the people of Canada want to see it ended now and for ever.

Mr. COWAN. We like to follow your good example.

Mr. MACLEAN. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) who represents the cake-walk district of this country will follow a good example when he gets it from a man like me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN. We have had enough of cake-walk interruptions in this House, and I hope we have heard the last of them. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do trust that the Minister of Railways and the First Minister will recognize that Canada is proud of her national railway, and that the people of this country would like to see it developed. I believe that the people of Canada would like to see the railways and the telegraph and telephone systems taken over by the government, but to begin with we must take these enterprises outside the domain of politics. I hope the Conservative party will come before the country in a very short time and declare that it is one of the planks in their platform to de-politicalize the railway system and the post office service of this country. If that be done, the people will think more and more of these great public institutions, and will be prepared to invest more of their money in the extension of them.

To pay land damages for subway at Amherst, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to build a subway at Christie's Crossing near Amherst which is a very dangerous point, and we require some additional land in order to do that. We require some additional land, which we have reason to believe will cost us $1,000, and we are asking for a vote with which to purchase that land. We have had an appropriation for the subway, and have expended it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And this is to pay for the land you take ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to pay for the land we have been obliged to take, and land damages. The chief engineer reports that this amount, he believes, will be sufficient to cover both. Last year or the year before we had an estimate, speaking from memory, of between $10,000 or $12,000 for the work, which has been done.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is a small item, but it is an extraordinary statement the minister makes. There was apparently a level crossing, and for the purpose of protecting the public he builds a subway. How could damages to the extent of $1,000, or any damages, occur ?

Mr. GERMAN. They certainly occurred in Toronto, when a subway was built there on the streets.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is a subway on an ordinary road in the country. What land damages could occur two or three miles outside of Amherst, for which $1,000 would be payable ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not going to pay any more than we are obliged to pay. The names of the claimants are Charles Patterson and the heirs of Moffat. In making this subway, I understand that we have cut into and injured the land of these two people. This roadway goes down a valley, and then rises up and crosses the railway on a level crossing, and we are building a subway under the tracks, and in doing so we are cutting into the valley on the one side or the other beyond our own boundaries.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How far is this place from Amherst ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. About a quarter of a mile.

Mr. WALLACE. What quantity of ground is taken ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know how much.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the minister in regard to the accommodation at Sydney. I am requested to ask if he has come to any settled conclusion as to whether he will make any change in regard to the running of trains to North Sydney and Sydney. As I understand, North Sydney is on the main line, while Sydney is on a branch.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman was not here when I made my reply on that subject, but he will find it in 'Hansard,' to the effect that we will be issuing the time-table for the coming season in a short time, and we contemplate making arrangements to remove the dissatisfaction which exists, which has existed for many years, but which is undoubtedly becoming more acute by reason of the increased business at Sydney. We hope to provide such accommodation for both places as will satisfy the rea-

sonable demands of the people resident in those places.

Mr. SPROULE. By what means do you hope to accomplish that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There would be different means of accomplishing it. One would be by having a train run out from North Sydney, and connect with the express when it arrives at Sydney junction—the main express going into Sydney, which would, perhaps, carry the major part of the travel. Another arrangement that might be made would be to increase the number of our express trains from Mulgrave, and arrange to have one train a day leaving North Sydney, and one train a day leaving Sydney, and on the return one train going to North Sydney and the other to Sydney. I do not know that it would be expedient for me at this moment to state to which of these plans my own preference would incline. But, the hon. gentleman can say to those who are inquiring of him, that the subject is not being overlooked, but that it will be dealt with in a manner which I am sure will be reasonably satisfactory to the people.

Mr. SPROULE. My information is, that the first plan would not be satisfactory, for this reason, that it would be making practically a branch of what was originally a main line. It would necessitate a transfer at Sydney Junction, instead of the train going on to North Sydney, which, I am told, is practically on the main line, and connects with the regular boat, which carries a large number of passengers. If the other plan were carried out, of running through trains—one from North Sydney and another from Sydney—I do not suppose that the same objection would prevail. But, the first suggestion will not, so far as I am informed, meet with the approval of the people of North Sydney at all. They have protested against that before, and will likely do so again.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not expect to be able to satisfy the people of both points, and I have some doubts as to whether I shall be able to satisfy them at either of the points. If the last suggestion I made were to be adopted, I am quite sure that the people, at least from one of these localities, would complain that both trains were not serving their particular point. There are objections to the running of through trains unless the needs of business justify it, and it is not a serious consideration for people to get on board a day car—a comfortable commodious car—and run up five or six miles and then change into another car. That is not at all a serious grievance, and if they can get first-class service, as they will by submitting to a little inconvenience of that kind, I do not think they can make much of a case on which to appeal to the public against the decision of the department. We have been giving the people of Cape Breton a great deal better service than they have been heretofore receiving. We have put additional trains on, and I think we will be justified in still more improving the service by giving, probably all the year round, a day and night service each way. But for some little time to come, it would not be reasonable to ask us to duplicate that improved service for both towns.

Mr. SPROULE. It may not be much trouble for passengers to get on and off a train, but when it is contemplated to make what was heretofore the main line a branch line, and make the other the main line, it seems to me it would be wise first to determine which line carries the largest number of passengers and the greater amount of freight. I understand that North Sydney is the line which connects with the boat line, whereas the other does not connect with any regular boat line.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The proportion of passenger and freight traffic is very much larger to Sydney than North Sydney. I would think two or three times as large. The other has steamboat connection with the Bruce and Newfoundland line, but with all that there is no real analogy between the two cases, so far as the volume of passenger and freight traffic is concerned. When you get to North Sydney you get practically to the terminus of railway connection, except so far as steamers are concerned, but when you get to Sydney you have connection with the Louisburg railway, along which line there are several important mines and large centres of population. The mines of the Dominion Coal Company are located chiefly along that railway, and the connection with Sydney brings you into contact with the population at these mines and at other points on the Louisburg railway.

Mr. SPROULE. What would be the respective population of the two places ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The population of Sydney is about half as much again as that of North Sydney, and in addition you are serving the population of these mining towns and villages along the Louisburg line.

Mr. MACLEAN. Has the hon. minister sufficient terminals at Sydney or is he likely to have to buy terminals at a high price from real estate speculators ? I hope that the country has something to show for the $2,000,000 invested in terminals at Halifax. The esplanade at Toronto is a very valuable work, which cost a great deal of money and is traversed by miles of track, but I do not think it cost quite $2,000,000. $2,000,000 for terminal facilities in Halifax is

rather a large item, and I would like to know whether the people are getting value for their money. If North Sydney is to develop as we are told it will, I hope that the hon. gentleman will have proper terminal facilities there, and thus avoid the necessity of having to pay two or three years hence, exaggerated prices for real estate in that town.

Original construction, $2,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is that for land damages ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, this is construction, the old item.

Land Damages—Oxford and New Glasgow and Cape Breton division of the Intercolonial Railway, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is an old item. Usually for the last ten or twelve years, $2,000 has been voted, but this year we believe that $1,000 will be sufficient. The only claims now pending relate to the Cape Breton division. They are : Charles E. Leonard, land damage in connection with the right of way of the original construction of the Cape Breton line ; Catherine McKenzie, and James and David Dowling, for the diversion of a stream. We believe that the amount here asked for will be sufficient for the claims to be paid during the year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We might as well take up the first item, which was held over—steel rails and fastenings.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Very well.

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to Capital—Railways—Intercolonial Railway—Steel rails and fastenings, $500,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I see by the returns brought down by the minister that he had tenders from seven parties, and as he stated, they were very nearly the same as that at which the contract was given. Did the hon. gentleman make inquiries as to the price of rails in the open market, the price paid by the ordinary railways of the country ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To what time does the hon. gentleman refer ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Within the last eight or nine months. The price has not varied for about six months.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the price to-day is lower. If you are ready to place an order to-day for delivery nine or twelve months hence, you can get quite a reduction upon the price we had to pay last year.

Mr. MACLEAN.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the price now ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know, but I think that it is probably $5 or $6 less than it was.

Mr. MACLEAN. The price is $24 a ton.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The highest market price at any time during the last five months has been $25 a ton. I have here the contract that the hon. minister has made with Mr. Clergue and his company, and I must say it is the most extraordinary contract that I have ever known to be presented to a House of parliament. This agreement was made in October, 1900, one month before the general election. I gathered from what the minister said the other day that he was ashamed of it, because he stated that it was for only 25,000 tons of steel.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I stated just what it was, did I not ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This contract is for 125,000 tons of steel. That is to say, here is a contract for about $4,000,000 that the Minister of Railways and Canals has entered into without consulting parliament and without a single dollar voted by parliament. What becomes of the promises made by these hon. gentlemen when in opposition ? What becomes of the principle they promised to carry out if returned to power—that no contract of any importance would be given without being first submitted to the House for its sanction ? Here the hon. minister, off his own bat, a month before the election, enters into a contract with a man who has had not a single forge, who was not in a position to manufacture a single steel rail, for 125,000 tons of rails at a price for the first year of $32.60, the price afterwards to be fixed in a very uncertain manner. Here are the words of the contract :

Whereas, for the purpose of encouraging the erection and equipment in Canada of plant and machinery for the manufacture and production on the most modern principle, of steel rails and plates and bridge material, the aforementioned Minister of Railways and Canals has been authorized to execute a contract guaranteeing to the company the acceptance by Her Majesty, during the five years next following, of 25,000 tons of steel rails at prices fixed as hereinafter specified. It is, therefore, agreed by and between Her Majesty, for herself, her successors and assigns, and the company for itself, its successors and assigns, that Her Majesty will in each year from the year 1901 to the year 1905, both inclusive, purchase from the company and take delivery of 25,000 tons of 2,240 pounds to the ton, of first quality steel rails, eighty pounds to the yard, of section from time to time prescribed and approved by the said minister.

Then, as to the price, it is fixed in this manner :

That, with the exception of the year 1901, for which year the price per ton is hereby fixed at

$32.60, the price for such rails per ton shall be the same as the price obtainable for the same quality of rails in the open market in Great Britain at the time when the respective orders for such rails are given under the said contract.

Now, if the minister is correct—though I see nothing about it in his contract—there is from 2 to 3 per cent of nickel in the rails. Unless the nickel is mixed in England to get rails of the same quality, it will be impossible to fix the price by the market price of rails in England. The contractor, before he goes into the enterprise, has $3 per ton promised to him in the form of a bounty for every ton of steel manufactured in Canada.

Mr. WALLACE. He gets $3 per ton for pig iron and $3 per ton for steel.

Mr. MACLEAN. And something out of the Ontario government.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, he gets $6 per ton from this government besides a bounty from the Ontario government. And he has a contract for five years to sell steel rails to a total of 25,000 tons, virtually at the price of $32.60 per ton. What better thing could a man desire with which to go into the market and raise capital for the purpose of fulfilling his contract ? The government have not only made an agreement for the purchase of these rails, but they have virtually furnished the capital to carry out the contract. I protest against this growing habit on the part of the government of letting contracts without tender. It was one of the principles laid down by these hon. gentlemen when they were in opposition that no contract should be let without tender. They also insisted that no contract of importance should be let without being first laid upon the Table of this House for the approval of parliament. I do not know what this country is coming to, when the purchase of locomotives, the purchase of cars, the enormous expenditure on capital account of nearly $2,000,000 for the Intercolonial is left to an individual, when it is left to the government of the country to enter into contracts for such enormous sums without competition. There is something wrong on the face of it. The contract does not bear the date it was entered into, it only says : 'An agreement made this day, 1900.' The party who engrossed and backed it was more honest than the party who copied the agreement, because he says the date of the agreement was in October, 1900.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Look at the agreement, I think you will see the date mentioned.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, yes, 9th of October, 1900.

Mr. WALLACE. Was that the date the writs were issued for the elections ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Very near it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is difficult to follow the hon. gentleman in his statements, they are so wild, so misleading, so entirely inaccurate, so unfair. I confess I feel some difficulty in dealing with the statements as they merit. I am willing that a comparison should be made between the methods of this government and the methods of the government with which the hon. gentleman was connected. I am willing that the bona fides of the transaction should be sifted, and examined, and investigated, and turned over in every shape and form. And after you have done that, what will you find ? You will find simply that the government has endeavoured to pursue a course which, without a loss of a dollar to the public exchequer, would guarantee, if it were possible to do so, the establishment of an industry which will be of an enormous advantage to this country. I would not have expected that an hon. gentleman who belongs to a party that professes to absorb almost all interest in the industrial enterprises of Canada, should have been the first to complain of an arrangement of this kind, so well calculated to confer immense benefits upon the country, by the encouragement of an industry which could not possibly hope to succeed unless it received aid and encouragement in a proper and legitimate way from the government of the country. Now, Sir, away back in the month of June last, as I told the House yesterday, this subject was a matter of discussion. Before the close of the last session of parliament, I find, as early as the month of June, a formal proposal was made to the government by Mr. Clergue. If that proposal was one which was proper and commended itself to the approbation of the government, do I understand from the hon. gentleman that it ought to be rejected because an election might possibly occur in the near future ? Do I understand the hon. gentleman to tell this House calmly and seriously that that is the course which he and his party pursued when they were in power, that they abstained from entering into a proper, necessary and legitimate contract because somebody would suspect and charge them with having done so in view of an impending election ? I say it is childish and absurd ; and however much the hon. gentleman may have succeeded in warming himself up on this question, he will find it difficult to impress that view upon any reasonable electorate in any constituency in Canada. In the month of June, I say, we received a formal proposal from Mr. Clergue pointing out that they were anxious, in connection with their enterprises at the Soo, having large mineral interests, having an enormously valuable deposit of iron ore of a character which would make a superior steel, to establish an industry for making

rails in Canada. Well, will anybody say that is not a desirable thing to encourage ?

Mr. MACLEAN. The Liberal party have said it from time to time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not care what the Liberal party said. I do not think the Liberal party ever proclaimed any such policy. I think the hon. gentleman will find it difficult to quote even individual members of the Liberal party—and individual members are not competent to speak for the party—who declared themselves against any such proposition. As long as there is no wrong done to the country, as long as there is not a dollar of burden placed upon the exchequer beyond what is necessary and reasonable, as long as you are not taking money out of the pockets of one person in order to put it into the pockets of another, I say it would be a laudable and legitimate policy and one which it is the bounden duty of any government to adopt and carry into operation, if they could do so under the circumstances which existed in this case. Mr. Clergue made this proposition, made it in good faith. It was considered in good faith, and it was finally determined upon by the government, not in the form of an order in council, but some time before the order in council was passed, some time before the date of the contract. It was determined upon by the government, and the conditions upon which such contract would be made were settled by the government.

Mr. WALLACE. When did the minister say the order in council was passed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If my memory serves me, it was in the month of September, not long before the date of the contract which has been read by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The contract itself states that the order in council was dated the 9th of October.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That may be the date on which the order was passed, but the recommendation to council, I am quite sure, went in in September, because I was not here on the 9th of October, and could not have been present at that time. 'On a memorandum dated the 26th of September.' Then the order goes on to say it was in September that the report went to council, and the order passed on the 9th October. Well, now, what are the terms of that contract ? If that is open to criticism, then let the hon. gentleman criticise it, as it is his right to do. Do the terms state that we are to pay to this Lake Superior Power Company any price they may ask ? Are we to pay a price higher than the market price ? No, we are not to pay a price higher than the market price.

Mr. WALLACE. You are paying it this year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not paying a price higher than the market price. If, six months, or nine months, or a year, after a contract has been made, the price has declined, it is not fair to any government, it is not fair to any individual, to say that he was paying an exorbitant price, and attempt to prove it by the fact that the price has since declined. That is no evidence. At the time this contract was made the price of rails, from what information I could gather, was as high in the English market as the price we paid.

Mr. CLANCY. Was it necessary for the hon. gentleman to enter into such a contract at the time he did, and pay the exorbitant price that he now admits he paid for these rails ? Did he require the rails then ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I want the hon. gentleman to understand that he is not quoting my observations correctly in the remotest degree when he says that I admitted paying an exorbitant price.

Mr. CLANCY. Why, the hon. gentleman said a moment ago that the rails could be bought probably $6 a ton cheaper now than then.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But what does that prove? Does it prove that when the contract was made the price was higher than the market price which existed at the time ? It proves nothing of the kind. I tell the hon. gentleman that you could not go into the market in the months of October, September, August, or July last, and make a contract for the delivery of rails at the time specified in this contract at any less price than the price we made it for. And you cannot go into the market to-day, if my information is correct, and make a contract for the delivery of rails within six, nine or twelve months—

Mr. OSLER. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong in that statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) know ?

Mr. OSLER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then I will have to yield to his superior knowledge. I am speaking from my information. I do know that when we made this contract for these rails we were not agreeing to pay an exorbitant price. I do know that the enormous demands that were being made at that time upon the rail manufacturers made it impossible to get

an early delivery at a less cost than that which is named here. Now, so much for this year. We are not bound as to what the price will be next year. When we come to settle up for the next year's supply of rails, if the contract which has been entered into is carried out and the rails are delivered, we will have to ascertain what the market price is in England and the market price in England is a safe guide. If you go by that you are not paying an exorbitant figure, and we have this company under obligation to accept from us the price which rules in the English market. If they do not agree to furnish us with rails at the price which rules in the English market, we stipulated in making our contract that we were not under any obligation whatever to take the rails from them; that if they have not fulfilled their contract we are under no obligation to fulfil ours. That is a perfectly safe arrangement. I do not know how it would be possible to hit upon any terms which are to have reference at all to the future which would secure or guarantee the exchequer of this country against any loss, against any imposition in price, other than the terms in which that contract has been framed, and when it stipulates that we shall go to the open market in England to find how much it would be just and fair to pay them for rails we make a stipulation which I do not think anybody can say is not an ample protection to the exchequer of this country.

Mr. SPROULE. There are two features of it that attract our attention at the present time. The first is the unwisdom of entering into such a large contract without parliament being consulted. All this is wrong and hon. members on the other side of the House for years and years invariably declared that it was wrong and condemned the previous government for doing that kind of thing to an extent which they thought was not justifiable. Now, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) says that there is nothing wrong in it. It seems to me to be practically another Yukon job—a worse job, some say than the Yukon job. It is, at all events, on a par with it. The same principle is involved. It is dealing with the money belonging to the country in a high handed way which is not, in my opinion, justifiable. The next feature of it is that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals did not treat the House with perfect frankness or fairness when he made the statement he did yesterday. What was that statement? We have entered into a contract with Mr. Clergue for 25,000 tons of rails at $32.50 a ton.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) pardon me for an interruption because it may avoid the necessity of his stating what he is proceeding to do. If he will look at 'Hansard' he will see just what I said on the subject. I said that we had no explicit contract for the full five years, that we had only fixed the rate for one year, and that subsequently, if they were prepared to sell us 25,000 tons of rails per year at the price which ruled in the English market, we understood we had an arrangement with them to take that quantity. These are the very words. Is not that really what we have done?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, I should say not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what I certainly would say we had done. I will read what I did say:

> When we had assured ourselves with reference to what would be a reasonable price to pay, we made a contract with this company to deliver 25,000 tons of the quality and standard which we have been placing upon the road, a rail eighty pounds in weight, and we were to pay them $32.50 per ton, the delivery to commence in the first week in August, and to continue at such a rate that we would be able to lay them before the snow fell. They were to be delivered to us in Montreal—that is in the present year. We have no permanent and explicit contract with them for the future, although in their proposal they asked us to give them a contract for a term of five years, and to give them an order for 50,000 tons with which to commence their industry. We finally concluded to give them an order for 25,000 tons, and while we have no explicit contract with them for any term beyond the year in which we are now entering, we have an understanding with them under which, if they furnish us, as they engage to do, with rails of the quality and standard we require, and at the current price in the English market, we are prepared to continue to take our rails from them.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is a contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is a contract, is it not?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, certainly. That is a contract to buy for five years.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, I say that we had no explicit arrangement because the price is entirely indefinite.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, you have a five years contract with them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is just as I stated, is it not?

Mr. MACLEAN. You said it was for one year, and now you say that it is for five years.

Mr. OSLER. You have a contract for five years.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have an understanding that we are to purchase rails from them providing they are willing and ready and prepared to sell them to us at the market price in England.

Mr. TAYLOR. You are obliged to take them by your contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not obliged unless they agree to give them to us at the prevailing price in England.

Mr. OSLER. Does the hon. minister say that the contract is all on one side? The government have bound themselves to take 25,000 tons a year, but it is not a contract unless the manufacturers like to give them these rails each year. It is a contract on the minister's side, but it is not a contract on Mr. Clergue's side.

Mr. GERMAN. Do hon. gentlemen object to taking Canadian rails if the government can get them as cheaply as they can be got in other quarters?

An hon. MEMBER. You will have to vote for it anyway.

Mr. SPROULE. I respectfully submit that my statement was absolutely correct that the minister did not treat this House with frankness and fairness. He left the impression on the House that the contract was only for 25,000 tons, whereas it is for 125,000 tons. He has read from 'Hansard' and his words have supported the statement that I made. He had a signed and sealed contract between the Minister of Railways as representing the government, and Messrs Clergue as representing the contractors. If this is not a binding contract, I do not know what it is. The condition of the contract is that they shall supply 25,000 tons of rails every year after the first year at the current market value. It is a contract all the same. I say it is not treating the House with frankness that the minister should mislead the House into the belief that there was no contract except for 25,000 tons to be delivered the present season. The other feature to which I wish to refer is the time at which the contract was entered into. When was it? In October at the very time that the writs had been issued and when the elections were on. I do not know what the date of the contract was.

An hon. MEMBER. The 9th of October.

Mr. SPROULE. The elections took place on the 7th of November. The contract was entered into at the very time that the writs had been issued and when the elections were on. About the same time he entered into a contract for nineteen locomotives at Kingston, when he telegraphed to his friend there regarding it, so that it might do the greatest amount of good to the party in power at that time. This has explained to me what would seem inexplicable before. I found that the Messrs. Clergue were very active agents in the interests of the present government during the election.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In your county.

Mr. SPROULE. They were making themselves very active in our part of the country. They were writing most diplomatic letters that had a political purpose, and when I wrote to them inquiring if there was truth in the report that this was done for election purposes, they did not deign to answer until about five weeks ago, because they did not dare to do it without having to confess. Now we have the explanation of the whole thing. They were playing into the hands of the Hon. Wm. Mulock, who was directing the campaign in that part of the country. Now we see the nigger in the fence. This contract comes out. A day ago, the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) told us that the contract was for 25,000 tons of rails, but he admits to-day that it is for 125,000 tons, and he merits the condemnation and censure of this House for not treating us with fairness. The minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) bought these rails in the face of a falling market. It must have been known to him that the price of steel was going down at the time he made this contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at that time.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, it was going down at that time. And to-day, only a few months after he made this contract, he is forced to admit that the price is $6 a ton less than this contract price. The whole thing looks like a scaly transaction, and the public of Canada will condemn it and condemn the minister. It is a contract that should receive the condemnation of this House and of the country.

Mr. MACLEAN. There is an old saying about teaching your grandmother how to suck eggs, and here we have the Liberal government professing to teach the Conservative party to set up an industry in this country. In fact the Minister of Railways has delivered us a lecture on the subject. Well, we do want an iron industry in Canada, and the government should encourage it, but they should go the right way about encouraging it. In this case they have gone back on all their record in the past; they have started out to build up an iron industry now, a thing which they told us in the past was an impossibility in this country. Why did they not invite capitalists to confer with them and discover from whom they could receive the best terms. That was not their policy at all. But just when an election is at hand they make a secret contract about which the public know nothing until four months after the elections are over. The whole transaction has not a good look about it; and especially so when we remember that these very men have heretofore been opposed to

the encouragement of an iron industry in Canada. They told us it was a hot-house industry, and that you could only encourage it by bounties and prohibitive duties, but now they go back on all their professions in this respect. What does the hon. member for South Oxford (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) say now about encouraging this hot-house industry ? In speech after speech, year after year, he has declaimed against encouraging any iron industry in Canada. What has he got to say now ? What has he to say to his colleagues in the government professing to teach the people of Canada to-day how a steel industry is to be encouraged here ? They make a secret contract and that in itself is opposed to all their declarations in the past. They should have intimated to the rail-makers of the United States and of Great Britain and of Europe that they were disposed to encourage the production of steel rails in Canada, and that they were prepared to make a contract with the company that would establish that industry on the best terms. But they make a secret arrangement which they are ashamed of now, and which the people of the country from one end to the other will repudiate. What becomes of their old idea of having public competition for all these things ? Why, Sir, with the bounties and one thing and another the people of Canada will have to pay $40 a ton for these rails.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What has the bounty got to do with it ?

Mr. MACLEAN. The people have to pay the bounty.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will have to pay the bounty anyway.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman is begging the question. The people of the country will pay in round figures $40 a ton for these rails, and as to the price of rails in the market to-day I read the following extract from the New York World of yesterday :

> Mr. Charles Thullin, a Pennsylvania contractor, recently secured a contract to supply rails for Russia's great Siberian Railway. He asked the leading steel trust companies here for bids. They all asked him about $35 per ton, with freight to be added.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How does that strike you ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Wait a minute.

> Mr. Thullin went over to England, sub-let his contract to an English firm, and one of the same companies that had asked him $35 plus freight here, sold the rails at $24 a ton, delivered in England to the English sub-contractors.

That is the ruling price to-day ; $24 a ton for these rails, rolled in America and delivered in England.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the ruling price, is it ?

Mr. MACLEAN. That is the price quoted in the New York World of yesterday for these rails for the Siberian Railway delivered in England, and it is $24 a ton. As my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) has pointed out, this contract was made with Mr. Clergue in the face of a falling market. A man in the position of the Minister of Railways must have prevision, and the government must have prevision and they must have known that the market for steel was declining. Every one knows that the price of iron had got to the highest point about a year ago, and that there was bound to be a decline, but in the face of that the government made this contract. I say that the contract is a bad one, because it was made in view of a falling market. I say that the contract is a bad one even on the ground of encouraging a native industry, because the government did not go the right way about it by putting it up to competition. I say that the contract is a bad one, because it was made in secret, and I say that a grievous wrong has been perpetrated on the country by the government in entering into such a contract. We have heard something about there being nickel in these rails. Is nickel an essential part of the rail, or will Mr. Clergue say hereafter : I am willing to abide by the price in England; but what is the price in England for rails containing two or three per cent of nickel ? That price may be $30 or $40 a ton in England, because they cannot make nickel rails in England, and thus we may have to pay an exorbitant price under this contract. Surely the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) cannot justify this. The minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) tried to make the House believe that this was not a five years contract, but from what we have heard to-day the period of five years is one of the essences of the contract. True the price may be reduced a year after, but if that idea of nickel being in the rails has any meaning, it undoubtedly may interfere with any reduction in the price. The result of the whole transaction is that this country is committed to a five years contract for rails with Mr. Clergue, and at a price which Mr. Clergue may fix and not the government. That is how it looks to me. What can the people think of this government professing to encourage the steel industry in this country ? Why, they are going back on their record as free traders. Did not we hear the Prime Minister state the other day that he was still a free trader, and did not believe in the encouragement of hot-house industries in Canada. What has he got to say to this transaction ? The two things do not go together. There is in them what is in nearly every one of their propositions, a great deal of hypocrisy. They are hypocrites in regard to taxation,

in regard to expenditures for public works, in regard to the encouragement of native industries ; and it will be as political hypocrites that they will be tried by the people of this country. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) smiles ; what does he think of this transaction ? We all remember the steel rail scandal in the time of the Mackenzie government ; but, it was as nothing compared with this. Steel rail scandals run in the blood of hon. gentlemen opposite ; this one comes out in the second generation. This great steel combine in the United States may collapse ; it may not be able to overtake English, Belgian and German competition ; and steel rails may before long rule at $20 a ton. True, they may go up ; but, no minister can justify what the hon. gentleman has tried to justify to-day—the making of that contract for five years in view of a falling market. No, he made it in view of an election on the 7th of November last.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is difficult to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. To-day it suits their purpose to complain that the government has not gone to the United States when it desires to procure additional rails. If it were a case of cars and locomotives, such as have recently been purchased by the government for the Intercolonial Railway, and the hon. gentleman were to repeat what he has stated in this House, and what other gentlemen beside him have stated year after year, he would say that it was a crying wrong for this government to have gone to the United States and asked American manufacturers to tender. It was used as an election cry from one end of Canada to the other by hon. gentlemen opposite and their newspaper press, that we did not get our locomotives in Canada, but had got most of them in the United States. I would like to know what we can possibly do to satisfy these hon. gentlemen. We felt that every interest called upon us to encourage the building of locomotives in Canada. We took hold of the matter, knowing that gentlemen of capital were willing to revive the Kingston industry, gave them a contract, and encouraged them to put their money into the enterprise of constructing locomotives in Canada. We have done the same with regard to rails.

Mr. CLARKE. Are you supplying the money ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So far as the purchase price of the article made for us is concerned, yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Are you supplying the money for the locomotives made in Kingston in advance of delivery ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are furnishing the manufacturers of the locomotives at Kingston with payments on account as the work progresses.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly we are ; we are not ashamed of it ; we glory in it, if you want to know, because it is giving employment to 500 or 600 men in the city of Kingston.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let the heathen rage—we stand on our record ; and we put the rail question on the same footing as we put the engine question. They stand together, and they will be both defensible, in the good opinion and the judgment of this country.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the minister allow me to ask him a question in regard to that ? Why did he not do that before, instead of sending orders for twenty locomotives to the United States ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I thank the hon. gentleman for asking me the question. We did it the moment an appeal was made to us to do it. We did not do it before, because we had given to the Kingston works, while they were in operation, orders for the building of every locomotive they would undertake to build ; and we did not go to the United States for an engine until they failed us. They had contracts for the manufacture of engines for the Intercolonial Railway unfinished when they closed their doors. Yet, hon. gentlemen opposite, from one end of Canada to the other, denounced the conduct of the Minister of Railways and the government because we did, when necessity compelled us, go outside of Canada and get locomotives from the neighbouring country. But, Sir, men came to us who, we were satisfied, had an interest in the country, and who desired to re-establish those works, from a public point of view as well as from a business point of view ; and they said, we will get the capital, put it in, and give employment to 500 or 600 people at least to commence with, if you will give us an order so that we can get the undertaking on its feet. As soon as they agreed to do that, we ceased to give orders for locomotives to the United States. We hope we shall be in a position, when these works are under way at Sault Ste. Marie, to do the same thing with regard to the production of rails. The establishment of a steel rail industry means a great deal for Canada. The amount of money going out of Canada for rails would be greatly augmented with the increased construction of railways in the future. A very large drain is made on the resources of Canada ; and when Mr. Clergue came to us and made such a proposition as he did in June last, knowing him to be an enterprising man, knowing the character of the work he had achieved, and

the immense number of people to whom he was giving employment, we felt that he was entitled to a hearing——

Mr. MACLEAN. And a contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And we gave him a hearing on business grounds ; and I want to say to my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) that we did not contract to buy upon a falling market. We ascertained what the price of rails was then. There were some people who thought that after a lapse of time, possibly before many months, the price of rails might fall ; but, there was then no evidence of it, and there was a great body of opinion to the effect that the price of rails would continue to rise.

Mr. SPROULE. Was not the price of steel going down all the time last year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, Sir, I say it was not ; and I defy the hon. gentleman to prove that it was. I can bring the names of persons who bought rails after we made this contract, and who agreed to pay a higher price than we agreed to pay.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who purchased at a higher price ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think I can give the hon. gentleman the statement ; I am going to ascertain. We did not buy in a falling market. The hon. gentleman takes out his New York paper, and absolutely ignoring the very language and pith of the statement he reads, says it shows that rails can be bought in the open market at $24 per ton. But, what he did read shows that the price which the makers of rails asked is $35 per ton.

Mr. CLANCY. The combine price.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. And the hon. gentleman bought at the combine price.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not, unless all the rail producers throughout the world are selling at combine prices. I bought at a price which I was satisfied was the market price ruling in England. Is that a combine market ?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the whole world is in a combine, and you have to buy rails at all, then you have to buy them from a combine market. If what the hon. gentleman says is true, I do not see how you can avoid buying in a combine market. The hon. gentleman says that $35 is the price that was asked, and that since rails have gone down, and we can buy them at $24. We find from this statement read by the hon. gentleman that $35 was the price asked by the rail manufacturers when called upon to name the figures they wanted ; but later on, when they found that these rails were going to England, they agreed to lower the price in order to be able to supply the English market. Is the hon. gentleman not aware that that is a common practice among manufacturers and not confined to manufacturers of the United States alone ? There may be manufacturers in this country who do the same thing, and it is a practice which is very common among manufacturers in the United States.

Mr. CLANCY. Why did the hon. gentleman not avail himself of this practice and get the rails at reduced prices ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why then does the hon. gentleman denounce the Minister of Railways and Canals for doing with respect to locomotives what he has the temerity to call on him to do with respect to rails ? If he can condemn us in the one case for doing a certain thing, how can he condemn us in the other case for not doing it ? The hon. gentleman is riding a pair of horses, each of which is going in a totally different direction from the other. You could not establish the industry in Canada if you went to the manufacturers of rails in the United States and said to them : We want to get quotations from you for rails to be shipped to Canada in competition with rails that may be purchased from other sources. How quickly would they not, in that case, drop their prices from the figures they would ask if we simply went to them and asked their quotations. The hon. gentleman is denouncing us for not having done the very thing which, under their national policy, they have always contended against our doing. Prior to the adoption of the national policy, they were continually asserting that the manufacturers of the United States were being permitted to make a slaughter market of Canada, and yet to-day because we have adopted a course with respect to the manufacturers of rails, which is calculated to establish the industry in Canada, and prevent the making of this country a slaughter market, they say that we are doing wrong. The present attitude of these hon. gentlemen is entirely inconsistent with the platform on which for years they have been standing. I leave my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) to reconcile, if he can, the statement he himself read with the inference he drew from it. It will be absolutely impossible——

Mr. MACLEAN. My statement which I read shows that the Russian government are getting rails for their railway at $24 and we are paying $32, plus the bonus, or about $40 per ton. I cannot reconcile the hon. gentleman's course with the facts.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If he cannot, I am not going to undertake to do it for him. We have agreed to take these rails for the current year at this price.

Mr. SPROULE. And for the succeeding four years.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not agreed for more than one year.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not the contract signed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not fix the price at all.

Mr. SPROULE. No, but it does the number of tons you must take yearly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly, we will take for the other four years 25,000 tons yearly, but have not fixed the price. We will take the rails at the current market rate in England.

Mr. OSLER. Is there any period fixed during the year for naming the price ? The manufacturer will no doubt tender each year his supply of 25,000 tons of rails at that particular period of the year when the prices are highest. It seems to me that the government are bound to take the rails at the price ruling at that particular period of the year which is most favourable to the seller.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. At whatever date we require these rails to be delivered we will expect to have them, and will have to allow the company reasonable time in which to manufacture them. The price will be that which will rule in England at that time. We will determine upon what is a reasonable and proper time, under the circumstances, to allow for the manufacture of the rails, and then can insist that the price shall be fixed. If the other party is not prepared to agree to the price at that time and make a regular contract with us, then he is not prepared to carry out his agreement.

Mr. OSLER. There is nothing in the contract to cover what the hon. minister has just stated, namely, that he can fix the price himself.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It must be implied that the price is to be fixed in advance and according to the market rates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am sure we are glad that one use at least has been found by hon. gentlemen opposite for the national policy, and that is to justify a contract for five years for 125,000 tons of steel rails, not submitted to parliament, and which contract, when it is mentioned in parliament by the hon. gentleman, is not stated very accurately, to put it very mildly. The hon. gentleman tells us about market prices during the past year. If his statement about market prices is not more correct than was his statement yesterday about this contract, I do not think the House would be inclined to place much reliance on it. Here is what the hon. gentleman said about this contract yesterday.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said at the same time that I would bring the contract down, and if the contract is any more explicit than was my statement, made from recollection, the contract is here and speaks for itself.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman comes down here with estimates and undertakes to give the House certain information. The House is entitled to rely on that information. If he cannot trust to his recollection, he should have the contract in his hands ; he should not make statements that are not justified by the contract when brought down. He has persisted in stating that his remarks with regard to the contract were correct——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In effect correct.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They are not in effect the same.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the hon. gentleman's view.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And I think I can persuade the hon. minister, if he is capable of persuasion, that that should be his view also. This is what he said :

> We have no permanent and explicit contract with them for the future, although in their proposal they asked us to give them a contract for a term of five years, and to give them an order for 50,000 tons with which to commence their industry.

That is pretty explicit. But the hon. gentleman was not satisfied with that. He went on :

> We finally concluded to give them an order for 25,000 tons, and while we have no explicit contract with them for any term beyond the year in which we are now entering, we have an understanding with them under which, if they furnish us, as they engage to do, with rails of the quality and standard we require, and at the current price in the English market, we are prepared to continue to take our rails from them.

No one would suppose, having regard to what the hon. gentleman stated, that there was an actual contract under which the government is bound to take 25,000 tons a year for five years from this very company. But the hon. minister will not dispute that now. He does not dispute it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If they furnish them we are bound to take them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, is that not a contract? The only difference between the contract for the present year and that for the ensuing four years is that in one case the price is fixed at $32.60 a ton, and that in the other place the price depends on a question of fact which is capable of being ascertained. The contract is, therefore, just as certain a contract, just as valid and just as binding with respect to the other four years as with respect to the first.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not as explicit.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by 'explicit.' He said he had no permanent contract with them. But he has brought down a contract covering a term of five years which is just as much a contract for the whole five years as it is for the first year, notwithstanding the difference as to fixing the price to which I have referred. That I may not be accused of speaking without the book, I will read the first paragraph:

> That Her Majesty will in each year during the years 1901 and 1905, both inclusive, purchase from the company and take delivery of 25,000 tons of 2,240 pounds to the ton of first quality steel rails, eighty pounds to the yard, of section from time to time described and approved by the said minister.

There is a distinct engagement.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the date of that contract?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The date does not appear here, but it purports to have been made under an order in council of 9th October, 1900. The other part, as to the engagement of the company to furnish the rails, is found in the last paragraph:

> That the company will execute all such contracts as may, during the period of said five years, be drawn in accordance herewith or presented by the minister for execution, and will manufacture and deliver the said rails for the said prices, and in all respects will comply with the provisions of the said contracts or any of them.

Surely, the hon. gentleman should not have come to this House and told us, as he did yesterday, that there was no contract for a term of five years, but a contract for one year with an understanding—an indefinite understanding apparently—as to the remaining four years. But I would like to know why the hon. gentleman found it necessary at that particular time to enter into a contract for a term of five years. He talks about encouraging the industries of Canada. Well, we are all very glad indeed to see that the hon. gentleman is converted to the view that the industries of Canada should be protected and encouraged, that he has become a believer in the national policy which some of his colleagues, in days gone by, have denounced in such scathing terms.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The time referred to by the hon. gentleman is the time when he himself entertained different views.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know that the hon. gentleman need have very much to say about that. Perhaps he will inquire of his colleague (Hon. Mr. Fielding) who sits beside him if he holds the same view with regard to secession that he held in 1886.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The House knows all about that. It has heard about it before.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not desire to refer to that, and would not have done so had not the hon. gentleman's colleague brought it forward. But I am ready to discuss the matter with the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals or the hon. Minister of Finance at any time and under any circumstances.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no objection.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the Minister of Railways and Canals is not doing his colleague any credit when he introduces that subject in the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Don't mind me.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not mind the hon. gentleman. I desire to spare his feelings, but his colleague would not permit me to do so. Now, what was the particular necessity for making a contract for five years with this particular company? Does not the Minister of Railways and Canals know that there are other companies in Canada that propose to develop the steel and iron business? Does he not know that there is a company in my own province which proposes to engage in the——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Never heard of it until long after this.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Indeed? Then the hon. gentleman is very much behind the times apparently. Because I think it was understood last autumn that that company was about to engage in this business. At all events, the hon. gentleman knew that they were engaging very extensively in the iron and steel business, that their works in that respect are much beyond the works of Mr. Clergue now, that at the present time they are manufacturing iron and sending it to England, and that they are in a better position, probably, to-day to advance the business of manufacturing steel rails than is Mr. Clergue. I do not wish to say a word against that gentleman. I admire his enterprise and hope his undertakings will succeed. I am not criticising Mr. Clergue but the Minister of Railways and Canals

when I say that it might have been preferable for the minister not to make a contract for more than one or two years at the outside and to look to the future to develop industries of this kind not only in this section but in other sections of the country, industries that will have an equal right to consideration at the hands of the government. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said that this was something like the Yukon contract. But he was hardly just to the Yukon contract. The minister in charge of that had the grace to insert in that contract the provision that it should not come into effect until confirmed by parliament. But the Minister of Railways and Canals has no scruples of that kind. He comes to parliament with the contract ready made, telling us that parliament has nothing to say about it, binding the country for five years. And the administration of which he is a member has cancelled contracts for the supply of cloth on the ground that the late administration had no right to make a contract beyond the year for which the vote of parliament had been passed. I know of one case in my own province, and there are many other cases I believe in which that was the policy of the administration with respect to such matters. Having cancelled contracts on that ground, a member of this same administration comes to this parliament with a contract for five years, and does not even tell parliament correctly what the terms of it are. And we should never have known what the terms were, had it not been for my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart) who asked that the contract should be laid on the Table before this vote was proceeded with. I do think the Minister of Railways and Canals has not shown very much providence or very much judgment in entering into this contract. He tells us that the price of steel rails was not falling during the past year. But, as a business man, he had every reason to believe that the price would probably fall this year. As a matter of fact, according to his own statement, this country is losing not less than from $150,000 to $200,000 a year on this very contract; 25,000 tons of these steel rails are to be provided during the present year, and on these rails, taking the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals himself, we will lose no less a sum than $150,000. Now, we may or may not lose to a corresponding amount in future years; possibly with regard to those, the price is fixed on a better basis, although it may be as the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has pointed out, that you cannot get a basis on the English market which will do justice to this contract, because, although it is not stated in the contract, nevertheless it is stated in the speech of the minister, that these rails are to contain nickel, and the minister has left it open in the second clause of this contract to make a provision that these rails shall contain nickel. In order that I may not be accused of misrepresenting the hon. gentleman, the second clause of the contract is as follows:—

That the minister shall, on behalf of Her Majesty, each year during the said five years, enter into a contract with the company, specifying, in greater detail than herein set forth, the time and place of the delivery of such rails, the section approved, the price and mode of payment, with other incidental particulars and provisions, at the discretion of the minister.

Now, that leaves a very wide door open for the minister to deal with this matter during the next five years. I think the contract is for that reason open to the criticism which has been made upon it by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart).

Mr. SPROULE. I want to reply to the emphatic contradiction the Minister of Railways and Canals made to my statement that the contract was made in the face of a falling market. He said: I deny that it is a fact, and I challenge him to prove it. I have the proof in my hand. I take the Monthly Summary of the Commerce and Finances of the United States for January, 1901. Remember that the recommendation was made to council regarding this transaction on the 26th of September, and on the 9th of October it was passed. Now, what was the market price then? On the 26th of September steel rails were quoted at $35 a ton.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is $2.40 more than the contract price.

Mr. SPROULE. On the 3rd of September they were quoted at $35 a ton; on the 10th of September they were quoted at $30 a ton, having fallen $5; on the 30th of September they were quoted at $30, and on the 3rd of October they were quoted at $26. Therefore, I was right in my statement that the contract was made in the face of a falling market, as the price fell from $35 on the 3rd of September down to $26 about the time he entered into the contract. Does that not look like a shady transaction of a political character? This is the official record of the markets during the whole year. Now, when the Minister of Railways and Canals gets up and emphatically contradicts a statement as he did, I would like some better authority to stand by than his own words.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With regard to the alleged readiness of the works in Cape Breton to supply these rails, I think I am correct in saying that the promoters of that enterprise have never made any proposal to the government for making rails, and I think I am also correct in stating that they have not been in a position to offer any rails up to the present time. I think they are

now contemplating an enlargement of their operations with a view to making rails; but it is correct to say that up to the present time the promoters of that enterprise have not been ready to make rails, they have made no proposal to make rails, and therefore the two companies have not come into competition. I hope to learn that by the enlargement of their operations they will be able to make rails, and if they do, I have no doubt that we shall find a chance to give them an order on fair and reasonable terms.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think from what I saw in the public press that the additional bonds placed upon the market by that company in December last were, among other things, intended for the purpose of enlarging their plant so that they could make steel rails. Of course, the hon. gentleman is better informed than I am with regard to that, and I will accept his word; but that is my recollection of what I saw.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only point, perhaps, in which I am better informed than my hon. friend is in the fact that they have made no proposal to this government to supply rails.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not suppose they had.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But the hon. gentleman mentioned the two enterprises as coming into conflict. I think the Cape Breton people are now contemplating the manufacture of rails, but the hon. gentleman referred to them as if they were to be considered in any contract for rails. My recollection is that the additional bonds, to which the hon. gentleman referred, were issued only a few days ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Before the House takes recess, I want to say one word in reply to the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule). I thank him for the extreme courtesy with which he has referred to my statement on the subject. But I desire to state to this committee now that nothing, in my opinion, could be more unfair, nothing could be more unjust than the hon. gentleman's statement, and the hon. gentleman's method of giving support to that statement. The hon. gentleman knows that the whole basis of this arrangement between the government and the Sault Ste. Marie Company was the state of the open market in England. Why was the open market in England chosen? It was chosen because no sane man would make any agreement to bind himself to the momentary fluctuations of the rail market in the United States, which is up to-day and down to-morrow, at the arbitrary wink and demand of the combine which controls the output. It is unfair for the hon. gentleman to challenge the correctness of my statement when I said that we did not buy upon a falling market, or, in other words, that there was no fall below the price we had fixed, by showing that the iron proprietors in the United States had lowered the price of rails from $35 down to $26 within a certain period. Let the hon. gentleman search the records and he will find that the price goes up and down, up and down again; it is pulled up and dropped down to suit the fancy of these people, and is not the result of fair business operations. Upon the open market in England no such condition of things, he will find, obtains. I would like the hon. gentleman to pursue his inquiries further, and to see whether the quotations were as variable in the English market as they were in the United States market, according to what he has read. I made inquiries from some friends in Montreal, I will not say on the 9th of October, but on the 26th of September, and thereabouts, a few days before, when we were coming to a conclusion upon this matter. I inquired from friends in Montreal what the English prices were, and I found they were maintaining about the same standard as the price at which rails were offered to us some months previously. Therefore, I felt justified, and the government felt justified, in deciding that we would give to Mr. Clergue's company the same price that we were then paying for rails. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman to turn up the English quotations. While I did not have the English quotations before me, I did have statements from people that I believed knew, who were reliable, as to what the price of rails was. Now let me make one further remark. The hon. gentleman says we bought on a falling market. Supposing we had bought on a market that fell—and no doubt the market has fallen in a sense—can you avoid that? Can any prescience foresee a falling market so as to provide against it? No. The hon. gentleman nods his head. I say no. You have to make your bargain for some time ahead. What time do you choose? When you want to ensure the earliest possible delivery. We had to make our arrangement with them in order to ensure delivery during this present season. We could not tell; the price might go up. You have to take them when you can get them. You must take the price as it exists when you make your contract unless there is some good reason for believing that a lower price may prevail. The year before that we wanted to buy 10,000 tons of rails. We went into the market. We had to give some months' time for delivery—I cannot say how many months elapsed before these rails were delivered—previously when we made our contract. But, we made our contract at the best price we could obtain. We made it for $20 a ton and before half the time had elapsed for delivery we could have sold those rails for from $34 to $35 a ton, $14 or $15 advance on the price that we had paid. No human foresight can always pro-

vide against falls or rises in the price. Make the best arrangement you can bona fide and in the exercise of reasonable judgment and let the consequences follow. That is what we are doing to-day in this case. We made a good many thousands of dollars by buying the year before. It may be that if we had the foresight to enable us to know that there would be a fall in the price, if we had had reason to suppose that rails could be got for summer delivery at a lower price, we might have possibly saved a few dollars in the present transaction. These are the circumstances under which the arrangement was made. It was made fairly, squarely and bona fide. It was made, I have no hesitation in saying, with the desire to encourage the establishment of an enterprise which we had no expectation would be established otherwise. It was made at the price then governing and at a price which is fair to the public.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at 8 o'clock.

CANADA NATIONAL RAILWAY AND TRANSPORT COMPANY.

On the order :

For resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Cowan: 'That Bill No. 13, to incorporate the Canada National Railway and Transport Company, be now read the third time.'

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I desire to move an amendment to the motion which is in your hands, an amendment of which notice was given some time ago. The subject-matter of the amendment has been discussed at considerable length both in the Railway Committee and before the Committee of the Whole House, and I do not intend to take up the time of the House, but merely to ask for a division on the motion. I move, seconded by Mr. Maclean :

That Bill No. 13 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the committee for the purpose of amending it by adding the following section :—

'His Majesty shall have the right at any time to take over the undertaking, property rights and franchises of the company, and for that purpose the provisions of the Expropriation Act shall apply.

From any valuation placed upon such property so taken there shall be deducted, on payment, the amount of any bonus or subsidy paid by the government of Canada to the company towards the construction of such line of railway or any part thereof.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I would like to say a few words. This amendment has already been discussed to some extent when the Bill was in committee. With the first part of it I am heartily in accord, but with the second part I am not in accord for reasons that I have already stated in the committee. It does not seem to me that it would be an equitable thing in all cases to deduct the whole amount of the subsidy. I would suggest to the hon. mover of the amendment (Mr. Clarke) that it would be fairer to the company if the latter part of the resolution read in this way :

From any valuation placed upon such property so taken there shall be deducted, on payment, a reasonable amount in respect of any bonus or subsidy——

And so forth. Instead of deducting the whole amount of the bonus or subsidy, which might not be equitable in some cases where the value of the property was very much less than the amount it had cost, you should take a reasonable amount of such bonus or subsidy, leaving it to the tribunal which fixes the value to determine what such reasonable amount should be.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, in support of the amendment moved by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), that it appears to be quite acceptable to those who are asking for railway subsidies in the local House, because I noticed by yesterday's paper that in the subsidies to be granted this year and which are not finally disposed of by the House, such a condition as that proposed by the hon. member for West Toronto is included in every grant that is made. That is, that, in the future, in the event of the government taking over these railways, the subsidy which is given to them shall be deducted from the price, so that it appears to be not so objectionable to railway men, or corporations, as some persons seem to imagine it is.

Mr. CLARKE. If it is in order to accept the suggestion made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), I will be very glad to do it. I am induced to do that because the suggestion is made by the hon. gentleman, and because of the further fact that I notice in to-day's papers that in bringing down a Bill governing the granting of bonuses to aid railways, the minister in charge of the Department of Public Works in Ontario has made a provision somewhat similar to this proposal.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does that apply to all railways ?

Mr. CLARKE. It applies to the railways that are affected by regulations made in the Bill introduced in the Ontario legislature a few days ago. Particulars can be seen in the papers, the Citizen of this morning and the Toronto papers that came this afternoon. I do not wish to take up time, but I will accept the amendment of the hon. member for Halifax, and ask for an expression of the House upon it.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). Before the motion is put, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the proposal in the motion goes further than I think it should. For instance, the resolution says that if the government desires to obtain control of this national railway from the Georgian Bay to Lake Ontario :

—they shall have the right to take over the undertakings, property rights and franchises of the company, and for that purpose the provisions of the Expropriation Act shall apply.

Now, this company have its terminals and warehouse at Fort William or Duluth or Milwaukee, or Chicago, and they may have warehouses in all of these places. What right would the government of Canada have to take over such properties ? What business would the government of Canada have to take over these four steamers that they propose in their minds to have on the upper lakes, and the half dozen steamers they talk about on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence ? Would Canada undertake to run a steamboat business ?

Mr. GERMAN. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Certainly not. We do not desire to do it, and we will not do it. They insist that if we take over the railway we would also have to take over these other properties, and it simply means that if they do not have complete control over the railway they do not want the steamboats at all. If the government acquires the railway it will be so much capital of the company liberated, and the money for the railway will be handed back to the company, less the amount of bonuses they received. That means that the actual amount of money they have expended on the railway will be paid back to them. The plain English of the contention of this company is, that if they have the steamers they must have the railway, and it is because the ownership of the railway would give their steamers an advantage over all other steamers carrying freight on the upper lakes and across this railway, and down the St. Lawrence to the sea, that they want the railway. The railway does not disappear if they retain the steamers. A railway owned by the government would be as eligible to carry the products from these steamers on the upper lakes on to the sea as would this private railway, and indeed it would be more advantageous for them, because past experience tells us that a government railway will carry products cheaper than any private railway. They would, therefore, be in a better position with these steamers on the upper and lower lakes than they would be to-day if they owned both the steamers and the railway. I contend that we should not take power—which, I suppose, means that it would be binding on us—to take over the railway and the steamers and the warehouses in the United States and in Canada. Let them go on with their steamer business, and the government of Canada will give them all the facilities they give any other carrier. Our experience on the Intercolonial Railway is, that goods are carried at about cost, and no doubt if the government owned this road the same thing would occur in this case. I am in favour of the principle of this resolution, but I would like to see that part of it which I object to eliminated. Of course, I would vote for the resolution sooner than not have the principle incorporated in the Bill at all, but, I would infinitely prefer to have that part of the resolution left out. This road is ostensibly a portion of the through traffic route of the country, just as the Welland canal is a link in the system of communication from the great North-west to the sea. It would, of course, be disastrous if the control of the Welland canal passed into the hands of a private corporation, who could charge what tolls they pleased, and who could put onerous restrictions on commerce. Our experience is, that the government never interfere in a case of that kind, and I cannot help stating that if this road is a necessity, the parliament of Canada, and the people of Canada, should be the owners of it. It looks to me, on the face of it, that this charter is a kind of speculation. There are a number of lines now connecting the Georgian Bay with Lake Ontario. There is the Northern Railway from Collingwood through Meaford to Toronto ; the Canadian Pacific Railway from Owen Sound to Toronto ; the Grand Trunk Railway, from Wiarton down through the country to Hamilton, and other points on Lake Ontario, and from Owen Sound as well. There is the Midland system from Midland to Belleville or Port Hope, or any of these ports on the lake, so that, in view of all the existing lines, this is, to my mind, a railway which should not get a government subsidy. The Minister of Railways has declared already his opinion that there should be no subsidy granted by the parliament of Canada for this road, and I am pleased to hear that, because it agrees with my own opinion. If this line is a necessity for the commerce of the country, then the government should make it a link in the canal system direct, instead of going at it in the roundabout way that this resolution proposes. However, parliament has disposed of that. Last session the House of Commons declared in favour of granting this charter, but the Senate, in its wisdom, declared that the people of the country had the most interest in it, and that the charter which was then asked for by the city of Toronto, the board of trade, and the commercial men of the country, should also receive consideration. I do not think there should be put into this Bill a provision that the government will be obliged to purchase those steamers, warehouses, elevators and terminals at

places in the states or in Canada ; because the governemnt of Canada would have no use for them, but this company would have the same use for them, and a better use, with more opportunity of doing business. if they desired to do it fairly if the government owned that connecting link than they would have if it were owned by a private company. If it is owned by a private company and the steamers are owned by a private company, they will be able to control the traffic of the road to the detriment of common carriers, and I do not think you could make an enactment of this parliament that would prevent them having the advantages of that control. I think it would be disastrous to this country if that were permitted ; and as this resolution goes in the right direction, though it goes a little further than I would approve of, I will give it my support.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland). I am rather amused to hear the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) talk absolutely against the amendment of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), and then say he intends to support it. There has been for some time, I believe, a sort of antagonism between those two hon. gentlemen in regard to the management of an institution in the province of Ontario which they work in the Conservative interest; but I never saw it exemplified so plainly——

Mr. WALLACE. If I may be allowed to set the hon. gentleman at rest in that matter, I will say that there is absolutely no truth in it.

Mr. GERMAN. No antagonism ? I am ready to accept the hon. gentleman's statement. The newspapers have always said so, however, and the indications point in that direction. The amendment of the hon. member for West Toronto is to my mind in the nature of an absurdity. The hon. member for West York has very truly outlined the situation, as to what would happen in the event of this amendment carrying—that the government would be bound to take over all the boats, all the terminals, all the plant which this company may see fit to institute in the carrying out of its scheme.

Mr. WALLACE. That is the proposal of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. GERMAN. It is the proposal of the hon. member for West Toronto. The proposal of the Minister of Railways, as I understood it, was to expropriate the railway and nothing more. The hon. member for West Toronto, in the Railway Committee, stated that his resolution was to take over everything that this company might inaugurate in carrying out its scheme. The proposition to expropriate the property less the bonus is not, I think, a proper suggestion. If this scheme is carried out to its legitimate conclusion, it means the expenditure of a very large amount of money. It means the expenditure of a large amount of money in order to get business. Suppose this company goes on for some years and loses money—loses more money in endeavouring to work up a business than the amount of the bonus would be, if it ever gets a bonus; and it is not yet asking for a bonus. Why should we endeavour to cross the bridge before we reach it ? This company has not yet asked for a bonus. When it does, it is time enough then to make propositions as to what shall be embodied in the Bill granting the bonus. But when you lay down a hard and fast proposition that any mercantile venture shall be expropriated by the government less the bonus that is given to it, I say you are laying down a proposition which is absolutely bad in principle. The gentlemen who are investing their money in the scheme may spend perhaps thousands of dollars more than the bonus amounts to, and when it has come to be a paying business, the government might say : We will take this over now, after you have spent the bonus we have given to you, and also spent money out of your own pockets. The hon. leader of the opposition has a view in the right direction, but it does not go far enough. He sees the dawning of the day, he knows what is the proper legislation, but he has not the courage of his opinion; he is a little afraid of his supporters behind him. If the leader of the opposition would do as he believes, I think he would say that this amendment should be voted down. His own suggestion points in that direction—that you cannot fairly take from the value of an article the bonus which has been given to it by the government of Canada, if it is given a bonus at all. If it is not a legitimate transaction, do not give it a bonus; but if it is entitled to a bonus, give it one, and then when you take it over, do not say : You men have made a property which is valuable to the Dominion of Canada, but we will expropriate the property and take away from you the bonus that we have given you, though you have spent perhaps thousands of dollars beyond the bonus in order to make the property valuable.

House divided on amendment to amendment (Mr. Borden, Halifax) :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Ingram,
Ball,	Kidd,
Bell (Addington),	Lancaster,
Bennett,	Lennox,
Birkett,	Maclean,
Blain,	McGowan,
Borden (Halifax),	Osler,
Brock,	Pringle,
Broder,	Prior,
Calvin,	Puttee,
Cargill,	Richardson (Grey),
Clancy,	Robinson (Elgin),

Clare.
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Culbert,
Earle,
Fowler,
Ganong,
Gilmour,
Hackett,
Halliday,
Henderson,
Roche (Marquette),
Simmons,
Smith (Vancouver),
Sproule,
Taylor,
Tolton,
Vrooman,
Wallace,
Wilmot,
Wilson.—45.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bazinet,
Bickerdike,
Borden (King's, N.S.),
Bureau,
Calvert,
Cowan,
Davies (Sir Louis),
Davis,
Dèchene,
Delisle,
Demers (Lévis),
Demers (St. John),
Dobell,
Dyment,
Erb,
Fielding,
Flint,
Fortin,
Fraser,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gibson,
Gould,
Guthrie,
Harwood,
Heyd,
Holmes,
Hyman,
Johnston (Lambton),
Lang,
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne,
LeBlanc,
Legris,
Lovell,
Loy,
Mackie,
Maclaren (Huntingdon),
McColl,
McCool,
McCreary,
McIsaac,
McKinnon,
Marcil (Bagot),
Meigs,
Mignault,
Monet,
Oliver,
Parmelee,
Proulx,
Ross (Ontario),
Schell,
Scott,
Sifton,
Stephens,
Sutherland (Oxford),
Thompson,
Tobin,
Turcot,
Turgeon,
Wright.—62.

PAIRS :

Against.	For.
Talbot,	Hughes (Victoria),
Emmerson,	Rosamond,

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

Amendment negatived.

Bill read the third time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the Bill now pass, and its title be as on the Order paper ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). When this Bill was discussed in Committee of the Whole, objection was raised to the use of the word 'national' in connection with a private railway. The Minister of Railways said he would like to see the word 'national' dispensed with, because that ought to be reserved for the national railway of this country, and I think the promoters ought to accept that suggestion, although I believe they intend to trade on the name 'national' in order to promote their enterprise. I beg to move in amendment :

That the title of the Bill be the Toronto and Georgian Bay Railway and Transport Company.

Amendment negatived. Bill passed.

OTTAWA AND HULL POWER AND MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 25) to incorporate the Hull Power and Manufacturing Company, Limited.—Mr. Champagne.

On section 15,

Mr. MACLEAN. This is a vicious principle, giving municipalities the right to make exemptions of this kind. This was fought out in the Ontario legislature the other day. I do not think that such a principle should be embodied in a private Bill.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. How can this parliament give a municipality the right to exempt ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I do not know. If it cannot do so, why should the Minister of Marine and Fisheries agree to have it put into this Bill.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not been asked to consent. I take the Bill as it has been passed in the committee.

Mr. MACLEAN. But the minister who represents the government is responsible for the legislation going through this House. The attention of the country has been called to this matter in a very pointed way. It has been made clear within the last two or three days that the government, and especially the legal department of the government is responsible for private legislation dealing with public questions. I do not know how this parliament can authorize a municipal corporation to give exemptions——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) will permit me—the power here conferred is a power conferred upon the company to receive exemption from a municipality, if that municipality has power to grant it and chooses to do so.

Mr. MACLEAN. Why should the company have that power ? This is a vicious principle, yet it is justified by a minister of the Crown. And the gentleman asking to have this vicious principle conceded is the gentleman who lectured us in the Railway Committee the other day telling us how Canada was to be preserved, how our condition was to be improved and everything to be made heavenly. This is not good legislation, it is vicious in principle, and should not be dealt with by the Federal legislature, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is leading the House, should not consent to it.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am surprised that my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), who so often strongly advocates what he supposes to be the rights of the people, should advocate our going back to the dark ages and denying municipalities

the exercise of the right to grant a privilege, should they choose to do so, to a corporation such as this. In my humble opinion the legislation is not required for the purpose of the company, but I did not think that any person in this age would deny the company the right to receive any favour that a municipality in its wisdom might decide to grant them.

Mr. PUTTEE. Would the company have the right to receive it, whether this Bill was passed or not ?

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then why put it in ? The parliament of the Dominion of Canada should not be employed in discussing things of this kind. You might as well put it in that the managing director of the company is hereby authorized to get his washing done in Hull instead of getting it done in Ottawa.

Mr. EDWARDS. Move it.

Mr. MACLEAN. Why not strike this out? We have something else to do than conferring unnecessary powers upon a private company. It is an insult to the federal idea to take up our time in dealing with little matters of municipal taxation. If they want anything of this kind, let them go to the provincial legislature and get it there.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). A similar clause to this was struck out in the Bill relating to the Canadian Lloyds the other day in the committee.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. No.

Mr. CLANCY. It had precisely the effect of the grant that we are now discussing. This is said to be an innocent clause because the people are not forced to make this concession to the company. But the vice is in permitting them to receive such privilege. Some may say that this clause has no effect, but it puts municipalities in the position to do wrong. We cannot give the municipality the right to grant, but if we give the company the power to receive, the opportunity for abuse is offered. If it was thought proper, after mature consideration, to strike out a similar clause in the Lloyds Bill on the ground that it was not a proper thing for the company to receive lands with the power to alienate those lands for other purposes, it is proper to refuse the privilege here asked for. I hope the hon. gentleman will agree to this being struck out.

Mr. MACLEAN. An example of how powers granted by this House without sufficient consideration are apt to be used is to be seen in the case of the exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway lands which was before the House the other day. If more care had been exercised in that case, we should not have had the gigantic grievance that we have to-day.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford).

Mr. GERMAN. Why do you support a party that would do that ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Why do you support a party that will not cure the grievance ? I wish to tell the promoters of the Bill that if they care to get this through to-night, they can do so by accepting a reasonable proposition. This clause is of no use to them and it introduces a bad principle. I move that the objectionable words be struck out.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). As one who favoured striking out a similar clause in a Bill before the Railway Committee the other day, I am opposed to this clause being left in the Bill. It is an invitation to this company to go to the government of the Dominion or the government of the province of Quebec or of Ontario and ask for a grant—say a grant of public lands, or of pulp wood, which we find is so rapidly passing out of the hands of those who ought to care for it in the interest of the people. I think this is dangerous legislation. Without this clause the company may be able to accept a grant of this kind ; but we have reason to believe, according to the opinion of legal gentlemen in this House, that if they do acquire it under those circumstances they will be unable to alienate it and so it will be of little value to them. To my mind, a great many charters are secured merely in order to get something to sell to others and to speculate in. This kind of speculative legislation should be cried down in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The time for private Bills having expired, the House will resume in Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The attention of the committee is called to the estimates of the Indian Department, page 66.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it would be advisable to have some more orderly system of taking up the estimates. There is a point in relation to the subject we were discussing at six o'clock to which I would like to have referred, and I would like to have known at six o'clock that we were to take up some other branch of the estimates. But generally I think that the suggestion made early in the session and accepted by the government should be carried out, that is to take the estimates as far as possible in some definite order so that hon. gentlemen on this side should know what business is coming up on a particular day. If the government's course is occasioned by the indisposition of the Minister of Railways, of course I have not a word of criticism to offer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is desirable, when possible, to take the estimates in order. But it is not always possible to do that. I agree, however, that hon. gentlemen opposite are entitled to a reasonable notice. I may say that immediately after six o'clock, the Minister of Railways and Canals having informed me that, not feeling very well, he was afraid he would not be here this evening, I crossed the floor and spoke to one or two hon. gentlemen opposite, stating that in case of the absence of the Minister of Railways and Canals, we would take up the estimates of the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Agriculture, if time permitted. I think the hon. leader of the opposition had left his seat, but the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was in his seat, and I mentioned the matter to him, assuming I was taking the best means afforded of communicating the matter to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. WALLACE. I was here, and I heard nothing of it.

Mr. MACLEAN. I heard it.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. The same statement was made on the adjournment of yesterday's sitting.

Department of Indian Affairs—Relief, medical attendance and medicine, Ontario, $1,100.

Mr. BENNETT. Who is the physician for the band of Indians on the Rama reservation, in the riding of North Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Dr. Macdonald has been the physician in charge.

Mr. BENNETT. Out of the moneys of the band, have other physicians been paid for services performed by them, and at the same time has the physician in charge been paid his salary ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Except in one instance, the only money that has been paid out for attendance has been paid to Dr. Macdonald during his term.

Mr. BENNETT. Is Dr. Macdonald to be kept there ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There has been some complaint and dissatisfaction amongst the Indians regarding Dr. Macdonald. An investigation was held by an officer of the department sent there for the purpose. I have examined the report which has been made, but I have not had time yet to come to any definite conclusion with regard to it.

Blankets and clothing, Ontario and Quebec, $500.

Mr. MACLEAN. Where are these blankets bought ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are all bought by public tender. The quantities required are advertised for.

Mr. MACLEAN. Are they of Canadian make, the same as the steel rails must now be ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We advertise to buy them in open market by public tender. I do not think there is any specification where they are to be made.

Mr. MACLEAN. But, the government have started out in the policy of encouraging home industry. We are to have nothing but Canadian-made steel rails. We have a lot of woollen mills in Canada that can make blankets.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The blankets that have been purchased are Canadian blankets.

Mr. HENDERSON. What price was paid per pound for them ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. 34½ cents.

Salaries of chiefs, Cape Croker and Gibson, and agent at St. Regis, $150.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask the minister if any investigation has taken place into the complaint made by Chief Marcil of the Micmac tribe, situated at Ste. Anne de Restigouche, in the province of Quebec, a notice of which complaint was laid by the chief before the members of this House at the first assembling of parliament.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I intend to send an inspector down to make a thorough investigation into the complaint. My attention has been called to it by correspondence, and I found that a complaint had been made, and had been dealt with by officers of the department. I decided to give the matter my attention, and I will make an investigation of the facts of the case.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. minister tell us why he did not bring down the correspondence ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The correspondence was laid on the Table some time ago.

Mr. SPROULE. I made inquiry once or twice, and I was informed that it was not down.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It was brought down a considerable time ago.

Removal, Lake of Two Mountains Indians from Oka to Gibson, $200.

Mr. SPROULE. How long will this $200 appear in the estimates for the removal of these Indians. I have seen it here almost every year since I first came into parliament, and it appears to be something like the case of Jarndyce vs. Jarndyce, the lawsuit which was likely to last for ever.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This item is one of the institutions of par-

liament. It is explained in this way : There was an agreement some years ago to provide for the removal of some of the Indians from the Oka reserve to the township of Gibson in the province of Ontario. The government undertook to pay the expenses of any of these Indians who desired to remove. We have taken a small vote each year in case that any of the Indians remaining should demand that we should fulfil our agreement. I do not think any money has been paid out since I took charge of the department.

Mr. WALLACE. How many are down at their old home, and how many are up in the township of Gibson ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are 123 at Gibson, and 447 at Oka.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the hon. gentleman tell us at the rate of progress they are making in the removal of these Indians, how long it will take to place the whole of them at Gibson?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If they keep on going at the rate at which they have been going for the last four years it will take a great while.

Survey of Indian reserves, $500.

Mr. WALLACE. Is that survey for the purpose of selling the timber ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Sometimes it is for that purpose, but our surveys in the North-west Territories have been necessary in selling the land that has been surrendered.

Mr. WALLACE. This is in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, my hon. friend is right. Last year we spent $47.45 for the purpose of defining the boundaries on account of settlers taking up land in the neighbourhood of reserves. It may be necessary to survey timber limits.

To provide for the Indian Land Management Fund, $14,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps this is just as good a stage as any in which to call the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior to a matter of very great importance to the Indians on Walpole Island. The hon. gentleman will have it in his mind yet, because it is not very long since he dismissed the physician who was attending the Indians and who was paid out of the fund belonging to the Indians. Since that time there has been an enormous death rate among the Indians, and it is ascribed entirely to the indisposition on their part to employ, or to have anything to do with the new appointee. Now, I have nothing to say against the gentleman whom he appointed at all, but the hon. minister himself knows the Indian character sufficiently well to know that they are suspicious and that they have very strange notions in regard to their attending physician. I believe some communication has been had with the department. I believe there is a Methodist minister, who has a charge on the island, who has communicated with the hon. gentleman's department, setting forth the facts of the large death rate that has existed there and ascribing it to the cause I have just stated. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has taken notice of the correspondence, and if he has taken any steps to remedy what is an admitted evil. It would be scarcely an answer to say that the Indians have a physician and that they may employ him. The fact remains in spite of that that the Indians would die rather than employ a man whom they, in a sense, mistrusted, so far as they consider that he would rather endanger their lives than relieve them of their burdens. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has had such a communication from the minister there. I think his name is Rev. Mr. Pickard; however, it is not important. The hon. gentleman will know his name, and I would like to know if he has taken any steps to meet the wishes of these Indians.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not had any such communication brought to my attention, and I am informed that he is not able to say from recollection that any such letter has been received in the department. His impression is that it has not been received, but it will be impossible for him to say positively that it has not. All I can say is that it has not been brought to my attention. In view of the hon. gentleman's remarks, I will undertake to have it looked into and endeavour to meet the necessities of the case.

Mr. CLANCY. The acting Minister of the Interior last session stated in the House, upon a similar question being asked, that such correspondence was in his possession, that he knew of it, and therefore I am able to state in advance to the hon. gentleman that there is such correspondence in his department.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was not aware of it, and I will have it looked up at once.

To provide for the erection of a lock-up at St. Régis, $500.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the result of the settlement of the disagreeable trouble that took place over the St. Regis lock-up, and what became of those Indians that were arrested ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The difficulty at the St. Regis reserve to which the hon. gentleman refers is of long standing. The officers of the department, when I first had it called to my attention, informed me that there had been a difficulty for some years owing to the fact that the

American Indians whose reserve adjoins the Canadian reserve were constantly fomenting disaffection amongst our Indians and endeavouring to persuade them that they should not submit to our Indian administration. These Indians made a practice of coming every little while to Ottawa by deputations and demanding changes in the administration which the department did not see its way clear to grant. They had some peculiar idea about the sanctity of their reserve and they had refused to allow provincial constables to go on their reserve to execute writs. Matters were getting into such a state that I made up my mind it was absolutely necessary to make them understand, as gently as possible of course, that the law had to be observed. The matter was brought to a head by a determination that we would appoint a constable to see that the law was enforced, and to make a long story short, we sent down the Dominion chief of police to prevent the constable being obstructed. The Dominion chief of police with some assistants went upon the reserve for the purpose of arresting one of the ringleaders in the riot and two or three of the Indians forced their way into the Indian office, assaulted the chief of police, threatened his life and he finally shot one of the Indians in self-defence. A number of the Indians were brought before the court and after a great deal of negotiation on both sides we finally came to an arrangement whereby the case went by default, and the Indians were let go upon agreement that they would appear for trial when called upon. This is the most difficult case connected with the management of the Indians I have had anything to do with, and it is necessary to use firmness with a good deal of consideration in order to bring about a peaceful result. It is necessary that we should follow up what we have done by having on the reserve a place of such a character that in case of disturbance we can take care of offenders. It is for that purpose we have asked for this vote.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the superintendent general of Indian Affairs abandoned the effort on his part to see that the Indians observe the law in the event of trouble. As I understand, the case against the Indians went by default and they were released. It appears to me that the Indians will feel that they are masters of the situation, and if so I do not see what great benefit you will derive from a lock-up when you cannot enforce the law.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Every step was taken after consultation with those who were best acquainted with the facts of the case. The Solicitor General gave the prosecution his best attention and we allowed the prosecution to go because we were satisfied that the Indians having been taught a sufficient lesson would be amenable to reason and that any further prosecution would result in exasperating them. Those in the neighbourhood strongly pressed me not to take any steps at all because they thought it would exasperate the Indians. Every one who is acquainted with the facts is satisfied we did what was best. I am not going to say that there will be no further trouble. Any one who knows anything about Indian character knows that it is impossible to predict that. But I am satisfied we have done the best that could be done, and that with judicious management we will be able to get along without further trouble.

Mr. SPROULE. You are going to build up a lock-up as a kind of object lesson to terrorize them.

Indians, N.S.—Salaries, $1,150.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What services are rendered for these salaries ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. For the small salary paid, the agent is supposed to have a general oversight over the condition of the Indians, to report from time to time to the department whether any relief is necessary, and to supervise the distribution of seed grain. Of course the salaries are very small, and we endeavour to keep the expenses down as much as possible.

Indians, N.S.—Seed grain, $2,000.

Mr. WILSON. Is this paid out of the Indian fund or how is it paid ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is not paid out of the Indian fund; it is paid out of consolidated revenue.

Mr. GOURLEY. Can you tell me the amount paid to the agent in Colchester ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The agent is Mr. T. B. Smith, and he gets $50 a year.

Mr. GOURLEY. Well you ought to give him more.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is an Indian reserve at Ship Harbour Lake in the county of Halifax. I have information from a responsible person in my constituency that a certain lumberman, whose name I will not mention, has been cutting timber on that land.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. On the Indian land ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes. I think it would be advisable for the hon. gentleman to cause inquiries to be made with regard to it. I may say that the gentleman who gave me the information states that he was endeavouring to purchase this par-

ticular lot some years ago, and the department after leaving the matter in doubt for some time eventually told him they were not in a position to sell. Since then the land has been very much damaged by other persons cutting logs on it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The complaint we generally have from Nova Scotia is that the Indians are cutting timber on other people's land. However, we will have this complaint attended to at once.

Mr. GOURLEY. They have a common law right to do that.

Mr. KAULBACH. I desire to inform my hon. friend that there are two Indian reserves in the county which I have the honour to represent, occupied by Indians. Has my hon. friend established a rule that all medical attendants or physicians shall be employed in the district in which the reserves are, or does he go outside of the district to employ others ? If it is an established rule that physicians in the district shall be employed, then the rule on principle has been broken in the case of reserves in Lunenburg, because physicians living miles outside of the district have been employed, and in consequence of which the bills are very greatly increased. If the government desire economy, we have lots of first-class physicians in the district, and I think they should be employed instead of those who reside at a distance. I would ask the hon. minister to give the matter his attention.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In the case to which my hon. friend refers, we have two doctors who attend the Indians, at a salary of $75 a year each ; Dr. Marsh, who resides at Bridgewater and Dr. Kelly, at Chester. I doubt if any economy would result from employing others and paying them fees. We have a constant struggle to keep down the cost of medical attendance in the maritime provinces, because the Indians themselves desire a doctor very often when there is nothing the matter with them, and if we gave them the least encouragement, the medical bill would run up to a high figure. Therefore, we endeavour to employ men whose judgment can be relied on not to attend the Indians except in cases of necessity.

Mr. KAULBACH. The medical calls are so infrequent that I think it would be economical to employ physicians only when they were required. I do not think the cost would reach $75 a year by a very great deal ; and I would urge that physicians residing in the district be employed instead of parties residing outside.

Indians, N.B.—Salaries, $1,184.

Mr. FOWLER. Why has a reduction of $100 been made ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. One of the missionaries who was on the list last year died, and we do not take a vote for him this year.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you intend to appoint another missionary in his place ? To what religious denomination did he belong ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Roman Catholic—Rev. William O'Leary, of York county.

Indians, N.B.—Relief and seed grain, $2,300.

Mr. FOWLER. On what reserves is this seed grain given ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Generally.

Mr. FOWLER. In my own county no Indians are given seed grain.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The rule is that it is generally given as a matter of relief. Wherever it is reported by the agent that there is a necessity for it, the smallest amount they can get along with is sent.

Mr. FOWLER. Was the whole amount spent last year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The amount spent last year was $1,872.17, the year before $2,005.86, and the year before that $2,213.10.

Indians, N.B.—Medical attendance and medicines, $1,749.

Mr. FOWLER. Who is the medical attendant for King's county, or is there more than one ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The medical attendance for King's county is now paid by salary. The amount paid last year aggregated $360.48, made up as follows : L. R. Murray, $90.30 ; F. P. Patterson, $74.65 ; J. N. Smith, $171.28 ; W. H. White, $24.25.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that for the year 1900 ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. For the year ending 30th June, 1900.

Mr. FOWLER. Are these gentlemen still employed ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Dr. D. H. McAllister now attends to these Indians.

Mr. GOURLEY. I intended to ask the same question with regard to Nova Scotia. Will the hon. gentleman tell me who are the medical attendants in the county of Colchester ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The expenditure for medical attendance for the year ending 30th June, 1900, for the

county of Colchester, was : M. S. Dickenson, $33 ; W. D. Finn, $7 ; W. H. Hills, $37.75 ; total, $77.75. Dr. Yorston, of Truro, is now the medical attendant.

New Brunswick—Miscellaneous and unforeseen, $300.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is it that the amount for relief and medical attendance and medicine are so different in the two provinces. In Nova Scotia there is $2,000 for relief and $3,000 for medical attendance. In New Brunswick, relief $2,300, and medical attendance $1,740.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot give any explanation except the endeavour to keep expenses down.

Manitoba and North-west Territories, General vote, $804,073.70.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman able to give the population of the Indians on the reserve in Manitoba, where there are 47 agencies ? Could he give approximately the population and the cost of maintaining each head of the population for all the purposes mentioned in these items.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I could not possibly answer that question off-hand. That would require me to separate the Indians of Manitoba from those of the North-west Territories, and in the votes the two are combined. Of course, we could go through the estimates of the Indian Commissioner and separate the items of Manitoba from those of the North-west Territories, but that would take some time.

Mr. CLANCY. Could not the hon. gentleman furnish that information on the supplementaries ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Certainly, I shall do that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman explain the number of increases ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The first increase is in the item of annuities. That is caused by the fact that in 1899 we made a treaty, Treaty No. 8, by which we have secured the surrender of a large portion of territory north of Edmonton, and have added to the list of Indians to whom must be paid annuities. The increase in agricultural implements could not be avoided on account of the fact that the Indians are not in so good a position to pay for these implements as they were last year, owing to failure of the crops. We are trying to advance the Indians into a condition of self-support, and considerable progress has been made. Where the Indians show a disposition to provide for themselves, we endeavour to assist them as much as possible by getting them to engage in agricultural pursuits. While we ask for an amount in bulk, it must not be supposed that the commissioner does not give each item in detail.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). By the annuity, I presume you mean a certain amount paid yearly to each member of the band.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The amount is paid to the Indians under treaty. In the North-west and Ontario, the Indian title to the land was recognized by the Crown, and before the Crown assumes to deal with the land the Indian title has to be extinguished. That is done by sending commissioners to negotiate a treaty. In the west it has been customary to give the Indians a certain cash amount per head by way of gratuity as an inducement to surrender, and an annuity of $5 per head.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many Indians are engaged in tilling the land in the North-west ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It would be difficult for me to give accurate information on that point, because in the different reserves there are a few here and there engaged in agriculture. But I can understand the hon. gentleman's desire for definite information on the subject, and I will undertake to furnish that information at the earliest possible time.

Mr. GOURLEY. Is that money paid for the lifetime of the children ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Only during the lifetime.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase in the amount for agricultural implements, seed grain and live stock. That would appear to indicate that a larger number were availing themselves year by year of the opportunity to engage in the pursuit of agriculture. What success has attended the efforts of the government of late in that line ? And what quantity of grain and other supplies have the Indians raised for themselves ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Generally, the results of the work during the last three years have been very encouraging. The Indians are rapidly becoming more self-supporting. They have been particularly successful in stock-raising. Where the country is adapted to that pursuit, the Indians manifest a desire to take it up, and, where we have been able to secure an Indian agent who understands the Indian nature, there has been a marked improvement. The amount of grain and other crops raised my hon. friend will find fully set forth in the report of the Department of Indian Affairs. Generally speaking that statement shows that the value of farm products, including hay raised last year on the Indian reserves in the North-west Territories —that does not include Manitoba—was $162,-639.07. Upon one of the reserves which I had the pleasure of visiting last summer we have an agent who has been extremely suc-

cessful. The Indians there raised over 10,000 bushels of first-class wheat. They have become extremely prosperous. The agent has been so successful that I have placed him in charge of three reserves, in the hope that he will bring about a similar state of affairs in the other two. The House may rely upon it that great progress has been made. In the organized portion of the country there is no Indian population that may be considered dangerous so far as the peace of the country is concerned. The Indians are becoming rapidly a peaceful population and self-sustaining. The expenditure we are making is very large, but it is made in pursuance of a policy favoured by parliament for many years based upon a belief that it is better—aside from the justice of the question—to bring the Indians into a state of civilization or comparative civilization, so that they may not be a menace to the country, than to take any chances of their becoming a disturbing factor in the community. Generally the results have been satisfactory. The Indians of Manitoba are differently situated. They are generally what we call wood Indians as distinguished from plain Indians, and they follow occupations of a more varied kind. They work in the lumber woods and engage in other occupations, and, from the beginning have been a rather better class of Indians to deal with. They are in a fairly satisfactory state and are making good progress.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. gentleman able to prevent them killing their cattle when they get hungry ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is very rare for a thing of that kind to happen without the permission of the agent.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Is any money spent for the education of the Indian children ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend will find at page 67 of the estimates an amount of $288,182 for the education of the Indian children in Manitoba and the North-west Territories alone. I think he will agree that that is a fairly large sum. I may say that one of the difficulties I have is to keep it from growing too large.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I suppose that all the Indian settlements have schools where the Indian children are taught ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think I may say without danger of departing from strict accuracy that there are schools in all the Indian settlements that may be called accessible.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Are they taught the English language ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Always.

Mr. GOURLEY. There may have been some misunderstanding as to the hon. gentleman's answer given a moment ago as to the annuity given to the Treaty Indians. Does the annuity cease with the death of the Indian, or is it paid to his heirs ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, it is, strictly speaking, an annuity, and dies with the person to whom it is payable. When the agent or commissioner goes to make the payments, if a certain person does not appear and satisfactory evidence is produced of his death, his name is struck off the list.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister may not have the information at hand at the moment, but if he has, will he please state the amount paid by way of salaries for the outside service in the North-west Territories ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The salaries amount to about $40,000. The amount paid for salaries in the commissioner's office in Winnipeg is $11,340. Then, we have two surveyors who are paid, one $1,800, and the other, $1,400. Then, Inspector McColl is paid $2,400, and Inspector Leveque, $1,800. Then, connected with the Portage la Prairie agency, there is Inspector Marlatt, who has a salary of $1,800 ; the agent, $1,200 ; interpreter, $360 ; farmer in charge, $300 ; business manager, $200 ; issue of medicine, $20. There are ten teachers who are paid for dispensing medicines to the different districts, $50 each.

Couchiching agency : agent, $1,000.

Beren's River agency : agent, $1,000 ; interpreter, $300.

Pas agency : agent, $1,000 ; allowance for interpreting, $100.

In the North-west Territories : Calgary inspectorate, the inspector, $2,200 ; Qu'Appelle inspector, $2,200 ; Battleford inspector, $1,800 ; interpreter, $360.

Pelly agency : agent, $1,000 ; clerk and farmer, $480 ; interpreter, $300.

Birtle agency : agent, $1,000 ; clerk, $720; interpreter and teamster, $300.

Moose Mountain agency : farmer in charge, $900 ; another farmer, $480 ; labourer, six months, $90.

Crooked Lake agency : agent, $1,000 ; clerk, $600; interpreter, $300 ; miller and blacksmith, $600 ; two farmers, $480 each.

Assiniboine agency : farmer in charge, $800 ; interpreter, $300 ; extra assistance, six months, $30.

File Hills agency : agent, $1,000 ; farmer, $360 ; stockman, $360 ; interpreter and mail carrier, $120.

Muscowpetung's agency : agent, $1,200 ; clerk and farmer, $600 ; interpreter, $300 ; farmer and blacksmith, $600 ; another farmer, $480 ; stock man, $480 ; Indian labour, $125.

Duck Lake agency : agent, $1,000 ; clerk and farmer, $480 ; interpreter, $360 ; three farmers, $480 each.

Carlton agency : agent, $1,000 ; clerk, $600; interpreter, $360 ; miller, $600 ; two farmers, $480 each ; three overseers, $180 each.

Battleford agency : agent, $1,000 ; clerk, $600 ; interpreter, $360 ; four farmers, $480 each ; stockman, $360 ; engineer, $300.

Touchwood Hills agency : agent, $1,000 ; clerk, $600 ; interpreter, $300 ; two farmers, $480 each ; one farmer, $360 ; overseer, $180.

Onion Lake agency : agent,, $900 ; clerk, farmer and miller, $600 ; interpreter, $240 ; stockman, $420.

Saddle Lake agency : agent, $1,000 ; clerk, $180 ; interpreter, $300 ; two farmers, $480 each ; miller, $600.

Edmonton agency : agent, $1,000 ; clerk, $660 ; interpreter, $360 ; two farmers, $480 each.

Hobbema agency : agent, $1,000 ; clerk, $600 ; interpreter, $360 ; two farmers, $480 each ; blacksmith and sawyer, $480 ; miller, $120.

Stony agency : farmer in charge, $720 ; clerk, $480 ; labourer, $240.

Sarcee agency : agent, $1,000 ; farmer and issuer, $480 ; assistant issuer, $60 ; scout, $120.

Blackfoot agency : agent, $1,400 ; clerk, $600 ; interpreter and teamster, $420 ; farmer and engineer, $500 ; two farmers, $480 each.

Blood agency : agent, $1,100 ; clerk, $600 ; interpreter, $420 ; three farmers, $480 each ; issuer, $540 ; two scouts, $240.

Peigan agency : agent, $1,000 ; clerk and issuer, $600 ; interpreter and assistant issuer, $300 ; stockman, $480 ; scout and mail carrier, $120.

Mr. CLANCY. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that, in round numbers, $40,000 covers all the salaries ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, I was in error. I think they will amount to about $80,000.

Mr. CLANCY. What are the salaries of the teachers, outside of that ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no way in which, with the information at my disposal, I could give this evening the actual amount we paid for salaries out of the educational vote. Let me understand what it is that the hon. gentleman wants. The hon. gentleman will see that the educational vote amounts to $290,171. I understand that what the hon. gentleman wants is to know how much of that $290,171 is paid for salaries of teachers.

Mr. CLANCY. What I want from the hon. gentleman is the amount of the total salaries paid in the North-west and Manitoba for the outside service, of course, respectively for other purposes and for the salaries of teachers.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have given the hon. gentleman all the salaries paid to other officers of the department. Now, what I understand the hon. gentleman wants is the salaries of the teachers.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes ; that, of course, includes all the salaries of the outside service.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR I have given the hon. gentleman the salaries of the outside service. I cannot give him the salaries of the teachers now without taking time to go over them.

Mr. McGOWAN. Will the hon. minister tell us how it is that there is such a difference in the salaries paid to different officers ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think if the hon. gentleman will follow it he will find that the lowest salary of an agent is $900, and that these salaries run as high as $1,400. Some agents have much more important positions than others. The Blackfoot agency is perhaps the most difficult agency we have. A man goes into the service at $900 or $1,000, and if he is satisfactory he gets a small increase. The gentleman who gets the highest salary has been a long time in the service, and has been an efficient officer. He gets a salary of $1,400. A man coming into the service is assigned to a small and comparatively unimportant agency, and he may get a salary of $900. The same thing is true in regard to the farmers. The salary paid to a farmer is about $480. There are only one or two variations from that, and they are owing to local circumstances. Take the case of an interpreter ; we generally pay an interpreter $300.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Before leaving this item, I would ask the hon. Minister of the Interior if he is in a position to give any further explanation in reference to the disposal of the printing plant that was purchased by the old government in 1893, and established in the industrial school at Elkhorn. When the teaching of the trades was stopped in the spring of 1898, this plant was handed over by the government to some one else. The hon. minister will remember that two years ago I asked him what disposition had been made of that plant, and he told me that it had not been sold, but that negotiations were in progress with Mr. Garrison, of Virden. Last session, during his absence, I put a similar question on the paper, and the acting Minister of the Interior replied that it had not been disposed of either by lease or sale. Knowing that Mr. Garrison had sold the plant himself, I could not realize that that statement was accurate, and I made out such a prima facie case that the acting Minister of the Interior promised to have a full investigation and to give an explanation to the House. Can the hon. minister say if such an investigation has been held or what

explanation can be given as to the disposal of that plant ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not remember what was said in the House last year. That was not called to my attention, but, I remember, on account of seeing something in one of the newspapers about it, that I made inquiry and ascertained that the late Indian Commissioner, now the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories, Mr. Forget, had sold the plant to Mr. Garrison, I think it was, of Virden, and that the department had made a demand on him for payment, but the amount had never been paid. I do not know whether any steps have been taken in connection with it or not. That was the position of the matter when I inquired.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). How much was the plant sold for to Mr. Garrison ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Something between $200 and $300.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The plant cost about $800, did it not ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, I do not think so.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Garrison has disposed of the plant to Mr. Wildman for $350.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will give the hon. gentleman a statement to-morrow about that.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the hon. gentleman tell us how many of these schools he is keeping up and the number of scholars that are annually taught in the schools ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The total number of children upon the roll at the various day, boarding and industrial schools in Manitoba is 1,811, and in the North-west Territories 2,159. The average attendance in Manitoba, as against a total on the roll of 1,811, is 1,132, and the average attendance in the North-west Territories, as against 2,159 on the roll, is 1,706. Outside of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, outside of the treaty limits, there are altogether 302 children upon the roll, and there is an average attendance in these schools of 180.

Mr. SPROULE. Upon what principle does the hon. minister have the money distributed towards the support of these schools ? There are three classes of schools —day, boarding and industrial schools. How does he distribute the money ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In the case of boarding schools there is a fixed amount per capita for each pupil which the school shows to have in attendance. The same thing is true in regard to the industrial schools, only we pay a larger amount for an industrial school than for a boarding school. In the case of a day school the plan is not invariably followed, but in most cases we pay the salaries of the teachers and maintain the schools ourselves. In some cases we simply contribute the salaries of the teachers and the churches take care of the schools. In Manitoba and the North-west Territories Indian education is almost entirely carried on through the different churches. The Roman Catholic Church, the Episcopalian Church, the Presbyterian Church and the Methodist Church, are the four churches which take the largest part in the work and the educational institutions are, almost in every case, affiliated with some one of these different churches.

Mr. SPROULE. As time goes on and as settlement takes place, and they are taking more and more, year by year, to agriculture, is there any decrease in the expense of keeping up these schools ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am bound to say that I cannot observe any decrease. I find continually a disposition to increase these expenses, because there is a continual demand made upon us for more schools and educational operations are extended. I am constantly in the position of having to resist demands for more schools.

Mr. SPROULE. We were told some years ago that after a time these schools would be practically self-supporting. Can the minister tell us how much per capita these schools cost ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In the case of boarding schools we pay a uniform rate of $72 per head. The church authorities say they want to establish a boarding school on a reserve, and we say: very good we will allow you $72 each for so many pupils, and they have to show that that number at least attend the school. In many cases a considerably larger number attend, but they only get a grant for the number agreed upon. For the industrial schools we pay as follows : Rupert's Land school, near Winnipeg, $125 per head, for 120 pupils. St. Boniface school $110 per head for 100 pupils. Brandon school $120 per head for 100 pupils. Qu'Appelle school $125 a head for 225 pupils. Regina school $130 for 125 pupils; Battleford school $150 per head for 120 pupils; Red Deer school $140 per head for 80 pupils. Calgary school $130 per head for fifty pupils; St. Joseph's school $140 per head for 120 pupils.

Mr. SPROULE. What success has attended the education of the Indians in these schools ? Are they making progress ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is a matter in connection with which there is a very great difference of opinion. I have given a good deal of personal attention to the question and my own conclusion, reached about a year ago after con-

sulting with men of experience, is: That the money we spend for boarding schools is the most effective, and that we are getting better results from it than the money we spend for industrial schools. It is the general conclusion of all familiar with Indian education that the ordinary day school is very ineffective, and that wherever a boarding school can be substituted for a day school it is desirable to do so. It is a little more expensive but the work is far more effective. The reason is that when the Indian child comes from the wigwam to school the influences centered upon the child at school are generally effaced by the home associations of the child. The boarding school is I think the best. It is not any more effective in regard to each pupil than is the industrial school, but the latter is much more expensive and in my judgment we get better value for our money than in the case of the former. When I took charge I found that the principals of the industrial schools kept the pupils for a length of time which seemed to me to be unreasonable, and I had to issue an order which resulted in a considerable number of pupils being discharged; they having been kept there as long as the state could be expected to keep them. The principals of the schools feared what would happen to the pupils if they left the schools, and of course that was some reflection upon the operation of the system. If a pupil spent five or six years in an industrial school at a cost to the state of $2,000 or $3,000, it was a poor commentary on the system if the pupil had to be kept in school after that for protection. One of the difficulties we have to face is to determine what shall be done with the pupils after they leave the industrial schools. They have then become so far removed from the ordinary Indian that they ought to be in a position to get along as well as an ordinary white man. But experience shows that in very few cases is the Indian boy or girl capable of taking care of himself or herself in contact with the white race. My own view is that the same amount of money spent on a boy or girl in a boarding school would result in training a very much larger number, and would have a better general effect in elevating the whole Indian race. I dealt with this matter at some length in the House a few years ago, and there was considerable discussion on the subject. I said then that while I was inclined to form that opinion I was not sufficiently clear on the subject to condemn an institution which had been founded before I took office, and I had not arrived at the conclusion that they were not doing sufficiently satisfactory work to warrant a radical change in the whole organization. With one exception there has been no industrial institution founded within the last four years. That exception is in British Columbia, where a church society offered to put up the building and incur all the preliminary expenses.

Mr. SPROULE. That corroborates the information I have had, namely, that the industrial schools are comparatively a failure, and that the money spent in that direction is almost thrown away, because unless the Indians are kept under control after they leave the school they relapse into a condition little better than before they went to school. If these schools are not giving moderately good results the question arises as to what we should do. We have had them long enough on trial to enable us to determine whether they are a success or a failure, and it is important that the Indian Department should consider as to whether it would not be better to change the system.

Mr. CLANCY. Have the supplies for the Indian Department been bought by tender?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, altogether.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the minister lay on the Table the tenders for some very large supplies of groceries and clothing which are mentioned in the Auditor General's Report?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When I said 'altogether'; all the supplies that can be scheduled before the beginning of the year are printed in a list. We advertised for tenders extensively, and we award to the lowest tenderer in each case. The only goods not purchased in that way are small articles for which there arises a demand during the year. Where it is possible to be done, the great bulk of the supplies are purchased by tender. Did the hon. gentleman call my attention to a particular case?

Mr. CLANCY. Groceries bought in the city of Ottawa. The hon. gentleman will find them in the Auditor General's Report all the way from J—18 to the conclusion of surveys for the North-west Territories and Manitoba.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The supplies to which my hon. friend refers on page 54 are small supplies for which a demand arises in the year, and for which we cannot advertise for tenders in the beginning of the year. Take, for instance, blankets, flour, and agricultural implements. These are purchased in accordance with an estimate sent to us by the Indian commissioner, and for these we ask for tenders. But articles required during the year, for which no definite estimate has been sent by the commissioner are purchased in the places where they are required.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman lay the tenders on the Table?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, certainly.

Indians—Manitoba and North-west Territories —Grist and saw-mills, $1,113.

Mr. CLANCY. On page J—54 the hon. gentleman will find this item: Amount of deficits to March 31, 1900, $7,942.92. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain what that means.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That was the shortage in the management of the Elkhorn industrial school, which was paid by the department. The school had been established on the basis of $110 per pupil per annum being granted, but it was found to be absolutely incapable of being managed on that basis, and the department paid the deficit, and has had to take the school over, and it is now managed as a government school.

Indians—Manitoba and North-west Territories —General expenses, $142,320.

Mr. CLANCY. As the minister has promised to give my hon. friend from Marquette some explanation in regard to the sale or lease of that printing press, and in view of the acting minister last session having stated that no lease or other disposition had been made of the press, I think it would be well to reserve this item or some other for the purpose of getting the information which the hon. gentleman promised us.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will give it on the supplementary estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. How many grist-mills is the department keeping up?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Six altogether.

Mr. SPROULE. Have any of them been disposed of during recent years? I understood that it was the intention of the department as early as possible to dispose of these to private individuals, as they were somewhat expensive and did not yield a very great return.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think it would be advisable to follow that policy. Where we can get the Indians to take an interest in them, I think it is desirable to retain them.

Mr. SPROULE. What special interest can the Indians take in them? If the mill is there to do their grinding is it not as valuable to the Indians in the hands of a private individual as it is in the hands of the department?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A private individual would run the mill for the purpose of making money, and would not be under the control of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. I imagine that the department could make such regulations as would ensure the use of these mills to the Indians on a certain basis that would give them all the advantages of the mills and yet enable the department to save something in the running of them.

Indians—British Columbia—Industrial and boarding schools, $68,750.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the same rule apply in British Columbia with regard to those articles which can be purchased by tender, as in Manitoba and the North-west Territories?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are very few supplies required for British Columbia, and they are purchased locally. My hon. friend will see that the conditions are not at all the same as in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, where we buy in very large quantities.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. How are the medicines purchased—by local tender or contract?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Indian superintendent has a schedule of prices, and whatever is bought is paid for according to the schedule.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. The superintendent has instructions only to go to certain men.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is quite right.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. How about the medical officers? Looking through the Auditor General's Report, I see different names for amounts paid for attendance on Indians. I suppose the hon. gentleman has changed his medical adviser in a good many cases?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are no salaried medical officers there. They are paid so much a visit.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Was anything paid to Dr. Sanson for the Williams Lake Indians or the Kamloops Indians?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The amount paid last year to Dr. L. Sanson was $224.50.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. What other doctor in the Yale district was paid?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Just one other doctor, Mr. Wilson Herald, $473.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like the hon. minister, when he gives the information already asked for, to give the names of the Indian agents who have been dismissed, and in whose places other appointments have been made, as well as the number of physicians attending the Indians, who have been dismissed and in whose places others were appointed, since the hon. gentleman came into office.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. What is the increase of $9,700 in industrial and boarding schools for ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is made up by a provision for a boarding school at Squamish, fifty pupils at $60 per head ; also, one at Albernie, at $60 per head, twenty-five pupils, and one at Lytton, an industrial school, $130 per head, forty pupils. This last grant is one I have been strongly pressed to give for a couple of years. The New England Company, a very ancient society organized to do missionary and educational work among the Indians, whose headquarters are in London, England, agree to put up all the buildings and pay preliminary expenses, if we will give a per capita grant.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Can the hon. gentleman recollect whether any application was made by Bishop Christie or any of his priests with regard to the increase for the Clayquot industrial school, on the west coast of Vancouver island.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It would be difficult to say that no application had been made for an increase, because, generally speaking, there is one in every case, but my attention has not been called to it, and I do not think that one was made.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Bishop Christie's school at Clayquot really needs assistance, and I strongly urge upon the hon. gentleman to do something for him.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are getting the same grant as the other schools in British Columbia, $60 per head for fifty pupils. The increase in travelling expenses of $600 is for the travelling expenses of the agent of the north-west coast. The agent there, Mr. Todd, had a small steamer, but it has got so old that it is not safe to use it any longer, and it has been disposed of. We are asking $600 to cover all travelling expenses.

Office and miscellaneous, including hospitals, irrigation, dyking and suppression of the liquor traffic, $10,920.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Can the hon. gentleman give us any information with regard to the Songhees Indian reserve ? I see by the papers brought down in the local House that our local premier had an interview with the hon. gentleman, and declared what the province wished in regard to that reserve. This matter has been under negotiation for many years, and surely it can be brought to a termination soon. It is one of great importance to the city of Victoria.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend is familiar with the negotiations we had a few years ago with the provincial government. I made a reasonably favourable offer at that time to the provincial government. But, provincial politics became somewhat disturbed shortly after, and it was difficult to bring questions of that kind to the attention of the provincial government. The offer I made was substantially declined by the British Columbia government, on grounds I explained to the hon. gentleman about that time, or shortly afterwards.

A little while ago, when the Hon. Mr. Dunsmuir and Attorney General Eberts were here, I discussed the question with them at some length. I quite realize the importance to the city of Victoria of having the Indians removed from the present reserve. I discussed the matter with Attorney General Eberts, and I think we arrived at a conclusion that was mutually satisfactory. The government of British Columbia has now made a proposal ; and I have submitted it to Mr. Vowell, the superintendent at Victoria, in order that he may consider it, and in order that I may be sure that I do not misunderstand the facts. I have a general recollection of the conformation of the reserve, but some of the references were such that I was not sure as to the portion of the reserve they referred to. At the same time, by letter, I intimated to Premier Dunsmuir in a general way that I was prepared to meet his views. I have no doubt that as soon as I get the report from Mr. Vowell, we can close the matter up and place the Indians on a reserve at a distance from the city.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I am very glad to hear it.

Department of Indian Affairs—General, $4,200.

Mr. CLANCY. Who is inspector of timber referred to in this article ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Chitty. He has been in the department for many years. There is also the inspector of agencies and reserves, Mr. Macrae, whom I found there when I came into office.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not had an opportunity of speaking to the premier, but I think the Minister of Railways expects to go on with his estimates. My hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) tells me he expects to go on in the afternoon with the franchise or election Bills. They will probably be the first order of business, and the estimates of the Minister of Railways next.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 11, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

BEACONS ON THE RIVER RICHELIEU.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked :

Which of the departments is invested with the control, maintenance, &c., of the beacons on the River Richelieu, between Sorel and Chambly?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies). I would ask my hon. friend to let that rest until we get some further information as to which department has control of these beacons.

CARETAKERS OF PUBLIC OFFICES.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked :

What are the respective salaries of the caretakers of the public offices at Three Rivers, Montmagny, Sorel, St. Hyacinthe, St. Johns (P.Q.), St. Jerome, Quebec and Montreal?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher), in the absence of the Minister of Public Works :

Salary per year of caretakers of public buildings :

Three Rivers customs house....	$300
Three Rivers post office.... ..	400
Montmagny, no salary, receives rent of offices.	
Sorel.....	$400
St. Hyacinthe	400
St. Johns.....	350
St. Jerome.....	350
Quebec post office.....	700
Montreal, Dominion buildings.	No caretaker.

ICE GUARDS, STE. ANNE DE SOREL.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked :

1. How many new ice guards have been constructed since 1896 in the parish of Ste. Anne de Sorel?

2. What has been the total cost thereof?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). In the absence of the Minister of Public Works :

1. Five.

2. $5,543.57.

MR. A. PACAUD'S LEASE OF BUILDING.

Mr. CLANCY asked :

1. Has Mr. Aurèle Pacaud, the publisher of Le Progrès, of Windsor, Ont., a lease of the government building which he occupies as a printing office? If so, what rent does he pay per annum?

2. Is he in arrears for rent? If so, how much ? What steps are the government taking to collect the arrears, if any?

3. When was the lease executed? Is Mr. L. N. Castanier, customs officer at Windsor, one of the lessees?

Mr. SIFTON.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). In the absence of the Minister of Public Works :

1. An arrangement was made with Mr. Pacaud by which he was to pay $10 a month, for two years, and make necessary repairs to the old Weights and Measures building at Windsor, and after the two years to pay $12 a month.

2. Orders have been issued to collect the amount of rent now due, which is $210.

3. As the lease was under pleasure, and for a small amount, it was not thought necessary to enter into a formal lease. The department is not aware that Mr. Castanier is one of the lessees.

COAL-BEARING LANDS.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART asked :

1. Referring to the statute 60 and 61 Victoria, chapter 5, section 1, subsection 1, has the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or any other company referred to in said subsection, conveyed or caused to be conveyed to the Crown in the interest of Canada, any and what coal-bearing lands in said subsection referred to?

2. If so, has the Governor in Council prescribed any and what conditions with respect to the holding, disposal or dealing with such lands by the government?

3. Has the government or the Governor in Council disposed of, or otherwise dealt with the said coal lands, or any portion thereof, in any and what manner ?

4. Has the government or Governor in Council disposed of the said lands, or any portion thereof, to any persons or corporations? If so, to what persons or corporations, and upon what terms have such lands been so disposed of, and what portion of such lands have been so disposed of?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). To 1, 2, 3 and 4, the answer is, no. But, I may say for the further information of my hon. friend, that the railway company has been for some time ready and willing to transfer the lands so soon as they might be selected. The selection is a matter of considerable difficulty, and involves a great deal of work. Ever since the snow went off the ground last year, and until the work became impossible again last fall, I had a party of topographical surveyors, and also an expert geologist, with the necessary assistants, going over the country for the purpose of putting the department in a position to make the selection. The plan of the territory has now been prepared, and I have all the information that is necessary for a practical selection. As soon as the snow is off the ground, it is the purpose of the government to send a properly equipped party, including men with the necessary expert knowledge, to determine upon the selection.

POSTMASTER AT GOODLANDS, MAN.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette)—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has Mr. Goodlands, formerly postmaster at Goodlands, Man., been dismissed from that position?

2. If so, why? Were charges made against him, what were their nature, and by whom made?

3. Was an investigation held?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND :

1. Yes.

2. On the ground of political partisanship, representations having been made by the member for the constituency. The Postmaster General accepted such representations and ordered his dismissal.

3. No investigation was held.

RECIPIENTS OF FISHING BOUNTY, QUEEN'S COUNTY, P.E.I.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. What is the name of the officer who received the claims for fishing bounty and who distributed the cheques to fishermen in Queen's county, P.E.I., for the year 1900?

2. How many claims were filed, and how many cheques issued for said year?

3. What are the names and post office addresses of fishermen who claimed bounty and were paid same, with the amount paid each?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) :

1. W. C. Hobkirk, fishery overseer, Queen's county.

2. and 3. I must ask my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett) to move for a return. I could not fill up 'Hansard' with the hundreds of names of fishermen with their post office addresses who received bounties. If I did it for Queen's county, I might be called upon to do it for the other counties in the maritime provinces, and that would take up a whole 'Hansard' of itself. If my hon. friend desires special information, I will be happy to show him the list in the department, and he can examine it ; or, if he prefers to do so, he can move for a return.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But there will be no opportunity to move for a return.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There will be no objection. It can be put on the Notice paper, and we will take unopposed motions some day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But notices of motions will not be reached.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would just point out to my hon. friends that there are thousands of names and post office addresses of fishermen who have received bounties, and a separate 'Hansard' would be needed if I should give the names of all in the maritime provinces. There are some hundred in this county alone.

LOSS OF THE JENNIE MAY.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ordered an investigation into the causes of the loss of the schooner Jennie May, at Ebbsfleet, P.E.I., as promised in his letter of the 25th May, 1900, to Capt. Thomas Reid, as follows :— 'I regret very much to hear of the loss you have sustained in going into the harbour of Ebbsfleet, as you allege, from want of buoys. I shall have immediate inquiries and a thorough investigation made into the alleged absence of these buoys. If the officials of the government are to blame, I will have them severely punished'?

2. If such investigation has been held, what is the report of the officer?

3. Has any person been paid for the loss thus sustained?

4. If so, what is his name, and the sum paid in connection with such loss?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) :

1. The minister did not promise an investigation into the loss of the Jennie May in his letter of the 25th May, 1900. He promised to investigate the alleged absence of the buoys ; a different thing entirely. It is alleged that the loss of the vessel was due to other causes.

2. The promised investigation was made. The report of the officers state that the buoy contractor was notified to place the buoys on the 5th of May, but owing to the impossibility of getting chain at Ebbsfleet for the can-buoy, the buoys were not put out till the 16th of May. This date was the earliest one on which the buoys were placed for many years. The officers also reported that the loss was due to causes which the buoys could not have prevented.

3. No.

4. Nothing has been paid.

IMPROVEMENT OF SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR.

Mr. HALLIDAY asked :

Is it the intention of the government to make the immediate improvements in the Southampton harbour that the Minister of Public Works found necessary on his recent visit to that place, and what are the improvements the government propose to make?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). The matter is now receiving consideration.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Summary report of the Geological Survey for the year 1900.—Hon. Mr. Sifton.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to say a word to give notice respecting estimates. We propose to resume the consideration of the estimates of the Minister of Railways and Canals tomorrow afternoon. To-day we proceed with the Election Bill, but if there is time for estimates during to-day's sitting the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture will be taken up.

THE TRANSPORTATION QUESTION.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (St. Lawrence, Montreal). I would ask the Prime Minister if he would fix a day next week —Wednesday would be convenient—for the further discussion of the transportation question. I have a motion on this subject on the paper, but I am afraid it will not now be reached in the ordinary course, and there will be no possibility of reaching it except by the consent of the leader of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I shall be happy, Mr. Speaker, to proceed with the discussion on Wednesday next.

BAR AT THE MOUTH OF THE THAMES.

Mr. GEORGE STEPHENS (Kent, Ont.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the government to a matter of immediate and pressing importance. When I reached Chatham last Friday I found that the bar at the mouth of the River Thames had so accumulated that the boats from the city of Chatham could not get out into the lake. I wired to the Minister of Public Works, this being a copy of my message :

Chatham, April 6, 1901.

J. Israel Tarte, Ottawa.

Steam barge "Ireland" stuck on bar since April 3rd. Cannot get off. Only seven feet water. Best time to do work now. Other boats waiting; cannot get out. Chatham dredging plant ready to begin work; price, $8 per working hour. Answer quick.

(Sgd.) GEORGE STEPHENS.

I waited until yesterday afternoon for a reply to this message, but did not get any. I then saw the Prime Minister and asked him to speak to the Minister of Public Works. Last night at eight o'clock I got this reply :

Office of the Minister of
Public Works of Canada,
Ottawa, 9th April, 1901.

George Stephens, Esq., M.P., Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Stephens,—Your telegram dated at Chatham, April 6th, has come to hand in due course. We have nothing to do with accidents to ships. It is the reason why I did not authorize the work suggested in your despatch.

Truly yours,
(Sgd.) J. ISRAEL TARTE.

Mr. SPEAKER. Do I understand that the hon. member (Mr. Stephens) will conclude with a motion ?

Mr. STEPHENS. Yes. Yesterday afternoon, I received this message :

Chatham, Ont., April 10, 1901.

George Stephens, M.P., Ottawa.

Major Gray expected here to-night. Have you orders for him to see about bar at river?

(Sgd.) CHAS. HADLEY.

I have not been able to see the hon. Minister of Public Works in his office. I met him in the lobby yesterday morning as he came out of the committee room, but he would not give me a hearing. He would not give me any information whatever. I met him in the afternoon and tried to show him this telegram, but I could not get him to stop and look at it or pay any attention. To-day I have another telegram :

Ottawa.

Can you not get reply to ours yesterday to George Stephens, M.P., signed 'Hadley.' ?

(Sgd.) Chatham, Ont.

I have not sent any reply to these telegrams, for the simple reason that I have not been able to get any information, and do not know what to say. Traffic by the river is at a standstill. Our lumber merchants in Chatham, who bring their lumber by boat from Georgian Bay points are unable to bring in material, except by rail, which is much more expensive. Buildings now under construction in Chatham cannot be proceeded with because building stone cannot be brought in. There are several boats now waiting ready to start, but they cannot get out. I do not see any reason why this work should not be done at once. I confess I am surprised at the manner at which the subject has been treated by the hon. Minister of Public Works. I know that he is a very busy man, but, if he has not time to attend to the business committed to his charge, one would think that at least he could treat members of the House with courtesy. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SPROULE. You had better resign and bring on another election, and then you will hurry the matter up.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I can quite understand the importance which the hon. gentleman attaches to the work of clearing the bar being done at once, and am not at all astonished that he should feel rather warm over the delay in doing that work. There is a capital dredging plant on the ground, and it seems very extraordinary that that dredge should not have been put at the work. The price asked is $8 per hour for each working day, which is the ordinary price for dredges of similar capacity. I hope that the Minister of Public Works will not delay any longer, because this is a matter of great concern to the people of that locality and the shipping interests.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is quite true that my hon. friend from Kent brought the matter to my attention, but he must remember that at this period of the session, when the House sits to a late hour and the committees are called at an early hour, such matters do not always move as promptly as would be satisfactory, but I have no doubt that my hon. colleague, who is not in his place just

now, will do what he can to meet the views of my hon. friend.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). The delays mentioned by the hon. member for Kent are quite inexcusable. We are told that there is a surplus of $8,000,000 in the treasury. Surely a few hundred dollars could be devoted to enabling the prosperous city of Chatham to carry on its essential business of getting lumber, stone and all the other supplies, which must necessarily come by the water route. It appears to me that the town of Chatham has a substantial grievance in this matter. We are voting large sums yearly to the Department of Public Works exactly for such improvements as are required in this case—improvements that are urgent. And, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Kent, there is a dredge right on the ground ready to do the work at the government price of $8 per hour, so that in the shortest possible time the sand bar could be removed and the navigation made clear. It seems extraordinary that a member of parliament should be obliged to rise in his seat and call attention to a matter of this kind, which should have been remedied the very first moment the attention of the Minister of Public Works was called to it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). I am sorry the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stephens) did not see fit to notify me that he was going to bring this matter before the House, but as he is a new member, this course probably did not suggest itself to him, and we will not be the worse friends on that account. A barge or a boat has grounded at Chatham, and it does not come within the province of the Department of Public Works to float boats that are grounded. The duty of removing such obstacles belongs to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Besides, I have no money available for dredging purposes, and I cannot carry on work without money, more particularly in a case like this in which it is not my duty to interfere. I would be very glad indeed if it were my duty, but there are boats grounded nearly every week in the St. Lawrence, in navigable waters, and I am never called on to send down dredges or other boats to haul them off.

My hon. friend would perhaps not have called the attention of the House to this were he aware of the fact that my youngest daughter is down with typhoid fever, and that the very first moment his telegram came, I had to leave for Montreal. I returned as soon as I could, and then answered the telegram.

Mr. CLANCY. Surely the hon. gentleman does not pretend to say that he would not be justified in sending a dredge at once to clear the harbour and trust to the House to vote the money.

Mr. STEPHENS. Has the hon. gentleman not got a vote for this in the estimates of this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend knows that until the money is voted I cannot use it, and at this moment I have not a dollar voted.

Mr. STEPHENS. I asked the hon. minister if he had the money in the supplementary estimates and he said he had, and I supposed that he would be prepared to go on and spend it. The company which owns the dredge would not be very exacting about getting paid at once, and would be quite willing to wait. And as regards the ungrounding of the boat, my telegram merely mentioned the fact that the boat had grounded, so as to emphasize the necessity of going on with the dredging at once in order to enable other boats to go over the bar. I did not ask him to take the sunken boat off the bar, but simply mentioned the fact in order to impress him with the importance of immediately setting the dredge to work to clear the bar so that boats could pass with facility. If this work be not done, navigation will be stopped and steamers will not be able to ply to and fro and may be tied up all summer. If that is what is going to happen, then Canada must be a very much poorer country than I thought it was.

FRANCHISE ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 63) to amend the Franchise Act, 1898—The Solicitor General (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick)—read the second time, and considered in committee.

On section 1,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. Solicitor General might explain to the committee the effect of this amendment.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Paragraph c of section 5 of the Franchise Act now reads :

> The voters' lists shall be those prepared for the several polling divisions so established, and which on the sixtieth day next preceding the day fixed for the nomination of candidates for such Dominion election were in force or were last in force under the laws of that province for the purposes of provincial elections.

The intention is to omit the word ' sixtieth,' so as to have it read that :

> The voters' lists shall be those prepared for the several polling divisions so established and which on the day of the date of the writ for such Dominion elections were in force or were last in force under the laws of that province for the purposes of provincial elections.

This eliminates the sixtieth day altogether. The clause as it now reads provides that the voters' lists shall be those in force sixty days previous to nomination.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is another amendment effected. Instead of the date of

nomination you take the date of the election.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, the date of the issue of the writ.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the hon. Solicitor General if this refers to some particular district, when the words 'polling divisions so established' are used, or, does that mean all the divisions throughout the Dominion.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. All the divisions throughout the Dominion.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. Solicitor General if there is any doubt under the clauses as prepared that the lists in force on the date of the writ will be the lists that will govern the election, because, if the Solicitor General will notice, the clause says further: 'Or were last in force.'

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think that these new words make any material difference.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I would like to ask the hon. Solicitor General whether this amendment will cure a state of affairs that occurred in British Columbia at the last election. According to the local Act, the list is revised twice a year—I think on the 1st of May and the 1st of November. If these are not the exact dates it is not material, but, it is a fact, nevertheless, that the revision took place a few days before the election, and as sixty days had not intervened between the revision and the election the electors had to use a list that was nearly seven months old. Owing to that there was a large number of men who lost their franchise. Will this do away with that state of affairs?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This amendment is intended to meet absolutely such a case as that pointed out by the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Prior). The object is to have the latest list for the election.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. Solicitor General if it is a fact that the voters' lists used in the last general election were some of them the provincial lists of last year and some of them lists of the year before? I am informed that in many constituencies the voters' lists were not at all of the one year, but that some of them were the lists of last year, and some the lists of the year before.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I presume there were some places in Ontario where the revision would not take place at a fixed period of the year and the list would not come into force within sixty days, and that, notwithstanding that it would be the list for that year, it would not be used for the election. Now, it is intended to so arrange matters that the list to be used will be the list in force at the date of the issue of the writ for the election, without any reference to any previous time of revision.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps it is rather late to discuss the question, for the discussion of which I rise at the present moment. I see in this clause, you have virtually adopted the provincial voters' lists, which may be in force from time to time, or, in other words, you give to the province the right of fixing the qualification of the voter or to decide who shall be the voter in Dominion elections. I may be entirely wrong, but I contend that we have no power to do that, that it is a power that is vested entirely in the Dominion parliament, and that we cannot, as we propose to do in this Bill, divest ourselves of that power and give it to the local authorities. I am objecting to it on the constitutional ground. The hon. Minister of Justice must have considered that point. It must have been brought before his department, and I would like from the Solicitor General an authoritative statement on behalf of the department whether the power is vested in the Dominion parliament to divest ourselves of the authority which is given us under clause 41 of the British North America Act and to give that power to the provincial legislature.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think the constitutional principle that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has laid down, is absolutely correct, that we have no power to delegate to the local parliaments the right to fix our franchise. But, this is not what we are doing. We are adopting the franchise of the provincial parliaments. We are not delegating to them the right to fix the franchise, but we are adopting the franchise that they have fixed. There is a broad distinction between the two, and I would like the hon. gentleman not to overlook the fact that previous to the adoption of the Franchise Act of 1886, this was the system which prevailed. It was only in 1886 that we assumed the right to make the franchise. This system is no new departure. It is adopting the old system, which was in existence from confederation down to 1886.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am glad to hear that we agree upon the legal point. Now, the question is one of fact. The hon. Solicitor General says that we have adopted the voters' lists which were in force in the provinces at a particular time. If that were so, I admit that we would be perfectly within our jurisdiction, but does he not see the distinction that it is not the voters' lists which are in force, but the voters' lists which may be altered from time to time by the provincial authorities that we are adopting.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Is it the intention to adopt the marked ballot as well as the provincial voters' lists, because if you propose to adopt the marked ballot I for one will fight it here all day.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The provincial franchise was adopted when we introduced this Bill two years ago, and it was

adopted after a very lengthy discussion. Then the question raised by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) as to our right to adopt the provincial franchise, was disposed of. With respect to the ballot, that question will come up on the Bill to amend the Elections Act.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I understand the ballot will be secret ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Oh, yes.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). All right.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. As far as my judgment goes, that is the principle upon which we have gone for the last two years.

Mr. INGRAM. In the electoral district of Nipissing when the government changed the date of last election the voters' lists for Nipissing were prepared the same as they would be prepared for any ordinary township, and as other electoral districts in Canada used lists that were not prepared in 1900 but prepared previously, how does it come that the government by order in council changed the date of the election in Nipissing ? The hon. gentleman from Nipissing (Mr. McCool) is elected on a list prepared less than sixty days previous to the election, and that being so, surely his election must be illegal. I wish to know from the Solicitor General why an order in council was passed changing the date of the election.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would not like to sit in judgment upon what has been decided by the Ontario courts in respect to the Nipissing election, and no opinion I would express would have any effect as against that judgment. It involves a question of fact as to which we cannot agree. So far as my knowledge goes there are unorganized territories in the Nipissing district within which the electoral lists must be made at a time fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and these are made at certain periods previous to the election. It was in consequence of the electoral lists in these particular districts not having been ready that the returning officer reported to the government that he did not have lists which would enable him to carry on the election.

Mr. INGRAM. That only applies to cases where they have a registration list and not ordinary lists. The Nipissing list was prepared in 1898, and that being so, surely it does not come under the Franchise Act of the Dominion which says that lists prepared under the Registration Act must not be older than twelve months. If it does not come under the Registration Act it applies in the ordinary way as in a municipality in which there is no registration list at all. So far as the Solicitor General sitting in judgment on the decision of the courts goes, I submit that it is our duty as representatives of the people, when we discover a defect in the election law, that we should set it right so that this kind of thing would not occur in the future. It does seem to me as a layman and from the consideration I have given the Election Act, that an unfair and undue advantage has been taken of the electors of the Nipissing district for the purpose of party gain and for no other object.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think that the Solicitor General apprehends what the judgment in the Nipissing case was or he would not have answered my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) as he did. The only thing decided in that case was, that on account of the returning officer hiding himself on nomination day, no nomination could be effective. The judges did not discuss the question as to whether or not there was a legal postponement, because that did not come before them. Therefore, the question put by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) is entirely relevant. I think it would puzzle the Solicitor General to show any authority in the Governor in Council or any one else to postpone that election under the circumstances. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) may have an opportunity before the session is over of giving us some information on that point, if he can. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what he intends to cover by the words 'or were last in force.' The objection raised by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is well worth considering. The lists are either in force or not in force on the day of the writ. It may be that some reason for these words has escaped my attention, but for the present I cannot see that the words 'or were last in force' will do anything except possibly create a doubt in the mind of some officer as to what lists he should use.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will bear in mind that these words are merely a repetition of the section of the statute as we now have it. There is absolutely no change. There must have been some reason for the words, because the matter was fully discussed in the House, and I have no doubt it was explained to the satisfaction of my hon. friend.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There were several things in this Franchise Act that were not explained to my satisfaction. A great many inaccuracies occurred in the statute as passed which none of us seem to have noticed, or which if they were noticed were not corrected. This may be one of them. I hardly think it is a sufficient answer for the Solicitor General to say that there must have been some reason in 1898 which none of us can now recall. The question is : Whether we have any reason now. I am not raising this point out of any factious desire to have it changed, but I suggest to the Solicitor General that these words may con-

fuse the officer. Do not these words give him an alternative, and will he not stop to consider whether he has to use the lists which are in force on a particular date or the lists which having regard to that particular date were last previously in force ? I venture to think that these words will create a doubt and can serve no useful purpose.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am quite certain they do serve a useful purpose. I am prepared at present merely to explain the changes in the law and I cannot give the reason for this now. There is no reason why we should dispose of the Bill to-day, and I will explain the matter when we get into committee again.

Mr. MONK. The language of the section is ' were last in force under the laws of that province for the purposes of a provincial election.' It is possible that some officer might think he had a choice between the lists in force at the date of the Dominion writ, or the lists that were in force at some immediately previous provincial election.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am quite sure I shall be able to make it quite clear to my hon. friend that there is really no ambiguity about it, and that it is not intended to leave it to the returning officer to decide which list he shall use in an election—because that would be utterly incongruous.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I would like to call the attention of the Solicitor General to one practical result which might result from this law. At the present time the lists in use are those in force sixty days prior to the isue of the writ ; and in the province of Ontario it is quite possible that a county judge, before whom an appeal has been taken, might have given his decision only a day or two before the issue of the writ, in which case it would be impossible in all probability to get copies of the voters' list until within a few days of the election. The hon. gentleman will understand that it takes some time after the county court judge gives his decision, to get the voters' list printed in Ottawa. I have always supposed that was one reason why the sixty days were allowed under the present law, and that provision has been an advantage in that respect. In the last election I had some difficulty in getting my lists from some municipalities ; and if an election happened to come on in October or November in any year, there would certainly be a great deal of difficulty in many constituencies in the province of Ontario if the lists used were as provided by this clause, no time being allowed for printing. If the hon. gentleman objects to sixty days, perhaps a compromise might be struck by saying thirty days.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The sixty days were put in the Bill when introduced so as to prevent the local government tampering with the lists previous to the election ; but, that provision was found to work so disadvantageously in many parts of the country that lists over a year old had to be used. The desire of everybody, it seems to me, is that we should have the freshest lists available for use in an election. My hon. friend says that it is possible that an appeal may not be disposed of by the county judge until shortly before the date of the election. My hon. friend will bear in mind that the list to be used is the list in force at the date of the issue of the writ.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am speaking from my own experience when I say that it takes a certain time to get the list printed. I only wish to have sufficient time allowed for that purpose. Perhaps a fortnight would be enough. In the months of October and November these courts are being held in the province of Ontario, and it is perfectly certain that there would be a number of constituencies in which the judgment would be given only a day or two before the writ was issued. The result would be that one side or the other, certainly one side, would have to go into the campaign without any voters' list, and I am sure the hon. gentleman would not wish to subject even an opponent to such a hardship as that.

Mr. INGRAM. I think it would be a disadvantage to us all if you abolish the sixty days. For the reasons stated by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), many of the lists will not be printed, and candidates will be put to the inconvenience of using a list which has probably been revised just two or three days before the issue of the writ, whereas the lists made up sixty days before the issue of the writ could be printed at the Printing Bureau and sent to the different candidates in time for the election. At present candidates have a great deal of difficulty with the registration lists which are prepared within a day or two of the election.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I would like to ask the Solicitor General if it would not be possible, while he is amending the election law, to have the election held at some stated time, so that we might know when it is coming on, and if it would not be possible to have it in November, or at some time when the farmers are not very busy. Then, everybody would know six months before when the election takes place. That would be a step in the right direction, and there is no reason why it should not be done in Canada as it is in other countries. I see no reason why we should not be as advanced in Canada as they are in other countries.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have on the Order paper a Bill to amend the Election Act, and when that comes up there will be an opportunity to discuss that question.

Mr. PRINGLE. Does this clause in any way conflict with the Ontario statute as to the registration of voters in towns and cities ? Because, as I understand this clause, the list to be used is the list in force on the day the writ is issued, while the list under the Registration Act does not come into force until some days after the issue of the writ.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In the Bill to amend the Election Act, which will come up after this Bill is disposed of, I am dealing with that particular point.

Mr. BENNETT. I quite agree with the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) that this is a very important question. In the province of Ontario, after the local lists are printed, courts are held by the county court judges. Then, the revised lists are returned and posted up in the office of the clerk of the peace. Assuming that a list has been corrected and is to be found in the office of the clerk of the peace on the 1st of November, then, according to the wording of this Act, that would be the list in force ; and were an election to take place on the 15th of November——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That could not be, because there must be thirty days at least.

Mr. BENNETT. Assuming, then, that it would be held on the 30th of November, what would be the result ? The government candidate might see that list on file in the office of the clerk of the peace was at once sent to Ottawa ; and the government, by reason of their influence in the Printing Bureau, might see that that list was at once sent back to the riding, particularly if it were strongly in favour of the government candidate. But, another list from another riding, which was not in favour of the government candidate, might be sent to Ottawa, and might be delayed in the printing. Then, what list would be used ? I think under some clause of the Act, the list on which the election is to take place is the list furnished from Ottawa, not the list posted in the office of the clerk of the peace. The result of this change will be that the government, in the event of the date fixed for an election and the printing of the lists being close at hand, can have those lists used which they wish and suppress or delay those they do not wish to use.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is purely a question of the balance of convenience, and there are certainly conveniences resulting from either system. It seems to me that we ought to make some sacrifice in order to get a fresh list, especially as the getting of it does not bring about the result pointed out by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). The returning officer is obliged to apply to the clerk of the peace of Ontario, who is the custodian of the list, and he may possibly get a list that never reached Ottawa at all, if it is the list in force at the time of the election.

Mr. BENNETT. There is just this disadvantage, that the clerk of the peace may not furnish the deputy returning officer a printed list at all, because the list was not prepared in time to be sent to Ottawa and printed. You will simply have a list with the names written in, which will open the door for fraud for every kind on the part of the deputy returning officer. He might, if he felt so inclined, lay that list conveniently where somebody might tear a whole page out, and those whose names were on that page could not possibly vote. Then, when the clerk of the peace gives out the list to be copied, those copying it might add names and omit names, and that is why we contended, when the present law was before the House, that the lists placed in the hands of the deputy returning officers, should be the printed lists issued from Ottawa.

Mr. INGRAM. If we leave the law as it is, we will be in a better position because we will know, sixty days before the election, the exact lists which will be used, and there will not be the same opportunity to partisan returning officers and Crown attorneys to tamper with the lists.

Mr. BENNETT. When the written list is made up in the office of the clerk of the peace, it is made up from a printed list compiled by the judge, and which the judge leaves in the office of the clerk of the peace. That list will have names written in and others scored out, and might easily be tampered with.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. These points were discussed very fully when the Bill was first introduced, and all these inconveniences were pointed out, but I do not think my hon. friends can find a case of the kind they have pointed out, which occurred during the last election.

Mr. BENNETT. Because you acceded to our request to have the lists printed at Ottawa.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We are not making a change in law in that respect. The lists will continue to be printed at Ottawa except such as come into force immediately before the election, and in such case you would have to apply to the legal custodian for a copy. I fail to see the probability of the frauds pointed out by my hon. friends being committed.

Mr. INGRAM. Should an election take place, for instance, on the 7th of November, you will find, a day or two previous to the issue of the writ, several municipalities in which the lists have just been completed and others again in which they are not completed, and every candidate will have the

disagreeable task of providing himself with the lists in these municipalities in which they were prepared a day or two before the writ issued. Why not retain the sixty days, which will give ample time to have the lists printed at Ottawa, and avoid that necessity.

Mr. SPROULE. The same thing may happen whether you have the sixty days or not. In my election last year, in one of the municipalities the list of last year was used while in all the others we had to use the lists of the previous year. But although in one municipality the list had been revised before the sixty days, a certified copy had not been sent by the judge to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and consequently we had no list until a short time before the election, and I had to fall back on the old provincial lists until I got the new one a few days before the election. Whether the delay be sixty days or less, you may have the same trouble.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Every lawyer will bear me out in saying that if an election should come on in October or November in Ontario, the very difficulty pointed out must arise in the majority of municipalities. And it would be an utter impossibility to obtain the list from Ottawa. Whatever drawbacks there may have been in the former Act, at least it relieved us of this difficulty. It is absolutely certain that in a majority of constituencies in Ontario, we should be driven to take the list from the office of the clerk of the peace, and whether or not he might be trusted, as suggested by my hon. friend, those who wish to face the matter honestly know that it is almost as bad to have a large proportion of the people suspecting fraud as to have fraud actually occur. I trust the Solicitor General will see his way clear to amend the Act in such a way that even suspicion of fraud will be removed.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am sure the Solicitor General will see the importance of making some change as indicated by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup). Take, for instance, the village of Hastings in my county, or rather the county which I have the honour to represent——

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCHRANE. Perhaps I have shown the same weakness that ministers show when they talk about 'my department.' I always fancied that 'their' departments did not belong to them, but that they were the servants of the people. In the riding I have the honour to represent, it was found that the list was printed in Ottawa, except for the village of Hastings. There was no revision for that village, the election taking place on a voters' list that was in the hands of the clerk of the municipality. There had been no application for a revision, and therefore the list was in the hands of the clerk unrevised for sixty days. Thus, the village of Hastings voted on a list that was a year older than the rest of the riding.

Mr. WALLACE. A year younger.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, a year younger. Now, the question is: Where are we going to get the list? Supposing that an election comes on in thirty days, the list that was in the hands of the clerk when the writs were issued would be the list on which the election would take place. How can you get that list printed in Ottawa? The Solicitor General will see that the Printing Bureau cannot print the lists for the whole Dominion in thirty days. I am not talking from a party point of view, for this does not affect one party more than the other. No matter what side the candidate is on, it would be impossible to get the list printed in Ottawa. This only shows the absurdity of having the local legislature provide the lists for election of members of the House of Commons. We should prepare our own lists. I believe the Solicitor General intended to prepare an honest list and have an honest election law; but, with the facts brought to his attention, he must see that last year's Franchise Act and election law will not remedy the difficulties which I feel satisfied he intended to remedy. Frauds have been perpetrated, and I am confident that unless some provision—I do not pretend to be able to suggest anything, but I am sure the Solicitor General will see the need of some change—unless some provision is made, it will be impossible to prevent frauds in the future.

Mr. CLANCY. We had an experience in the last election that should be a lesson to us as to adopting the proposed change. I address myself particularly to members on both sides from the province of Ontario, and I venture to state that not 10 per cent of new lists for 1900 were used in the last election. In Bothwell, there was but a single case in which the list for 1900 was used, and that arose out of the assessment having been changed some years ago from February to July. The election was held late in the year—the 7th November. But any hon. gentleman will see the utter impossibility of having lists prepared and printed if the work is to be done in the Printing Bureau. It was a physical impossibility in the past, and must continue to be so for the future. There might be many reasons why the change the hon. gentleman proposes should take place, but I do not see how it will overcome the difficulty I have just pointed out, so far as the province of Ontario is concerned. This is not a party question, and I appeal to hon. gentlemen on both sides if their experience in Ontario has not been that less than 10 per cent of the lists of 1900 were used in the election,

though that election took place on the 7th November.

Mr. MONK. The same difficulty would meet us in Quebec. For instance, if the election writ was dated between the 20th April and the 1st June, the parties interested would have the greatest difficulty in obtaining the lists, because the registrar of the county cannot possibly furnish these lists without taking on an additional staff of employees. It would be equally difficult to get the lists from the secretary-treasurers of the municipalities. The registrar for the registration division of Montreal East, who was the custodian of the list of the county of Jacques Cartier, found it impossible to conform with the provisions of section 10. If the Solicitor General will look at section 10 of the Act of 1898, he will see that it provides that within ten days the custodian of the lists must transmit to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a copy of the lists. In the case I speak of, the custodian of the lists found it impossible to do that. Even by taking on a large additional staff of employees, which cost very dear, he required twenty or twenty-five days before he could have the lists copied and forwarded to Ottawa. The provision which it is proposed to substitute would leave it impossible for the parties interested to procure the lists in their divisions, except at very great expense.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I appreciate the fact that this is a matter that we have to consider from the standpoint of the convenience of members of the House. We need give no consideration whatever, so far as I can see, to party politics in this matter. The difficulties, as I understand the matter, are these : Our present system leads to this result, that is if you take the list in force sixty days before the election, you are liable to have election lists more than a year old. That is the inconvenience that has resulted from the law in its present form.

Mr. CLANCY. But the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) will not pretend that the change he proposed will overcome that difficulty.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The change will, to a very large extent, obviate that difficulty. But it will bring about this other difficulty—that, instead of having lists printed in the Printing Bureau at Ottawa we should be obliged to depend on the copies of lists we get from the custodians of the lists, the local officials. That is the question for us to consider, which of the two inconveniences are we most willing to submit to. So far as I am concerned, I have an absolutely open mind on the subject. As I said before, there is a portion of this section that I will refer to later on and explain. But I would like to hear all that can be said both for and against the amendment ; I do not intend to dispose of that section to-day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman amends this section he will have to amend some other sections of the Act as well, it seems to me. If he looks at section 10 of the Franchise Act, 1898, he will see it is there provided that within ten days after the final revision of the list of voters for the purposes of a provincial election :

> It shall be the duty of the custodian thereof to transmit to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery by registered mail a copy of such list, certified under his hand.

Then subsection 2 provides :

> That for the purpose of a Dominion election such certified copy shall be deemed to be the original and legal list of voters.

I think it will be apparent to my hon. friend that that provision can scarcely be carried out with the amendment he now suggests. It could probably be carried out in most cases under the section as it now stands, because there is a period of sixty days within which this could be accomplished. Suppose the lists were finally revised a week before the election, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery does not get this until after the date prescribed by this amendment, and the result would be that you have no original and legal list of voters within the meaning of subsection 2. I do think that my hon. friend will have to amend this Act very much further than he proposes at present to do, for this purpose. I may say in passing that the hon. member for Lanark has suggested to me a possible reason why the words were used to which we made reference a moment ago, and that is the possible case that in some province there may not be, by reason of local legislation, any list in force upon which an election could then be held. If that is the intention, then I think my hon. friend had better amend the language of this subsection. I should think the sense would be more clearly expressed something in this way : The voters' lists shall be those prepared for the several polling divisions and which, on the day of the date of the writ for such Dominion election, were in force, or in case no such lists were then in force, then the lists which were last in force. That prevents the difficulty arising from the standpoint of alternative lists.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would ask the leader of the opposition to read subsection 10 which I think meets the difficulty he has suggested with respect to the lists being sent to the Printing Bureau.

Mr. INGRAM. There is another important point that will affect our friends opposite as well as us.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Nothing can affect you that does not affect us.

Mr. INGRAM. The last portion of section 10 of the Franchise Act affects us in this way: Supposing the sixty days provision is abolished, and the lists are not printed by the Printing Bureau and furnished by the government, then each candidate, in order to obtain them, would have to go to the custodian and the latter would have to comply with this provision of section 10:

> The fees to be paid for such certified copy shall be those fixed by the provincial law for furnishing such copies to applicants therefor, and if there is no fee fixed by the provincial law, it shall be 25 cents for each 100 names, including additions and descriptions, and 50 cents for the certificate.

Take my own case where there are 10,000 names, it will cost me over $20 for the list, and we all know that one copy would never do on which to conduct an election.

Mr. FRASER. You get twenty free.

Mr. INGRAM. No, the law cannot be carried out because the list has just came into existence. Therefore, the government would not be in a position to supply it. Then we would have to apply to the custodian who keeps the list and to pay him for it. Now, I contend it is not a fair thing that the candidate should have to pay for these. I think in the way the law stands now, the government is really the proper source to which each candidate ought to apply for lists.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is the intention of the statute as we have now got it. With respect to the lists which reach the Printing Bureau, a certain number are distributed gratis to the candidates. But I admit that when the list is to be taken from the legal custodian, who will be the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in Ontario, then you have got to pay him regular fees for the work he does.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like the Solicitor General to tell me which of the three custodians it is to whom we apply, whether to the county court judge, the officers of the municipality to whom he sends the list, or the clerk of the peace. That difficulty arose in my constituency. When the returning officer got the list he found out that there were three parties in the riding who were equally legal custodians of the list.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. So far as the province of Ontario is concerned, I understand the local Act makes the clerk of the peace the custodian of the list, but I speak subject to correction. In the province of Quebec he sends it to the clerk of the municipality and the registrar of the county.

Mr. BENNETT. I think some hon. gentlemen do not remember the exact procedure in the province of Ontario. After the courts have been held the county court judge returns to the clerk of the peace the list, and in that list are the interlineations, giving the names that have been added and the names that have been struck out. That list is then in the hands of the clerk of the peace, and if an election is coming on the clerk of the peace furnishes to each deputy returning officer a written list, not a printed list at all—he furnishes him with a written list. Now, the clerk of the peace would never think of doing this work himself. He gets some one to copy this out, but the original list is in the possession of the clerk of the peace all the time, he is the custodian of at least one list, and that is the important one, because that is the one upon which the alterations will be found. In the province of Ontario it is an admitted fact that the local lists are very faulty, so faulty that there is a procedure allowing a man to vote whose name is not on the list at all. They have what is known as tender ballots, so that a man may go up and vote in a local election, even though his name is not on the list, and afterwards, on the scrutiny, that vote may be counted, provided he has a right to vote. Now, if you are going to open the door to the same thing here——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We are not.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, in the very next section the hon. gentleman will find he has got something a good deal worse than tender ballots.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There will be no tender ballots in my Bill.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the Solicitor General, in case of the candidate having to procure a list from the clerk of the peace in Ontario, who is the proper custodian? He knows that he has to pay for one copy. But he requires twenty copies, or a considerable number, in order to carry on his election. That is indispensable in the usage that prevails. How is he going to get the additional copies? At his own expense?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If he has to apply to the custodian he has to pay the custodian for the first copy and then he makes his own copies for his own benefit at his own expense.

Mr. WALLACE. That means an expenditure of several hundred dollars. I would like to know why each of the two candidates should be at the expense of several hundred dollars in order to get copies of the voters' lists that the government are bound to provide. The government are bound to provide you with the first copy and you have no right to pay for it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That applies to those lists only that have reached Ottawa for the purpose of being printed. There will be a very small number of such lists.

Mr. WALLACE. It may be a very large number. In regard to the proposal of the hon. Solicitor General to reduce the time from sixty days to thirty days, I think I am correct in saying that in the last election there would have been a very large percentage of the municipalities in which the candidates would have had to procure their lists in Ontario. Under the sixty-day limit the number was small. Each of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken have had one or more municipalities in which they had to procure the lists in that way. That was the case in my own constituency. In one small municipality the list was completed within sixty days, and therefore the list for 1900 was used. The list for 1900 should have been used in all of the municipalities, and with an assessment made in February, the lists should have been ready before the 7th of November and eligible for use, but, instead of having the lists for the election which took place on the 7th of November, 1900, the lists which were used were those that were commenced to be made and which were practically completed before the 1st of May, 1899. More than a year and a half had elapsed. The lists were necessarily old. We had just about finished the revision of the lists of 1900 before the judges of the court of revision when this election was called on, and not one of these lists was used except, as I have said, in one small municipality in my constituency. Therefore, notwithstanding the statement that the government had made that they were going to have an up-to-date list in Ontario, there was practically no up-to-date list, but the list for 1899 was used instead of the list for 1900. Then, there is the additional fact that I have already pointed out, that in the case of reducing the sixty days to thirty days, you will have a much larger number of cases in which you will have to go to the clerk of the peace for your original list, and then you will have to go and have those lists printed at your own expense, at a cost of hundreds of dollars, which is an injustice to the candidates, because you say you will provide the voters' lists for the electors. You have to provide one list anyway and hand it to the candidate through the clerk of the peace, and you should give twenty additional copies, so that he will have a sufficient number to run his election properly. You are not doing that, but you are making it more difficult by the proposed amendment.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. In order to get an up-to-date list, that is to say, the last possible list obtainable, there will be certain inconveniences resulting from the fact that you have to apply to the clerk of the peace to get the last list and to pay his fees for copying that list. But, then you are going to have up-to-date lists instead of lists such as we voted on in 1896, which were three or four years old.

Mr. HENDERSON. No, no.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In 1896 we had no revision for three years.

Mr. HENDERSON. The lists voted on in 1896 were made in 1895.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We are going to have an up-to-date list. In order to get that it is necessary to consider two things : are we going to allow the law to remain as it is and take our chances on the old lists, or are we going to amend the law further so as to make provision that this expenditure shall be borne by the public in the event of our being obliged to go to the clerk of the peace. It is worth our while, in order that we may get a real up-to-date list, to adopt the principle I suggest by this amendment, and make some provision whereby those who are subjected to the inconvenience of having to go to the clerk of the peace, shall not have to pay out of their own pockets for so doing.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman is opening the door again to a good deal of intrigue, because when you come to revise the list, if the list is in favour, we will say, of the Conservative candidate, he will do everything he can to have that list completed in order that it may be used at the election. On the other hand, if it is in favour of the Liberal candidate, he will do all he can to have it revised. Where the list is objectionable to a candidate, he will do everything possible to prevent the court of revision completing the list, in order that it may not be available for use at the election.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We cannot prevent that.

Mr. INGRAM. We can prevent it by simply having the list completed sixty days before the election.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There are better reasons than those which have been given by the hon. gentleman. I am not prepared to admit that there is intriguing in the court of revision.

Mr. INGRAM. I am prepared to admit that there is a great deal of intriguing before the court of revision. I remember in the case of a court of revision there were six men employed to scrape up all the appeals they could in order to prevent the court of revision completing the revision of the list. The same thing can occur in other parts of the country. If a man chooses to rake up a lot of appeals he is at liberty to do so, in order to prevent the court of revision completing the list in time to be used in the election. You are opening the door to intrigue by doing away with the sixty days, and you are imposing additional expense upon candidates. The proposed amendment leaves it open to parties to intrigue in order to prevent the lists being

revised, because it might give one or other party an advantage in the election. I know several constituencies where that has occurred, and it will occur again. Besides that there is the uncertainty of it. Here your friends are endeavouring to canvass a municipality, and they do not know whether to canvass on the list about to be revised or on the list of last year. They do not know whether the list will be revised in time or not, and you are placing them in this position of uncertainty by removing the sixty days' limit. Why not leave it so that we will know that the list in force sixty days before the issue of the writ is the list that we will use, and so that we can canvass on the list that we know will be used.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I think it is impossible to get along with any shorter time than sixty days. There is only one officer, the clerk of the peace, who is bound to furnish the lists. Let us accept the Solicitor General's position.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Perhaps I ought to say that I am confirmed in my opinion by reference to section 77 of the Election Act, which says :

> Subject to the provisions in the next succeeding six sections contained, the first and third parts of the last list of voters certified by the judge and delivered or transmitted to the clerk of the peace, &c.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. That is not the only difficulty. I am bound to say that I am doubtful what the law is, but there is a question whether there are not three custodians of the list. The clerk of the peace is generally considered to be the legal custodian and the man that finally gets the list that may be certified. At the same time there is a list in the hands of the judge, and there may be a list in the hands of the clerk. It is a thing legislation should rectify in the province of Ontario. You can get county judges who have carefully considered the matter, and they believe there are three custodians. Thirty days after the writ issues is the usual time for an election to take place.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It cannot be shorter.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. How are you going to get these lists printed and circulated within that time? I find it very hard work even in a longer time to get the lists in such a shape that I can hand them to the different committees in forty-five or fifty polling divisions. I guarantee that in many instances, when you go to the polling place, you do not know whether your list is correct or not. That is a very undesirable state of things. The Solicitor General says very truly that it may happen, not must happen, that we will have old lists, and that depends on the time the government bring on the election. It is well known in Ontario that the lists begin to dribble in on the 1st of November and continue until the 1st of January, and if you put a provision in the law that there should be no elections held between the 1st of November and the 1st of January, we might get at it. Either do that, or say that the election shall be appointed three months after the issue of the writ instead of thirty days. As it is now, neither the candidate of one political party nor the other will be satisfied, and the candidate of the opposition must be dissatisfied, because whether the government take advantage over him or not, they have the power to do so. It is a physical impossibility to do all this within thirty days, unless clerks of the peace are empowered to have a numerous staff to get ready the lists, and one written list to a candidate is of no use whatever. I grant you this is a difficult thing to legislate upon, but we have embarked upon this principle of our franchise, and even with the best care possible, it will take us some time to get the law into such a shape that it will be fair to both parties. Do not let it go abroad, no matter what party is in power, that this law is unworkable, and that both candidates will not have a fair chance. I believe, so far as the Solicitor General is concerned, that he wants to have a fair Bill. An election contest is bad enough if we make it as short as the law allows, because it disturbs business, and all that sort of thing, and generally the result is about the same. I have considered the question very carefully, and I see no practical way, except by adopting one of the two suggestions I have made.

The PRIME MINISTER. I submit to the House that the evils which are contemplated by the removal of the sixty days are very much magnified. Undoubtedly there may be some inconveniences. There are some inconveniences admittedly under the present system, and, as has been suggested by the Solicitor General, there will be some inconveniences, even if we adopt this section. In some cases we shall have to go to the registrar in the province of Quebec, and to the clerk of the peace in Ontario to have lists. Well, we used to do that in former times. Every member who sat in this House previous to 1886, remembers that the candidates had to go to the registrar in the province of Quebec or to the clerk of the peace in the province of Ontario to obtain the lists at his own cost. The cost was not very heavy, and if, even in rare cases, the same thing has to be done now, the cost will not be very heavy either. The Solicitor General has informed the House that he does not intend to press this Bill to-day, but that he will leave it to the consideration of members and of the government, and take it up at another sitting.

On section 2,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The change here is very trifling indeed. The form of the oath required by the repealed section is different from that described in section 64 of the Elections Act, as the one puts the oath in the first person and the other in the second person. The intention here is to make the two oaths agree.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do you intend to change the oath now ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, we will do that in the Bill to amend the Elections Act.

Mr. CLANCY. This is one of the greatest difficulties we had to contend with during the last election. I know of no provision in the Act which men more honestly violated than that. I know of one case in particular in which all parties concerned consented to a man who had absolutely no right to vote, going up and voting. He came to the polls, and said, 'I lived in the riding and in the municipality, and it is a mere oversight that my name is not on the list.' He took the oath, and was permitted to vote. There was no doubt of the honesty of the returning officer and the others who allowed him to vote. There was no intention of wrong-doing from start to finish; and the slight changes which the Solicitor General proposes to make will not alter the case in the slightest. What oath is a man to take to qualify him to vote ? It is simply this :

You solemnly swear that you are legally qualified to vote at this election, and that you verily believe that your name was omitted from the list of voters by reason of——

What ? He might insert absence or that his name was overlooked or some similar reason. I think it would be infinitely better, so far as the province of Ontario is concerned at any rate, that we should drop that section altogether, rather than make provision for the few persons, if any, who would be disfranchised under the provincial Act. I am not able to call to mind any cases of Dominion officials who have been disfranchised under the provincial law. If there are any, they are very few; and it would be infinitely better that those persons should not be permitted to vote than that we should open the door so widely to an evil practice which has taken place from one end of the country to the other. I will venture to say that in most municipalities many votes have been honestly polled under such conditions, and they will be again if the same conditions continue to exist. I do not care how anxious municipal officers may be to conduct the elections properly, you cannot train them so as not to be liable to go wrong under the law as it stands, or under the proposal the hon. gentleman now makes. I know of no evil in connection with the law as it now stands that is productive of more serious consequences.

Mr. BARKER. I think there cannot be any question as to the seriousness of the objection which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has stated. There is no provision in this statute which is so open to abuse as this particular one. A man, by way of committing a fraud, knowing that he is not entitled to vote, or an innocent man, believing that he is entitled to be on the list, may come forward and take this affidavit and vote; and I have not the slightest doubt that hundreds of votes were polled in that way in the late election. The Solicitor General knows that there is not a very large class of people affected by this clause. I do not quite agree with the hon. member for Bothwell that they might be omitted from the franchise altogether, for the Franchise Act acknowledges their right to vote. But instead of providing for their voting in this way by taking a special affidavit not applicable to any one else, I would suggest to the hon. Solicitor General to provide in the Election Act a summary method of adding their names to the voters' list by application to the county judge. These few people, who are government officers, would know when an election was coming on, and they could have an application made to the county judge to be put upon the list. Then they would simply take the ordinary affidavit, if required to be sworn ; and there would be no danger of others improperly getting in votes under the special oath.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Hon. gentlemen must not overlook the fact that this clause is intended to meet what may be a very real and serious difficulty. It might appear to a provincial legislature desirable to disqualify a whole class of voters. This I admit is one of the consequences of our adopting the provincial franchises. While it may be that up to the present time this provision meets only a limited number of cases, the principle involved is a very serious one, and I do not think it would be proper to place the whole of our lists under the absolute control of the provincial legislature without reserving to ourselves the power to correct any wrong which a provincial legislature might think proper to do. The question of the method to be adopted to meet the difficulty is one we may fairly discuss; but, as I view it at present, I would not be disposed to sacrifice the principle.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to point out to the Solicitor General that this affidavit is framed in such a way as to lead people innocently to take it who have really no right to take it. The oath is as follows :

You do swear that you are legally qualified to vote at this election, and that you verily believe that your name was omitted from the list of voters by reason of your being at the time such list was prepared, and for no other reason.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman look at form T in the Act as we have it now ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This form reads:

You swear that you are legally qualified to vote at this election and verily believe that your name was omitted.

Then there is a blank in which to fill the reason, but the difficulty is that the deputy returning officer or the voter may think that that oath would be properly filled in if the word 'absent' were inserted or some other such reason, whereas the intention of the Act is that he should swear that his name was omitted because he was the holder of some office or was engaged in some employment or occupation which disqualified him under the local law.

Mr. HENDERSON. I quite agree with the hon. leader of the opposition that it is very important the form of this oath should be changed. No doubt serious mistakes occurred in the last election by reason of persons not on the list claiming to be entitled to vote on taking this oath. I have in my mind two constituencies which, I believe, are now represented differently from what they would have been had it not been for this oath. In the earlier part of the session I carefully thought out the matter and drafted and introduced a Bill which was advanced to the second reading, and then allowed to stand, at the request of the leader of the government, on his assurance that the matter would be dealt with by the hon. the Solicitor General in his Bill to amend the election law. But I find the hon. gentleman's Bill does not provide a remedy, and I propose, when we come to the election law, to move the following amendment, which I hope the hon. the Solicitor General will accept :

You swear or solemnly affirm that you are legally qualified to vote at this election and verily believe that your name was omitted from the lists of voters by reason of your being :—

A. A holder of any office.

B. A person employed in any capacity in the public service of Canada or any of the provinces.

C. A person belonging to or engaged in any profession, calling or occupation.

D. Belonging to any class of persons who, though possessed of the qualifications generally required by the provincial law, are by such law declared to be disqualified by reason of their belonging to such class.

In this oath there is no blank space left in which some fictitious reason might be inserted such as being overlooked or absent. The whole space is filled up so that only the reasons assigned by section 6 of the Franchise Act of 1898, or one or more of these reasons, can be assigned by the voter why he is entitled to vote although his name is not in the list.

I also make this provision to enable him to vote :

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

5. If his name has been omitted from the list of voters on account of some disqualifying provision of the provincial law specified in section 6 of the Franchise Act, 1898, he shall be entitled to vote upon his taking, or offering to take, the oath in the form T : Provided, however, that it shall be sufficient if any one or more of the four paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) in the said form are included in such oath, the remaining paragraphs being eliminated therefrom.

A man comes to vote whose name is not on the list. The deputy returning officer tells him he can vote if he will take the oath form T. There are four reasons set forth in that oath why he should vote, and he selects which one he will swear to and eliminates the other three. No other reason can be accepted by the returning officer beyond the ones given, and a penalty of $500 is to be imposed on the returning officer if he allows a man to vote, whose name is not on the list, for any other reason than those assigned in the amended Act. This is the amendment I propose to move when we come to the election law, and I hope the Solicitor General will accept it, even if he choses to adopt some other form of words, for I am not particular as to the form provided we get the substance.

Mr. BENNETT. In the new Dominion Act, how many forms of oaths will there be. There are now sections T and U. Which one is it intended to do away with ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The intention is to amend the form U. We are dealing now with the Franchise Act, and the intention is to amend subsection (c) of section 6 so as to amend the oath——

Mr. BENNETT. That would leave section T in the original Act ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, in the Election Act. My intention is, after the discussion that has taken place, to amend section T to meet the difficulty pointed out by the hon. leader of the opposition and the hon. member for Halton.

Mr. BENNETT. I would call the attention of the Solicitor General to the form U and the reading at the head of it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That will be provided for in the Election Act also.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the Solicitor General permit me to mention that the first part of section 6 seems to be very badly worded. I do not see any connection, as a matter of sense, between the first part and the second.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I remember that the impression made upon me when I first looked upon it was much the same, but if the hon. gentleman will read it again I think he will see that it expresses about what we wished to say.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will read it and point out what I refer to :

No person possessed of the qualifications generally required by the provincial law to entitle him to vote at a provincial election, shall be disqualified from voting at a Dominion election merely by reason of any provision of the provincial law disqualifying him from having his name on the list.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman will observe that there is no 'him' after 'disqualifying.' If you put in that word, it does read badly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is a little better than I thought, the word 'him' not being there, as I thought it was. It is not very clear yet, but perhaps it is not worth amending.

Mr. MONK. Since we are trying to make the clauses as perfect as possible, I would point out, that even admitting the principle contended for by my hon. friend from Halton—and I think that if that principle was adopted it would prevent many of the frauds that were committed last election, and I think the Solicitor General admits that it would make the situation clearer if the form of oath suggested by my hon. friend from Halton was adopted—but even then we have the alternative remedy suggested by the hon. member from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). I am not quite sure whether it will be necessary to provide such machinery as he suggests, difficult and expensive as it may appear at first sight, and endeavour to make it as little expensive as possible. I was thinking of the possibility of men disqualified for some provincial reason such as registrars or men declared guilty of corrupt practices under the Election Act, obtaining some certificate or authorization to vote at a Dominion election. During the last election, to my knowledge, a number of people voted who came to the polls—I do not mean to say that the deputy returning officer was in bad faith, because we all know how excited officials get in a political campaign, and on the eve of voting, filled with the importance of their functions—forty of them at one poll, and gave an affidavit that they had been disqualified from voting under the provincial law, having been found guilty of corrupt practices. And, having that affidavit, as the Solicitor General will readily understand, the deputy returning officer was obliged to admit them to vote. The precautions suggested by my hon. friend from Halton would not meet a case like that, because a person who would go to a poll and swear that he was not entitled to vote in a Dominion election because he had been disqualified in a provincial election trial would be ready to take the oath suggested by my hon. friend from Halton. Therefore, as the Solicitor General pointed out in the beginning of the afternoon, we have to meet difficulties at every step. We had them under the sixty days' delay—that we have under examination at the present moment—and under this section we have to determine whether we ought not to provide extra precautions. We all know from experience that the moment a discretion is given to the deputy returning officer to admit to vote a man who is not on the list before him, no matter what oath you provide, no matter how precise it may be—it is unfortunate to have to admit it—you will find men ready to go to the poll, imported you do not know from where, ready to take that oath. It ought to be a matter for consideration whether we ought to surround the exercise of the franchise—there are only a few cases, as the hon. member for Hamilton pointed out —with these extra precautions.

Mr. INGRAM. The object of the provision in the law which has been referred to was to enable persons to vote in Dominion elections though disqualified under the provincial law. One of the reasons they are allowed by the deputy returning officers to take the oath and vote is to be found in subsection (c) of section 6, which seems to me unnecessary. It reads :

(c) Any person belonging to or engaged in any profession, calling, employment or occupation——

A layman acting as deputy returning officer might fairly take that to mean that a person 'belonging to or engaged in any profession, calling, employment or occupation' by taking the oath might be entitled to vote. Therefore, if the hon. gentleman is going to amend section 6, it would be well to consider whether that subsection (c) is necessary or not. I know perfectly well that when the Franchise Act was before the House it was only intended to cover the cases of such persons as postmasters, collectors of customs, officers of the inland revenue, and, I believe, in the province of New Brunswisk, railway men, because a large number of the employees of the Intercolonial Railway were disfranchised under the provincial law. It was not intended to cover the cases of men whose names, for some other reason were not put upon the list. This section was not intended to cover a class of men of that kind. But during the last election in Ontario, in many constituencies, this section was taken advantage of in order to give these men a vote, they having taken the oath which is very imperfect.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. There is one strong point in the suggestion made by the hon. member for Hamilton, and which is in keeping with the principle of our legislation, that is the finality of the roll. Every suggestion that gets rid of an affidavit is a good one. We know the frauds and difficulties that used to exist, but we gradually got rid of them. I see no difficulty at all in saying that at some time after the writ is issued a man may go to some official and, after satisfying him of his right, get his name put on the roll and get a certificate. In Ontario there would be no difficulty, be-

cause the county judge is always convenient, and he is the official that decides all the appeals, practically. I think that would meet the view expressed by the Solicitor General, that this is to meet cases that might arise hereafter where a province disqualified voters that we think should have a right to vote. We ought to take a good deal of trouble rather than acknowledge the principle that we cannot settle the question of qualification by ourselves, instead of leaving it to the provinces. For my part, I would like to get rid of any affidavit if we can do so.

Mr. HENDERSON. I agree with the member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) with reference to the wording of paragraph (c). As the Solicitor General was kind enough to listen to what I said a short time ago, I would endeavour to press upon him the propriety, if possible, of revising those sections (a), (b), (c) and (d). I think they can be made much more definite, and worded in a way that would cover the whole ground, and yet be more easily comprehended by the ordinary voter, and by the deputy returning officer. I would like the Solicitor General to give some attention to that. I did not like to use the expressions in the amendment that I prepared, but, I had no desire to interfere with the existing law, and, consequently, used these words exactly as I found them in the Franchise Act.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). I take the liberty of drawing the attention of the Solicitor General to another defect in the present law. It was found, during the last election, that a man whose name, for instance, is John Smith, carpenter, if he happened to be down on the list as John Smith, painter, was not allowed to vote. Although he was prepared to take any oath put to him that he was the man, yet, the deputy returning officers throughout the riding, would not give these men ballots. There were cases where the man demanded the ballot, and the returning officer point blank refused to give him one, because he was described as a painter, for instance, or as a man of some other occupation than the one he followed, although he was evidently the same man, living in the same house, and on the same lot. There were other cases where the initials of the names did not correspond. I would ask the Solicitor General to look into that, and to provide some clause by which a man whose name purported to be on the list. should be allowed a ballot; in other words, that the returning officer would have no option in withholding the ballot. Why should the returning officer constitute himself a judge in that case? If a man comes forward and is willing to take the oath and to abide by the consequences, let him vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In support of what has been said by my hon. friend from North Victoria, I may add that a good deal of difficulty of that kind occurred in my own county, for the reason that clerical mistakes had occurred in making a copy of the lists in the first place, and then in the printing of the lists that was done in Ottawa. There is more danger of that kind now than formerly. For example, in my constituency, about fifty electors were disqualified for those reasons. We came to the conclusion that upwards of a hundred other electors would have been disqualified except that the candidates on each side agreed that the sheriff should take this faulty list, which came from the printers here, and correct it by the local list, to which he had access. That was done in the city of Halifax, by consent of the candidates. Otherwise a great many parties would have been disqualified.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). There were six in one polling division who, although they had lived in the locality for upwards of twenty years, and were on the provincial list and the municipal list, yet when they presented themselves to the deputy returning officer and satisfied him, and satisfied the scrutineers that their names had been miscopied, the deputy returning officer would not hand them ballots.

On section 3,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The only change is in the proviso. The proviso was intended to apply to a case, for instance, where a Dominion election takes place, and where there are no local lists, no provincial lists which are not more than a year old, and it is necessary to appoint Dominion officers to prepare those lists. In the event of a by-election taking place for the same electoral district within a year from the time within which these lists are made, these lists will be available for the by-election. I hope I make myself clear. If these were local lists and not more than a year old, they would be available. In the last general election we were obliged, by the Manhood Suffrage Act, to prepare lists which were prepared by the Dominion officials. This is a proviso, that, in the event of an election taking place for the electoral district within a year, these lists shall be available.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the hon. gentleman in his mind a case that this will cover?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We might take the city of Toronto or any of the cities in Ontario to which the manhood suffrage voters lists apply. It might be that after the general election a by-election would be necessary and in that event we would have to make a new list notwithstanding that we would have a by-election possibly three months after the general election.

Progress reported.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 64) to amend the Dominion Elections Act 1900.—The Solicitor General (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) read the second time, and considered in committee.

On section 1,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. As this clause now stands the only effect is to substitute paragraph (g) of section 41 for paragraph (h). There is really no paragraph (h) in section 41, so that the amendment is merely clerical. I beg to move to amend the Bill by omitting these words in the sixth line of section 1: 'And subsection 2,' because it is intended by this Bill to repeal subsection 2 of this Act altogether. That is the subsection which has reference to the stamp that the returning officer uses for the purpose of stamping the ballots.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he is going to strike out the stamp?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman explain why he wants to repeal this provision? Is it not working satisfactorily?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Because I think it would be absolutely useless if we adopt the amendments I suggest here in respect to the ballot. The stamp is intended for the purpose of identification. In the new form of ballot that I shall ask the committee to adopt, it is intended that we shall have the ballot numbered on the stub with a corresponding number on the counterfoil.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A printed number?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, a printed number on the counterfoil so that there will be no doubt that the ballot that will be given to the voter can be identified when it is handed back to the returning officer as the ballot that he received, because the number on the counterfoil of the ballot must correspond with the number on the stub. Therefore, this will be unnecessary in view of the fact that there will be a great many other things that must go on the back of the ballot.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not sure that the sole object sought to be obtained by the stamp on the back of the ballot was identification. I think the particular object was to prevent what is called the floating ballot. I do not know how the hon. Solicitor General is going to protect us against that sort of thing.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not being initiated into the mysteries of the floating ballot, I would be obliged if the hon. gentleman would give an explanation of what he means.

Mr. COCHRANE. Call in Preston.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no doubt there are plenty of hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House who are perfectly able to instruct the hon. Solicitor General, and it surprises me that a man who comes from the city of Quebec and who has gone through so many campaigns should never have heard anything about this particular kind of ballot. I think the hon. gentleman is playing the part of an innocent man. However, I merely throw this out. I think the intention of the stamp was to prevent a larger number of ballots being given out, or getting into circulation, than actually were given out by the returning officer himself, and to provide that the genuine ballots might be identified. When we do away with that stamp what is to prevent that? I think that the matter ought to be very fully considered before we repeal what we considered two years ago was a very important protection.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I belong to a province where we have no trouble. Our system is that the ballots are counted by the returning officer, and the number of ballots polled are counted and the number of ballots on hand that have not been voted must correspond; the whole thing comes out like clockwork. It appears to me there is an awful amount of trouble in Ontario which I am happy to say does not exist in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. HACKETT. A great deal of care should be taken by this parliament to ensure that the franchise of the people shall be preserved inviolate. I ask the Solicitor General if he remembers that on the 10th of November last a ballot box was stolen between Alberton and Summerside, and whether he has taken any action to discover the miscreant, the wretch who stole that ballot box, and who by that act endeavoured to deprive the people of West Prince of their rights and privileges as freemen of Canada. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is the representative in this House of the Department of Justice. What has he done? Has he offered any reward? Has he attempted in any way to trace that missing box? We are here to safeguard the rights of the people and I state that an atrocious act was perpetrated at that time. What has the Solicitor General done to discover the rascal who stole that ballot box?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If there was a theft of a ballot box in Prince Edward Island, the ordinary machinery of justice in that province ought to be sufficient to enable those who suffered by that theft to detect the criminal. The theft of a ballot box after all, in one respect, is the same as the theft of any piece of goods that might belong to any individual and the culprit might be very well detected. If my hon. friend de-

sired the Department of Justice to take action, it seems to me that the Department of Justice should have been notified at the time of this theft. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett) that so far as my knowledge goes, the matter has never been brought under the notice of the Department of Justice.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand it is contemplated by this amendment to do away with the necessity of using the stamp. Personally, I am opposed to that. The stamp was a safeguard to some extent against improper ballots getting out, and I do not think that the proposal of the Solicitor General to have the stubs numbered as well as the counterfoils, will be effective to prevent wrong-doing in this respect. We know from what took place in elections in the past, that the deputy returning officer was in league with those who did the dishonest work outside, and therefore the numbering of the ballots would not prevent fraud. If the number on the stub has to correspond with the number on the counterfoil, a dishonest deputy returning officer could hurry the ballot into the box without allowing the scrutineers to see it, or perhaps the scrutineers would not think it was their business to take the trouble to look at it. If the official stamp is used, it could readily be seen by all parties, and while the stamp is not an absolute guarantee of honesty, I believe it provides some safeguard.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). What was it that influenced the government to depart from that principle which they adopted in reference to accepting the provincial franchises for the Dominion elections? Why did the Solicitor General make an exception of the North-west Territories? When the Election Act was originally introduced, the Solicitor General did provide for the ordinance of the North-west Territories to be accepted, just as the franchises for the different provinces were accepted. This was sent to the Senate and was amended, making an exception for the Territories. That Bill was sent back to the Senate, and it was returned the second time and accepted by the House of Commons, it being the latter end of the session. What possible reason had the present government for departing from that principle when, as they claim, they were adopting the franchises of the different provinces? Why make an exception of the Territories?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The Territories have always had a special ordinance with respect to Dominion elections, and we have allowed that to continue. That is all.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). You did not accept the Territorial Representation Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Why not?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We allowed the Act to remain in force as heretofore. We saw no reason to make a change.

Mr. INGRAM. The Solicitor General withdrew at its second reading that portion of his Bill which referred to the North-west Territories, leaving it as it is now.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That was the objectionable part last year when we introduced the Bill.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Did not the Solicitor General himself favour that?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not remember what I favoured last session; that was previous to the election.

Mr. HACKETT. I am astonished to hear that the Solicitor General places the stealing of this ballot box on the same footing as the loss of a barrel of flour from a freight train. Here we had in that polling division the ballots of two hundred freemen of the Dominion of Canada, and that ballot box was stolen. The whole matter is in charge of the government of Canada. Not only the returning officer and the deputy returning officer, but the railway officials, are all under the control of the government of Canada, and between Alberton and Summerside, one box was found to be stolen when the ballots were called on for a recount. There was a majority of thirty-three for me in that ballot box. The miscreant, the wretch who stole that box, knew well that if the judge would take a partisan view of it, and not having these ballots before him, that I would be counted out, and would not be here to-day to represent the people of West Prince. The Solicitor General places the stealing of that ballot box in which you had the rights, the franchises of two hundred freemen of the Dominion, on the same level as the loss of a barrel of flour on the railway. The railway officials would compensate for the loss of a barrel of flour or a cask of sugar or of molasses. But how are they going to repay the honest freemen of Canada for the loss of two hundred sacred votes. Sir, they have not sufficient money in the treasury of Canada, with all their surpluses, to repay the people for that loss. I ask the government; I ask the Solicitor General, representing in this House the Department of Justice, what action has he taken? Nothing has been done to bring this thief to justice. No reward has been offered. The ballot box has been stolen, the ballots have been taken away, and these men were supposed to have been deprived of their rights and liberties as British freemen. When we are passing legislation of this kind, I ask the government to put a stop to that machine that is working all over Canada. It is a part of the machine that was working in the province of Prince Edward Island. I had occasion a few days ago to bring to the attention of the House

the fact that a man from La Patrie office was down working in Prince Edward Island for a few months prior to the last election. That man was on the train that evening watching everything when the ballot box was stolen, and I solemnly and sincerely believe that that individual, being part of the machine that is working from the Atlantic to the Pacific, stole the ballot box, with the intention of depriving me of my seat and electing a supporter of this government. We only ask for justice and fair-play at the hands of the government, and that where a man honestly records his vote, that vote shall be counted in favour of the candidate for whom it is cast.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I have a Bill before the House to make certain amendments to the Election Act, particularly as regards the North-west Territories ; and if the Solicitor General will look at that Bill between now and the next time his Bill is taken up, and will adopt some of the amendments there proposed, he will save me the trouble of going on with it. It deals with certain grievances growing out of the late election which ought to be remedied.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 29) to amend the Dominion Lands Act (Hon. Mr. Sifton), read the second time, and considered in committee.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I will explain briefly to the committee the different sections of the Bill. The first clause is for the purpose of enabling the minister to appoint an officer of the department to take the place of the Commissioner of Dominion Lands and sign documents in the absence of the commissioner. It has been customary for a number of years, when the commissioner has been away, for one of the other officers of the department to act in his place ; but a legal firm in a certain case has thrown a doubt upon the power of another officer to do so in the absence of a statutory provision, and I desire to put the question beyond a doubt by the amendment. The second clause is for the purpose of making the following change. At present, when a person makes a homestead entry, he is required by the Act within six months to prove the entry, otherwise it is void. As a matter of practice, it has never been customary to insist on that provision, and in order to bring the uniform practice of the department into accord with the law, I desire to have this clause amended so that the entry will not be void unless it is so declared by the minister. As to the third clause, I intend to ask to have the first two paragraphs struck out. The third paragraph has this effect. Two or three years ago a Bill was introduced by the then member for Western Assiniboia, providing that under certain circumstances the having of stock and corresponding improvements on a homestead should entitle a homesteader to a patent, in place of the usual cultivation conditions. This was to meet the case of persons who devoted themselves to raising stock instead of grain. The Bill of the hon. gentleman, which I accepted, required that one acre should be cultivated. That has been found to be of no value and vexatious, because in some cases the homesteader has been entitled in every other respect to a patent. Therefore, as a matter of convenience, I think it well to strike that out. Section 4 I will ask to have struck out as being unnecessary. Section 5 refers to a set of provisions in the Dominion Lands Act under which companies were authorized some years ago to make advances to settlers and to take liens on their homesteads. The plan did not prove to be a success, and has been more or less a source of embarrassment ever since. The majority of the settlers who came in under that plan did not turn out to be successful. But we have had to administer these clauses of the Act, and there were cases in which it was necessary to issue the patents to the companies which advanced the money. Some cases occurred in which there was no statutory provision for the issue of the patent, because the settler in whose name it had to be issued was not a British subject. Of course, under the ordinary law the patent cannot be issued unless the applicant is a British subject ; but when he has fulfilled the conditions, made his application and then left the country without liquidating the claim of the company which advanced money to him, and without taking out naturalization papers, the only way to enable the company to realize upon their security is to take authority to issue the patent without requiring the patentee to become a British subject. I would ask that section 6 be struck out. The effect of section 7 is to enable the minister to execute leases of Dominion lands when authorized by the regulations, without having to execute these leases under the great seal. That is simply a matter of departmental convenience and there is no object to be served in executing the leases under the great seal. Section 8 is for the purpose of enabling all persons owing money to the Crown for or on account of Dominion lands to secure the benefit of the reduction in interest from 6 to 5 per cent, which was made under the Act of last session.

Mr. MONK. Is there at present any commissioner of Dominion lands, or is this entirely a new function ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The office of commissioner of Dominion lands has been a statutory office for ten or twelve years. It has been customary for another officer to sign the name of the commissioner in his absence. I am not at all sure that this is not authorized by the Act, but a legal firm has raised the question, and I ask to have it made clear.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Under the present Act if a homestead entry is not perfected within six months, it becomes void. We have many applications for extensions of time, and this is to relieve the department of considerable work caused by these applications, by providing that the entries shall not become void by the mere lapse of time alone but that after the six months have elapsed the minister must declare the entries void before the lapse of time takes effect.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice a good deal of work is thrown on the department by applications to have the time extended. I have sent in a number myself, but the question is whether this amendment would not lead to a greater abuse in another direction, by allowing people to hold lands indefinitely.

Mr. MONK. I do not see any provision for giving notice to the homesteader before the minister declares his entry void.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The power of the minister to declare it void only comes after the expiration of the six months, so that the homesteader has still as much time as he has now.

Mr. MONK. But still he will have no notice.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In every case thirty days notice is given before any action is taken affecting the entry. What the hon. member for East Grey said is perfectly true with regard to the early development of the North-west when many people went in and took up lands solely for speculation, but that practice has gone out of existence altogether, and the officers of the department are satisfied that this change will facilitate the administration of the Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Would not this tend to revive the system ? Trouble like this arose : A man went from Ontario intending to settle in that country and took up land, but afterwards returned to Ontario, and, owing to business affairs or some other cause, was unable to go back. He found some person going into the country and sold his claim for a consideration. In the meantime, some one had applied for the cancellation of his title, and the party who had paid the consideration found some one else on the land. I remember having a number of these cases to discuss with the department. The party who paid money for the location claimed that he was badly used, and the man who got it thought he was entitled to it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The party who bought it had no right to buy it.

Mr. SPROULE. No legal right, but there seemed to be some sort of a moral right, since the original claimant's right had not been cancelled. I fear that this will revive the same system—not to the same extent, but to some extent at least.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not explain the latter part of this clause. The third subsection of section 36 of the Dominion Lands Act says :

Provided further, that in the case of immigrants from elsewhere than the North American continent the Governor in Council may extend the time for the perfecting of entry to twelve months from the date thereof.

It has been found unsatisfactory to confine that to immigrants from elsewhere than the North American continent. We are receiving a large number of settlers from the United States, and it is sometimes desirable that they should be brought within the same category. So, it is proposed to make the clause read thus :

3. Provided further, that in the case of any immigrant the time for perfecting his entry may be extended by the minister for any period not exceeding one year from the date upon which he obtained such entry.

I doubt if this is absolutely necessary, in view of the amendment made in the former provision, but it will make it clear.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that you substitute 'minister' for 'Governor in Council.' Why is that ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is absolutely useless to have this go to the Governor in Council, and it has the disadvantage of hanging up the departmental business. It is impossible for the Governor in Council to consider such applications as that. As a matter of fact, in the administration of the Dominion Lands Act, one of the greatest sources of embarrassment is the number of cases that have to go to the Governor in Council. I am naturally indisposed to have the responsibility upon the minister rather than upon the Governor in Council, but, in such matters it is impossible for the members of the government to enter into the merits of the case, and they must take the opinion of the minister on that subject.

Mr. SPROULE. The only difficulty would be that it seems to leave a great power in the hands of the minister, should he choose to use it, as between friend and foe——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) takes the least objection to it, I have no objection to changing it.

Mr. SPROULE. I have not said that I take serious objection to it. I am only suggesting what might take place.

On section 5,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Section 44 of the Dominion Lands Act closes with these words :

—and thereafter the said charge shall become a statutory mortgage on such homesteads.

As I explained, when a settler has failed to take out his patent, we are authorized by the Act, in certain cases, to issue the patent to the company. This, however, is a case where the settler has fulfilled the conditions, and we are providing for the issue of the patent to the settler. In such case, the claim of the company that advanced the money becomes a lien upon the land. The law clerk, in drawing a section, made it read :

—and thereafter the said charge shall become a statutory mortgage on such homestead.

I do not see the necessity for that. It should be left as it was in the original legislation, and leave the charge as a lien upon the homestead.

Mr. MONK. What is the object of having a patent issued in the name of the settler when he has left the country ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He has fulfilled the conditions, and if the land should sell for more than the amount advanced, the settler's representatives are entitled to it.

On section 7,

Mr. SPROULE. What was the original law with regard to this ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The corresponding section in the Act of 1894, is as follows :

The Governor in Council may authorize the sale or lease of any lands vested in Her Majesty which are not required for public purposes, and for the sale or lease of which there is no other provision in the law. The expression 'lands' in this section means real property of any kind, or any interest therein.

That definition is the usual one, and is in the present Act. This provision would have the effect of enabling the Governor in Council to make general regulations for the distribution of certain classes of land, but when leases are made in pursuance of the regulation, the leases need not be executed under the great seal. That is the only effect of it.

Mr. MONK. I want to ask the minister if these words: 'For the sale or lease of which there is no other provision in the law' would allow lands to be put up at auction?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. The invariable rule is that the first person who applies gets the lease upon terms fixed by order in council. That has not been changed for many years. The same with homesteads.

Mr. SPROULE. I find the same objection to this that I found in the other, that is that what the law allowed to be done by the Governor in Council is here done by the minister.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is impossible for any minister to make an examination of all the files to see whether they are all regular, and he must depend upon his officers. Indeed I may say that this particular amendment is made largely owing to the continual remonstrance of my colleagues. It is impossible for any minister to go into details of matters of that kind.

Mr. MONK. Could not the minister meet the objection by a proviso that the Governor in Council, when authorizing the sale or lease of any lands, should fix a minimum price ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Certainly.

Mr. MONK. But that is not mentioned in the section.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Of course the regulations specify the terms and conditions. I have no objection to saying that the regulations shall specify the price.

On section 8,

Mr. SPROULE. I understand there are many outstanding leases for grazing and other lands which were rented, and in all probability many of the payments remain unpaid. Will the payments that accrued up to that time be calculated on the higher rate of interest, or on the lower rate of interest ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will look at the section again and see whether the point is covered.

Mr. MONK. There is a proviso in the statute we passed last year which says :

Provided that the change in the rate of interest in this Act shall not apply to liabilities existing at the time of the passing of this Act.

The disposition of section 8 is very general.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will see that it is perfectly specific. If my hon. friend will look at page 3 of the Bill, commencing with the fourth line, he will see that it says :

The rate of such interest from the 7th day of July, 1900, the date upon which chapter 29 of that year came into force, shall be 5 per cent per annum.

I think that covers everything.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not perhaps apropos, but it might not be amiss to ask the hon.

minister if he has any knowledge of what the outstanding claims are in regard to mining leases, grazing leases and timber lands. Perhaps he could tell us whether the collections are pretty well kept up to time or whether there is a large accumulation of arrears in these claims.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I could not give any general statement, but it would be a very simple matter for me to have a statement prepared which I will lay on the Table of the House in a couple of days if the hon. gentleman desires it.

Mr. SPROULE. That would do. I do not expect that the minister will have it with him, but it would be interesting if the minister would prepare such a statement.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no difficulty whatever about it. It is a very simple matter to find it in the records of the department. I would like to say, however, to the hon. gentleman that there is one class of the outstanding liabilities of the government which I have never pressed at all, which I have never made any effort to collect, because I have not been able to see any object in doing so; that is to say, the money that is owing by farmers on account of pre-emptions. The land is becoming more valuable all the time, the government has been getting 6 per cent and when this Act comes into force it will get 5 per cent which is more than the money costs the government. As the land is becoming more valuable I think there is no object in pressing the farmers to pay this money if they are unable to do so without embarrassing themselves. From my own experience in the North-west I know that on account of the pressure that was put on the farmers some years ago many of the farmers were obliged to mortgage their property simply to pay the government claim when the government did not need the money. The government are getting more interest from them than they are paying for the money.

Mr. MONK. Do they pay the interest?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, we endeavour to see that the interest is paid as rapidly as possible, but as to the principal the security is getting better all the time and there is no object in pressing them.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think there would be any object in forcing payment, nor do I think it would be right as long as a man is on his homestead and cultivating his land. I think it should be allowed to run the same as it is in the province of Ontario. I think it would be very unreasonable to force the payment on the pre-emption as long as the man is there and cultivating his land.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Every year a notice is sent out to the farmers giving the exact amount that is due.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

UNORGANIZED TERRITORIES—GAME PRESERVATION ACT.

Bill (No. 46) to amend the Unorganized Territories Game Preservation Act, 1894.—the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Clifford Sifton), read the second time and considered in committee.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Act that we are amending has reference to the protection of game in the unorganized portion of the North-west Territories, the far northern part which is not organized, or represented in the North-west Territories Legislative Assembly. The section as it is in the original Act is as follows:

> Any beast, bird or eggs in respect of which, or of any part of which, any conviction has been made under this Act, shall be held to be thereby confiscated, and the authority who has made the conviction may make such disposal of them as he thinks fit. They may be kept for his own use, but shall not be sold or exported.

The provision in the last line, is, in my judgment, very objectionable. We had a case not long ago in which the officer who made the conviction kept the pelt of the animal, in respect to which the conviction was made, for his own use. Great fault was found, and it was thought that the effect of the punishment was very largely done away with by the fact that the convicting magistrate kept the pelt for his own use. I disapproved of it, but when I looked up the Act I found that it authorized the magistrate to do what he had done, and that the magistrate had only done what the Act permitted. I propose to have it amended as follows:

> All animals, birds, fish or eggs, or the pelt, skin or head of any animal, killed, trapped, snared or taken in violation of any provision of this Act, or any part of such animal, bird, fish, pelt, skin or head, shall, after the conviction of the person who so killed, trapped, snared or took the same, respectively, be confiscated to the Crown by the authority who made the conviction——

Practically that is the same as anything else that is taken under a conviction.

> —who shall have power to declare the same so confiscated, and to order the sale or destruction thereof, and, if sold, the proceeds thereof shall be deposited and applied in the manner provided by section 15 of this Act; provided, that such convicting authority may give or direct any animal, bird, fish or egg so confiscated, or any part of such animal, fish or bird, to be given to any religious, charitable or scientific institution or purpose, as in his discretion seems proper.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me that under that section the convicting authority might very well continue to appropriate the animal or the skin to himself.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Under what clause ?

Mr. MONK. Under the wording of the section which says that he can devote it to some charitable purpose. These North-west men are very ingenious and they might say it was a charitable purpose to keep the skin for themselves.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have correspondence in the department from scientific institutions in the United States and Europe, asking for a specimen, if an animal or bird of a certain description is found, and we exchange specimens in that way. Suppose we say that it should only go to scientific institutions.

Mr. MONK. Very good.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I would ask the minister to put the word 'school' in there before the word 'purpose.'

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Very well.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY—APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES IN ONTARIO.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the government to an article that appears in the Toronto News relative to the judiciary of Ontario. At the outset I may say that there are fifteen Superior Court judges in that province, and these are distributed in four different courts. We have first, the Court of Appeal composed of the chief justice and four puisne judges ; then the Chancery division with a chief justice and three puisne judges; and then the King's Bench and Common Pleas divisions similarly constituted. About eight months ago on the retirement of Sir George Burton, Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal, Justice Armour was promoted to the position and that left a vacancy in the King's Bench division. That vacancy has existed ever since. It is true that the government made an honest and strong effort to fill the vacancy, because it is well known that Mr. J. J. Foy, K.C., of Toronto, was proffered the position, but he for reasons best known to himself saw fit to decline. The fact that the vacancy has been allowed to exist for so long results in very great detriment and inconvenience to suitors. Under the procedure of our courts, an action may be brought before one of the judges of the King's Bench division without a jury, and if one of the parties feels aggrieved by the judgment he may appeal, and his appeal will come in due course before that very same division. He has the adverse decision of the trial judge against him and his appeal comes before that very same judge again. Associated with the trial judge will be another justice of the court, and if the court divides in its opinion the appellant is left where he originally stood. If the vacancy were filled and there were three judges this could not occur. Again, there are certain actions in the High Court in which an appeal is not permitted to the court of appeal. If the litigant in such a case found himself with the two judges divided, and he then had the right to go to the court of appeal, his position would not be so bad, but he is debarred from going to the court of appeal and thus the unfortunate suitor has to face the judge who has given an adverse decision against him. There was, for instance, what is known as the West Durham case. In that case Chief Justice Falconbridge and Judge Street took different views, and the result was that the action was a nullity, and had to go to the Supreme Court. Had there been three judges in that court, two of them would of necessity have had the same opinion as against one, and that judgment might have been accepted and the case terminated. The Evening News says this, that the following notice has been posted at Osgoode Hall :

> In consequence of it having become necessary for one of the judges to take the business assigned to the Hon. Mr. Justice Meredith, it has been found impracticable to continue the sittings of the divisional court this week.
>
> If, however, there be any case of special urgency, a court may be specially constituted to hear it. Otherwise, no further sittings of the divisional court will be held this month. By order of the court.

Fancy the position that these suitors are placed in. Take a case involving the ownership of a large quantity of saw-logs. It might be necessary at this time of the year to get these logs down the streams while the water is high, but owing to the fact that an injunction may be pending neither party can touch the logs, and great loss may result. This kind of thing will go on unless the government rises to the occasion. This government boasts that it is a strong government, and surely a strong government ought not be under the necessity of keeping a judgeship dangling before its friends in the province of Ontario for eight months. When the lamented death of Judge Rose caused a vacancy, an appointment was speedily made in the person of Mr. Justice Lount, and I may say that the appointment of that gentleman has given a very great deal of confidence to the bar of the province. But why this other vacancy

should be kept dangling for eight months it is hard to surmise. Had Mr. Foy accepted the position, he would have relieved the government from the trouble they find themselves in. I presume that the government has many applicants for the position, but I point out that it is humiliating to see what is going on in reference to this matter when it has been stated in the public press that petitions have been hawked about Toronto asking lawyers to sign them for the appointment of certain gentlemen to the bench.

That cannot do otherwise than bring the judiciary into disrepute, not only in the province of Ontario, but in other provinces as well; for I have recently seen the statement in a Montreal paper that a judicial vacancy has existed in the province of Quebec for some time, and that a member of this House has threatened to resign if an appointment is made not to his liking. In view of the condition in which litigants find themselves in the province of Ontario, and in view of the fact that the present condition of things is demoralizing to the opinion in which the judiciary is held by the public, I trust, now that the attention of the government has been called to the matter, that they will announce that an appointment to the vacant position will speedily be made. I do not know who the fortunate gentleman may be. It is true, this government have evinced a disposition to confine the judicial appointments in the province of Ontario to their political friends. That was not always the case. The government of Sir John Macdonald appointed Mr. Samuel Blake and Mr. Justice Maclennan to the bench, and, I believe, the late Chief Justice Moss, a Liberal, was also appointed by a Conservative administration, though I am not sure as to that. In view of the statements which have been made in the press, and in view of the fact that the business of the courts is congested, I trust that the government will make an appointment to the vacant position at a very early day.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have to express my regret that my hon. friend did not give me any notice of his intention to bring this important question to the attention of the government. If I had been so notified, I would have informed myself as to the exact condition of judicial matters in the province of Ontario. I shall, therefore, have to answer only with such knowledge as I have. And at the outset I can say from the hon. gentleman's own statement, that I do not think the government are so guilty as he wants to represent them to be. My hon. friend, at the close of his remarks, said that this government had evinced a disposition to appoint to the bench only their political friends, whereas, in the earlier portion of his remarks, he had stated, with equal emphasis, that this government had offered an appointment to Mr. Foy, who is not a friend of the government, but an opponent. At all events, I think my hon. friend will agree with me that since this government have been in office the appointments made to the bench in the province of Ontario have not caused the admitted high standing of that bench to deteriorate. The last appointment made, that of Mr. Justice Lount, has given satisfaction to the bar of Ontario. We thought it would, and that is one reason why we made that appointment. The fact of our having offered, as my hon. friend states, an appointment to Mr. Foy, shows that the government have no inclination whatever to hawk about judicial appointments among their political friends; and the appointment we afterwards made of Mr. Justice Lount shows that the government have some regard to the character of the men to whom they entrust that high judicial office. As to the present position of judicial matters in the province of Ontario, so far as my memory goes, no complaints have been made of the vacancy still existing, caused by the retirement of Mr. Justice Burton. If complaints have been made—I will not say they have not—at least they have not come to my ears. Although I cannot say I look very carefully into these matters, as they do not belong to my immediate office, still I look into them with sufficient care to be pretty well informed; and I really believe that if any complaint had been made I would have known of it, and the government would have taken some action. The article which has been quoted by my hon. friend is the first intimation which I have had that the need of an immediate appointment has been felt; and this is felt, perhaps, as much from the unfortunate illness of Mr. Justice Meredith as from the retirement of Mr. Justice Burton. At all events, it is part of the duty of the government to see that an appointment is made. I would only add another word, and it is with regard to the hon. gentleman's statement that petitions are being signed in the city of Toronto.

Mr. BENNETT. I said they were hawked about one time, before a certain appointment was made—and it was quite current in the newspapers—not at the present time.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know whether any petitions were circulated. The hon. gentleman may have information on that subject which I have not; but, if petitions were circulated at one time, asking for the appointment of this gentleman or that gentleman, it was a most unseemly thing; but my hon. friend will give us this credit, that if there were such petitions, they had no effect at all on the government. I do not know what the hon. gentleman has in his mind as to the object for which petitions were circulated; but, I am quite sure of one thing, that no appointment was made

in the province of Ontario because of any petitions being signed in favour of Mr. So-and-so or Mr. So-and-so. This ought to satisfy my hon. friend that the government are not reproachable in that respect. But, the question my hon. friend has brought up is a quite proper one to bring to our attention, and it must engage our attention.

Mr. MONK. In this connection, I might ask the right hon. gentleman if there is going to be a delay to the same extent in the appointment of some one to replace Mr. Justice Ouimet in our province, at Sorel ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know what my hon. friend means. I am sorry to see that my hon. friend, who is an important member of the bar in the province of Quebec, is so ill-informed as not to know that Mr. Justice Ouimet has been replaced two months ago by Mr. Justice Fontaine.

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

Patent Record, $12,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How does the hon. gentleman account for the increase of $2,000 in this item ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Owing to the increased number of patents issued during the past year, the Patent Record is a larger volume and the Printing Bureau has charged more.

Mr. SPROULE. How do the fees collected compare with the expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The receipts for patent fees go into the consolidated revenue, and the expenditure is regulated by the number of clerks employed and the amount necessary to carry on the business of the office. Roughly speaking, the receipts are something over $100,000 a year, and the expenditure about $30,000 a year.

Mr. SPROULE. I see that the models are kept in one building down on Sparks street, while the patent office is on the third flat of the Langevin block. Is it the intention of the government to continue this arrangement ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The models used to be in the upper part of the Langevin block, but after the fire in the Western block it was found that there was a similar danger of fire in the Eastern block, the upper part of which is largely occupied by the Department of the Interior. It was therefore found necessary to furnish better accommodation for many of the important records of the Interior Department, and my hon. colleague, the Minister of Public Works, asked me whether we could not spare the model rooms in the Langevin block for that purpose. I found that for years back, models were no longer required from applicants for patents, and that models were no longer used by the patent examiners. It did not therefore seem necessary or wise to continue using the spacious departments in the upper part of the Langevin block for these models, which were no longer of practical use, and I advised the Minister of Public Works to that effect. We therefore engaged rooms in a building on Sparks street, where we put on exhibition the most interesting models, and they are there at present. I have, however, advised the Minister of Public Works that it is no longer necessary, so far as the requirements of the department are concerned, to keep even those models on exhibition, and he is at liberty to have them stored away in the same way as a large number of others are stored, and give up renting the room.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be a great mistake to do that. It seems to me that these models are useful, even if not required by the department. Many people examine and take specifications from them when they wish to make something of the same kind, and there ought to be some building provided where they might be properly kept. If we are paying very large rent for the building they are in, it might be possible to purchase ground and erect a building where they could be stored away at less expense, and which could be utilized for other offices as well.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was no intention to destroy or dispose of them. A large number, as it is, are packed away in cases and stored in the basement of the same building. If the government had an abundance of room, it might be possible to put these models on exhibition, but it would cost considerable to set them out and put them in shape for exhibition. As regards the utility of these models, the number of people who come to examine them in the course of the year for the purpose of getting ideas for similar inventions, is so very small that it is hardly worth while considering it.

Mr. SPROULE. No doubt since they were removed to another building, people do not go to see them to anything like the same extent as they did when these models were in a more prominent place. The reason probably is because people do not know where to find them. But I know that when they were in the Langevin block, a great many strangers used to visit these models.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is quite right, so far as sightseers are concerned, but any one who wishes to examine a model for the purpose of getting information, can obtain all the information he requires from the drawings, copies of which he can get for a very small sum indeed. These drawings are so made that a mechanic can make the object in-

dicated by the drawings and specifications just as well as by seeing the model itself.

Mr. SPROULE. I know that the change which requires applicants for patents only to furnish drawings was made some years ago.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Twelve years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. But I know that I have taken parties repeatedly to see the models, who claim that they could not intelligently make the article from the drawing as they could from seeing the model.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have now the figures the hon. gentleman asked for. The receipts for 1900 were $113,852, and the expenditure $43,040, showing a net balance of $70,812.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman gave as a cause of the increase of $2,000 in this vote, the enlargement of the monthly publication of the Patent Record. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give some details.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can give the hon. gentleman an indication of the increase in this way: In 1897 the number of patents reported by the examiners was 4,861, and in 1900 it was 6,161, an increase of 1,300. Up to the present date, the increase of this year is even greater; so that, I venture to say in the current year the patents reported upon will number about 7,500.

Mr. CLANCY. Does that mean an increased number of examiners?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. That was not the reason given by the hon. gentleman at the outset, but the greater size of the Patent Record. Now it turns out that the hon. gentleman has additional examiners, and this money goes out in salaries.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Patent Record is a record of the patents issued. When there are more patents issued, the volume is larger. The Printing Bureau charges us for the printing, the cuts and so on, and consequently we have to pay a larger amount.

Mr. CLANCY. How many additional examiners does the hon. gentleman propose to employ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have been adding to the staff of examiners, and consequently have been catching up with the arrears of work and issuing a larger number of patents. The size of the Patent Record depends not on the number of examiners, but on the number of patents issued.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps it is due to my dullness that I do not understand the hon. gentleman. At first, he said the increase was due to the greater size of the volume, for the reason that he has now stated that there is an increase in the number of patents issued. He stated later that, owing to the increase in the number of patents applied for and issued, additional examiners are required.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I have not said anything about that yet.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell the committee whether there is anything in that item of $2,000 for additional examiners.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. As the patents issued are realizing a net income of about $70,000 a year, has the hon. minister ever considered the advisability or wisdom of reducing the expense of obtaining a patent? It seems a small sum, about $45 for an ordinary patent, but I know that many people that take out patents, think it ought to be done for a great deal less. I have long been of opinion that the charge for patents ought not to be more than enough to cover the cost. Has the hon. gentleman given the subject any consideration?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, I have. And I have had under consideration somewhat radical changes in the fees and the mode of collecting them. But I have not been able to work out what I consider a satisfactory amendment on these lines. I have examined pretty carefully into the working of the patent laws in the United States and England, and have had several conferences on the subject. Had it not been for the unfortunate long-continued illness of the deputy commissioner of patents, Mr. Scarth, who has been confined to his house during the last year, I think I might have been able to come to some conclusion. But Mr. Scarth, who was helping me in the investigation in this matter, has not been able to take it up with me, and I have been waiting until such time as he could. I am not prepared to say that I can do anything in the matter this session, but I believe that before another session comes, I will be able to introduce a Bill making considerable amendments, amongst them something in the line the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has indicated.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—Statistical Year-Book, $3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How many of these books are issued usually?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We expect to publish this year, 4,300 copies in English and 1,200 in French, the same number as for the past three years.

Mr. MONK. When is this book supposed to be distributed to the public ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This work is compiled from departmental reports, which are generally ready for the public within six months after the termination of the fiscal year. But it is only after they are all completed that the Statistical Year Book is worked out from them. The result is that practically the Statistical Year Book reaches the hands of the public from a year to fifteen months after the end of the fiscal year with which it deals.

Mr. MONK. In what month was the last issue published ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was laid on the Table of the House toward the end of last session and distributed after the session.

Mr. MONK. Has the French version been distributed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, long before this.

Mr. MONK. There are two things to be said in this connection. In the first place there is great delay in the publication of the French version. In the next place, I do not believe there are a sufficient number of French copies printed for distribution. I have been asked time and again for the French version, and found it very difficult to obtain it ; I have been time and again told it was not ready, or that there were no more copies for distribution. I think the minister should publish a much larger number of the French version. I do not think 2,000 would be excessive.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am surprised to hear my hon. friend's statement, because I have been told by the statistician every year that while he had a large number of French copies left on hand, the whole of the English edition was exhausted. I state positively that has been the case every year. I have been frequently advised that it was not necessary to add to the French edition. I may say that the book is compiled in English originally and is translated immediately by an officer in the department and sent to the printer. If there is any delay in the issue of the French edition, the fault does not lie with the officers of my department. It may be that the printing of the French edition does not take place rapidly, but the translation of the copy is furnished to the Printing Bureau within, at most, a few weeks of the printing of the English copy.

Mr. MONK. There is something difficult to understand in that, and I shall certainly place in the hands of my hon. friend letters that I have received in which I was told that there were no more French copies for distribution.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Was it not that the French copies were not yet issued, or were being issued at the time ?

Mr. MONK. Both.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I grant that the French copy is not printed as soon as it might be after the English copy is issued, but I can hardly understand why, after they are printed, there should be any shortage of the French edition, because I have been told every year that there were French copies on hand but no English ones.

Mr. MONK. I have had letters making complaints of both kinds, and I will look them up and hand them to the minister. I am surprised to hear that only two or three weeks elapsed between the English and the French publication.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said between sending the copy to the Printing Bureau when responsibility in regard to it is removed from my department.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I have seen a copy of the Statistical Year-Book in the Library, and I think it is a very interesting work, and if possible it should be placed in the hands of all the school teachers of this Dominion. It contains knowledge that should be specially disseminated among the agricultural community. How many copies does the minister supply to each member of parliament for distribution ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This book is not distributed as parliamentary printing ; it is not printed on the same basis or on the same principle as the departmental reports and other things which are printed by order of parliament. This book is printed by a special vote. There is in the department a list of public bodies and individuals throughout the country, largely engaged in education, to whom this book is sent as a matter of course. That list has been in existence a long time. Sometimes additions are made to it. I have never disturbed the list that I found when I came into office, except to make some few additions to it. Two years ago, and last year, a demand was made by members of parliament for a number of copies of this book for ordinary parliamentary distribution. That of course can be done if parliament so desires. But the vote that I am asking for is for the purpose of the distribution of that statistical Year-Book as a part of the work in my department. In deference to the requirements of the members of the House I agreed that a limited number of this work should be placed at the disposal of every member, and I said I would try to give about ten copies to each member. I think it is possible to continue that with the vote that I have at my disposal. If parliament wishes to have a larger number distributed to each member,

a vote will have to be passed especially for the purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me the efficiency of the work is considerably impaired owing to the delay that takes place in its publication. I never could understand why it requires twelve, fifteen or sixteen months after the returns are made to parliament to get out this book. It is only a compilation, that a few hands ought to be able to put together in a short time, and the printing is not a serious matter. To have it coming out fifteen months after the returns are made diminishes its value. With regard to the number that are distributed, I think it should be increased. We have applications from school teachers and people in various other lines for copies of the book, and are unable to supply more than a small fraction of the number asked for. Some years ago I suggested that certain classes of schools be supplied with this book, and it was thought that would cost too much. But I think the money would be well spent. At any rate, members of parliament ought to have a reasonable number for distribution to those who apply.

Mr. McGOWAN. Does the hon. gentleman send this book to the public libraries throughout the Dominion ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is sent to public libraries, to mechanics' institutes, to the press, and to a number of other people. To send it to all the schools would require an edition of 40,000 or 50,000, and a ten-fold increase of this vote.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the hon. gentleman reduced his staff in the Statistical Department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When I came into office in 1896 there were a number of employees whom I dispensed with, but there has been no change within the last year or two.

Mr. INGRAM. That accounts for the delay in getting out the book.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not reduced the staff for the last three years. When I came into office those I dismissed were not engaged on the Statistical Year-Book, but on the remains of the former census.

Mr. MONK. What is the amount of the cost that would cover the cost of printing ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Practically in this item, the whole amount. The salaries of the men who do the statistical work are in another item under civil government.

Mr. MONK. I agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram). I think it would be desirable that we should have a larger number of these books. It is a well prepared book, and it would be of infinite use in our schools. I know that in Montreal, very probably, you will not find in one of the elementary schools in that city, where they have 35,000 or 36,000 children, a single copy of the book. I think a great many of the pupils would be better employed perusing that book than many other books that they have in the schools. I think that next year the minister should make note of the necessity which exists throughout the country and make a larger distribution of that valuable volume.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would like to give some figures which will show the hon. member for East Elgin that I am correct. In 1893 there were issued 3,374 copies of this book, 2,600 in English and 774 in French, at a cost of $4,431. In 1894 there were issued 2,400 copies in English and 750 copies in French ; that is to say, 200 less in English and 24 less in French than in the previous year, at a cost of $6,000 odd.

Mr. WILSON. The book was larger ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, the book was larger. But, I may say that the book to-day contains all the information that it contained at that time in the way of statistical tables, and so on. By condensation and rearrangement the information is all there, although all the opinions that were expressed are not there. In 1895 there were issued 2,400 copies in English and 750 copies in French, at a cost of $6,000. In 1896 3,000 copies in English and 1,000 copies in French were issued. It increased the first year that I came into office. The expense was only $2,100.

Mr. INGRAM. How was the reduction brought about ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. By condensing the book and doing the work more cheaply. In 1897 4,300 copies were issued in English and 1,200 in French. The edition of 5,500 cost $2,544. In 1898 the same number was issued, at a cost of $3,090. That was due to the increase in the wages of the Printing Bureau. In 1899 5,500 copies were issued, 4,300 in English and 1,200 in French, at a cost of $3,161.

Mr. WILSON. How many copies does the hon. minister intend to issue this year—an increased number ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the cost per volume comes up to last year, I will have to continue with the same issue, because I have reached the limit of the money which I have at my disposal—$3,000.

Mr. INGRAM. The government have established a department of labour, and the duty of those engaged in this department

is to collect labour statistics. It strikes me that instead of creating another department, when the department of statistics has been continued for years, if the government had employed such men as Mr. King and some parties to assist him, and allowed the department of statistics, as now conducted, to collect these labour statistics as well as other statistics, they would have been adopting a wise policy. It would save expense, and if members of parliament and others desiring information in respect to agriculture, labour, or any question affecting the welfare of the people, instead of getting the Statistical Year Book on the one hand, and taking a monthly pamphlet on the other, could get all these statistics in the Statistical Year Book, it would be much handier, because we could get all the information we required on any of these subjects in one volume. It would also be much cheaper than it is under the present system of having a statistical department controlled by Mr. Johnson, and a labour department controlled by Mr. King. I think the statistics would be more accurate, and they would be in a much more convenient form. There would also be the advantage of being able to procure the Statistical Year Book much quicker than it is issued to-day. As the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said, the great fault with the present Statistical Year Book is that too long a time is allowed to elapse between the end of the year with which the book treats, and the time when members of this House receive their copies. It is a great fault, because many persons, when they want to look up different questions, instead of referring to the Year Book, have to take the departmental reports to acquire the information that they desire.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not going into the general question of policy as to the Labour Bureau and the compilation of statistics. I do not agree with the hon. member for East Elgin, that, on the whole, it would be more handy for the public to have all these different kinds of statistics in the same volume. There are many people who want labour statistics, and who are not interested in the other statistics contained in this volume. There are those who are engaged in studying agricultural statistics who are not desirous of studying labour statistics.

Mr. INGRAM. Why not ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because they do not happen to be interested in those lines. They may not be or they may be. But they can get full information when the books containing all these particular things are issued. If you were to put all the statistics in one volume it would make a larger and bulkier volume, and those who do not wish to study one part would still have to take that part. The hon. gentleman has to a considerable extent answered himself, when he said that the fault of the Statistical Year Book was, that the information did not come out until twelve or fifteen months from the end of the year for which it was compiled. In the Labour Gazette that information comes out month by month. The information is given promptly and accurately. The Labour Gazette is published for other purposes besides those of statistics, and it deals very largely with other things. I think it is better that all labour matters should be dealt with by men who are specially charged with that kind of work, and that statistical work of another character should be in the hands of others who are accustomed to deal with it. As to the general policy as to the establishment of a Labour Bureau and the publication of labour statistics, I do not know that it is necessary to go into that.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that because a man wishes to find statistics affecting labour he would not be interested in questions of agriculture ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I do not say so.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman could not say so in reason, because it is a well-known fact that all those interests are so closely associated with each other that it is an important question for all persons who wish to understand public questions. I believe that by an increase in the staff of the statistical department, instead of reducing the staff, the Statistical Year Book would be published sooner, and it would be of more advantage to the public.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It never has been.

Mr. INGRAM. That is no reason why it should not be.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. INGRAM. Because we know perfectly well that some years ago the Statistical Year Book was a very large book, twice as large as it is to-day, and if you increase the staff, which could be done at a very small cost, it would be a great convenience to the public.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is not because of the lack of staff ; it is because it comes out after the other departmental reports.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister will have to find some other explanation for the delay. Every one knows that the Year Book is a mere repetition of tables, and that for each year there has only to be another year added. The book should come out immediately after the departmental reports, because the figures are all in shape for the statis-

tician to classify them. Surely the hon. gentleman will not plead that because the Year Book was late in publication in the past, that he should continue what I consider the insane policy of having a Statistical Year Book a year behind the time. There is not so much work about this after all. Hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, when they were in opposition, were not reputed to be friendly to the Year Book. It was made the subject of annual attack, and whether the minister shared these views or not, his friends were so hostile to it that he can hardly be expected to have become friendly within a few years. This is a useful book, but it is only useful if it is properly issued and in time. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) should give some other reason for his pursuit of this snail policy in the publication of this Statistical Year Book. I think the House will justify the minister in an increased expenditure if he needs a larger staff in order that we may have this book published in proper time, when it can be of use.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What I have stated here is the reason that has been given to me by the statistician. I confess I have left the matter very largely in the hands of Mr. Johnson, a gentleman who was the statistician when I took office, who has been carrying on the work connected with this book ever since it was inaugurated, and who, I believe, is competent to carry it on. I have not given the matter my personal supervision, but I will be glad to tell Mr. Johnson of the remarks made here, and see if he can work out a scheme which will satisfy the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister knows that he is responsible, and that Mr. Johnson is in no sense responsible.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the minister no suggestion of his own to make, rather than merely to tell Mr. Johnson what has been said in this House ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will be very glad if I can hasten the publication of this book.

Mr. PUTTEE. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) is rather off the mark in charging the delay to the statistical department. It was well into the summer last session before the blue-books were laid on the Table, and I understand the Statistical Year Book is compiled from these reports. The report of the Superintendent of Printing states that the Year Book for 1899 was turned out of the Bureau before June 30, 1900, and that is within a month or two of the date that the departmental reports were brought down to this House.

Mr. CLANCY. What departmental reports does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Puttee) refer to ?

Mr. PUTTEE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) knows that some of the blue-books were not put on the Table until May of last year, and the Statistical Year Book, which is made up from them, was out of the Printing Bureau before June 30 last year.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Puttee) is not well informed or he would know that this book is always a year after the departmental reports are made.

Mr. MONK. And the minister admits it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What I said was : that the statistics of the year ending June 30, 1899, are made up in the Year Book which is issued in 1900. about twelve months after, and that is what the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) has stated.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Puttee) stated, but that is exactly what we are all saying here.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) is correct in stating that the departmental blue-books were laid upon the Table of the House in the month of May last year, and the Statistical Year Book was issued in June.

Mr. SPROULE. Not for the same year.

Mr. CLANCY. Whose fault was it that the departmental reports were not down before ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Our Year Book is like the Newcastle horse, very hard to catch and very little worth when you do catch him. I do not care so much for the delay, but I do say that the make-up of the book and the information it contains is not what should be expected from the Year Book for the Dominion of Canada. I have been in the habit for a long number of years of getting the Year Book of New Zealand, which I will place on the Table for hon. gentlemen to examine, and they will see a Year Book that is worth looking at. Both in the printing and in the information it contains the Canadian Year Book, when we do get it, does not do justice to this great Dominion of Canada.

Mr. MONK. If the Minister of Agriculture will take the trouble to look at the New Zealand Year Book he will feel considerable humiliation at the Year Book published by his department. The preface for the New Zealand Year Book of 1900 is dated August, 1900, and it states that parts of the book have been issued already and circulated in England, as the statistics were being prepared. It is only sufficient to look at the New Zealand Year Book to see how far we are behind. I can readily understand

from the remarks of gentlemen who were in the House before the present government came into power, why the Canadian Year Book is thought so little of by the government. I appeal to the minister to get out his Year Book as quickly as possible, and if he wants the necessary money for that purpose, we will not refuse it.

Aid to agricultural societies, $7,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister might tell us how this money is expended.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is expended in the North-west Territories entirely. The local territorial government are not able to encourage agriculture in those territories in the same way that the local governments do in the different provinces, and for many years the parliament of Canada has voted this sum, which is distributed among the agricultural societies of the North-west Territories in proportion to their membership. A return is made every year to the department of the number of members of the different societies.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not object at all to the item, but I think it would be just as well if the whole truth were told in the estimates. Then this item would read: Aid to agricultural societies in the North-west Territories. We have a great deal of complaint from that section of the country that the people there are getting nothing at all, and when we are giving them $7,000, and giving nothing to the other parts of the country, I think we should state the fact.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Might I ask the hon. gentleman why it is given to the North-west Territories and to no other portion of the Dominion ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Each province has the power of taxation and can do this work for itself; but the North-west Territories are not organized, and the Dominion government, which has to act for the Territories, does the work there.

Mr. WILSON. Will the minister explain the difference between the item Statistical Year Book and the item General Statistics, or are they the same ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The item Statistical Year Book is for the printing of the book, while the item General Statistics is for certain temporary clerks who are employed in the department, in collecting statistics and doing work almost entirely for the book ?

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman tell the committee who furnishes the information upon which this grant is made, that is, with regard to the number of members of each society, and so on ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is furnished through the Department of Agriculture of the Territories.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman said that the cost of the Statistical Year Book in 1893 was $4,000, in 1894 $6,000, in 1895 $6,000, in 1896 $2,100, in 1897 $2,500, in 1898 $3,000, and in 1899 $3,100; but when we take these two items together we find that this year it will cost $6,200.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The figures I gave the hon. gentleman were for the printing alone, and did not include this item of general statistics.

Mr. INGRAM. It is not fair to the committee to say that is what the book cost.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman does not mean to misrepresent me. The item before me was for the printing of the book, not for the compilation, which is done by the clerks in the department.

Mr. INGRAM. We did not understand that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot help that.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman was claiming credit for the reduction of the cost of the book. Why did he not say that that was for the printing of the book alone ? Were these items always separate before?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, always. The figures I read were a fair comparison with the cost in previous years.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman say what both items amount to from 1893 to 1899 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would have to look back at the estimates of previous years. The item of $3,200 has I believe been the same ever since I have been in office.

Mr. MONK. How many clerks are employed in this compilation, which costs $3,200 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are as follows : Mr. Watts, $730; Mr. Munro, $725; Miss Ross, $672; Mr. Lepage, $650; sundry accounts, $423; making up the $3,200. But this does not include Mr. George Johnson's salary, nor the salaries of a couple of other clerks in the office.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman unwittingly, I think, did mislead the committee. I was impressed with the remarks the hon. gentleman made. He was discussing the compilation as well as the printing.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) asked how the cost came to be reduced. The hon. gentleman's answer was that he had dismissed a staff,

who were at work on the census instead of compiling this book, and there was a reduction in consequence.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, no.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that money for agricultural societies paid to the North-west council, or to the individual societies ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. To the societies directly.

Mr. CLANCY. Upon a statement made by the North-west council ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The statement comes through the North-west council from the secretaries of the different societies, and is certified to as correct by the secretary of the Department of Agriculture of the North-west Territorial government, he getting the returns from the societies.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not going to quarrel with the grant, but I can say to the hon. gentleman that there is a great deal of slipshod business about it. There is a great deal of padding as to the number of members, which is without foundation, and I think it will be worth while for the hon. gentleman to make inquiry into the matter. He can see at a glance the opportunities there are, in the channels through which the information comes, without attempting to cast discredit on any one.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that when I first came into office this grant was distributed without reference to the territorial government; and to avoid just what the gentleman suggests, and believing that the territorial government had more intimate relations with the people there, I required that the list of members should pass through their hands, thinking they could check it better than I could at this distance.

Experimental farms, $80,000.

Mr. CLANCY. In view of the course taken by the Minister of the Interior with regard to the growth and planting of trees, and in view of what is being done in the experimental farms, the work of one department would seem to have run somewhat into the other. I think the hon. gentleman ought to state to the committee what is being done in that respect at the agricultural farm in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Ever since the establishment of the experimental farm, the attention of the staff has been turned to the cultivation of trees in order to find out what trees were most suitable for plantation in our territorial plains and then producing and distributing such trees as largely as possible to individual farmers. Mr. Mackay, the manager of the farm at Indian Head, started with sowing seeds of certain kinds of trees, which Professor Saunders thought were likely to succeed. He also planted certain seedlings, some of which were procured from the adjoining northern states of the American union, some from Europe, and some from different parts of the Territories where tree seeds could be conveniently collected. This experimental work has been eminently successful. We have at Indian Head rows of trees which, I think, will average from 24 to 30 feet in height and which have been grown during the last twelve years, and to-day form most splendid wind-breaks. After careful investigation, we have found that for every foot added to the height of those wind-breaks, the effect upon the fields to the leeward has been extended forty to fifty feet. When a wind-break is ten feet high, it will help the culture of crops on a stretch of land about 500 feet out from the wind-break. When the tree is twenty feet high, it will affect an extent of 1,000 feet in width, and about forty or fifty feet more in width to every foot added to the height. This is of the utmost importance in those plains in which there has been found difficulty in raising successful crops in all seasons owing to the wind sweep. This work has been going on ever since the farm was started, and we have been able, by the distribution of small bundles of these young trees, to encourage the growing of trees in homesteads all over the North-west Territories. To-day there are many homesteads surrounded by little groves of trees, the first seedlings of which were sent out from the Brandon farm, which furnish striking object lessons to the people of the plains, and the result has been a constant stream of requests for these bundles of trees. But we could not possibly send out a very great number, and those we did send out were only sufficient to form object lessons, and not really form great stretches of wind-breaks for the practical working out of the problem of protecting our wind-swept plains. The Minister of the Interior appointed a gentleman some two years ago, Mr. Stewart, to study this question of forestry, especially in the Territories, and Mr. Stewart came to the conclusion that it would be well for the Department of the Interior, which has charge especially of those lands, to largely increase the supply of such trees to the settlers. The officers of the experimental farm are entrusted with the duty of finding out what can be done, but it is not their duty to supply trees on a commercial scale or in such numbers that the farmers can supply themselves with wind-breaks. That is a work which falls naturally on the Department of the Interior, in whose charge is the improvement and settlement of the public lands of the Dominion, and the officer in charge specially of this work has applied to me to allow the experimental farms to help him in producing large quantities of these

trees for general distribution. We have agreed to do this and have devoted a small portion of each of the farms at Brandon and Indian Head to the production of these trees. But as the experimental farms are intended for experimental work and not for commercial production of trees for the settlers, we have required that the Department of the Interior should pay to the Department of Agriculture the expenditure caused by this work, just as my department pays the Printing Bureau for the printing of the Statistical Year-Book, and the details are now being arranged between Professor Saunders and Mr. Stewart.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand from the hon. minister that the work carried on by the experimental farms is of an educational character, in order to ascertain the kinds of trees that will be suited to the country generally and to particular localities as well. That educational work must be to a very large extent already accomplished, and the remaining question is, how that western country can be supplied with proper wind breaks. Then it appears that Mr. Stewart was also called in by the Minister of the Interior to study the kind of trees best suited to that country.

I was impressed with what the hon. gentleman said had already been accomplished by the experimental farms. If the experimental farms have been engaged in carrying out this work, a useful work, I admit, to that country, there was no duty for Mr. Stewart to perform but to draw his salary—and that is what has been suspected from the first. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has given away the case of the Minister of the Interior. What the Minister of the Interior stated, and what Mr. Stewart stated, was, that the latter's efforts were directed toward finding what trees could be grown in that country. That work seems to have been performed by the experimental farm. If that is so, we had better do without Mr. Stewart; or, if the experimental farms have been idle all this time in relation to work, we ought to know it. This matter was under the management of the former government. I am not going to say whether it was well or ill-conducted, but if it was not well carried out in the direction indicated by the hon. gentleman, it was useless then, and it is useless now. The hon. gentleman has said, as I understand, that the experimental farm expects to furnish tree plants for that whole country. But, the people of Canada hold that the government is not called upon to do more than carry on the educational work. There is no more reason why the government of Canada should furnish windbreaks at the public expense than there is why it should build barns for the farmers of that country. I am glad to hear the minister say that the educational work has been fairly well done in that country. And in the face of that statement the Minister of the Interior should withdraw the grant that he has asked this House to give him for that purpose; from the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture, it would seem that the department was teaching Mr. Stewart. I rather think the hon. gentleman is right in that. Because, as everybody knows, Mr. Stewart had not given this subject special study and was not specially informed upon it. He was respectably, and, I hope, profitably, employed for many years —all his life in fact—as a provincial land surveyor. He had nothing to do with matters of this kind, nor was he called upon to fit himself for a position of that kind. I am glad to have the hon. gentleman make the statement that the work is being well done by the experimental farms there, and after that statement, which I regard as very important, I think the House will hesitate to pay for the carrying out what I think I may characterize as the pretended work of Mr. Stewart.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is not my duty, nor is it my purpose, to discuss the grant which has been made by this House, I believe, to my hon. friend, the Minister of the Interior, to carry out this work. But, I wish to say a word or two with regard to the sense in which the hon. gentleman has taken the question up. I am sure he does not wish in any way to misrepresent me, but he has tried to give a complexion to what I said that is entirely different to what I intended. Mr. Stewart has not called in the officers of the experimental farm to teach him anything, but he is simply asking us to produce the plants which, according to his opinion from observation of the work on the plains will be useful for wind-breaks. Mr. Stewart's intention, as I understand from him—I was not present to hear the explanation that my hon. friend and colleague (Mr. Sifton) gave here the other night—is to give object lessons on a large scale to the people in the different parts of the plains, by planting wind-breaks on a considerable scale, perhaps half a mile or a mile long, for the purpose of showing the different kinds of trees that can be used—to carry on on a large scale the work that the experimental farm has been carrying on on an experimental scale.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will pardon me, but he was not present when the Minister of the Interior explained the matter. If he will consult 'Hansard' he will see that on the application of any person the Department of the Interior would take the work in hand for that person.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. And they will show how this work ought to be done to be successful, having studied the conditions, the methods and the requirements. It is to help the settlers to accomplish work which is so much in the interest

of the country there. This work the experimental farm has not undertaken to do, because it was out of the line carried on at the farm and by the officers of the farm. I have explained what the farms are doing, and I will leave the explanation of the other work to my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton), who is in charge of it.

Mr. WILSON. I think the hon. minister stated that the work done by Mr. Stewart and the officers there is merely experimental.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not intend to say that. But, what I intended to say, and what I think I said, was that that was the work that the farm was doing.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Stewart stated that on the application of anybody, a man was sent out to give instructions as to tree planting. He views the land and makes a rough sketch, which is sent to the head office, where a plan is drawn to a scale, and this officer will go back and see to the planting of the wind-breaks. If that is to be done throughout Manitoba and the North-west Territories, the government will have a whole army of officers. I do not think that that should be done, nor do the members of this House, I believe. I should like to have an explanation as to the proportion of this $80,000 that is to go to each of the farms. Then, as to the course in giving out trees, have they given out small trees, or have they furnished the farmer with seeds? I understand Mr. Stewart to say that where seeds could be given, it was better than to have the small trees planted.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The only place to which the Experimental Farm sent out trees to any extent is in the North-west Territories. Occasionally a few ornamental shrubs which we want to test are sent into eastern parts of the country, but that is not the regular work of the farm. In the North-west Territories, however, small bundles of perhaps a dozen trees, or twenty or twenty-five in some instances, have been sent up, young trees. In other cases small bags of tree seed have been sent out. The farm at Indian Head and at Brandon collect seeds from all the trees growing there every season, and these seeds are distributed when asked for, much in the same way that grain and potato seed are distributed from the other farms to the farmers for trial. The hon. gentleman asked what proportion of this amount was spent on the various farms. The Central Farm at Ottawa takes $42,000; that includes the salaries of the officers at the Central Farm, and I may say it also includes practically the whole of the seed distribution which goes on from the Experimental Farm.

Mr. WILSON. Is the seed gathered on the farms in the North-west and British Columbia, distributed to the farmers there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A part of it is, and a part of it is sent down here to be used in the eastern part of the Dominion. There is much more seed distribution proportionately from the Central Farm than from any branch farm. The maritime province farm takes about $9,000; the Manitoba farm takes about $10,000; the Indian Head farm about $10,000, and the British Columbia farm about $9,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture could tell what kind of trees have been found to be successful.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not say definitely without looking at the report, but I may say in a general way that the Manitoba maple has been found most successful, and is most generally used. There is also a tree called, I think, the Russian poplar that has been successfully used, but it breaks more easily than the Manitoba maple.

Mr. CLANCY. Has that been found successful all over the Territories?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not say as to that. There are some parts in which it has been difficult to get any trees to grow successfully, but I think those parts are narrowing down. I think that in those sections where trees have not been grown successfully it has been owing to want of careful cultivation. I do not think the experiments of the Central Farm have yet shown a state of affairs about which we could dogmatize. It is possible that in certain sections other trees might be found more successful, because, although we have sent small packages of trees to the farmers in many parts of the Territories, I am sorry to say that in many cases the trees when planted have not been properly taken care of and treated as the directions called for. But we are not prepared to say that, because a package of trees sent to a particular farmer in a particular locality has not been successful in his hands, that therefore, they could not be successful elsewhere. But we take the reports as we get them and tabulate them as well as we can, and draw from them such conclusions as we feel justified in doing.

Mr. CLANCY. I can understand that there may be cases where the trees have not been given a fair chance; but this work has been going on for many years, and surely the hon. gentleman will not now confess that he is unable to present any definite information as to the result of the experiments. I want to call his attention to a statement that was made in this House by a gentleman from the North-west to the effect that this Manitoba maple is the victim

of an insect, and has been found a failure. That statement has been made in the House, I do not know whether the minister heard it; but the hon. gentleman who made that statement is sitting in his place to-night. And he has stated that this tree of which the minister speaks has been planted in the vicinity of Winnipeg as well as in the Territories, and has been found to be a failure.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not undertake to give information on that point without looking into the matter more carefully.

Mr. CLANCY. Surely after the hon. gentleman painted in the most roseate hues the success of the Experimental Farm in tree planting, he is not now going to collapse and to say that he does not know anything about it.

Mr. MONK. This brings into question the position of Mr. Stewart. When I heard the description given by the Minister of Agriculture of the success of the experiments made in the North-west in regard to trees, and particularly trees planted as wind-breaks, it seemed to me, in the first place, that we must be ready to vote any amount of money to the experimental farms, and in the next place, I asked myself what the position of Mr. Stewart really was. Would the minister tell us what is the function of Mr. Stewart? At one moment he says that Mr. Stewart is working in conjunction with the employees of the farm in the North-west on extensive trials of tree planting for wind-breaks; at another moment the minister disclaims any knowledge of Mr. Stewart, and the amount which we voted the other night he says he is not called upon to defend. Now, I would like to know what Mr. Stewart's position is there. Has he really under his direction a certain number of farm hands engaged in new experiments, experiments on a grand scale of planting wind-breaks half a mile long? They say that he is not in the department of the minister. But, I find an immense variance between what the hon. Minister of the Interior told us as to the mission of Mr. Stewart in the North-west Territories, and that mission as explained to us by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I would like to find some way of conciliating these two gentlemen before we proceed to adopt this resolution.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend need not find any trouble. There is no difficulty in conciliating us. Mr. Stewart is an officer of the hon. Minister of the Interior, and I have no details as to his work. Mr. Stewart does not report to me, and although I have talked with Mr. Stewart frequently, I have no information under my hand to give to the committee in regard to Mr. Stewart. All I said about Mr. Stewart in connection with the experimental farms was, that by an arrangement between myself and my colleague, the hon. Minister of the Interior, the director of the experimental farms is going to raise trees on the experimental farms for Mr. Stewart's work. I did not inquire particularly what Mr. Stewart is going to do with them. I have no control over Mr. Stewart's operations after he gets these trees, but that work is going to be carried out on the experimental farms at the expense of the Department of the Interior. I have no further information in regard to Mr. Stewart's work to give to the committee on this occasion, and the vote which we are now discussing is not a vote for Mr. Stewart or a vote under the control of the department for which Mr. Stewart works.

Mr. MONK. That is about as clear as mud to me, because the hon. gentleman told us a moment ago that the work of his department in the North-west Territories was purely experimental. I understood him to say distinctly that the experiment in regard to raising trees had extended over several years and that the conclusion was arrived at that it was perfectly successful. Now, he tells us that the experimental farm is, under the direction of this officer, Mr. Stewart, to raise trees for experimental purposes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The work is not going to be done under the direction of Mr. Stewart, but under the direction of the director of the experimental farms.

Mr. MONK. For Mr. Stewart.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All the trees that are produced are to be handed over to Mr. Stewart for his work.

Mr. MONK. For distribution.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For his work, whatever it may be.

Mr. MONK. Well, I give it up.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps the hon. minister could tell us the number of farmers to whom trees or tree seeds have been distributed from the different experimental farms. I presume he keeps a record of that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, there is a record, but I have not it under my hand. I could not give the hon. gentleman the number of farmers to whom tree seeds have been distributed.

Mr. WILSON. For the past year?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not see any record of it in the report of the Brandon farm.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there is any truth in the alleged

statement of Mr. Stewart which was repeated here the other night that all experiments in tree planting in the North-west Territories had utterly failed and that Mr. Stewart's mission was to go around preaching the proper doctrine of tree planting, and to give the people instruction as to how trees could be raised and proper experiments could be made. That statement was made here, and I would ask the hon. minister how he reconciles it with his own splendid experiments in the North-west ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not attempt to reconcile it. I do not know whether it was made or not.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman stated in the early part of the evening that it was found to be difficult for the agricultural farms to produce trees to any considerable extent for planting in the country more than merely for experimental purposes. I understood the hon. gentleman to make that statement.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said we had not done so before.

Mr. CLANCY. Am I to understand that the hon. gentleman intends to enlarge the building of tree planting now ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, at these farms for this purpose.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman intend to grow trees at the experimental farms to provide wind-breaks in the country ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I propose to raise trees and to hand them over to Mr. Stewart for whatever uses his department requires them and Mr. Stewart's department, the Department of the Interior, has to pay for that work.

Mr. CLANCY. But, it is paid out of the public purse.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. What I ask the hon. gentleman is if he is going to devote, to a larger extent than in the past, the efforts of the farms to the growth of trees for the purpose of making wind-breaks upon the application of such parties as may apply to the Department of the Interior. Is his department to be a pack horse for the Department of the Interior ? The hon. gentleman stated in most explicit terms, that, while in the past, only a comparatively few trees were grown for educational purposes, now he intends to enlarge the service and hand the trees over to Mr. Stewart to make wind-breaks in the country. I do not think I am misstating the hon. gentleman in the statement that I make. If it is the intention for the Agriculture Department to furnish trees to the Department of the Interior because the Department of the Interior pays for them it is a mere change of tyrants. It does not make any difference which pays for them; it all comes out of the public purse. The question is : Should it be paid for at all in the sense of work that is to be carried out by Mr. Stewart ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is another matter.

Mr. SPROULE. In the distribution of these trees to the farmers, are they to be charged for, or are the farmers to pay anything for them ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My department has nothing to do with the distribution of them. We hand them over to Mr. Stewart's branch and he deals with them entirely.

Mr. SPROULE. In connection with that, we would require more information because you are establishing a new line. It is practically the establishment of nurseries for the benefit of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. If you are going to supply the demand for trees which will be enormous in the future it would be well for us to know whether they are to be supplied free or to be charged for. If you are to become the patrons of the farmers in the whole country it would be a very expensive business.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not going to give them to the farmers. I am going to give them to the Department of the Interior and I am not able to give the hon. gentleman any information. The information does not really affect this vote because the money asked for here is not going to be used for that purpose in any way whatever. I do not raise any technical objection to the hon. gentleman's questions; I would be glad to give him the information if I could. But, the work, being paid for by the Department of the Interior, I am not in a position to give him any information in respect to it. This work is not being done by my officer, but by an officer responsible to and paid by that department. The products will be handed over to them to do with them as they see fit according to the needs of their work. I am not responsible for that part of it.

Mr. SPROULE. This vote in the first instance applies directly to the experimental farms. They are undertaking a new line of work for which the hon. Minister of Agriculture asks an amount to be voted in the estimates.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, Sir.

Mr. SPROULE. Well now, will the hon. minister wait till he hears the statement I am about to make before he so emphatically contradicts it ? I say that he asks for that item in the estimates for these experimental farms while at the same time he tells us

that they are undertaking this work. It is for us to say whether it is the part of wisdom to commence this divergence or not. Therefore, it is necessary to get this information to enable us to judge whether it is wise to keep up the farms for that purpose. I think the hon. minister ought to be in a position to give that information to the committee.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No increased expenditure which is required for this work is to be taken out of the vote under consideration. The land of the farm is to be used, it is true, but any other work in connection with the raising of these trees for this purpose is to be paid for by the Interior Department.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps only a dozen farmers may apply this year, but if the experiment is a great success there may be a thousand applications next year. This will, of course, entail increased work on the farms, and before we determine whether it is wise to maintain these experimental farms for that purpose, we should have the information I have asked for.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot give any more information.

Mr. MONK. I do not think that is at all fair. As the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) has pointed out, we are embarking upon a new policy. I am far from saying that it is not a proper thing to maintain these tree nurseries for the farmers of the North-west, but surely we are entitled to know what amount out of this vote is to be expended for the cultivation of these trees.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No portion of this vote will be so expended.

Mr. MONK. Who will pay the expense then ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Minister of the Interior will pay the expense in that connection. I have already explained that no part of this $80,000 will be devoted to that work. The farm work will be carried on as it has been in the past, and every bit of work connected with the raising of these trees will be paid for out of the Interior vote.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, we are commencing to divide the farm work between two departments of the government, and that is a bad system. In the past we thought it wise to keep all this work under the Department of Agriculture, so that we might see at a glance what is the expenditure and what is the progress made. If the Department of the Interior becomes a co-partner with that of Agriculture, it will be more complex and more difficult to get at the value of the work done.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Although the work is going to be paid for by the Department of the Interior, that department will not have anything to do with the actual management of the work. The work will be done by the farm at the expense of the Interior Department, but it will be done by my officers and by the hands employed on the farm, and if more hands are needed, as they will be for this work, the time and the work of those hands will be charged to the Minister of the Interior, just the same as the Printing Bureau charges my department with printing other work.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose that on one of these farms a dozen men are employed and three are engaged in the arboretum, and the demand will so increase in the future that it will require a couple of hundred hands to supply it, that extra demand would not be in connection with the farm work, and yet we will be called upon to vote larger sums year after year, to meet this increased employment of labour.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Through the Department of the Interior.

Mr. SPROULE. Will not the Department of Agriculture pay for the farm hands ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is impossible for me to explain any further than I have.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister told us a few minutes ago that this vote covered the salaries of the farm hands. But suppose this work requires a far greater number of hands, will we not be obliged to vote a larger sum year after year to pay them ? In order to enable us to determine if it is wise to enter into this business, it is essential that we should have the information that we ask. As soon as the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture get through their consultation, I will resume. I am not talking for the mere amusement of it, nor for the purpose of killing time, but with the endeavour—somewhat ineffectual, I admit—to get information which we ought to know before we can intelligently vote this money. We ought to know upon what line it is proposed to distribute these trees to the farmers, and whether or not, an unlimited number will be supplied in the future, as the demands may increase.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I must tell the hon. gentleman frankly that that is information which I cannot give. My hon. colleague (Hon. Mr. Sifton) has that information, and I believe gave it to the House when he got the vote out of which this expenditure is paid. I have explained that the money which I am asking now will not go for that purpose, and therefore I do not think I can fairly be called upon to give that information.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand that no portion of this $80,000 will be applied to the distribution of the trees ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. None of it will go for paying the expense of supplying these trees to the Interior Department. Some of it now does go for the distribution of trees, as has been the case for years, and that same kind of distribution will be continued, but that is different from the distribution carried on by Mr. Stewart for the Interior Department. In answer to my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson), I wish to say that I have found a statement of the amount of tree seed, and trees distributed from the Brandon farm last year. The following is the distribution : Six hundred bags of maple seed, of one pound each ; three hundred and sixty-one packages of seedling trees containing various numbers of box elders, cottonwood, caragana arborescens, plum seedlings and artemisea cuttings.

Mr. WILSON. These were distributed in the North-west ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. In the Auditor General's Report (D—31) there is an amount of $395.46 for distribution of trees from the Brandon Experimental Farm. Do these trees go to farmers in that neighbourhood ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was the cost of the distribution which was carried on at Brandon. These tree seeds and seedling trees are sent out through the province of Manitoba in the same way as seed grain is sent out all over the country from the experimental farm here.

Mr. INGRAM. Then I understand that the Department of Agriculture does not intend to go any further than it is doing now ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, the same kind of work.

Mr. INGRAM. But the Department of the Interior intends to inaugurate a system of planting wind-breaks for the farmers of the North-west, and the government is to pay for the trees for that purpose ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is a detail of the work as to which I am not in a position to give information to the committee, because it belongs to my colleague's department. While I have talked the matter over with him, I have not under my hand the details as to how the work is to be done.

Mr. MONK. When we come to Mr. Stewart's mission in the North-west, the Minister of Agriculture reminds me of a character in one of Dicken's novels, who, whenever asked a question, replied : 'You must really know what you want to know.' I suppose this new line which is to be taken up on the experimental farms of the North-west has not been taken up without a previous understanding with the Department of the Interior as to the extent to which this tree-planting would be carried as an experiment in favour of the farmers of the North-west. What is the agreement arrived at as to that, and what are the trees which at the present moment are being nursed on the farms to serve as wind-breaks.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As to the exact extent of this work, I would have to inquire of Professor Saunders. I left the matter in his and Mr. Stewart's hands for mutual arrangement. In the conversation I had with him, it was considered that four or five acres of tree seed would be planted at each of these farms this spring. The hon. gentleman asks what trees are at present on the farms for this purpose. There are none. That work is just beginning. We have been doing this work for years, and a list of the trees that are planted appears in the reports of the farm from year to year.

Mr. MONK. What is the tree Mr. Stewart has recommended ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell exactly. We are going to plant two or three different kinds, we think. The Manitoba maple and the cottonwood have been mentioned ; but I would not undertake from casual conversation to give the committee a list of the trees that are to be started. That is under discussion between Professor Saunders and Mr. Stewart.

Mr. MONK. Then it amounts to this, that we are entering into this work without knowing the extent to which it is to be carried or what trees are to be planted. I do not think it is fair for the minister to ask us for this vote without giving that information.

Mr. SPROULE. It looks like a vote of want of confidence in the Minister of Agriculture by the Minister of the Interior. The hon. gentleman tells us that his department have carried on that work for some years, but I understood that it was comparatively a failure—why ? Because it was not done on intelligent lines. Now the work is to be taken out of his hands by the Minister of the Interior. The hon. gentleman's department will do the menial work of planting seeds, but as soon as the trees are above the ground the Minister of the Interior will take charge of them and will become the medium between the farm and the farmers. That is the sum and substance of the information we have had up to the present. Would the minister tell us about the number of stock on these farms, and what experiments are being carried on generally ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The annual report of the farms gives full details of the number of head of animals of all kinds on each farm. I could look up the report, and give it to the committee if

the hon. gentleman insists upon it; but I do not think that is what he means. We have on these farms cattle, sheep, swine and poultry as well as horses for the carrying on of the work. In round figures we have at the present time on the experimental farm at Ottawa 125 or 130 head of cattle, 35 or 40 sheep, 40 or 50 pigs, and between 100 and 200 head of poultry. I would not like to give a more exact statement without referring to the actual figures. At the farm of the maritime provinces at Nappan we have probably 75 head of cattle, including the young calves, 40 or 50 pigs, 30 or 40 sheep, 40 or 50 head of poultry, and the horses necessary for carrying on the work. We have at Brandon about the same number as at Nappan, and at Indian Head about the same—perhaps not as many cattle. I do not think we have any sheep at either Brandon or Indian Head. At Agassiz, B.C., we have a smaller stock—20 or 25 head of cattle, 12 or 15 sheep, 20 or 30 pigs, some poultry and a few horses. The hon. gentleman has asked me about the lines of stock breeding and general work. I must be pretty general. The details of all this are given before the Committee on Agriculture every year by the officers of the farm, and it would be tedious and, I think, unimportant for me to go into the details. But generally I may say that at the farm here and at the Nappan farm we carry on considerable dairy work, besides feeding cattle for beef every winter. I have a number of steers fattened every spring, most of which were bought in the fall and sold in the spring. They are fed on experimental lines, and the results are published in the report for the information of all those interested in feeding stock. The feeding of swine and sheep and poultry is also carried on for the same purpose. The farms in the west are less devoted to dairying, although at each some cows are kept all the year round.

Mr. SPROULE. A few years ago there was considerable tuberculosis among the stock, and while a number were slaughtered, I understood that some were kept in quarantine under treatment. What has been the result of that treatment?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was none of that stock kept at the farm. The animals that were found to be tuberculous were slaughtered, with the exception of ten head, which were sent to Montreal, and put into a small quarantine station to be treated by Dr. McEachran. They were kept about ten months and then slaughtered. Since that other animals have been quarantined in the same way, and subjected to various experiments, but there have been no tuberculous animals on the farm since the spring or winter of 1897. Since then we have carefully tested every animal purchased with the tuberculine, and when, as has occurred in very few instances, reaction took place, the animal was slaughtered immediately.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. gentleman made up his mind as to the value of the tuberculine test?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That subject will be more properly treated under the heading of the tuberculosis vote.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. minister has stated that the cost of growing trees for distribution in the Territories was to be paid by the Interior Department. Has the hon. gentleman made any calculation to show what that additional cost will be?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, because that matter is now being arranged between Prof. Saunders and Mr. Stewart, and the details are not yet settled.

Mr. CLANCY. I see that out of an expenditure of $15,000 voted last night to the Interior Department, only $1,500 is for tree-planting. Evidently the Interior Department has made no provision for what the hon. gentleman says that department will have to pay with regard to those trees.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. $1,500 will cover the expense.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, it is evident not much will be done.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the plan adopted with regard to the distribution of these trees? Have the farmers to apply to the Agriculture Department for the trees they require, or will so many trees be distributed to each municipality?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is a matter with which the Department of the Interior has to deal and not my department.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, the Minister of the Interior should be here to give the explanation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He explained it when his items were before the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly $1,500 is not going to meet the expense of raising and distributing these trees and supplying all the tools necessary to cultivate them. If the Department of the Interior is to run the business, why not give the land to that department, and not make a joint account?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because it is considered that the work will be done more cheaply and better by the experimental farms.

Mr. MONK. Have any representations been made to the hon. minister for the establishment of a farm—I do not say an experimental farm—but a farm under government control in the province of Quebec?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Requests have come from various parts to increase the number of experimental farms. The Experimental Farm Act specifies the number and where they shall be. The farm at Ottawa is on the boundary between Quebec and Ontario, so that it serves these two great provinces. That was the decision arrived at by our predecessors, whom the hon. gentleman and his friends have supported.

I confess that I consider that the number of experimental farms at present is sufficient for the needs of the experimental work of the country, so far as great experimental farms can carry on that work. I have always believed as I stated when the establishment of the experimental farms was originally proposed, that it would have been better if, instead of the great farms, farms smaller in extent and less expensive in their management—small illustration or experimental stations—had been established all over the country. That view was not accepted at the time. Great establishments were made at the various points, and a large amount of money was spent on them, and a large amount of annual expenditure entailed. We would not be able to change that whole policy without making a radical change in the Act, and involving the country in large additional expenditure. The work has been done on the lines laid down, it has been carried out by the officers in an excellent manner. I am glad to say that this work inaugurated by my predecessors in office and my political opponents has been well carried out, and has resulted in great advantage to the farming industry and population of the country. I am not prepared, in view of the large expenditure of the farms to-day, to propose a radical change in the farm policy. I have had it in view, as is well known to hon. members who were in the last parliament to extend the work with establishments on a smaller scale. But that was met with such opposition by hon. gentlemen opposite, and by other gentlemen in this House, that it was dropped. I still believe that it would be in the interest of agriculture and of the community at large, if such a change could be brought about. But I have not seen my way to repeat the proposal this session. It would not have involved any change in the management or equipment of the present experimental farms.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman has gone far beyond the question I asked him. What I wished to elicit a reply to is this—as he says there is no desire in the province of Quebec to have a complete experimental farm; but representations have been made, I believe, and figures laid before him to show that the Experimental Farm at Ottawa is not easily accessible, and therefore it is desired that a station upon a modest scale, a sort of model farm, should be established near Montreal. I wished to know if the minister had arrived at a decision on these representations. I know that such representations have been made from my own county.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Similar representations have been made from various sections all over the country.

Mr. MONK. But I would like the hon. minister to answer with regard to the province of Quebec.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am going to answer the hon. gentleman's question, but in the way I think right to answer it. Similar representations and requests have been made from various parts of the country, from Vancouver on the west to Prince Edward Island on the east. I have never seen my way to acceed to one of these requests, or to deal with them as I thought it would be well to do, if I dealt with one.

Mr. SPROULE. What has been the hon. gentleman's success or otherwise in dealing with the San José scale last year and the year before?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Here again I would point out that I am taking a vote to deal with that, and I shall be prepared to discuss the subject when the question comes up.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, there is an item?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes—not in the main estimates, but in the supplementary estimates for this year or next year.

Mr. McCREARY. In view of the fact that the hon. gentleman has stated, that these farms have become unwieldy——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are the same as they were.

Mr. McCREARY. Yes, but they have accomplished their object and are not accomplishing the same object to-day—has it been brought to his attention that these establishments might be turned rather into agricultural schools than into experimental farms. Many hon. gentlemen on both sides have expressed the idea that we should have more British immigrants. But I submit that the only British immigrants we are likely to get—and I think the reports of the High Commissioner will bear me out—are young men who are not familiar with farming—sons of professional men and others. Their parents send these young men out with sums varying from £100 to £600. But the difficulty is to get these young men to engage in farming. If they go to cattle ranching or horse ranching, that is looked upon as a kind of sport, and they will go into it at once. But as to going into actual farming, they hesitate to risk their capital, on account of lack of knowledge of farming. The

only alternative is to send them to a farmer at £1 per month for a year at least to learn farming. The farmer is looking after the almighty dollar, like most other men, and he tries to get all the work he can out of the boy who goes to him at this small wage. Of course, a young man brought up in luxury is apt to get tired of the work, and many of them flock to the cities in Canada or the United States, or go back home and say that farming is mere slavery. If there were one or two farms started in the west to which the parents could send their boys, knowing that they were to attend a government school and learn farming in a practical, as well as in a theoretical manner, the parents to pay £100 a year, that would be one solution of the question. These farms need not cost the country very much, for they could probably be made self-supporting. Hon. members on both sides of the House must be aware that in past years it has been the custom of some parties to send out boys on the farm pupil system, which was a curse. The High Commissioner had to report upon it, and it has been done away with nearly altogether, though it is still carried on secretly. And, being carried on secretly, the boys who come out must be sent to speculators in the west, at the outskirts of civilization, at whose hands he is certain to be subject to abuse. We have actually had to send the mounted police to take these boys away from these people and save them from the abuse that was being heaped upon them. These were the sons of wealthy men in the old country. If the hon. minister would consider the advisability of turning the farm at Brandon or Indian Head into a school of that sort, I believe that he would see that it would be a move in the right direction.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would point out, in the first place, that what we may call agricultural education, like every other kind of education, is purely within the sphere of the provincial government, and the provincial law. Several of the provinces of the Dominion have provided out of their own resources for the agricultural education within their boundaries, which I think is the proper method of providing for education, agricultural or otherwise.

Mr. McCREARY. There they are trying to settle them on lands owned by themselves, but the Dominion own the lands in Manitoba and the North-west Territories with regard to settlement.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I wish to point out that the work of the experimental farm is not in any way connected with teaching people on those farms to do farm work. The experimental farms are for the purpose of investigating facts and truths in connection with the production and utilization of farm crops. That experimental work is entirely inconsistent with the teaching of ignorant pupils. That must be done by those who have a scientific training. I venture to think that such a system in the experimental farm would involve a radical change in the whole aim and object of those farms, and would be entirely inconsistent with their present work.

Mr. SPROULE. Is any portion of this vote used for repairs of buildings at the farms ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is used for the purchase of implements, but not for repairs of buildings, which are done by the Public Works Department.

Printing and distribution of reports and bulletins of farms, $4,000.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to bring to the attention of the minister the fact that there is some complaint made by the farmers that the reports of the experimental farms are much delayed in distribution. Farmers have brought to my attention the fact, for instance, that experiments made in one year are not available to them until the second succeeding season, on account of delays in the distribution. It would be advantageous if the distribution could be made so that the farmers would have the benefit of the reports in the next succeeding year.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In justice to my officers, I must say that invariably, or almost so, the various reports of experimental farms, are placed in the hands of the printer before the 1st of January, in any year. The reason of the long delays has not been due to any neglect on the part of my officers. In consequence, however, of the complaints that have been made, I have arranged this year with my colleague, the Secretary of State, who controls the Printing Bureau, to have the report of experimental farms for last year printed more promptly, and it is now being printed, and is almost completed. It was only placed in the hands of the printer on the 27th or 28th of December. It is now more than half printed, and I trust that before the close of the session the whole report will be printed and distributed.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) complained of the lateness of the distribution of this report. The evidence given before the Agriculture Committee, which is largely the same as that contained in the report, is generally printed every session, and a large number of copies are distributed to members of parliament. But the trouble is that although the order is given early in the session with the view of having those reports distributed before the session closes, they are often issued too late, and have to be sent to the members at their homes. I think if a little more expedition was used in the Printing Bureau this report could be

got out before the session of parliament is over. There are about 20,000 copies printed for distribution by members, and unless they are got out during the session they are of very little use.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have mentioned that fact to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. But I want this committee to know that the Department of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture have absolutely nothing whatever to do with the distribution of the evidence which is taken before the Committee on Agriculture. That is purely a matter concerning the Printing Committee of parliament, and the department cannot interfere with it. Some time ago I undertook to do something and I was simply told it was none of my business.

Mr. SPROULE. If I were a Minister of the Crown and I got an answer like that from any department, I would know the reason why. The government are there to control the Printing Bureau.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it is not the Printing Bureau, it is the committee of the House that has control of the matter. I have no control over it, I cannot go to the Printing Bureau and ask the Bureau to do anything, because they say that it is under the direction of the committee of the House, and they refuse to recognize me as having any authority.

Mr. SPROULE. It depends largely upon the number of employees engaged in that Printing Bureau whether they will turn out the work early or late, and the hon. gentleman, as a member of the government, is responsible to that extent for the action of the Printing Bureau, and he should see that the staff is enlarged. The committee only gives the order, but the order may not be executed by the Printing Bureau as soon as it ought to be. The question is, Why ? There are either not enough hands employed, or they have not enough machinery, or they are dilatory in their work. They must be amenable to the department to which the Printing Bureau belongs.

Mr. WILSON. Are these reports not distributed from the experimental farm to the parties whose names have been given in by members ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The bulletins ?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. That is what I thought, so that it does not matter so much whether they are printed before the House rises or not.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is discussing the evidence which is given before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. WILSON. I mean the evidence.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is not distributed from the farm. The farm has nothing at all to do with it.

Mr. WILSON. I do not think I have got a copy of it for two or three years.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is because it has not been sent by the committee of the House.

Mr. WILSON. I understood it was distributed from the experimental farm.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is an entire mistake.

Mr. WILSON. I furnished a list to the experimental farm of those I wished to be supplied in my riding with these reports and I expected they would get them but they have not gone out. I have been mistaken about that. I think somebody ought to move that these reports should be distributed fairly to the members, and that every constituency should be fairly furnished with the information that we get before the Agricultural Committee.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I want the hon. gentleman to understand the difference between the evidence taken before the Committee on Agriculture and the reports and bulletins which are issued from the farm.

Mr. WILSON. I understand the difference.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman understands the difference I need say no more.

Mr. CLANCY. This is an important question which has arisen more than once in regard to the delay in having reports sent out. For instance the question has come up more than once in connection with the printing of certain departmental reports, the Auditor General's Report, and so on. The hon. minister knows that the standing committee of the House ceases to have any functions when the House rises. Therefore, whatever may be done must be done during the sitting of the House. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who is responsible for that ? Does it belong to the Department of the Secretary of State ? Who is the officer who is responsible ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The officers of the House.

Mr. CLANCY. Under Mr. Speaker ? It would be well to learn who is responsible in order that this may be remedied. It is certainly a very great evil and we ought to be able to trace the responsibility to the officer whose duty it is to see that this is done.

As I said before, when the House rises a standing committee ceases to have existence for the purpose of performing the duty involved in this discussion. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is able to state, after the House rises, whose duty it is to carry out the orders of the committee so far as they have gone ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman which officer of the House it is, but it is an officer of the House.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps the hon. minister will be able to tell us to what extent the annual report of the Committee on Agriculture is distributed ? How many are printed?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The evidence which is given before the Committee on Agriculture by the different officers is ordered to be printed by the Committee on Agriculture itself. There was a motion the other day in the committee ordering 20,000 copies to be printed. The committee regulates this for itself. I believe that the committee makes a recommendation of that kind which is referred to the Committee on Printing and that the Committee on Printing gives a final decision. I understand by the rules of the House that if any one of the standing committees wants certain things printed it refers its recommendation to the Committee on Printing and the Committee on Printing eventually gives the order.

Mr. WILSON. I was asking when the whole report was printed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no such report of the Committee on Agriculture that I know of.

Mr. MONK. The hon. member (Mr. Wilson) means the printed evidence.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think my hon. friend is referring to the farm report.

Mr. WILSON. No, I am referring to the evidence taken before the committee. It is in a form like this report. I want to know to what extent this has been distributed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. To the extent the Printing Committee ordered it.

Mr. WILSON. You have nothing to do with it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Nothing whatever.

Commissioner's branch for agriculture and dairying, including cold storage on steamships, on railways, at warehouses and creameries, and for expenses in connection with trial shipments of products, and for securing improvement and recognition of the quality of Canadian farm products, $140,000.

Mr. MONK. I would suggest to my hon. friend not to take that item this evening. It is very, very late and it is a very important item. There is a very thin House and I am sure it cannot be discussed within the short time that the House will likely have at its disposal this evening. We have voted a considerable amount and have spent a considerable time on these estimates. This item connected with transportation is one which will give rise to considerable discus sion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not wish to urge the committee. I am quite willing to have this discussed as much as possible. But it is rather early for us to rise at this stage of the session at ten minutes to twelve. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would take a few of the smaller items and let us go on for another half hour ?

Mr. MONK. We might take some of the smaller items.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We will allow No. 83 to stand.

Mr. SPROULE. And 84 as well.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Eighty-four is purely a formal item.

Mr. CLANCY. It is very important.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Well then let us take No. 85.

Classifying all Canadian patents and preparing drawings of same for classification and for exchange with the United States in return for their patents, to be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase in this item.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is in consequence of the fact that we are pushing the work along a little more vigorously, doing more of it and requiring more paper and photographs.

Census, $250,000.

Mr. CLANCY. That is a big question.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That can go through.

Mr. WILSON. Do you expect that amount will finish it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The last census took more than $500,000. No, I can hardly expect that this year's work will finish it. It is not at all likely.

Mr. HENDERSON. How much was voted last year for this purpose ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was $250,000 voted for this current year, and now I am asking for $250,000 for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. HENDERSON. That will make $500,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, $500,000, and I expect to have to ask for something for the following year but nothing like so much. I cannot estimate what the whole thing will cost.

Mr. HENDERSON. When does the hon. minister expect to be able to give the population of the Dominion ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not like to give the date. It will be probably two or three months after the returns come in before we can give an accurate statement of the population. The returns ought to be largley in by the end of the month, and in the main centres of population we ought to be able to make them up within a couple of months. We have not come to any decision as to whether we would issue reports before the whole of the returns are in. I do not see any objection to issuing the reports for the various divisions when we can get them in, but that is a matter that has not yet been determined upon.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I would like to ask the hon. minister how they expect to get a proper census of the population of the country unless they are quicker than they are at present. They wish to know the population of the country on a certain day, on the first of this month. To my certain knowledge there are dozens of places where no one has seen a census paper yet. It would be impossible for an hotel to tell how many people they had in the house at a certain date, if you ask them a month afterwards. I always understood that in former years the papers were left to be filled in by the householders.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE No.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. It used to be so.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. The enumerators carry the forms around, and they ask all their questions with reference to the 1st of April. The forms are not left to be filled in.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. How could they possibly tell in a large hotel who were there on the 1st of April ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is one of the difficulties which is necessarily attendant upon a de jure census which has always been taken in Canada. The same difficulty has arisen in past census, and will in this. I understand, however, that the returns were fairly accurate in that respect in the past, and I trust they will be again on this occasion. It is well understood that in unorganized and thinly-populated centres the work cannot go on so rapidly as in older settled districts. The work has been going on as rapidly as possible, and I hear very satisfactory reports from the officers throughout the country. While the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Prior) may be correct, that in some of the outlying portions of his province—

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. I was speaking about the capital of the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The enumerators have been at work here since the 1st of April, and they have been going as rapidly as possible from house to house.

Mr. WILSON. Does the minister pretend to say that there is one of these schedules left to be filled in at each house ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. WILSON. I was not at home when the officer came around, and he left a paper, which I filled in on Saturday last.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The practice is for the enumerator to fill it in himself.

Mr. INGRAM. In this city the enumerators are leaving the papers at the different houses to be filled in. I had occasion to look over some of these papers, left by the enumerators at houses in Ottawa, and if there is any man in the employ of the government who can figure out the answers given in them, he can do more than I can. The questions are not properly answered at all.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. It is a perfect farce.

Mr. INGRAM. It is a perfect farce. The proper way is for the enumerator to visit each house and put down the answers intelligently if he knows how, and I suppose he does or he would not be appointed. The way the work is being done in the capital of Canada is a perfect farce. In my own city the enumerators ask the questions and put the answers down intelligently, and when these papers are sent in to the department they will give an intelligent report as to that district, but I have seen some of the papers in Ottawa to-day, and I am sure the officers will never be able to make out what the answers are.

Mr. MONK. I am afraid that very much the same state of affairs exists in the city of Montreal, and I think the minister should look into it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will make inquiries about it.

Mr. MONK. The minister spoke about taking up some of the smaller items.

The PRIME MINISTER. Is not this vote passed now ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

The PRIME MINISTER. This was only a preliminary skirmish.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We will take up some other items, and leave this one for the present.

Fumigating stations, $2,500.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is for fumigating the nursery stock imported under the amendment to the San José Scale Act. At first we prohibited the importation, but we afterwards discovered that it was possible to fumigate the stock so as to completely destroy the scale. We agreed to establish fumigating stations at different ports, similar to the cattle quarantine stations. These stations are : St. John, N.B. ; St. Johns, P.Q. ; Niagara Falls and Windsor, Ont. ; Winnipeg, Man. ; and Vancouver, B.C. We require to appoint, for a short time in the spring and fall of the year, a man to do the fumigating work.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked the minister, before we reached this item, if he could give us any information as to what success attended the effort to stamp out the San José scale.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My department is not undertaking to stamp out the scale, except in so far as the entomologist and botanist of the Experimental Farm are giving information by letter, and word of mouth, and visit to any one who asks for information regarding the pest. We are taking no active steps towards stamping it out in the sense that the Ontario government has been taking steps. The San José scale exists in Canada only in the province of Ontario, I think. I am not speaking from my own personal knowledge, but from the reports in the newspapers and the debates in the Ontario House, and the statements that are made at public meetings. These sources of information are as available to the hon. gentleman as they are to me, and, perhaps, I may not be correct in every detail as to what I am saying. The Ontario government have been taking active steps in trying to stamp out the scale, and if they cannot stamp it out, to prevent its being spread. One of the most effective steps which I think they have successfully taken has been to require that all nursery stock raised in the province should be fumigated before being distributed by the nursery men. I believe that the nursery men are fumigating the stock, and if they do that there is, I think, not the slightest danger of the spread of the San José scale from that source. Our work has been directed entirely to protecting this country from the importation of this scale from abroad. We first of all prohibited the importation of nursery stock altogether, but we afterwards amended the Act so as to allow the importation, under certain conditions, which, I believe, will prevent any danger of the importation of the scale. The work has been carried on last fall and last spring, and it has been done thoroughly and satisfactory.

Mr. SPROULE. I remember somewhat distinctly that the minister announced to the House some time ago, that the scale was only to be found within a limited area in the country, and that he entertained the hope of being able not only to stamp it out entirely, but to prevent the importation of it in the future. There was a discussion in the House at the time, and some hon. gentleman questioned the propriety of the steps that the minister proposed to take. According to the hon. gentleman's report, the scale seems to be spreading. It says :

> The establishment of fumigation stations for the treatment of nursery stock so as to prevent any further introduction of the San José scale into Canada was placed in charge of the entomologist, and has taken up some time. Unfortunately it would appear as though the San José scale has increased in numbers in the districts which were known to be infested last year, and the pest has spread somewhat into adjacent localities. Several experiments are being tried in the hope of getting a practical remedy.

This does not give very much encouragement for the stamping out of the pest. On the contrary, I am told that it is spreading to other sections of the country. Whether the fumigation is ineffectual, or whether the spread of the pest is from some other cause, is not quite clear. It may be that the fumigation is not effectual, and that it is spreading through the importation of stock. If not, then by what other means is it spreading ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The scale is a thing which spreads from tree to tree and from farm to farm. I am not aware that it has been spreading to new sections of the country, although I understand that it has been spreading over a slightly greater area in the province of Ontario than it was before. I think, too, it has been found in some parts where it was not believed to be before; but it was found on old trees, and not on nursery stock. The statement that fumigation is ineffectual is entirely unfounded. On the contrary, we have had no reports of any cases from nursery stock which has come into the country and has been fumigated at those stations; and as the matter is largely in the minds of the horticulturists and tree-growers, I am sure the fact would have been reported to us had the scale been so found.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman attributed to me a statement which I did not make. I asked if the fumigation was effectual, or could it be that the scale was spread through that means ? I noticed a report last fall that while the scale was at first thought to be confined to a limited area in the Niagara district, it was afterwards found in different districts between Niagara and the Western Peninsula, and that it was believed to be spreading with

considerable rapidity. I also saw in the same communication that the Department of Agriculture had abandoned the idea of eradicating the scale from the country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. You have reference to the Department of Agriculture for Ontario, not to this department.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood it applied both to the Department of Agriculture of Ontario and the department here as well.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. The first proposal was, of course, to destroy the trees on which the scale was found and to fumigate the stock. I understood that that first plan was abandoned.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All the work the hon. gentleman is discussing was the work of the department at Toronto, not of this department at all.

Mr. SPROULE. This department outlined the methods by which it was thought it could be eradicated, and it was proposed to take up the work jointly with the Department of Agriculture for Ontario.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says no, but I remember the discussion distinctly. The question was asked, why keep it out if there is no effort to stop it in the country, and the answer was that the Department of Agriculture for Ontario would endeavour to destroy it in the country, and the effort of this department would be directed to prevent its importation, and by these joint means we would hope to get rid of it. It is quite clear that one or both were out in their judgment, and that the means adopted were not as effectual as it was thought at that time they would be. It may be that we are preventing the importation of it, and yet it may be found after a while that we are not.

Tracadie Lazaretto, $5,500.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Last year, the hon. minister will remember, I brought up the case of the Chinese lepers in British Columbia. I pointed out to him how manifestly unfair it was that the government had not taken charge of those lepers. At the present time and for many years past the cities of Victoria and Vancouver have had to pay for the maintenance of those lepers. Large sums of money are collected every year from the Chinese who land in British Columbia, as head tax—over $200,000, the larger proportion of which goes into the Dominion treasury. I am well aware what the minister said last year with regard to the lepers in New Brunswick—that the Dominion government were obliged to take care of them, because they had agreed to do so when New Brunswick entered confederation. But it was also proved at that time by documents which I read from, that the Dominion government had taken charge of lepers from Nova Scotia and Manitoba; and my contention, and that of all British Columbians, is that if the Dominion government do that, they ought also to take charge of those poor wretches in British Columbia. It is costing $1,000 or $1,100 a year to maintain those men on D'Arcy Island, and the former government used to allow $1,000 a year for this purpose; but since the present government came into power——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is not an accurate statement of fact.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Well, they have not paid anything for the last two or three years. I would not say that they did not pay the first year or the second year; but they certainly stopped it; and they have not paid a cent for the last two or three years for the maintenance of those lepers. It seems outrageous that the government should treat British Columbia in that manner. What is the reason British Columbia cannot expect the same treatment from the government as Nova Scotia and Manitoba? There is not a man in British Columbia but thinks the same as I do with regard to that matter—that it is unfair to make flesh of one and fish of another. I cannot understand it unless it is because Victoria has always sent Conservatives here to represent it. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman on what ground he has refused persistently to maintain these lepers in British Columbia?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I stated a few moments ago that the hon. gentleman's statement was not accurate. I understood him to lead the House to believe that the Conservative government had paid $1,000 a year for several years.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. So they did.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is incorrect. They paid it one year. They did not pay it the year before I came into office, and it has not been paid since.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. They paid it more than one year.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman says so; I say they did not. It was open for discussion at the time, and I looked into the matter and decided it was not necessary or proper that the department should pay, and I declined to pay it.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. For what reason?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because it was a matter affecting the public

health of British Columbia, with which the people of British Columbia should deal.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Why adopt a different practice in Manitoba ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because the lepers in Manitoba were immigrants who had come in through the departmental work of this government, and therefore this government was responsible for their presence in the country.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Is not the Dominion government responsible for the Chinese who come in to British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, not more than for the Japanese or for the hon. gentleman himself, who were not brought in as immigrants by the department, but came in of their own accord.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. What about the Lazaretto at Tracadie ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I need not go into the question of the responsibility of the Dominion government to the province of New Brunswick in this matter of the Lazaretto, because that is ancient history.

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. The excuse given by the hon. gentleman for his manner of dealing with British Columbia is a miserable subterfuge. I see no reason why the government should not, out of the $200,000 and more paid into the Dominion treasury by the Chinese as head tax, take a sum sufficient to meet this expense. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying that the late government paid only one year. They paid two or three years, and the last year they did not refuse to pay, but had the question under discussion.

Mr. SPROULE. It is quite clear that this is a matter which comes under the charge of the Department of Agriculture, because that department has charge of the quarantine stations, and if these men were admitted, owing to insufficient inspection, the department should pay the cost of taking charge of them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is nothing to show that they had the disease when they passed through the quarantine.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a matter on which there is considerable room for doubt, and if these people were affected with leprosy when they came into the country, then they should have been kept in quarantine or sent home again, and if the department failed in its duty, this government ought to pay the cost.

Mr. ROSS (South Ontario). How many lepers are there in British Columbia ?

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. Five or six in the Lazaretto.

Mr. ROSS (South Ontario). Is the number increasing ?

Hon. Mr. PRIOR. It remains about the same. Occasionally one or two die and one or two others will come in.

Winnipeg and St. Boniface hospitals, $4,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Are these ordinary hospitals or quarantine hospitals ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One of these is for Protestants, and the other for Catholics, and this government contributes this amount because they take in immigrants who have no homes.

Mr. McCREARY. I think that this item ought to be increased by a further vote in the supplementaries. This is the same amount as was allowed these hospitals eight or ten years ago, when the number of patients was only half what it is now, and the cost of living was not so high. The maintenance of these institutions is a very heavy drain on the people of Winnipeg, St. Boniface and Manitoba generally, and a large number of the patients are immigrants just newly arrived. Last year one of the cases was that of a gentleman who was passing through from Japan, and who had to be taken to the hospital to be treated for a malignant attack of small-pox. The new wing, which the citizens of Winnipeg had put up at a cost of $87,000 had just been opened and furnished, and the admission of this patient caused a great deal of damage and loss to that institution. The city corporation pays $10,000 a year to the General Hospital, and the government of the province $16,000 a year, I believe. The St. Boniface General Hospital, which is controlled by the sisters, and is equally a general hospital, because it admits Protestants as well as Catholics, it has a grant also from the province. This government should certainly give more to these institutions than it does, because the larger number of the patients are people who have only been in the country a short time, many of them merely passing through on their way to the coast. You would be surprised to know the percentage of the patients in that hospital who have not been in the country a year.

Mr. MONK. Is there any account kept of those immigrants who are merely passing through ?

Mr. McCREARY. The report shows the number, and over 50 per cent of the people are patients who have not been in the country three years. I submit that this vote should be doubled and would ask the government to give my appeal their best consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. According to the decision of the minister in the previous case, this government would not pay anything, because these people had developed the disease

after they passed the quarantine stations, and consequently the province should pay the cost.

Mr. McCREARY. This man Mathewson, who was afflicted with malignant smallpox, must have caught the disease on board the vessel.

Mr. SPROULE. The quarantine stations are at Vancouver and down in the east. Now, it must come in from the east or the west. If there is any evidence of disease they are supposed to be retained in quarantine until the danger is over, and if it breaks out afterwards it becomes the duty of the municipality to bear the expense of looking after them. I do not think that is right, because a few years ago the city of Winnipeg was put to a heavy expense on account of a smallpox that had been brought in by some immigrants. It must have been with them when they came through the quarantine at Quebec, and therefore the government should have borne the expense. On the same principle, it seems to me, the city of Victoria should not be called upon to bear the expense to which it has been subjected.

Mr. CLANCY. We could not well open the door to that. The cases are exceptional. Both the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario take care of such patients by grants to hospitals.

Mr. McCREARY. In the older provinces the cities and large towns are close together. And they are wealthier and better able to take care of the people. But when a man leaves Ottawa he does not strike another point where there is a hospital until he reaches Winnipeg. If he contracts disease at North Bay or Sudbury he is taken by the conductor of the train straight through to Winnipeg. They are not even taken off at Port Arthur. In the same way, coming from Vancouver they are taken through to Winnipeg. Consequently, Winnipeg and St. Boniface hospitals have to take care of all the people who become ill while travelling between Ottawa and Vancouver. Why, if a man is hurt on the Canadian Pacific Railway track eight hundred miles east or west, he is conveyed to Winnipeg. It is true that within the last two or three years, largely by the action of the Canadian Pacific Railway and its officials and labouring men, small hospitals have been established at Medicine Hat and other points. Still, a large majority of the patients are sent to Winnipeg.

Mr. WILSON. But are not the people who travel generally of a class who are able to pay for themselves ? It may be that now and again there is an immigrant who must be taken care of by others, but generally people who travel can afford to pay their own way.

Mr. McCREARY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) would be surprised if he were to go through these institutions as I have done and study the records. Many of the patients are servant girls recently from the old country, and young men who have come out from the old country to make a living. Many of these young men are not accustomed to outdoor life or hard work or hardship, and when exposed to them they take sick. Even after they get out of the hospital, they have to be taken care of until fully recovered by the city, which has a central relief fund of $5,000 or $10,000 a year.

Mr. MONK. The reason I asked the figure is because Winnipeg is peculiarly situated, and if it is true that the expense is incurred through immigrants, I think we would be justified in coming to the relief of that city. I think the case of Victoria is even stronger, because disease originates in a class of immigrants to whom special exception has been taken, and upon whom the government imposes a tax, thus raising a revenue. If you gave relief in one case, you must in the other.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. While we have left aside the large votes, we have made fair progress, and I move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and some resolutions reported.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONK. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

The PRIME MINISTER. If the Minister of Railways and Canals is in his seat and able to proceed, we shall take up the estimates of his department. If not, we will proceed with some Bills and then estimates.

Mr. MONK. Estimates of which department ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Agriculture.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, April 12, 1901.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

GREAT NORTHERN TRANSIT COMPANY.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta) moved :

That that portion of the sixth report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines reporting the preamble of Bill No. 38, respecting the Hudson's Bay and North-west Railways Company, and to change its

name to 'Great Northern Transit Company,' not proven, be referred back to the said committee for further consideration.

He said : I have no wish to refer the Bill back to the committee for reconsideration on the merits of the question that has been discussed before the committee. The Bill as originally introduced provided for certain railway connections between the waters of Hudson's Bay and the Mackenzie river. Application was made for an extension of time for the completion of the work, and for the privilege of making a further connection between Lake Superior and Hudson's Bay. In the committee, the discussion was on the application to make connection between Lake Superior and Hudson's Bay, and that application was refused by the committee. We have no wish to renew the application so far as that point is concerned. We merely ask that the Bill in its original shape, providing for connection between the waters of Hudson's Bay and the Mackenzie river be allowed the ordinary extension of time.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry to be obliged to say that, for my part, I cannot agree to the hon. gentleman's motion. The question has been brought to the attention of the House, and, in the ordinary course of parliamentary procedure, has been referred to the Railway Committee, where it has been considered, with the result that the proposal has been rejected by the committee. The position that the government have always taken in matters of this kind is to support the decision of the Railway Committee, unless very strong reason is shown to the contrary, unless substantial injustice has been done or gross error has been committed. When the question has been considered in all its aspects in the committee to which it has been referred, and a conclusion has been reached, I have always thought it safest for the House to uphold the decision of the committee. If we review the judgment of the committee in these matters; we are apt to be led into error. Without looking into the merits of the motion, since it revives, even though in modified form, a question already decided by the committee, I shall feel it my duty to oppose the motion and maintain the decision of the committee.

Mr. SEYMOUR E. GOURLEY (Colchester). I have no interest in the Bill whatever, but I took an interest in the discussion of the matter in committee ; and while I would accept the principle laid down by the Prime Minister, that the decision of the committee should be accepted, yet, I understand the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) does not seek to conflict with that principle. The discussion in committee was confined to the proposed connection between Lake Superior and James Bay, and the rest of the Bill, providing for an extension from Hudson's Bay west to the Pacific, was not considered. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes, as the judgment of the committee was given upon that subject, to accept it ; but, as the other question was not discussed, to refer it to the committee for a decision. With all deference to the Prime Minister, I think that if he would reconsider the matter, he would not feel it his duty, to disagree with the proposition.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the House will bear with me—the report of the committee, as I understand it, was that the preamble of the Bill had not been proven. That being so, the assumption is that the whole question was considered, and the conclusion come to that the charter could not be granted. To adopt this resolution must be to revise the decision of the Railway Committee.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). In general terms I am prepared to assent to what the Prime Minister says, that we ought to be guided by the action of the Railway Committee. But, I think that it will be within the recollection of this House that only a few weeks ago the principle laid down by the First Minister was not recognized. Strong reasons being shown why the action of the Railway Committee should not be sustained, the House felt quite justified in dealing with the subject in a manner different from the manner recommended by the Railway Committee. I have in my recollection one case where private interests and public interests were affected, yet the First Minister himself assisted in pushing that Bill through to a third reading without allowing the parties to be heard. I was present in the Railway Committee when the Bill which is now under discussion was defeated. It was, practically, not defeated on its merits—I think that might quite fairly be said. It was simply defeated on the ground that the promoter of the Bill had had a former charter over a portion of the same route, and had disposed of it to another man, and now he is seeking for a charter, not over the same ground, but probably 150 or 200 miles away from his former line. Now, I have thought over that matter very carefully since, and I am not sure but that we made a serious mistake, and I for one am always prepared to remedy a mistake when I think I have made one. I think I made a mistake on that occasion, and I am prepared to support the motion of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) to refer this Bill back to the Railway Committee for further consideration. After having told Mr. Harvey, the promoter of the Bill, that we did not believe in charter selling, and warned him in that way, and punished him, I think we should be prepared to deal with this question on its merits.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). I think the motion made by the member for Alberta

may very well be adopted by this House without any sacrifice of the principle or rule enunciated by the Prime Minister, and if he will give me his attention I will explain my reasons for thinking so. The Bill asks for two things ; it asks for a connection between Hudson Bay and Lake Superior, and it also asks for an extension of time for the construction of the other portion of the charter already possessed by the people who were before the committee, that is, an extension of time for constructing a road partly by water and partly rail from Hudson Bay along the Mackenzie river. That part of the Bill was not considered by the committee. All the committee considered was the granting of a charter for the connection between Hudson Bay and Lake Superior, and that the committee refused to entertain. As I understand the motion of the hon. member for Alberta, he does not ask the committee to reconsider that question, the question which the committee really decided, but simply to grant the other portion of the Bill extending the time for the construction of the rest of the road already chartered. Therefore, in referring the Bill back to the committee, it is not sought for a moment to ask the committee to change its decision in order to reconsider that which it has already decided ; it is simply asking the committee to consider a question involved in the Bill which was not at all considered by the committee on the previous occasion.

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). I do not think the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has fairly presented the case to the House. The case he quoted is not analogous to this. In that particular case a Bill was reported by the committee, and on strong statements being made that other parties wished to be heard, it was referred back to the committee. To the principle now advocated by the Prime Minister, there was an exception made in that case, and when the Bill was reported and came before the House for the third reading the members of the House were divided on the question as to whether it should be read the third time or laid over. The present case is altogether different. I would say to my hon. friend from Alberta that it would seriously inconvenience the business of the House if we adopted the custom of referring Bills back after they had been thoroughly threshed out in committee, except, as the Prime Minister said, very good cause were shown therefor. In this case I am free to say there is no such cause. There was a very long debate in the committee, nearly the whole day was spent in the discussion, and the Bill was thrown out by a large majority indeed. Evidently there was very little difference of opinion in the committee as to whether the legislation should be granted. I would be the last member of this House to refuse an opportunity of reconsidering a Bill if good cause were shown, and I would myself move such a motion ; but if, every time a Bill is defeated, we are to have a motion in the House to refer it back again and open up the whole question, I say the business of the House would be seriously interfered with. In this particular case I do not think a good case has been made at all for referring the Bill back to the committee.

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé). I may add to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who is chairman of the Committee on Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Sutherland), that I voted for the Bill in question when it was discussed in the committee. I must say it was discussed on its merits, and although several amendments were suggested, the committee persistently refused to adopt the Bill. I think it would be simply a waste of time to send the Bill back to the committee. We discussed it nearly two hours, and a great many suggestions were made by the promoters, but the committee would not accept them, and rejected the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. The question for consideration by the House turns on whether good reasons have or have not been shown for a reference back to the committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. member state the reasons, as I did not quite catch them at first.

Mr. OLIVER. I am going to do so. The chairman of the committee has said that it is perfectly legitimate to refer a Bill back to that committee if there is just cause therefor. Now, the cause we allege in this case is that the powers asked for by the Bill were divided distinctly into two parts. One of those parts was fully considered by the committee, all the amendments suggested were refused by the committee, and the Bill as a whole was rejected on the ground of objections made to that part of the Bill. The chief objection was that the line paralleled another line for which a charter had been granted between Lake Superior and Hudson Bay, that it was entering into a territory about to be provided for by another charter. Now, we have no desire to raise that question again, we accept the judgment of the committee in that particular.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). What part of the Bill do you wish to have reconsidered ?

Mr. OLIVER. The part which allows the construction of a railway connection between the waters of the Hudson Bay and the waters of the Mackenzie river. The first charter that was granted provided for a railway connection between the waters of the Hudson Bay and the waters of the Mackenzie river.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. Would it cover the same ground ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, it was not discussed on those lines. There was no connection whatever with the alleged sale of the charter. I hear the hon. chairman of the committee say the whole thing was sold. Now allow me to say that the charter that was sold was an Ontario charter and not a Dominion charter. The Ontario charter covered the ground between Lake Superior and Hudson Bay and did not cover any part of the ground that was covered by the original charter of this Hudson Bay and North-west Railway, because the Ontario government has no power over that region. Four years ago a charter was granted to the Hudson Bay and North-west Railway Company to make a railway connection between the waters of the Hudson Bay and the waters of Mackenzie Basin by way of Chesterfield Inlet and Great Slave Lake. The term allowed for the commencement of the work under that charter either had expired or was about to expire. The company come before parliament and asked for a revival of that part of the charter, and for a new charter, or a new extension, to cover the line between Lake Superior and Hudson Bay. It was that part of the charter which the committee objected to, and we have no desire to ask the committee to revise its decison on that point. All we ask is that the House refer back the Bill to the committee so that the company may get the usual extension of time that has repeatedly been granted to railway enterprises in new parts of the country, where they do not compete with anybody, and where they cannot stand in the way of any other enterprise. I am willing to accept the judgment of the committee that the granting of that part of the charter between Hudson Bay and Lake Superior might have interfered with another charter, and therefore the committee were justified in refusing that charter. I cannot agree that to continue a charter which covers ground no less than 700 or 1,000 miles distant, which is not in that part of the country at all, in which no man is asking for any authority or power, can in any way prejudice any existing interest, and therefore there can be no harm in giving the extension of time asked for.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Speaker, I think the remarks which my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) has made are worthy of this consideration at least, that the question as to whether the extension of time which is asked for in respect to the other railway lines is a different matter altogether from that which the committee discussed and decided should be again considered by the committee. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he withdraw his motion now and renew it in a couple of days. In the meantime the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and the Chairman of the Railway Committee may confer with him and look into the question so that when it comes before the House again we will know the exact position of the matter.

Motion withdrawn.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND (Oxford) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 121) to amend the Post Office Act. He said : Mr. Speaker, I may say that this is principally a departmental Bill. The first clause is suggested by the Department of Justice as being a necessary amendment to the Post Office Act to make clear the meaning of the words 'post letter.' I believe this has become necessary in view of some cases that have come before the courts, and that it is desirable to amend the Act. The second clause is to provide for the establishment of dead letter offices in some places not now provided for.

Mr. CLARKE. Have you decided at what point you intend to establish these dead letter offices ?

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. This amendment provides that there shall be dead letter offices at St. John, Kingston, Hamilton, London, Vancouver and Dawson. I may say that the department have found this desirable and necessary. The results of the establishment of offices for newspapers at these points have been so satisfactory that it is desired to have power given by the Act to deal with letters as well as papers at these points.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Have you not that power now under the Act ? Did not the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) introduce a Bill last year giving you that power ?

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. No ; in looking into the Act I find that the power is given in respect to special points, and this Bill is to increase the number of places where these offices may be established. The last clause provides for the establishment of a class of employees known as 'train porters.' I do not suppose the name would indicate particularly what they are, but it is found now that two or three times a week, especially in the large cities during the time that newspapers are being sent out in large quantities, an extra mail clerk has to be sent, and he has to receive mileage in addition to his salary for doing what is ordinary work in assisting the mail clerks with an overcrowded mail. It is thought that a saving would be effected, and that the work would be more efficiently done by establishing a class of employees known as train porters who would be at headquarters, who could go out with these overcrowded mail trains, and who could, also, from time to time, take the places of transfer officers who are ill. There is a difficulty found in the department when a transfer officer is ill in

finding an experienced man to take his place. It has been thought that after a short period of training these train porters would be able to do this work very much better than it can now be provided for. In the first instance that I have given where, on overcrowded trains, extra help is required, instead of sending out a mail clerk, the work would be done at a considerable saving to the country.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to draw attention to the character of the return made to the order passed by the House on the 21st February relating to the coal and wood tenders which have been received by the government, and upon which contracts have been awarded. The return which has been brought down refers only to tenders for wood. No attention has been paid to the order asking for a return of the tenders for coal. I would like to ask the government if it is the intention to comply with that part of the order and bring down these tenders.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). That relates to the Public Works Department?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will take a note of it.

SUPPLY—IMMIGRATION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to call the attention of the House to a question that I think is well worthy of its attention, I mean the immigration question. It is a matter of expending nearly half a million dollars a year. In looking over the report of Lord Strathcona, the High Commissioner, I was very much pleased to observe one thing the government have done; that is, that they have placed Canadian readers and Canadian atlases in the public schools of the United Kingdom, and that in this way they have done good service to the country, because these readers and atlases have reached 930 schools. The pupils in these schools have been passing examinations upon them, and bronze medals are being given to the pupil in each school who passes the best examination. I am very much pleased with this, and I think this departure has been of service to the country, because, by this means, we are educating the people of Great Britain and Ireland as to the resources and geography of Canada, and we have been giving them, so far as I have been able to learn, some information of which they are very much in need. We are not only educating the young people by this means, but I have no doubt they will discuss the subject with older people, and in that way they will get a good knowledge of this country. I would be very glad if the department would go farther and introduce readers and geographies into the schools of other civilized countries, if that were possible. In that way the department might be able to distribute information that would be very valuable to this country, and I think it would be particularly advantageous in Germany, where we are not allowed to send our immigration agents to distribute literature of that character which would give them a knowledge of the country that would be valuable to us and which would induce a large immigration from that country. Now, I would like to refer for a short time to what took place in this House at the last session. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) was very sanguine that we would have a very large immigration from the older countries during the year 1900. I pointed out to him that he differed entirely from the views held by the most of his officers in high places. They pointed out that unless the mode of looking for immigrants was greatly changed there would be no increase, while the minister himself was very sanguine that there would be a great increase. The Deputy Minister of the Interior during the year 1899 visited the old country, and from his report I would gather that he personally visited all the agencies in the old country. He reported very strongly in favour of assisted passages, and not only the giving of assisted passages to immigrants of a certain class, but that when they landed in this country the government should make an allowance to them to enable them to get through the first year, for which advance they would take security on the lands ; the lands that we had already given them. This, I was very strongly opposed to then, and I have since seen no reason why I should change my view. Mr. Smart the Deputy Minister of the Interior visited the agency in Dublin, and he spoke in high terms of Mr. Devlin, who is our immigrant agent in that city. Mr. Smart said that while there had not been much done in the way of getting immigrants from Ireland in the past, he thought the time was ripe now, and that we would surely get a very much larger number during the coming year. Well, Sir, what has been the result ? In 1899 we got 743 immigrants from Ireland, and in 1900 we got 765, an increase of 18, all told.

Mr. CLARKE. From all Ireland.

Mr. WILSON. From all Ireland.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much did the increase cost ?

Mr. WILSON. I have not got the increased cost specially as regards Ireland, but I will give the increased cost and the increased number of immigrants later on. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that Mr. John Redmond, a very prominent Irish member of parliament made a speech on the 17th March last and he stated that 45,000 persons had left Ireland during the year 1900. Well, we succeeded in getting 765 out of these 45,000. I am of the opinion that if we had no immigrant agents in Ireland at all that we would have got just as many people from that country as we did.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. Probably more.

Mr. WILSON. Not only that ; but Mr. Devlin in his report complains of the criticism he has received in the past, and he says it was unfair to measure his efforts by the number of immigrants that reached this country from Ireland, and in fact he seems to make out that he is doing other work. My impression is that Mr. Devlin was appointed to Ireland as an immigration agent, and that his principal business was to get people to come to Canada. That being so he certainly has succeeded very poorly. Mr. Devlin complains of the miserable pittance he is getting in the way of salary and he points out in his report that the Lord Mayor of Dublin gets more for one year than he gets for three years.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). Why does he not run for Lord Mayor ?

Mr. WILSON. I suppose there is no reason why Mr. Devlin should keep the job if he does not want it. But, of course, we all understand why Mr. Devlin is emigrant agent in Ireland.

Mr. BENNETT. Why ?

Mr. WILSON. It is not from choice but from necessity. His leader and he differed very materially on the Manitoba school question, and when Mr. Devlin was elected in 1896 as a member of this House and found that he could not get the Prime Minister of Canada to carry out his pledges as he (Mr. Devlin) understood them, then rather than quarrel with the Prime Minister and his party he accepted the position of emigrant agent in Ireland. That is my version of why Mr. Devlin is an emigrant agent. We find, Sir, that Mr. Smart, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, makes no reference to assisted passages in his report this year. He does not seem to have a word to say about it, and neither does he refer to the great increase in the exodus from Ireland. Lord Strathcona in his report for 1899 took the same view as Mr. Smart and felt that it was important that we should give assisted passages if we were to get immigrants from the old country, but this year Lord Strathcona is as silent as the grave on what ought to be done in that line. Then we have a gentleman who was appointed by this government as superintendent of immigration in the old country ; one Mr. W. T. R. Preston——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) mean by the 'old country.'

Mr. WILSON. I mean the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland ; that is what I meant.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). What did you think he meant ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). There are older countries than that in the world.

Mr. WILSON. Not being accustomed to speak very often in the House I may be pardoned if I sometimes make a slip.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You were perfectly right.

Mr. WILSON. I was about to refer to the superintendent of emigration who was appointed by this government, and I can hardly see what the necessity is for paying this gentleman, who is well known in this country, a salary of $3,000 a year and expenses to superintend seven or eight emigrant agencies with about as many agents in charge. Mr. Preston has a salary of $3,000 and his expenses, and during the year 1900 these two amounted to $4,825. I would like to know what Mr. Preston did for that money. In his report for 1899 he also recommended strongly, assisted passages, and he went further. He said that the time had come when the old methods must be done away with ; when we must not only give assisted passages to desirable emigrants, but when we must pursue the same course that insurance agents do in this country, namely, see the parties who intend to emigrate and canvass them. Mr. Preston's excuse in his report of this year is, that the time was not opportune for that kind of work. It does seem to me that if there ever was a time that was opportune it was this year when 45,000 people were leaving Ireland and seeking homes in foreign countries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words with reference to the fitness of the men who have been appointed by this government as emigration agents. I am afraid they have been chosen more because of political services rendered to their party than for any fitness they possess for the office they were to fill. Mr. Preston in his report refers to New Brunswick, and he says that province appointed an emigrant agent by

the name of Mr. Hickman, and Mr. Hickman got a year to go over the province to make himself thoroughly familiar with it before he went to the old country. Mr. Hickman travelled all over New Brunswick, took hundreds of photographs of the country, which he had fixed on slides so that he could exhibit them with a lantern when giving his lectures. Mr. Hickman made himself acquainted with improved farms that were for sale in the province ; he took photographs of the buildings and some of the fields, and in that way he was prepared to deal with the better class of intending emigrants who wanted to get improved farms in Canada. Mr. Preston says that Mr. Hickman has been a great success. He writes in his report :

> Mr. Hickman has been meeting with considerable success in inducing a most desirable class of immigrants into New Brunswick; that is, young men with means, or whose relatives are willing to advance a considerable sum of money with a view of getting them lands in the more populated parts of Canada. He has succeeded in getting attention at his meetings and has incited an interest in New Brunswick in marked contrast with the almost utter failure of meetings that have been held in many localities in the interests of the Dominion.

Now, Sir, why has Mr. Hickman been able to attract the attention of the people of the old country, more than have the agents of the Dominion government. I think the reason is very obvious. Mr. Hickman was better equipped for the work. He had taken the time and the trouble to make himself perfectly familiar with the business he was going to do and perfectly familiar with the province he was trying to induce emigrants to come to. Mr. Preston appeared before the Committee on Agriculture last year and in his evidence he said, with reference to Mr. Jury :

> It has been very seldom, I have been told, that at these meetings there would be more than possibly a dozen or fifteen or twenty children, with perhaps a half dozen or less, half a dozen being the maximum, of adults that would be present at a lecture about Canada.

That shows what Mr. Jury's lectures have been, for if he could induce only half a dozen grown-up people to attend, they could not have been very instructive. They were looked on, Mr. Preston says, more as outings for Sunday school children than as lectures to induce people to come to Canada.

Last year Mr. Preston said that he was going to try to get some Boers to come to our North-west. He thought they would make good settlers and would be glad to get away from South Africa. At that time I gave as my opinion that we did not want any of that kind of people, that we did not want any people who were disloyal and had an unfavourable idea of the British flag or British institutions.

Mr. Preston has now got a new notion in his head. He wants to form a company with a capital of two or three million pounds to promote immigration, and he wants the interest on that amount guaranteed for twenty-five years by the Imperial and colonial governments. In addition to that, he wants a bonus given by each of the colonies for the immigrants in proportion to the number it gets. In this way he says you could induce the young men who are wasting their time around the cities and towns of the old country to come to Canada and make good settlers. I would say, for the information of Mr. Preston and the government, that if they want to go into that kind of work, there are in all the cities and larger towns of Canada plenty of that class of young men who, if they could be induced to go and settle on the lands of the North-west, would make better settlers than any of the same class we could get from the old country.

Mr. Preston has also been along the coasts of the Black Sea, and he has there met a tribe of people whom he is anxious to bring to this country. So far as I am concerned, I would like to have a little more information about those people before holding out any inducements for them to come to Canada, for we have already had an experience that has not been very satisfactory or profitable with reference to bringing in strangers that we knew nothing about.

There has been a great deal of talk about assisted passages, and some of the colonies have tried to promote immigration in that way; but I believe all the Australian colonies except Western Australia have abandoned the giving of assisted passages to immigrants. I will read a short extract from the Australian Handbook for 1900, with regard to the kind of people they must be in order to get assistance to go to Western Australia:

> The class eligible (for assisted passages).—The classes at present eligible for assisted passages are : Farmers and agriculturists, who must be possessed of some small capital, and who should be under forty-five years of age (and, if married, their wives and families). The amount required in each case will be decided by the agent general, and must be deposited with him. A single man is required to deposit not less than £100, a married couple not less than £150, and for each child over twelve years of age, £25. The deposit is repaid to the immigrants immediately after arrival in the colony. Each adult immigrant will be granted £10 towards his passage money, and £5 for every child between one and twelve years of age. Single women or widows without children, not exceeding thirty-five years of age, are also eligible.
>
> The nominees must be in the habit of working at one of the callings mentioned above, and must in accepting an assisted passage under these regulations do so with the intention of working in one of these occupations in the colony. They must be sober, industrious, of good moral character, in good health, free from all mental and bodily defects, within the ages specified (excepting when specially approved), appear physically capable of labour and have been vaccinated or had the smallpox.

In 1897 there were 40 males and 140 females,

or a total of 180, assisted on these conditions; in 1898 there were 29 males and 68 females, or a total of 97; and in 1899 there were 12 males and 24 females, or a total of 36. That shows how much success has attended that kind of assisted passages; but I think the people of Western Australia were right, if they were going to assist people to go to their country, in insisting that they should be first-class people, and that they should have some capital, and not be liable to become paupers on their hands, to be supported at the public expense.

Now, the kind of immigrants we have been receiving in Canada are a very different class from those I have just been talking about. We have allowed to land on our shores people who were paupers, and who were not able to pass the ordinary regulations laid down by the department. The Montreal Herald, which is a very strong supporter of the present government, in its issue of the 13th of August, 1900; makes this allusion to some immigrants who were brought into the country during last summer :

More Roumanians.

They arrived here on Saturday afternoon, and were allowed to land on an agreement with the Baron de Hirsch Institute. After an exchange of telegrams between Montreal and Ottawa yesterday and to-day, an order was issued by Mr. Frank Pedley, superintendent of immigration, this morning and sent to Mr. Hoolahan, the agent here, permitting of the landing of the Roumanian immigrants, who came over on the Elder-Dempster steamship Lake Megantic and who are detained at Montreal. The permission was conditional upon the steamship company or the Baron de Hirsch Society guaranteeing that the new-comers will not become a charge upon the Canadian people.

I do not think that even with that guarantee these people should have been allowed to land. They have been landing in large numbers and no one society is able to take care of so many, and we only ought to allow people to land who are fit to take care of themselves and will not become a burden as paupers on this country—neither they nor their children. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to take care of our own people, but I do not think that we should open our ports to the whole world and allow this country to be overrun with paupers. I am decidedly opposed to anything of that kind.

The Lake Megantic arrived in port on Saturday with 183 Roumanian Jews on board, and the immigration officials at Quebec refused to allow 126 of them to land, for the same reason as they refused a number of the immigrants brought over by the steamships Lake Champlain and Louisiana. They did not possess the amount of money required of their class, coming into Canada should have.

On the next day, the Montreal Star pointed out that there were over 300 families settled in Montreal of the same class of people, and each family is composed of from five to six members. These people have greatly disturbed the labour market, and many of them have undermined our own people who had employment and have secured their jobs, so that our own people have been forced out of their positions and had to make the best shift they could. This is one of the things the government should stop at all hazards. On no account should we allow these paupers to land on our shores and displace our own people.

We have another illustration of the mistaken policy of this government. Not long ago an hon. member in this House—the hon. member for Selkirk—told us that 50 per cent of the sick in the two hospitals of Winnipeg had not been in this country three years, and many of them had not been here one year, and he urged that as a strong reason why this government should give additional assistance to these two hospitals.

Let me now refer for a moment to the Doukhobors, and I think, although I see the Minister of the Interior smiling, that he would feel much more comfortable if these people were not in this country at all. We remember that at the time the Mormons wanted to come and settle in this country and bring their institutions with them, but Sir John Macdonald said, no, we will not have polygamy in Canada. Then they wanted to come, and each Mormon bring only the wives he then had and leave the others behind, but Sir John again said no. He said : If you come into this country and are guilty of polygamy, you will be punished just the same as anybody else. You must abide by our laws or stay at home. It is very much to be regretted that a similar stand was not taken by this government with regard to the Doukhobors. The first unfortunate concession made to them was that they should be exempt from military service and not be compelled to defend this country under any circumstances. That was a great mistake. I do not see why any persons settling in our country should be allowed privileges which are not granted our own people. If there are any privileges to be given to anybody, our own people should be preferred. Let me quote from the press reports of what these Doukhobors have been doing :

They have issued an appeal to the nations of the world asking that they may be given a refuge from Canadian tyranny !

They object to our land laws, to our marriage laws, and to our registration laws.

And because they cannot have their own way, they are now looking for some other country where their religious liberty will not be oppressed.

These people, Mr. Speaker, must be a pretty bad lot indeed to declaim about the tyranny of Canadian laws, when everybody knows that Canada is as free from tyranny as any country in the world, notwithstanding the bad government we are at present afflicted with:.

The story of this Doukhobor revolt against the laws of Canada is an interesting one.

In June last the Doukhobors settled in the neighbourhood of Yorkton, N. W. T., addressed a petition to the Dominion government setting forth the grievances which they consider the Canadian laws impose upon them.

Their first objection was to their taking up homesteads individually, on the ground that private ownership of land is opposed to the law of God. They wished to have a tract of land set apart for their brotherhood, in the same manner that reserves are set apart for Indians, the title to the whole tract being vested in the sect and not in the individual members of the community.

This is a system to which the government cannot consent, and to which I do not believe they will consent. If the Doukhobors are going to settle in our country, they must take out land the same as other people and obey the laws just as our own people do. They cannot be allowed to live like Indians. We have got all the Indians we want, but while we are bound to take care of our Indian tribes, because they were the original owners of the soil and we have taken their property from them, we owe nothing to the Doukhobors and ought to insist that they comply with our land laws just the same as our own people.

Then they object very strongly to our marriage laws. They say :

We cannot accept such a law, for we believe that it also breaks the law of God. We cannot believe that a marriage can become legal because it is recorded in a police register and a fee of two dollars paid for it ; on the contrary, we believe that such recording and payment annuls marriage and breaks up its real legality. We believe that the real legalization of a marriage union is when it is brought about freely as a result of pure feeling, of a mutual moral affection between man and woman.

How does that strike you, Sir, from a moral point of view. They do not recognize that the community has any right to determine on what conditions marriage shall be celebrated. They contend for the right to do as they please, and pretend that the open sin of leaving a wife and taking another woman in her place is less than what they call the secret sin committed by a husband of living with his wife after he has got tired of her.

Mr. McCREARY. Are you reading from the manifesto of one Bodjiansky ?

Mr. WILSON. I am reading from the reports in the newspapers. There is a motion on the Order paper calling for all the papers in connection with this matter, but as the government has seen fit to take all the private members' days, that motion could not be made and the papers have not been brought down. I can, therefore, only use such papers as are at my disposal. Not having any access to the private office of the Minister of the Interior, I cannot get the documents, but no doubt my hon. friend has the opportunity and can get them all if he wants to. I put the question myself to the minister, and he admitted that there had been a petition received from the Doukhobors expressing their dissatisfaction with our marriage, land and registry laws. And you will see, as I go on, that a copy of this petition was sent to the gentleman who was principally instrumental in bringing these people to the country ; and he wrote a letter to the Doukhobors, advising them to comply with the laws of the country in a formal way. He said : You can take a wife and marry her ; and, if you do not like to continue living with her, you can leave her and take another woman without marrying her—there is no law against bigamy in Canada, but there is no law against adultery. If that is the doctrine taught by the leaders of this society, what may we expect of the rank and file ? To my mind, these are the most undesirable people we can possibly have, because they have no regard for our laws. I heard an instance the other day. A railway company was in a great hurry to build a piece of line, and some of these people were engaged for the work. They were poor, and the men who employed them paid their way out to the work. But when they got out there, he found that it was a holy season for them, and for two days they refused to enter upon the work, though they had been engaged specially for that purpose.

Mr. McCREARY. Was that not all right—not to work on Sunday or a holy day ? Is that not all right according to any religion ?

Mr. WILSON. I can only answer by saying that if these people were as religious as they pretended to be, they would have told this man : Our feast day comes at such and such a time, and we cannot go until after that time. Is that not what an honest man would have done ? We do not want to be dishonest, whether we are religious or whether we are not. But, when men who profess to be better than their neighbours deceive people and get benefits under false pretenses, they are worse than the out-and-out man who does wrong things openly. I have not much use for the religious man who is dishonest—I do not think he has much religion or much principle. I am of opinion that if the government had to bring these people in to-day, they would hardly do it.

But, there is one matter I had overlooked, and that I want to refer to. We have appointed Mr. Preston as superintendent of immigration. If it was necessary to have such a man and he were a good man for the place, we would expect that he would increase the numbers coming from that part of the world in which he carried on the work. But, what are the results ? We got from countries other than the United States in 1899, 32,598 immigrants, while in 1900, we got only 29,197, or 3,401 less. These are

the facts, if we may believe the reports of the department. What is the advantage of having appointed Mr. Preston, if we have 3,000 fewer immigrants now that he is full-fledged as our representative, and has spent nearly $5,000 in a year? The fact is, we have had to provide a place for Mr. Preston, as for hundreds of others since hon. gentlemen opposite came into office, and I think that is the only excuse that can be given for his appointment at all.

Now, I wish to read from a little history of the Doukhobors about the circumstance under which they left Russia. They wanted to get the same privilege in Russia that they get in this country—to be exempted from military service. But, the Russian government said: No; if you are going to stay in this country, you will have to do as the rest of us have to do; you will have to perform your share of the duties falling upon the whole body of citizens. When they got leave to go, they had to sign a document, which I will read:

That they leave the frontiers of Russia at their own expense; and that before leaving they sign an agreement never to return within the borders of the empire, understanding that in the case of non-compliance with this last point the offender will be condemned to exile to remote places.

That shows in what esteem they were held in their own country. I venture to say that Russia was very glad to get rid of them, because they had been a source of great trouble. They had been asked to comply with the laws of their country, and they refused. Of course they suffered by reason of refusing. You may say that their suffering was for conscience sake. But, it is very strange to me that men take these fads, and seem to be entirely unable to reason out what their duty is or what they should do as citizens of a country. These people have had to sign an agreement never to go back to Russia under penalty of being banished from that country. I am afraid we shall have to take very strong measures with these people, more especially if they persist in their views of marriage. We cannot tolerate the idea of a free-love association in our midst. I do not think the people of Canada, under any consideration, will submit to anything of the kind—that a man can live with a woman for a time, then banish her and leave his children illegitimate. This seems to me outrageous. The authorities of this country ought to insist upon these people complying with our laws or leaving the country.

Now, this government tells us that the only kind of people they are bringing in are farmers and farm labourers. Last year, in the committee, we went into an investigation of the number of immigrants that came into this country, and, outside of the Doukhobors and Galicians—and I might say that the Galicians have had to be fed by the government, if the reports of the newspapers are true—the number of immigrants has been comparatively small. The great trouble has been that the government has ignored quality and looked altogether to quantity. Now, what we want is quality more than quantity; and if we can have only one, let us have quality; if we can have both so much the better. But, leaving out the Galicians and Doukhobors, we received, in 1899, about 10,000 or 11,000 that might be considered desirable immigrants. This year we have not had the pleasure of having any of the officers of the department before us to give evidence on the subject of immigration. We are in hopes that, before the estimates on immigration are taken up, we shall have the privilege of having two or three of these gentlemen before us to give us information if they can, which will enable us to discuss the estimates properly. I find that, in 1899, about one in four of those who were brought into the country settled on the land. In 1900, the proportion was about the same. As to expenditure, we find that, taking into account the appropriations they have asked for the coming year, $445,000, this government has spent in immigration in five years, $1,524,074, as against $876,369 that was spent by their predecessors. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say: We get a great many more than our predecessors did. But, if you have only brought so many more people to the country to loaf around the towns and cities instead of going on the land, I do not see where you have benefited the country. I am afraid, when we come to look for those you are supposed to have got, you will have a good deal of difficulty in finding them. I have here several resolutions passed by the Congress of the Trades and Labour Councils of Canada for several years. These are the people who represent the working classes of this country, and who, I presume, have a good knowledge of their condition. It is true that this government, and the Ontario government, have taken care of two of the most prominent members of those organizations, and in one way have shut their mouths; nevertheless, I think the views set forth in these resolutions are those held by the working-people throughout this country. I will read first a resolution passed in 1893:

Moved by Mr. O'Donoghue, seconded by Mr. Glockling,——

An hon. MEMBER. Who is he?

Mr. WILSON. I believe Mr. O'Donoghue is in the Department of Labour in Ottawa, and Mr. McGlockling has been given a comfortable government situation in Toronto.

——that this Trade and Labour Congress, composed of regularly elected and credentialed delegates of bona fide labour organizations throughout Canada, having a knowledge that for years past, and at the present time, the labour market of the Dominion has been and is constantly overcrowded in all its branches, mechanical and manual; be it therefore resolved, that the ex-

penditure of any public money, directly or indirectly, for the purpose of assisting, bonusing, encouraging or decoying immigrants of either or both the classes mentioned, adult or juvenile, from abroad to Canada is unnecessary and unjustifiable under such circumstances.

Be it resolved further, that as a consequence of the existence of such a condition of the labour market in the Dominion of Canada, the existing unjust and misleading system of Dominion immigration, as well as like expenditures on the part of all the provinces except British Columbia, should be abolished, and only those possessed of financial wealth should be encouraged to the country.

I think that fairly represents the feelings of the working classes. Indeed, what is the use of bringing out large numbers of people, without means, to settle on our prairies? There is no labour for them, their neighbours cannot give them work until they can get a start, and we ought to have, I was going to say, more Christian charity than to put men off in a lonely part of the country like that, and without means. What will happen is what is now happening, that the government will have to see that they do not suffer for the common necessities of life, and they will have to be supported out of the public exchequer. Here is another resolution of a similar character, passed in 1894 by the Trades and Labour Councils of Canada:

Moved by Mr. O'Donoghue, seconded by Mr. Holmes, and resolved:

That in view of the past and present experience of organized labour in Canada, that the labour market is overcrowded; be it therefore resolved, that the expenditure of any public money, directly or indirectly, for the purpose of assisting, bonusing, encouraging or decoying immigrants, adults or juveniles, from abroad to Canada is unnecessary and unjustifiable under such circumstances.

Be it resolved further, that as a consequence of the existence of such a condition of the labour market in the Dominion of Canada, the existing unjust and misleading system of Dominion immigration, as well as like expenditure on the part of all the provinces except British Columbia should be abolished, and only those possessed of financial wealth should be encouraged to the country.

Be it resolved still further, that it be an instruction to the executive committee of this congress to prepare and present to the hon. the Minister of the Interior and Immigration for Canada and the several immigration bureaus of the provinces, a duly certified copy of this resolution.

I will read one that was passed in 1896:

Moved by Mr. O'Donoghue, and seconded by Mr. Little, and resolved——

Mr. CLANCY. Is that the same Mr. O'Donoghue?

Mr. WILSON. I guess likely it is, he had not been shelved at that time.

—that inasmuch as the immigration policy of the Canadian government in the past has not been beneficial either in the matter of desirable settlers or as to the character of the immigrants encouraged and assisted to this country, it be an instruction to the executive committee to immediately press upon the government of Canada that the immigration system be remodelled so that only the proper class of people should be sought as immigrants from abroad for Canada, and that to the better attainment of securing the settlement of our vacant lands a very liberal system of colonization should be inaugurated, not only by the Dominion government, but by all Canadian provincial governments as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have laid pretty fully before you the opinion of the labouring classes of this country with reference to the course pursued by the government in bringing undesirable immigrants to this country. I think no one will object to any man coming here who is able and willing to take care of himself and of his family. We will welcome such men with both hands. But, I would be just as strongly opposed to bringing people here who would not be able to take care of themselves, and who would become a burden on the country.

Now, I want to call attention to the expenses in connection with the immigration system, to the money spent both in the United States and in Canada. It is true that according to the reports we are getting a good many more people from the United States than we have heretofore. I am going to give the cost of the various agencies in the United States, a bulk sum, in order that our people may know how much of their money is being spent in the United States, and also in the old country.

Omaha, Neb., W. W. Bennett, agent	$2,339 75
Chicago, Ill., C. J. Brouther, agent	2,665 00
Bad Axe, Mich., D. L. Cavan	3,198 33
Kansas City, J. S. Crawford	2,590 84
Steven's Point, Wis., T. O. Currie	2,818 00
St. Paul, Minn., B. Davies	3,966 06
Reed City, Mich., James Grieve	2,699 94
St. Paul, Minn., E. T. Holmes	2,521 58

Mr. COCHRANE. Who is he?

Mr. WILSON. I never had the pleasure of meeting the gentleman. I presume he is a gentleman whom the government employed, thinking that he was possessed of suitable qualities for an immigration agent, or for political services that he had rendered.

Detroit, M. V. McInnes	$4,981 29
Watertown, South Dakota, W. H. Rogers	2,301 08
New England States, C. O. Swinson	2,338 78
Press agent, W. J. White	5,443 69
Total	$37,866 04

Mr. COCHRANE. Who is Mr. White?

Mr. WILSON. Well, he is a mere wanderer, he is a press agent, and appears to have travelled all over the country. Now I will give you a little detailed account of what he expended his money for. In the first place he is getting a salary of $2,000. In the second place his accident insurance costs $20; board and lodging, $1,117.65—a very moderate sum; baggage transfer, $26.50; bus fare, $45.30. I wish we had the

former member for North Wellington here to criticise this properly. Banners for side of cars, $16 ; cabs, $56 ; fares, $669.70 ; flags, $10.50 ; laundry, $18.02. That is his washing. Livery, $70 ; loss on dining car, $107.25. I suppose he had to have a dining car to himself and that it did not pay very well. Pullmans, $590.05. I guess he slept in a Pullman car all the time pretty nearly. Special supper to Press Association, half price, $150 ; tips, $51.95.

Mr. COCHRANE. What is the total amount ?

Mr. WILSON. The total is $5,443.69. I believe it is the custom of the department now to insist upon immigration agents sending in a diary every day showing where they are and what work they are doing. I took the pains to copy out of a return brought down to the House a short time ago a few of these particulars. Mr. T. O. Currie, in 1898, was employed 151 days and was unemployed 162 days ; or, at least, there is no report for those days. He drew his salary of $1,200 just the same. In 1899 he was employed 156 days and unemployed, so far as the report goes, 157 days. He drew his $1,200 just the same. In 1900 he was employed 167 days and unemployed 146 days. He drew his $1,200 for the year just the same. Now, of course the hon. Minister of the Interior may be able to explain this. He may say that his diary did not give a detailed statement of what he was doing. If it did not, and the hon. minister has the information it is his duty to give it to the House. This is the information that I have gathered from the report brought down by the Department of the Interior. Then, there is Mr. W. H. Rogers. The House will remember and the members of the Agricultural Committee will remember that we had great difficulty with this gentleman last year. He seemed to ignore the instructions he got from the department entirely, because, on four different occasions at least when they asked him to give a daily report of what he was doing he never did it apparently. In 1898—I take it that he was only appointed in 1898—he drew $525, and in 1899 he drew $900. There is no account in either year as to what he did, but, in 1900 he reports as having been employed 126 days and unemployed 166 days, but he drew $900 all the same. Here is Mr. M. V. McInnes. He is located at Detroit. He is reported in 1898 as having been employed 177 days and unemployed, or no report as to what he was doing, 136 days. He drew his $1,500 just the same. In the next year he only lost 65 days, Sundays and all, but there was no reduction made in his salary in either of these two years. Now, there are others here that I could talk about in the same way, but I do not suppose it is necessary, because, if the hon. minister will clear up these gentlemen, it may go a good way in clearing up the whole lot.

Now, then, I shall come to the results of our immigration policy, taking Ireland first. We have Mr. C. R. Devlin and Mr. John Webster at the Dublin agency. They got $6,689.35 in 1900, and we have the Londonderry agency, in charge of Mr. E. O. Kelley, which cost $3,253.27, or a total of $9,942.62. I have taken in this case the fiscal year. There were 701 immigrants in the fiscal year of 1900. Perhaps I should have taken, to make a fairer comparison, the calendar year, but, in the fiscal year 1900, as I have said, we got from Ireland 701 persons and they cost us $14.18 per head. The Glasgow agency cost us $5,123.73, and the Dumfries agency, $1,872.08, or a total cost for Scotland of $6,995.81. The number of immigrants we received was 1,411, at a cost per head of $5. The Liverpool agency cost us $10,730.54, the London High Commissioner's office $2,132.72, and the Welsh agency, $5,164.65, making a total cost for England and Wales of $18,027.91. The number of immigrants we received from these parts of the United Kingdom was 8,814, at a cost per head of $2.20 as against $14.18 per head of the immigrants received from Ireland. Now, I just want to make, in conclusion, a comparison between the United States and ourselves. You will understand, Mr. Speaker, that in the United States, instead of sending parties abroad to induce people to go to that country they have a large staff to prevent undesirable immigrants landing there. In 1899 they prevented over 1,800 people from landing in their country who were considered undesirable immigrants, and they have adopted more stringent measures than those before in force because they are appointing men to come to Canada to prevent people going into the United States from Canada as immigrants. The number of immigrants that came to Canada in 1899 was 44,543, and in 1900, 44,697, an increase in 1900 over 1899 of 154 persons. That was the total increase, and had it not been for the increased immigration from the United States there would have been a very large decrease on the whole. The expenditure on immigration in 1899 was $255,878.88, and in 1900 it was $434,562.61, an increased expenditure in 1900 over 1899 of $178,683.88. That is paying pretty dearly for the extra 154 people we got. We are paying over $1,000 a head for them and the increased cost in 1900 over 1899 was nearly $3 per head. In 1899 the cost was $5.74 per head, and in 1900 $9.72 per head. Now compare that with the United States. The commissioner general reports that in 1898 the number of immigrants to the United States was 229,298, and in 1899 the number was 311,715. The total expenditure by the United States on immigration in 1898 was $275,809.32, and the total expenditure by the United States on immigration in 1899 was $288,002.26. The cost per head of immigrants to the United States in 1898 was about $1.20, and the cost per head of immigrants to the United States in 1899 was

about 92 cents. Now let us take the cost in Canada. The cost of immigrants per head in Canada in 1899 was $5.74, and in 1900 it was $9.72. We therefore find that Canada's immigrants in 1899 cost her six times as much as it cost the United States for their immigrants, and Canada's immigrants in 1900 cost over ten times as much as it cost the United States for their immigrants. Remember, Sir, that this expense has to be borne in Canada by a population of less than 6,000,000, as compared with a population in the United States of over 70,000,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well for this government to consider the situation, and either to pursue the course which the United States is pursuing, namely, call their agents in from the old countries; or else, let this government do as the province of New Brunswick is doing, bring their agents back to Canada, give them instructions that they may know what they are expected to do, and let them go to the field of their labours properly equipped for their duties. If these men who now are agents are willing to do that, and if it is necessary we should have immigrant agents abroad, then they should pursue their work properly; but, if our present agents are not willing to do their work, let the government appoint others who will do it in their stead.

Mr. WM. F. McCREARY (Selkirk). I have understood, Mr. Speaker, for the last ten days that the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) was likely to speak on the question of immigration, and as I have a quantity of data from which I could have spoken in probably more detail, I regret that I have not been able to collect these papers for the present occasion. I think, however, Sir, that I will be able to show the House that some of the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) are absolutely without foundation. In the first place, I do not know that there is any more important subject that could be brought to the attention of this parliament than the question of immigration. It has been recognized as such by both political parties for many years. When during this session two or three weeks of valuable time were expended in discussing the tariff, I thought that while that might be an important matter, yet there were other matters of equal importance to the west especially, to which very little time or attention is given. When the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper and other hon. gentlemen were, in 1881, urging the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate bargain to the favourable consideration of parliament, one of their strongest arguments was that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the government would fill up with settlers our great territories in the west. And while we are proud of possessing that line of steel that connects one province of this Dominion with the other; while we are proud of pointing to the Canadian Pacific Railway as a great military road, we must bear in mind that to the people of the North-west, it has not been altogether an unmixed blessing. That is due to the very fact that the building of that road so rapidly across the prairie district, has caused many hardships under which the people of the North-west are to-day labouring. The same remark would apply to the city of Winnipeg. We were told that the city of Winnipeg was going to have a great population in a comparatively short time, and during the boom of 1882 they so enlarged the city limits of Winnipeg, that they are at present of the same extent as the limits of the city of Glasgow, or Manchester, England, each of which has a population of about 800,000. The consequence is, that in Winnipeg, as some of you know, people flock to the outskirts, buy small lots, put up houses, and when a few get together they demand a sewer, a sidewalk, and a graded street, so that it is difficult for the corporation of Winnipeg to provide for the government of the city because of the sparse population extended over the extensive limits of the municipality. Well, Sir, the same thing applies in the North-west Territories. When the road was extended, settlers came to pass by good lands quite close to the city of Winnipeg, with the expectation that they would get better land in Alberta or Saskatchewan, and so they proceeded on a thousand miles with the hope of settling prosperously at the foot-hills of the Rockies. That has had a bad effect upon immigration. It has had the effect of driving people away to seek land in countries more thickly settled as there is nothing so prejudicial to settlement as the absolute loneliness of life on the prairie, especially for women and children, when they are located miles from any organized community. Schools cannot be erected; there is no society, and a great many of the people who have left our country did so on account of these conditions. Sir Charles Tupper, when he urged the adoption of the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate bargain, was of the opinion, and no doubt justifiably so, that we would have two or three million people in that country within ten years. We all know that unfortunately that result has not been obtained, and that unfortunate result is due largely to the policy adopted by the then government. As a matter of fact, the census of 1891 showed very little more than the natural increase notwithstanding that we had expended over $1,000,000 on immigration. If there ever was a time when we should have got emigrants into that country it was during these years. The Canadian Pacific Railway main line was built between 1882 and 1886; the Deloraine and Glenboro branches running through southern Manitoba, and the line to Yorkton were built during these ten years, and in that same ten years the United States got

the largest number of immigrants that ever came into their country. In the year 1883, 788,000 immigrants settled in the United States, and in each of these ten years there was never less than half a million immigrants to that country. Therefore, if ever there was a time in the history of the Northwest when that country should have been settled it was the time when these roads were being constructed, when that money was being expended, and when that country was being so well advertised. That is the time we should have got our immigrants and kept them. I submit that owing to the peculiar policy adopted by the late government, the few emigrants that were brought into that country were allowed to go away. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that if there is any one question from which party politics should be entirely swept away it is the question of immigration.

Mr. WALLACE. Why have you not set the example thus far ?

Mr. McCREARY. I think it has been done to a great extent, and I think before I am finished, I will be able to show that so far as the western portion of Canada is concerned it has been done.

Mr. WALLACE. I was speaking of the hon. gentleman's own speech.

Mr. McCREARY. I was not referring to this matter because the government was Conservative or Liberal; I merely mentioned a particular period, and you can call it what government you like which was in power then. As to excluding politics from this question of immigration, I shall quote the Hon. T. Mayne Daly, who, in the last report he made to this House after a trip to the old country, said :

> The question of immigration should be considered entirely aside from politics. Both political parties should approach this subject from the standpoint of nationalism only and do all they can to assist in strengthening the government of the day in carrying out, this, in my humble opinion, the greatest work that presents itself to the government of the country.

Again, he says :

> It is admitted on every hand by both political parties that the future welfare and prosperity of Canada is in a very large measure bound up by the peopling and developing of our great west from Port Arthur in Ontario to Vancouver Island on the Pacific. We have everything to offer the coming settler, and we can feel justified in encouraging the right class of people to come to make their homes amongst us. It has been calculated by American statesmen that each settler who takes up land in the United States is worth $1,000 to the State. I agree with this estimate.

Mr. CLANCY. Are the Doukhobors worth that ?

Mr. McCREARY. I will come to that in a moment. I shall give you the authority of gentlemen who are identified with the Conservative party for nearly everything which I shall say to-day. The hon. gentlemen opposite should be satisfied with that authority. I say the Hon. T. Mayne Daly was correct in the statement he made at that time. In the United States, notwithstanding the political feuds that exist between the two parties, when the Democrats were in power the Republicans abstained from criticising their immigration policy, and the Democrats act in the same way when the Republicans are in power. The only criticism was by the labouring men when large numbers of people were imported from foreign countries to flock into the cities and cause strikes. It is not necessary for me to refer to the various reports made by the High Commissioners in England, Sir Charles Tupper and Lord Strathcona, in which they dealt with the immigration question entirely in a non-partisan spirit. And I want to say here on behalf of Sir Charles Tupper, that I have noticed that since he re-entered politics, he never criticised the policy of this government in regard to bringing in Galicians and Doukhobors. Although his satellites and party papers attacked those people as the scum of Europe, Sir Charles Tupper never made a statement derogatory of them, because he had been in England and on the continent of Europe, and had studied the situation. In his various reports he commended the very policy which this government are pursuing. I am glad to be able to compliment him in this respect.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson), in the first place, seemed to commend some features of the policy of the present government, especially the literature they have issued. Then he took up the question of the desirability of procuring immigrants from the Britsh Isles. There are very few members of this House but will agree that if we were able to get suitable immigrants from the British Isles, they would be much better than those who come from continental Europe. However, I submit, after some experience, that the most desirable immigrant is not from Great Britain. The most desirable immigrant is the man from Ontario, and the older provinces of Canada, who has had some experience in the Western States, such as Kansas, Missouri, Wisconsin or Dakota, because he adds to his knowledge as a farmer here a valuable experience derived from living in a prairie country. With regard to getting immigration from Great Britain, the High Commissioners in their reports of the last ten years, have pointed out the difficulty ; and the Hon. T. Mayne Daly, who went abroad to look into that question, explained very fully in his report why it was difficult to get immigrants from Great Britain. He showed that one of the causes why such a large number of people went from Ireland to the United States was that their passages were prepaid, and I will quote from his report what he says with

regard to Canada doing the same thing. He said :

A system has been in vogue in the western states for some years back known as 'prepaid passages.' It means that through the assistance of local banks, railway corporations, and other agencies, settlers in the western states have been enabled to send money or tickets to their friends in the old land whom they were desirous of bringing to America. It is surprising the thousands of people that have been brought out to the western states by this means.

As a matter of fact, I believe about 95 per cent of the immigration from Ireland to the United States went there through prepaid passages. Mr. Daly goes on :

What we want, and the only class of people our agents are authorized to encourage, are agriculturists, farmers and farm servants of both sexes, or others having experience in, or who are desirous of engaging in agricultural pursuits. We are getting our share of this class of immigrants at present; if we desire them in large numbers, we will have to offer the inducements I have enumerated.

I have spoken entirely of this system being carried out in Great Britain and Ireland. There is no reason why it should not, under the same supervision, be extended to continental Europe —in such countries as the government officials would be permitted to carry on their propaganda.

So we have the statement of Mr. Daly that he would not only allow immigrants to come from continental Europe, but he would actually have their passages prepaid and every other possible inducement offered.

The hon. gentleman dealt at considerable length with the question of foreign immigrants, especially the Galicians and the Doukhobors. I might point out, in the first place, that this government is not to be given the credit of having brought in all the Galicians. The Galician immigration to Canada was started under a former government. I think it was about the year 1893 that Prof. Oleskof was brought from Galicia and travelled through the North-west Territories and made a report in behalf of the Galicians. The first large band of Galicians arrived in this country on the 17th of June, 1896, just about the time of the general election of that year. Mr. Carstens, the Galician interpreter at Winnipeg, speaks in the highest terms of these people in his report, as published in the Report of the Department of the Interior for 1896. Sir Charles Tupper, in his report as High Commissioner, also says that he is satisfied with the Galician as an immigrant ; and I submit, after an experience of four years in dealing with that class of settlers, that they are going to make good settlers for the North-west Territories. The Galicians differ from the Doukhobors in some respects. They do not hold their property communally, but individually. They may not be in one way as moral a people as the Doukhobors, and of course they have not the same religion. The Mennonite prefers to go on open prairie where there is no bush or scrub, and where he can engage in the raising of wheat, and agricultural machinery can be used. The Galician differs from the Mennonite in this respect. He prefers to go on land where there is scrub or timber, with which to build his small house and provide himself with fuel ; and the quality of the land does not make so much difference to him. For instance, the first party of Galicians sent out settled east of Emerson, in the district known as Greenridge or Dominion City, within forty miles of Winnipeg. The greater part of that district was settled in 1872 by some of the soldiers who went out with Lord Wolseley ; but there were six or seven townships of very inferior land left, and the government showed the Galicians that land and they took it up. It has a great many gravel ridges and small pocket meadows or sloughs, and machinery cannot be profitably worked on it ; but the Galicians like to have fields of from five to twenty acres here and there, on which they can raise pigs, poultry, coarse grains, vegetables and cattle. They do not care for raising grain on an extensive scale. In fact, they are the very class of farmers the North-west stood in need of. The great drawback in the North-west was that every man wanted to grow grain on a large scale. There were not enough men raising cattle and other stock, or what is known as mixed farming. Fortunately, in the last few years there has been an improvement in that respect. The Galician prefers the very kind of mixed farming which is carried on here in the Ottawa Valley, and I have no doubt that many of those people will be able to supply the country with large quantities of the things which we have hitherto had to import.

As regards the cleanliness of the Doukhobors and Galicians, I would point out that when they landed on the docks at Halifax or Quebec, they had just left a vessel on which they had been two or three weeks crossing the sea. And if the hon. members could see the condition in which the holds of such vessels are kept—vessels that have brought cattle across and return with immigrants—they would realize how difficult it was for these people to have any regard for cleanliness. And there was not much use in their going to any pains to wash and take care of themselves on their landing, because they had still a long journey over land to make. But, the moment a train load of these immigrants arrives at Winnipeg, and before they are there an hour, the water is boiling, and those people are washing night and day until they are just as clean as any other settlers. When I remonstrated with them about their condition, they said to me, with tears in their eyes, how could we help it, our linen was clean when we left, but the vessel was in such a condition that we could not keep ourselves clean, packed as we were in a

small hold. I might say that a similar condition prevailed in the old days, when our forefathers came over, and it is not reasonable to reproach these people with a lack of cleanliness which, under the circumstances, was unavoidable. I have visited their houses, and can give personal evidence of their proper habits. If any hon. gentleman is coming west this coming summer, let him drive some sixty miles from Edmonton and visit the houses of these Galicians, who have been in the country three years, and he will see that the common opinion circulated regarding them is a very erroneous one. Some of these settlers, who had not $100 when they arrived here, have built substantial log houses and have well cultivated farms, with five or six cows, a pair of oxen, and lovely gardens, blooming with not only plants and flowers common to the country, but also brought from Austria with them. He will also notice that the manure is removed from their stables every day, and will find more cleanliness on their premises than he will around many Ontario farms. Last year I had a letter from a gentleman named Ross, who had farmed many years in Ontario, and afterwards conducted a large farm and private bank in Minnesota who had paid a visit to the Galicians west of Edmonton. I regret that I have not that letter with me, but in it he said that within five years these people would not only be among the most prosperous farmers of the west, but be lending money, as the Mennonites in southern Manitoba are now doing. This testimony, coming from a man of his experience, is worth any amount of newspaper gossip, founded on prejudice or idle rumours.

A great deal has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, and by other speakers on other occasions, regarding these Doukhobors. These people have been misrepresented, probably, even more than the Galicians. The first party of Doukhobors with which I came in contact numbered 2,100. They arrived in January, 1899 and had been painted to me in such colours that I was afraid we were going, particularly at that season, to have terrible difficulty with them. I put 600 in the immigration hall at Winnipeg, 300 in a building 300 or 400 yards off, and a little over 1,000 in the immigration hall at East Selkirk. I engaged a number of Galicians, who spoke English, to act as interpreters. About one half the words of the Galician language are the same as the Doukhobor tongue, so that these Galicians were rather imperfect interpreters, but, I employed them to look after these Doukhobors. These people, however, soon came to me, and said they did not want interpreters, and if told what to do, could look after themselves. I, therefore, allowed the Doukhobors to look after the buildings, see that the fires were kept up—it was intensely cold—and they kept the buildings and did their business in such a way that few business men could have kept them better. I discharged the interpreters except the official one, and allowed those people to manage for themselves, and I concluded from the way they did manage things, that they would make very good settlers on the prairie.

It is charged that they have interfered with the labour market. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is just the reverse of what they will do. If they believe in anything, it is the great brotherhood of man. They believe in every man getting decent wages for a day's work. Let me give an instance of this. On the Canadian Northern road, in 1899, there were about forty Canadians working on a piece of grading from Swan river east, some twenty-six miles. It was very swampy and these people were up to their knees in mud and water. A party of Doukhobors was sent up, and after a while their leader wrote me that his people could not make any money at the wages, and were going to quit. I advised him to go to the proprietors and explain the matter. They followed my advice. They went up and asked 20 cents a yard instead of the 13½ cents or 14 cents which they were getting. They did not get the 20 cents, but they got a raise to 17 cents. Then they went to the forty Canadians and told them that they had got a raise of 3 cents a yard, so that, instead of decreasing the wages they actually gave the forty Canadians the benefit of their efforts to raise the pay. The same thing has invariably prevailed elsewhere. I defy the hon. gentleman to show me one case in which the Doukhobors have cut down wages, except during the first two or three months when they were in Winnipeg, and sawed wood at a lower price than they should. But, that was done in ignorance. They did not know the value of money, and could not tell 25 cents from a dollar. Why, the president of the Manitoba and North-western road, Mr. W. R. Baker, told me, that the first time these Doukhobors worked on that road, when they got their first $15 in new one dollar bills, so ignorant were they that they came with the money and wanted to know how much they should give back to the landlord—what percentage was his and what theirs. They could not believe that all that money belonged to themselves. They are honest labourers, and let me tell you what was done in some cases. They were imposed upon by railway foremen. Take the division west of Moosejaw, known as the western division, of which Mr. Milestone was superintendent. He sent a gang of Doukhobors to work on that road, but they did not give satisfaction, and I could not understand why. I found out, however, the reason. You know, Sir, that these people will not eat meat if they can avoid it, and the cook in the camp used to put meat in their soup, which was made of vegetables, and after they had eaten their soup, he would take out the piece of

meat, show it to them and mock them. They did not know how to put a remonstrance, and quietly left the place. Mr. Milestone said they were no good, but I told him that if they got fair treatment they would do very well. I got evidence of the fact, and laid it before Mr. White, of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Then, some of these men went back, and Mr. Milestone has since written a letter in which he states that he has handled men for thirty years in railway construction, and a better class of men he never handled than those 300 Doukhobors. But, he saw that their consciences were not interfered with, and that they were properly treated. The same experience is told by Mr. Sullivan, one of the foremen on the South-eastern road. When some 300 or 400 Doukhobors went down to work on that road, he had difficulty with them at first, but as soon as they understood that they would get fair treatment, and be properly housed and fed, they gave every satisfaction, and Mr. Sullivan says he never had a better gang of men.

The highest record for grading work done by any man in the North-west Territories is held by a Doukhobor working on that road. He made $119 in twenty-four days at dump work. Now, with regard to the Doukhobors, as I have said I spent the winter of 1899 with them. There were six hundred of them around me in the hall where my office was. I was passing out and in among them all the time. I had the best citizens of Winnipeg come to see them. On Sundays, these immigrants generally occupied the evening in singing their psalms, and I had the choirs of the various churches come in. There were people about them there all the time ; and surely, if there had been anything immoral or wrong, we should have had an opportunity to know of it. I have watched these people and studied them for the last three or four years, and I defy any one to show a single case of anything wrong or unchaste in their conduct. I wish, here in my place in parliament, to give a denial based upon my knowledge of these people, to the statements that have been made here, and not only that, but to statements made in another place within the last two weeks. I think it is a disgrace—I cannot use any other term—that public men and public journals should cast such aspersions upon people who have suffered so much for conscience sake as these Doukhobors have. Now, where do we find the greatest opposition to these Doukhobors ? Certainly not where they are best known. Swan River around, Yorkton and Rosthern, the three colonies, are situated out from these towns—and what do the people of those towns say ? When it was said that 150 of the Doukhobors were going to California a couple of years ago, the Yorkton Board of Trade, a body composed of men of all shades of politics, met and passed a resolution asking the government to do what it could to keep them here. Take the statement of such a man as Mr. Thomas Meredith, one of the strongest merchants there. He said to me : McCreary, when you trust one of these men to pay you on a certain day for a bag of flour or other goods that he has bought, you may make up your mind that on the day, and at the very hour agreed, he will be there with the money or with a satisfactory explanation—and we cannot say that about all the other settlers. It is true they do not buy as largely as some of the others. But they do buy. And what is the result ? The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who is largely interested around Yorkton will bear me out in saying that, whereas in 1896 Yorkton was so dilapidated that you could buy a lot on the best street for $50, that town has taken life, and to-day you have to pay $1,500 for the same lot. This is evidence of what effect the Doukhobor, Galician and other immigration has had upon the country. They have built a school-house there of solid brick, costing $10,000, and a church costing $15,000. And that Protestant church is patronized by these very Doukhobors and Galicians. I think I have said enough to show that these people will become good settlers. The only thing, apparently, that can be said against them is that in some of their peculiar laws, they do not agree with the laws of Canada. Now, from some of the remarks that fell from the lips of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) the other day, when he was urging the establishment of a divorce court for Canada, I do not know that we have so much to boast about in our marriage laws.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McCREARY. I am not giving my own opinion, but am referring to what the hon. member said. He quoted cases in Toronto and other cities throughout Canada showing that there was a very serious condition of affairs. Now, as a matter of fact, while the Doukhobors have a peculiar system of marriage, there can be found only one case of divorce among them during fifty years. The authority of that is Count Tolstoi, the authority for that is Prince Hilkoff ; the authority for that is Alexander Konshin, of Moscow, a gentleman who belongs to the Greek Church, and has no connection with the Doukhobors, who is a merchant prince of Russia, and a man of the highest standing in Russia and in Europe, a man whose word I would take at any time. The authority for that is John Bellows, of Purleigh, Essex, the leading Quaker of England, a gentleman whom I have heard went to the peace conference at the Hague, as personal representative of Her late Majesty, a man of the very highest standing in Great Britain. Surely the word of such a man should be worth more than the utterances

of some hon. gentlemen opposite and some newspapers in Canada. With regard to marriage, these Doukhobors are something like the Mennonites. They do not believe in taking out a license for marriage. They will, in time, register their marriages in their own way just as the Mennonites have done. In fact, they are something like Roman Catholics in their views in one respect, if I am to judge by the decision of Judge Archibald in the Delpit case—they look upon marriage as a sacrament, and not as a civil contract to be dealt with by the courts or civil authorities. That marriages are registered in Heaven they take literally. Shortly after they came, I had Premier Haultain, of the North-west Territories, and Hon. Mr. Bulyea, come to Winnipeg and meet the representatives of the Doukhobors. They discussed this question for four hours, and Mr. Haultain told me afterwards that there would be but little difficulty in bringing these people to our way of thinking. Why, we had difficulty with regard to others of their customs and methods—not relating to such serious matters, of course, but still involving some difficulty. For instance, there was the way they treated their horses. The horses in Russia are a light class, and the people are in the habit of driving them rapidly and feeding them at intervals of two hours day and night. The horses they bought here were heavy draught horses, and they could not treat them in the same way. They could only be driven thirty miles a day. The Doukhobors wanted to race them. The consequence was they killed off 40 or 50 per cent of their horses by improper feeding and driving. Then, there was trouble about their wagons. They wanted the Russian wagon to be brought out, and that wagon is about three times as heavy as ours, and not at all suitable to the prairie. I told them that they had better have Canadian wagons. But there was a party of men, eight or ten of them, and some women as well, who came out here with the Doukhobors as nurses and doctors, who were more impractical than the Doukhobors themselves. They were theorists, fadists, anarchists you might call them. It was a case of the blind leading the blind. Instead of trying to persuade the Doukhobors that they were wrong, and leading them to take up Canadian ways, they told them that they were right, and told us that we must come to the Doukhobor's ways. But I said : No, there is no use in that ; we know best what is suitable for this country. But the only way you could teach some of them was by experience. They went to a factory and ordered the material—oak—to be sawn for eighty wagons. The order was given to a man from Almonte, who keeps a mill there, in Winnipeg. They ordered the hubs, spokes, fellows, and so on, three times the size that are used in our wagons. Young Tolstoi encouraged them to get wagons after their own pattern. But I got eight or ten of the more intelligent to buy the Chatham wagon. And when the Doukhobors, after they had got two or three of their own wagons, saw how the other teamsters could do far more work with the Canadian wagon, they threw their own wagons aside and bought ours. Prince Hilkoff had to go down and pay out of his own money $1,650 for the oak that had been sawn for these heavy wagons, and that had to be thrown away as useless. This is a simple thing, but it shows how difficult it is to overcome their prejudices. Why, they wanted to use the shorthandled axe—to chop logs with one hand. We had less difficulty in convincing them that that was wrong. No doubt in a very short time there is not a law in force in Canada but these people will cheerfully comply with. I mentioned that the greatest difficulty we had was with the people who came out with them. But thank God, I got rid of them all—all but one. That one was Mr. Bodjiansky, a well-meaning man, but one of most peculiar ideas. About fifteen months ago, I found that correspondence was going on between him and the Southern Pacific Railway, who were anxious to get five hundred or a thousand men to engage in railway construction work in California, about eighty miles south of Santa Barbara. I learned of this correspondence, and also got a copy of the contract signed by the milling and railway company, and, with this contract, tried to stop these men at the boundary line. But, notwithstanding the boasted laws of the United States, they were allowed to pass, though they were going to the United States under contract, and though there was not $25 among one hundred and fifty of them.

Notwithstanding that I produced the contract in Russian, notwithstanding that I produced the English copy of that to the authorities at the boundary line, notwithstanding that the custom-house officer told me clearly that a case had been made of a breach of the Allen Labour law and also of the immigration law,—notwithstanding all that, so great was the influence of the Southern Pacific road at Washington that his decision was overruled, and these people were allowed to pass through. This Bodjiansky was the prime mover in all this affair. He sent his son with this crowd, he was in the first crowd that went. I told the people they would regret it. I said : If you go down there you will get a little bigger wage, more steady employment, but the land is so high that you will never be able to become the owners of your own homes. The climate will not suit you, as it is too similar to the climate that you left in Cyprus and in the Caucasus in Russia. The result was that a short time before I came here a large number of these people came back and almost kissed my feet on the platform at the station at Winnipeg. They told

me that had they followed my advice they would not have been coming back in the famished and sickly condition in which they arrived at Winnipeg. This was all the work of this man Bodjiansky. He knew that he was foiled, he knew that I had spoiled his game. I do not wish to say that the man was trying to get a large percentage on the people he sent away, but I have my own suspicions. However, he was foiled in his efforts, the people have all returned, and as one last gasp before he left he published a manifesto. But the Doukhobors did not believe him, and twenty-two names are all he could get on the manifesto. I may say that I wrote up—I had not time to write the Doukhobors themselves—but I wrote to a young Doukhobor of the name of Michael Cacazoff, who had been living in Brandon. I will give you the history of this young man. He is about 23 or 24 years of age. He was anxious to get an education, and I said I would try and get him into a Winnipeg school, but it was difficult to get employment for him. He went to Brandon and saw Mr. Fox, professor of foreign languages in the Brandon Baptist college, who took this young man up. That was about October last. He now writes me a letter in his own hand, in as good English, with as good penmanship as myself, or most of the members of this House, could frame a letter in,—learned in eight months, showing how that young man got along. I wrote to him telling him the injury that was being done by this manifesto, and asking whether Bodjiansky voiced the feelings of the people. Here is what Mr. Fox wrote to me on the young man's behalf :

As English instructor to Michael Cazacoff, the Doukhobor whom you know, and knowing that you are both personally and officially interested in the welfare of the Doukhobors, I have taken the liberty to write to you briefly of my experience with that people during the past winter.

When I came to Brandon last October to take charge of the language department in the college here, it was suggested to me that I give Michael English lessons. Interested as I am in foreign languages generally, and desiring to learn the Russian particularly, I took him in hand as soon as he was free to come. Ever since he has had regular appointments with me. He has been exceedingly faithful, never having missed an appointment, always coming on time and without fail, at the close of each lesson showing me his deep appreciation of what is being done for him. He tells me from time to time that the fact that he receives any recognition from an official such as yourself, is great encouragement to him. I assure you that your name stands high in honour among the Doukhobors. They are a grateful people.

Through Michael I have come in contact with them quite often, frequently visiting their homes. I have found them all as you described them in your last letter to Michael—clean, peace-loving and thrifty. They all unite in saying that not only do they feel satisfied with the Canadian laws generally, but also that their dreams could not picture to them anything that they would like better.

Mr. McCREARY.

I have been questioning Michael regarding the Bodjiansky letters. He says they were written at the instigation of two or three disgruntled Doukhobors who are of the kind that would never be any good anywhere on this globe. Michael got this information from his father who lives in one of the villages in the same locality where Bodjiansky resides.

I have no doubt but some of the hon. gentlemen from Ontario may know Mr. Fox, the writer of this letter. He says further :

A number of people here call the Doukhobors lazy, using as their proof, so-called, the fact that very few of them are learning English. I confess I thought at first that it was strong evidence in that direction; but now I see that their backwardness in this respect is owing to their timidity of people.

That is just the thing, the very difficulty of the whole question. They have been so down trodden by the Russian soldiery and the Cossack authorities, their women have been so flogged and so persecuted, they have been so beaten on account of their religious beliefs and for other reasons, that to-day they are very suspicious, and it takes them a long time before they will believe that what a man says to them is true. They have been deceived so often that they will not believe a man the first time. That is one of the difficulties that has stood in the way. A school was set up at Winnipeg by a lady, or under charge of a committee of ladies. When they first went into that school there was a large number of pictures hung around the hall. They did not know but that these pictures represented the doctrines and rites of the Greek Church, and they began to leave. The lady did not know why the children quietly slipped away from the building and would not attend ; they would not even tell my interpreters and officers for some time why they would not go to that school. Finally they said : These are Creek Catholic schools, and we do not want to go where the Greek religion is taught. We believe in our own religion. We want to come here to learn reading and writing, history and geography, and we do not want to see these pictures hung around the walls. The consequence was that the pictures were taken down and the children went back to school. So you see, Mr. Speaker, some of the difficulties we have to encounter in dealing with these people.

As I have said, this man Bodjiansky tried, and is trying to the last to make trouble. There is no doubt he feels aggrieved because he was not able to carry out his measure for removing these people to the United States. He tried to stir up strife among them ; and I may say that since he wrote that manifesto he hawked it around the city of Winnipeg to try to get it published in the daily papers. For a long time I have known that he was trying to get this up. Seeing he has been foiled in his efforts he has gone back to Siberia in Rus-

sia, and I am told by the Doukhobors in the North-west that they are glad to get rid of him. I may tell the hon. member that if he desires it I can bring a statement from the North-west signed by every Doukhobor that the sentiments expressed by Boujansky are not the sentiments of the Doukhobor people. I have hopes that in a short time, even this year, the Territorial government and the Dominion government may make certain slight amendments to the marriage laws by which these people will be able to register their marriages in a little different manner from what they do, different even from the Mennonite custom. I think any difficulty of that nature will be got over.

In regard to taking homesteads communally, that is another objection. The hon. gentleman may be surprised to know that within the last six weeks more Doukhobors have taken up individual homesteads than in all the previous time since they came to Canada. Not only have they taken up homesteads in their own villages, but quite a number of them are breaking away from their villages and going off and taking up homesteads among Canadians. At Swan River they have asked to be excluded from the colony, to go out of the communal system and start for themselves, just after they had acquired sufficient money to buy a horse and cow to start with. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is only one argument in favour of the communal system, in favour of settling foreigners in a colony, but that argument is a good one, and that argument has prevailed throughout Canada. The fact has been mentioned in another place, in Ottawa, to the prejudice of the Doukhobors; but it is a strange thing that even in older Canada the Scotch Highlanders like to get together, Frenchmen like to get together, where their language is spoken, and where their religion is taught. I do not blame them. We see the same thing among many nationalities except perhaps those from the North of Ireland, the country from which my father came. Perhaps we do not flock together quite so well, because we are a little too belligerent. But most all nationalities like to come together and settle in colonies. The same rule prevails all over this continent. The Moravians settle together in colonies, so do the Roumanians and the Hungarians. Every one of the foreign peoples brought to the North-west in the early days have settled in colonies. Why? Because they were poor, and they have got to depend upon one another until they are rich enough to help themselves. One man cannot buy a team of horses, but two men together can buy one ox each and put them together; one man may not have enough money to buy a plough, but as they get a little richer three or four of them can buy a reaping machine. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that had that communal system prevailed a little more in the early days, among Anglo-Saxons, we would not have had so many Canadians leaving there to go to the United States? So with those who came from Ontario to the west with very little means. Then, as now, the implement agents had sweet mouths and oily tongues. These travelled throughout the west, and just as soon as a farmer had ten or fifteen acres of ground he was asked to buy a binder, he was asked to buy a rake, and all the implements necessary to run a farm of ten times the size. They bought this, probably the crop failed, but the note was due, the interest on the note had accumulated, 12 per cent compounded year after year, the creditor got a judgment, the implement man came around and sold out the belongings that were not exempt under the law, he took the old machine back, and the consequence was there was that man struggling, there was no use of raising a crop next year, because it would be seized again, and the man, struggling against fate, concluded: I might as well quit, and quit they did in many cases. So many of them were quitting that the Manitoba and Territorial governments were obliged to make the very wide exemption under the law of which I spoke a few nights ago. If these farmers had done something similar to that which the Doukhobors have done, gone a little slower at first and worked a little more on the communal or co-operative plan, they would have been able to get along all right. The Doukhobors, as the Mennonites are doing now, as soon as they become possessed of sufficient means, will go into individual ownership to a large extent.

There is one more word that I wish to say in regard to the education of the Doukhobors. One of the difficulties that was encountered at first was, that the Doukhobors did not want to learn the English language. I asked Prince Hilkoff what he though the Doukhobors would be willing to do in this respect, and he said that he thought about one-third of them would be willing to learn the English language at once, and that, with the balance, two-thirds, it would take some time. I asked Mr. Haultain, the premier of the North-west Territories, if he would be willing to provide schools for the one-third of these Doukhobors, and he said that they would be willing to provide these schools as soon as possible. As the result of the united efforts which were made by the Quakers in England, a young man, a graduate of Oxford, was sent out. He travelled amongst the Doukhobors, and is now endeavouring to secure funds for carrying on educational work. The Quakers of the United States have also contributed largely in that direction. In the meantime there were two Canadian ladies who undertook the work. A young lady from Kingston, Miss Nellie E. Baker, and Eliza Varney, a fine old Quaker lady, who lives in Prince Edward county, came

up to the North-west, and started a school. They started a school in a tent which I loaned them. The children squatted on the grass. I would like to read a few extracts from a letter written by the young lady to me shortly before I came down here. She says :

But here were the children, all as ignorant of the English language as I of the Russian, waiting to be taught. We had not expected such a prompt response to our project. So my first experience as a teacher began under decidedly unique conditions, teacher and taught being without a single word in common. By signs and motions I got them seated in rows on the prairie grass of the tent floor—later we had plank benches—and holding up a pencil said 'one.' I could detect no apparent comprehension; then taking up another pencil said 'two,' and adding a third, 'three'; still no response, and my heart sank somewhat. However, I decided to repeat the method, and as I said 'one,' I noticed a look on a boy's face that told me he knew I was counting, and I saw him turn and speak to the others. Almost instantly they understood, and soon repeating after me, counted up to ten. Then making the figures on a large sheet of paper—that had to serve as a blackboard—they soon knew perfectly the English numerals. . . . .

All were very attentive and eager to learn. Some of these children came regularly from the village, Dtshenje, five long miles in all weathers. They came early; too. So I opened school at half-past eight daily, and when closing time came at four, I often thought I was the only tired one. So much of the teaching was of necessity oral that the six and a half hours a day for five and a half days each week I found rather trying.

At the first the school was visited by several of the older Doukhobor men, who, I apprehend, were present to satisfy themselves as to the nature and probable influence of the undertaking. Later this critical attitude gave way to a feeling of hearty approval and confidence. . . . .

As to writing, which was done on slates in school and in 'scribblers' for homework—of which seemingly they could not get too much—I must confess that it was often at least as good as my headlines. This shows that the Doukhobor has a strong eye for form, and certainly in the scrupulously artistic power in the handling of strong colour effects. . . . . .

The manliness and independence of the Doukhobor character was shown when these poor villagers found that the school was entirely non-official, and my work wholly voluntary ; a committee of the men offered me remuneration, which, being declined, they expressed their gratitude, and told me through their spokesman, Constantine Plaxton, that they 'thanked me all the day and all the night.' . . . . .

The importance of some knowledge of English to the Doukhobors is apparent when it is shown that one who cannot understand is only able to get half wages, but apart from this there is a general desire to learn our tongue and to become Canadians. This view, formed in my visits to the villages near Good Spirit Lake, was confirmed when later I visited many villages to the south and north colony. . . . .

When Mr. Barcroft came to the tent school at Good Spirit Lake, he was accompanied by M. Nicholas de Struve, the Russian consul to Canada at Montreal, and these gentlemen were good enough to express their gratification at finding in my school a 'going concern' of considerable experimental importance, which, it was said, would throw practical light on the subject in hand. . . . . .

It does not require a very keen perception on the part of one who has had a welcome into hundreds of their homes to be assured that this is a community living up to high moral standard, and holding tenaciously to the simple tenets of Christian faith.

That is good enough evidence for me to believe, besides that which my own eyes taught me in four years, that these people are good people. At one time I made up my mind that I would visit these people in their own homes. I was brought up in this country amongst the pioneer settlers on the Upper Ottawa, and I know what pioneer life is. I know what it is to build log houses, and I am in a position to judge as to what kind of a settler is necessary for a new country. I decided that I would not take any provisions with me, but that I would live with them as they lived. I made a trip to Swan river, over to Fort Pelly, and down to Yorkton, and slept five nights in their homes. I was surprised and astonished at the cleanliness of their places. I was surprised at the kind of log houses that they built. I have seen very good log houses built in the early days here, and I have seen what were called first-class 'corner' men, but I had never seen any log houses of which the corners were as neatly made, and in which the plastering was so neatly done, and on which the roofs were so well put on. I have never seen any log houses built by any Canadian builder equal to these houses. They had blended the clays used in the decoration of these houses in such a way as to almost make you think that they were actually painted. There was another prejudice that they had at first. They would not have stoves in their houses, but they had large clay ovens, which they placed next the doors. When I said to them that they should have stoves, they at first said that they would burn out, but they quickly overcame that prejudice, and in two or three months there were a great many box stoves in use. As to their food, it is true there was no meat, but they had vegetables, onions, &c., and they made a very nice salad. They had soup of rice and barley, which they took with bread, well baked. I found them most polite people, and the best things in the house they gave me. Their style of living was a little different from ours; they did not use the ordinary bedsteads but they had pillows made of down and feathers which were taken out every day to be exposed to the fresh air, and in that they gave us a lesson in hygiene. I was as comfortable as I would be in a hotel. It is true that twenty or thirty occupied the same house. Their beds were arranged on platforms at the end of the wall, but they had neat curtains and hangers and you were just as private as you would be in a Pullman car. These people are most religious as regards their

food. Even in an hotel or rough boarding house, it was one of the noticeable features that they were not afraid to stand up before they partook of a meal to thank God in their own way for providing it, and after they had eaten they were not ashamed to do the same thing. I saw these people out through the west, and I say that at Yorkton, Swan River, and in other places where they are settled amongst the roughest class of men, they are thought a great deal of by 95 per cent of the people. There are a few cranks up there. There are some worse than cranks who do not want any one but themselves to go into that country. One of the greatest difficulties we had to face came from the rancher class who went there as so-called ranchers with 100 or 150 head of cattle, and they thought because they had taken up 160 acres—which a great many of them had not paid for although they had been there for fifteen years—they thought because they squatted upon that land and put up a small house and let their cattle roam over the entire prairie, that the country was sacred to themselves alone. Merchants in Yorkton told me that these so-called ranchers were not of much benefit to the country. It was true they raised these cattle, but they shipped them to the east and they did not even buy their supplies in the country, because they brought them in from eastern cities. I was told that every quarter section taken up by Galicians and Doukhobors was a source of wealth to the country and the trade had increased in such a manner that the business people saw the difference and wanted to get rid of the ranchers. I reasoned with some of these ranchers, and I said : Do you expect to tie up a half a township for the sake of your cattle ? I told them : Go to Cypress Hills or to Maple Creek district for your ranching, for you have no right to say that this land which is suitable for mixed farming shall be retained for your benefit for ever, and that the Dominion government are not to get out of it what they should get out of it, because you claim that the country is to be kept apart for men like you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is also said that these Doukhobors and Galicians were fed by the government. It is charged that in the first place they were brought in by the government, and then that they were fed by the government. Certain newspapers throughout the west and throughout the east too have told that lie so often that they have got to believe it themselves. They say it is peculiar of a man who is a pretty square liar that if he tells a lie often enough he gets to believe it is true. Nothwithstanding that the story about the government feeding these immigrants has been denied time and time again, it has been repeated by every Conservative newspaper in the west and in the east. Why, Sir, not a single Galician or Doukhobor was ever brought in by this government. They paid their own fares in good coin of the realm. It is true they were assisted by the Society of Friends, a Christian sect, one of the most Christian sects in Canada I believe; one of the most self-sacrificing religious denominations I have ever known, and I was very much surprised to hear the hon. gentleman from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) say anything disparaging to the Quakers. We have not very many Quakers in the west, but from the experience I have had in dealing with Quakers from Philadelphia, from Great Britain and from Canada, I think that if ever I should desire strongly to belong to any denomination, it would be that denomination. They are men whose religion consists in helping the needy, whose religion consists in taking out of their own pocket what they can spare and giving it to those who want it. That is a good enough religion for me. We see too little of it in our days.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCREARY. I repeat that I was surprised to hear the member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) cast a reflection upon the adherents to that religion. Now these people were never assisted by the Dominion in any way except that the ordinary bonus was paid as in the case of other immigrants. If I wished to occupy the time of the House I could refer to the bonus paid by the Conservative government. I could go back to the time when they paid two pounds sterling per head on some of the immigrants coming in here. I have with me the names of some of these immigrants and certainly they are not French, English or Irish; they sound very Polish. I will tell you the history of some of these, and I can tell you why they were unable to settle down permanently in the North-west. A number of these immigrants were brought out from Galicia in 1889. That country has a population of 7,000,000 people, 3,000,000 of whom are Roman Catholics and 4,000,000 of whom are Ruthenians who are interspersed with Germans, a number of whom were sent there about 104 years ago. A number of these people were brought out and settled in the North-west, and where were they settled, do you think ? They were settled in a country where it was known that a man could not live on mixed farming. There was no water. The government had sunk wells there and they could not find water. I refer to the settlement nine miles this side of Medicine Hat, south. However, the government settled these people there, and what has been the result ? They paid a very large bonus of $10 a head for those immigrants and here are some of the names. Konrad Gredl, Heinrich Vockeroth, Takob Kraushaar, Tehan Dochotke, Gottleib Fliller. What do hon. gentlemen think of those for Anglo-Saxon names ? The first thing the government had to do was to try and get them

water, and when they failed in that, these poor people had to haul water from the Saskatchewan river. The government gave them seed-grain the first year, but there was no rainfall; the seed failed, and there was no crop. Some of them left. Some remained there and the following year the government advanced them seed-grain again as well as provisions to keep them from starving. Very large sums of money were expended in this way. Some of them left again, and finally every single settler was forced to leave that district and not one was left to tell the tale. All that money was wasted. And, Sir, the result has an injurious effect to-day on the settlement of that country. The seed-grain mortgage rests on these homesteads to-day, and when we send a settler in there to take up one of them, he is met with a seed-grain mortgage of $45 or $50 which he does not want to pay, and so he gets out. I point out to the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) that this seed-grain mortgage will have to be wiped out. It is stopping the settlement of that district to-day, because men will not pay a debt which they did not incur. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you where these immigrants went when they left the Medicine Hat district. This settlement took place in 1889 and 1890, and in 1895 the exodus from that country was so great that the people of Winnipeg became alarmed. I left Winnipeg with some members of the board of trade and drove out Portage avenue on the main road heading west, and in the space of four miles on that road, we met no less than twenty-nine wagons, prairie schooners as they are called, with a family loaded in on top of the few belongings, and the teams were hauling these people from the great Canadian west to the United States. That is where these immigrants went. A few went to Northern Alberta, but the great number left for the United States and became good American citizens. That was the result of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. That was the policy which they pursued not only with regard to farmers, but in regard to other classes of immigrants. What about the Crofter Colony ? What about the great Imperial Colonization Company that settled at Yorkton, and about Churchbridge and about Saltcoats ? Millions of money was spent by the Imperial government to settle these people there. It is true they spoke our language, but they did not know anything about farming, and whom do you think the Conservative government sent to teach them ? They sent political party hacks who knew nothing about farming. These men said to the settlers : You have $600 grant on your quarter section which is advanced by the Imperial Colonization Company; for that $600 I will buy you a pair of oxen and I will buy you a plough and we deduct from that two years interest on the $600. The stuff that was supplied these settlers was grossly over charged, and was in many cases absolutely unsuitable. In fact some of these men told me : We did not understand it then, but the oxen actually never were hitched up at all, and some of them were both for the off-side or both for the nigh-side. The men who should have had the best implements, oxen and equipments were supplied with oxen and implements that were not suitable. The result is that there are just nine families of Crofters left in that district, and they are destitute. It is not their fault, but it is the fault of hon. gentlemen opposite for putting men in charge who did not understand their business, and who cheated the people. A few of those people can be found to-day around East Selkirk, and will give evidence to this effect. It is the same in other parts of the country. To-day the town of Yorkton is thriving, and the hon. gentleman from West York who is interested in the York Colonization Company has become almost a rich man through the efforts of this government to bring in immigrants and he should be thankful.

One hon. gentleman said a few moments ago that there has been no change in the policy adopted by this government which made it differ from that of the late government—that the Minister of the Interior has inaugurated nothing new. Well, the best evidence of a change is in the feelings of the people of the west and in the progress of the country. One evidence of the change is in the fact that in Manitoba last year, although we had a very poor crop, one of the worst since the grasshopper plague of 1875 and 1876, you could scarcely hear a farmer or a merchant murmuring. Why ? Because they have got on their feet, and have confidence in the country, and they know that one year's failure cannot affect them as it would have done ten or fifteen years ago, when the failure of a crop caused many people to leave the country. They know that they have a government in power who are administering the affairs of the country in a business way.

Does the hon. gentleman want any more evidence of the wisdom of the policy pursued by this government as contrasted with that of their predecessors ? Let him look at the city of Winnipeg itself. Stand on the post office corner, and within a distance of four or five hundred yards you will count more substantial warehouses which have been erected in the last four years than ever existed before that time. Take the case of Gault Bros., of Montreal, who a few years ago would not invest a dollar in brick and mortar in Winnipeg. Their confidence has become such that they have erected a $50,000 warehouse in Winnipeg. Geo. D. Wood Co., R. J. Whitla, and others have done the same thing. In fact, thirty or forty warehouses averaging $30,000 in value, have been erected in Winnipeg in the last four years. Last January, on the train going west, Mr. Gault said to me : 'I do not know

anything about Sifton, but if his policy is such as to produce the development of the west that we have seen in the last three or four years, we ought to keep him where he is. It is a policy which has enabled us to double our business, not only in Winnipeg, but in many towns in the west where we formerly were afraid to trust our goods; now we send them out with perfect confidence that we shall be paid.'

What about the value of property in and around Winnipeg? I was for ten years, from 1880 to 1890, handling 80,000 acres of property, as manager for the late Sir John Schultz, and I know almost every quarter section of land around that city. I know that at that time it was impossible to sell much land even for the taxes. The municipalities frequently put up land for sale for arrears of taxes, and they had to adjourn the sale, because no one would give $30 for a quarter section. The municipality had to buy in the land, and on the day following the sale, I have bought a quarter section for $5, and got a tax deed for it. What is the case to-day? The country around Winnipeg is filling up with settlers, largely from the United States, to such an extent that land which was valued a few years ago by the Hudson Bay Company and others at 50 cents to $2 per acre, is to-day worth from $7 to $8 an acre. This fact shows the difference between the policy of this government and the policy of the former government; and the same condition of things prevails in many parts of the west. I venture to say that this year that there will be an unprecedented number of people from the United States coming into that country. To-day they are flocking into the country between Calgary and Edmonton at the rate of three special train-loads a day, in addition to the regular train service, and I believe 25,000 people from the United States will go in there this year. I showed Prof. Saunders a letter which I got a few days ago from Thos. A. Foster, a man who went from Kemptville and settled in Iowa and afterwards in North Dakota, where he resided for twenty years, and who sold his land in North Dakota for $30 an acre, and his land in Iowa for $50 an acre, and having a large number of sons, came back to Canada and the old flag. I asked him about his politics, and found him to be a good Conservative. He bought 2,240 acres of land within thirteen miles of Winnipeg, and he wrote to me the other day thanking me for a sample of seed oats which I had sent him, and for the care which the government were taking of new settlers, and he added: 'You will be surprised to know that I have already 90 lambs, some over 50 pounds.' He had brought in 800 sheep, and he said: 'This is better than I have done in raising sheep in the United States.' That is the best kind of immigration literature you can send out. I immediately had that letter sent to the United States, and I am going to use it there. The result of this policy will soon make itself known. It is just like advertising any business; tell the people what you have got, and the results will follow. We have been practically only advertising our wares; now the fruits will be shown. These men will write to their friends, and before long, instead of having 40,000 immigrants a year, we should more nearly approach the number of 440,000 who go to the United States annually. At all events, we ought to get into this country 200,000 people a year, and we will eventually, because we have now the right policy. I will just give you a list of the amounts of money which some of these people are bringing in.

Mr. Foster brought in $30,000. We have also received the following farmers from the State of South Dakota: Johan Benner and family, with a capital of $10,000; Peter Buller and family, with $25,000; Johan Boese and family, with $12,000; Cornelius Bayer and family, with $2,000; John Keaassen and family, with $1,000; Johan Goerzca and family, with $1,500; N. Sfvoble and family, with $3,000; Peter Paukratz and family, with $1,000; John Baerg and family, with $1,000; Isaac Adrian and family, with $1,200; N. Patzlaff and family, with $1,000. The Americans almost invariably bring in large sums of money, whereas during the time hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, some of even those few immigrants we got from the United States were the class of people known as professional movers,—a class of people who keep moving about and will not settle down. A story is told of some of them who settled in Red Deer district, that so accustomed were they to move, that their hens and chickens invariably once a year threw themselves on their back to have their legs tied preparatory to moving away.

I will not enlarge further upon this immigration problem, as it will probably be discussed later on. I would like, however, to quote one authority in support of the policy of the government. I think that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) quoted the report of the Labour Union of the east—men who know as much about the Doukhobors as I do about the Fiji Islanders. But let me quote the report of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, which is composed of about four hundred citizens of Winnipeg, representing not only that city, but the entire Manitoba and the North-west. When you speak of the Board of Trade of Ottawa, you mean a body whose interests are almost exclusively centred in Ottawa, but the Board of Trade of Winnipeg is a body whose interests extend over the west—who are agents of the loan companies and the machinery companies and the other great concerns which have their ramifications all through the Territories. And if you will read the names

of the members, you will find that a large number are Conservatives. You will find that the presidents of the Board and the vice-president are both strong Conservatives. Well, what do these people say ? This is what they say in their report :

The work of this department of the Dominion government is being prosecuted vigorously, and its splendid results are shown in the large number of 38,324 added to the population of the west, during the year 1900. Of these, 14,000 were Canadians, and 5,136 came from the United States, and are principally well to do farmers, who have a thorough knowledge of the requirements of the country, and can adapt themselves to the state of affairs existing here. They bring with them a large amount of money and personal effects, and in most cases either enter directly upon land previously selected by them, or purchase improved farms, and engage at once in the cultivation of their new properties.

It is reported by the department that the foreigners who have come to our country are rapidly becoming self-sustaining, and exhibit a keen desire to remain upon and cultivate their farms, and it is evident that they will prove a valuable addition to our population.

I think, Sir, you would rather have that authority than the authority of politicians, and a very low order of politicians, too.

There have been 8,827 government land entries and sales during the year, aggregating nearly two millions of acres and in addition to this the Canadian Pacific Railway have made 2,283 contracts, covering 432,000 acres, and amounting in value to $1,377,715.48.

The very question raised by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) and others about taxing the Canadian Pacific Railway land, is going to be solved in a most satisfactory manner by having these lands sold to bona fide, actual settlers.

There is one other point which I have partially forgotten. The hon. gentleman stated that one out of every four of these people remain in the cities and towns. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got his figures, but I do know that out of the immigration which has come into this country in the past four years, not one-tenth of one per cent has remained in the cities or towns. Winnipeg is the only place where they would be likely to remain, and I do not believe that you can find one hundred foreigners in that entire city out of all those who came in during the last four years. I know every street and lane of that city, and speak from personal knowledge. It is true that some who came out in the winter season, when they could not go on to farm lands, remained in Winnipeg during the winter, but even those who remained sometimes a whole year in that city, are gradually moving out on to the lands. The only people among these foreigners who come to the cities and towns are what are called the Pollaks.

The hon. gentleman spoke of the American immigration problem. Well, I could show him something that would astonish him. I could show him that out of 330,000 immigrants to that country, only 16,000 went on the farms, and the rest went to the thickly settled manufacturing states, such as Ohio and Indiana, where labour is congested. The United States got 84,000 southern Italians and 90,000 Slavs last year, and 60,000 Galicians of the worst kind—those who go to the cities and towns. The hon. the minister will recollect that two or three years ago I went to Milwaukee to see about the advisability of bringing into this country 1,700 Galicians who had settled on an island in Lake Michigan. It did not take me very long to find out that these people had come from the towns of Galicia, some twenty years ago, and had gone into the cities and towns of the United States and would not go on land. I immediately advised our agent that these were not suitable people to settle on our prairies and to have nothing to do with them. The Galicians taken from the land in Galicia and transplanted on the land in the Territories, are the raw material of very good settlers, fit physically and in every way, but the Galicians who have lived twenty years in the cities of the United States and were never accustomed to farming, would not make suitable settlers at all. We have none of that class coming to the west. I think I have shown sufficient to warrant this House in coming to the conclusion that the immigration policy of this government is one most satisfactory to the people of Canada.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

OTTAWA AND HULL POWER AND MANUFACTURING COMPANY, LTD.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 25) to incorporate the Ottawa and Hull Power and Manufacturing Company, Limited.—Mr Champagne.

On section 13,

Mr. HENDERSON. We were told this afternoon by the First Minister that the proper course for this House was to accept the judgment of the committee on a private Bill. It will be within the recollection of hon. gentlemen who were there that the Railway Committee, the other day, struck out a clause identical with this in the Bill relating to the St. Lawrence Lloyds. I can scarcely consent to giving power to this company which was refused to another, unless some very strong reason is assigned for so doing. For one, I am opposed to this class of legislation. It is simply an invitation for this company to go to the Ontario government or the Quebec government and ask for a grant of land. Now, it is quite evident to those of us who are watching legislation, more particularly of the province of Ontario, that all the valuable pulp wood of Ontario is rapidly passing

out of the hands of the government of the province, and is becoming the property of private individuals. This is an inheritance of the people, and it is unwise on the part of this parliament—and, if I were permitted, I would say on the part of any other government—to foster legislation that will tend in the direction of giving away what properly belongs to the people. It is said that in one instance, a company in the province of Ontario that received a gift of pulp wood, a short time after the grant was made sold one-thirtieth of it for $10,000. The property did not require development, but the moment they got the charter, were awarded by the government a gift of $300,000. Are we justified in promoting legislation that will help this sort of thing ? True, we are not giving these people any land, but we are putting a clause in the Bill which enables them to accept such a gift, to own it and dispose of it. And, in all probability, it would be disposed of within thirty days at a very large figure, as there is a great demand for that kind of property at the present time. I dare say that legal men will tell us that it makes no difference to the company whether they get this power or not, that they will be able to accept such a gift if it should be offered. But, legal men tell us also that they will have no power to alienate it unless they get a clause like this in the Bill. That is why we should leave out such a clause, because it will compel the company, if they receive such a gift, to develop it, and to use it so that the people may get some benefit, and not have the whole value going into the pockets of a favoured few. I am decidedly opposed to this legislation, and I hope the committee will not entertain it, more especially as it was refused to another company. It would be very strange if we gave to this company what the Railway Committee refused to another company within the last ten days. Unless some very strong argument can be advanced in favour of legislation of this kind, I shall vote against it. In fact, I can hardly conceive of any argument that would convince me that legislation leading in the direction of giving away the public domain without compensation should be passed.

Section agreed to.

On section 17,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are the sections of the Companies' Clauses Act which are not to apply to this company ? Will the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill please tell us ?

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. I have not under my hand the Companies' Clauses Act, and cannot inform the hon. gentleman as to the substance of these sections. Perhaps the hon. gentleman himself could inform the committee on that point.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not in charge of the Bill. As the company is exempted from the operations of these sections, I suppose that—however, I will not press it.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. GERMAN. There are several private Bills standing on the order paper for second reading, to which there will be no opposition. I would suggest, with the concurrence of the leader of the opposition, that these Bills be read the second time, so that they can be sent at once to the committees. It will take but a very short time to go through them ; whereas if we take the committee stage on these Bills that are standing for that stage, the chances are the other Bills will not be read the second time until next week. Some of them involve legislation of an important character. I might say that I spoke to the premier about it this afternoon, and he concurred in the idea, and I understand that the leader of the opposition is not averse.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not pretend to dictate at all to the hon. gentlemen who have charge of Bills as to what course they should pursue. Some gentlemen who have Bills standing for a second reading asked me if I had any personal objection to the course suggested by the hon. gentleman (Mr. German), and I stated that I would not pretend for a moment to dictate to them what they should do.

Mr. GERMAN. It will only take a few minutes to get through with the second readings.

Mr. CLANCY. There was an important Bill standing for the third reading a day or two ago, and I asked permission of the House to have it called out of order, that is Bill (No. 6) that was in charge of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), who is unfortunately absent from the House by reason of illness in his family, but the House did not assent to that proposition. If the committee is willing to allow that Bill to take its third reading, I am willing to assent to the proposition of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German).

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose this can only be done with the unanimous consent of the House ?

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. member for Welland consent to Bill (No. 6) being taken up immediately afterwards ?

Mr. GERMAN. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose that if objection is made to the second reading of any one of these Bills out of their order they will have to stand over ?

Mr. GERMAN. Certainly.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 99) respecting Le Crédit Foncier du Bas-Canada.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company.—Mr. Fraser.

Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the Kamloops and Atlin Railway Company.—Mr. Prior.

Bill (No. 106) respecting the South Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 107) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of John Abell.—Mr. Bell (Addington).

Bill (No. 108) respecting the Manitoulin North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 109) to incorporate the Canadian National Bank.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 110) to incorporate the Debenture and Securities Corporation of Canada.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 111) to incorporate the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Murray.

Bill (No. 112) respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Carroll.

ST. LAWRENCE LLOYD'S.

House in committee on Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the St. Lawrence Lloyd's.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Hon. Mr. DOBELL. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. As the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) is not here, I would ask that this Bill stand over.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

LONDON MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 12) respecting the London Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Hyman.

On section 1,

Mr. CHARLTON. Would the hon. gentleman having charge of the Bill please make some explanation in regard to this change of name, and in regard to the provisions of this section.

Mr. HYMAN. There is no change of name.

Mr. CHARLTON. What are the provisions ?

'An Act to grant certain powers to the Agricultural Mutual Assurance Association of Canada and to change its name,' is repealed.

Why is that repealed ?

Mr. HYMAN. That is merely the title of the Act. There is no change in the name.

Mr. GERMAN.

On section 2,

Mr. CHARLTON. What is this amendment in section 2 of chapter 118 ?

Mr. HYMAN. I will have to send for the Act. The reason of the change is this : It was originally a mutual company, and it was changed by the Act of 1899 to a part stock company. The effect of the amendment is simply to allow by any one holder the holding of more than thirty shares of the stock, a provision which was not considered proper with a mutual company, but which is quite proper with a stock company.

On section 3,

Mr. CHARLTON. What are the words that are omitted from paragraph (b) of section 9 ?

Mr. HYMAN. The only change in this section is one in accordance with the change in the other section, by which a holder shall be allowed to vote on more than thirty shares of a holding. It is a necessary change, because of the change in the former section.

Mr. CHARLTON. The explanation is satisfactory.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

EASTERN CANADA SAVINGS AND LOAN COMPANY (LIMITED).

House in committee on Bill (No. 19) respecting the Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company (Limited).—Mr. Borden, Halifax.

Mr. FLINT. Were there any amendments made to this Bill in committee ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill would make a brief explanation of the general provisions of the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The first section is to give the company the usual powers of lending money which are possessed by all such companies, and which have been included in all charters granted within the last fifteen years. When the company was originally incorporated the powers were very much more restricted in that respect than was the case later. It is simply to put it in the same basis throughout the Bill as that accorded similar companies during the last ten years. Every one of the sections has been taken from either the general law, or the general form of such sctions in similar Bills.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

THE RATHBUN COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 12) respecting the Rathbun Company.—Mr. Britton.

On section 1,

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) having charge of the Bill will state the significance of the change from 'five' to 'seven.'

Mr. BRITTON. The company has a very extended business and there are a large number of persons interested in it, and it was thought that five was rather a small number to have as its board of directors. This company stands in a different position from most of the joint stock companies in the Dominion, inasmuch as it is incorporated by a special Act and the section in reference to its board of directors is a hard and fast one limiting the number to five, and not giving the shareholders power to increase. It is thought desirable to have that amended.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

THE CLERGUE IRON AND NICKEL STEEL COMPANY OF CANADA.

House in committee on Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Clergue Iron and Nickel Steel Company of Canada.—Mr. Dyment.

On section 4,

Mr. CHARLTON. I would inquire from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dyment) having charge of the Bill, where the operations of this company are likely to be carried on, and whether this large sum of $10,000,000 will be employed in the Dominion. I think the House should have a brief statement with regard to this very important Bill.

Mr. DYMENT. The works that are destined to go on are of a very extensive character including the building of steamships and bridges which will require a large amount of capital. The time before the demands can be made is usually extended over a long period and a large capital is required.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are the works to be located at Sault Ste. Marie ?

Mr. DYMENT. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Will works be located anywhere else ?

Mr. DYMENT. As far as I know the intention is to carry them on altogether at Sault Ste. Marie.

On section 7,

Mr. SPROULE. How is this section amended ?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Britton). It is amended by inserting after the word 'purposes' the words 'of its undertaking as hereinbefore set forth.'

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that that amendment only applies to anything coming after subsection 2 and it would be much better if the words were inserted at the top of section 7. It says :

> The company may (b) acquire and operate coal, iron, nickel and other mines, timber limits and other sources of fuel supply.

Timber limits may be a source of fuel supply or they may be for the purpose of engaging in the lumber business. It appears to me they crowded every power possible into this Bill and that they can do almost anything they like : Build railways, be a construction company, and be lumbermen.

Mr. CHARLTON. They have pretty extensive powers.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think it wise to allow such extensive powers. So far as they require these things in connection with their undertaking I fancy there would be no objection to it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The clause is modified to the extent, that all powers are limited to things pertinent to the undertaking.

Mr. SPROULE. It would appear that the limitation only applies after subsection 2.

Mr. BRITTON. The entire part of section 7 has reference only to manufacture.

Mr. SPROULE. Timber limits is not a manufacture.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The timber limits are for the purposes of a fuel supply.

Mr. SPROULE. When you say 'timber limits' I take it that it is broad enough to cover dealings in all kinds of timber.

Mr. HEYD. They have one million acres now.

Mr. SPROULE. Of pulp wood.

Mr. HEYD. Of pulp wood and hardwood. Their purpose is to sell the best wood and to make charcoal of the other.

Mr. SPROULE. As far as it is required for coke or coal, I do not think there would be any objection, but this goes further than that.

Mr. HEYD. What would they do with their good wood ? They must cut it up and sell it.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not objecting to taking the wood off, but I am objecting to allowing them to go into so many other lines.

Mr. HEYD. They are not asking for a single thing more than the industries which they are engaged in at present. Every one of these is a by-product of a larger industry. They will do everything they promise here.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a mere statement of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HEYD. I had the pleasure of going through their works, and saw what they are doing.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman might see a great deal, but that statement is not borne out by facts. The Bill gives them larger powers than they have to-day. My only object is to confine them to the operations which they are engaged in to-day.

Mr. DYMENT. This is just a copy of the Dominion Steel Company's Bill which was passed by this House last year.

Bill reported, and read the third time.

Mr. DYMENT. I move that the title be changed to An Act to incorporate the Algoma Iron and Nickel Steel Company of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 68) respecting the McClary Manufacturing Company.—Mr. Hyman.

Bill (No. 37) to incorporate the Bishop of Keewatin.—Mr. Osler.

SUPPLY—IMMIGRATION.

House resumed debate on motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). I feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is my duty to say a few words on this question, which was discussed so long and ably before recess. The question of immigration is one of the most important that can be considered by this House, because the future welfare of this country depends on the class of people that we bring into it. If it be necessary to bring in people to settle our wild lands, and help to carry on the industries of this country, it is the duty of the government to see that the very best class of people from Europe are brought in, and no others. We have heard something this afternoon about certain people who have been brought in, and concerning whose desirability there is considerable difference of opinion. We had the two sides of the question presented to us this afternoon. The hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) thinks that the Doukhobors are a detrimental class, who will be of no benefit to us. On the other hand, the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) says they are a very fine people, who will make most excellent settlers. There are the two opposite opinions, and it is not for me to say which is right, because I do not remember ever seeing a Doukhobor, and, consequently, am not in a position to judge. But if, as the hon. member for Selkirk says, they are, they are equal to the Society of Friends, known by the name of Quakers, then, I think they will be a great addition to our population, because I am satisfied that there is no denomination which stands higher than the Society of Friends. If what the hon. member for Selkirk says be true, then, hon. gentlemen on this side have nothing to grumble about. However, I cannot pretend to be a judge.

The member for Selkirk spoke with a great deal of zeal for something over an hour. He waxed fast and eloquent, and I must say that he not only spoke with zeal, but with knowledge. He had a right to have knowledge, for I see in this book, the Auditor General's Report, that he had expended $90,000. I did not know whether that is the same gentleman, and if I have made a mistake I apologize. I would have a good deal of knowledge and a good deal of zeal, too, if I had that amount of money voted for me. The reason why I feel, perhaps, more interested in this question than most of the hon. gentlemen present, is that I am one of those whom you have been talking about so much—I am an immigrant and a farmer. And, being an immigrant and a farmer, I think I have a right to speak for these people. But it is forty-five years since I came here—that is to say, I came here before some of these hon. gentlemen were born, so I know as much about Canada as many who are not immigrants. Then I have had the pleasure of having under my rôof and under my tuition quite a number of young immigrants. And I have to tell some of these hon. gentlemen that I wish I could say that they were as good men as those whom I have educated. Some of these men are now settled in the North-west, and I am satisfied that they do credit to the community wherever they may be located. I was sorry to hear this afternoon the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) say that a certain section of the country was not fit for settlement. I had the plea sure of visiting that section some eighteen years ago. The Dominion government has established an experimental station in that section. As well as I could judge of the soil—there were no crops growing there then—I thought the country was fit to produce an excellent crop. I went further than the Canadian Pacific Railway was then built, and I had a favourable impression of the country. With proper irrigation and cultivation, I am satisfied that that land will some day be a garden. I believe in that country around Medicine Hat that was traduced this afternoon by the gentleman that was so much interested in immigration last year, and I am sure the people there will not thank the hon. gentleman for what he said. Now, we heard this afternoon not only that the success of immigration work was due to the fact of this government being in power, but that it was to the same fact that we must look for the

cause of the good crops in that country. We know that for ten years previous to last year there were good crops in the North-west—and I am always pleased, though the people of the North-west compete with me in growing grain, to learn that they have escaped frost and have good crops. And why ? Because they are my neighbours. A large number of young men from Ontario have settled in that country and have built up homes for themselves there. The hon. member for Selkirk gives us to understand that it is only when the present government is in power that the crops are good ; but according to the hon. gentleman himself, last year the crops were not good, although this government was in power. I believe that immigration should be carried on. We must have people in this country, we must develop our vast resources. We must settle people on our land. A former government, led by one of the great statesmen of this country, thought it advisable to enter into an agreement with British Columbia to build a road across the continent. And, as a result that great North-west which, when I first heard of it, was known as the Hudson's Bay territory, was developed. All this has been due to that railroad that was built by the much-abused Conservative government. I do not think that the present government would like to destroy that great highway across the continent ; I feel confident that they are glad that a party was then in power that had the courage and the hardihood to build that road. I am satisfied that it was one of the grandest things that ever happened to Canada. I am not speaking from a party point of view, for, I care not who did it, it was one of the grandest things that ever happened for the development of this country. I do not intend to bore the House by speaking at great length. The first time I spoke here, I said I would not say very much during this, my first session—whatever I might think, I would say little. But, unfortunately, I have been on my feet a number of times. And I have failed to give satisfaction to all parties when I have spoken, and I do not expect to give satisfaction to all to-night. But let us investigate this immigration business a little further. I shall not give the government my plan for bringing immigrants into this country, because they would not accept it. They might take advice from a straight Tory—but they will not take it from me. But there is one thing I object to, and that is sending out as immigration agents every party hack who cannot get a job at anything else. Now, I find here in this report mention of a gentleman whom I have never seen, but whose name I have often heard. The people of my county would like to see something of him, because in West Elgin they know something of him—to their sorrow. He came there on the eve of a by-election and took up quarters at one of the hotels and sent for some of the young and doubtful voters. He had strong views in regard to their health and wanted to see them. Some people are uncharitable enough to say that they voted as he told them to.

Some hon. MEMBER. What is his name ?

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I never like to mention people's names unless they are present. But I find in this book that he is an immigration agent and that his salary for twelve months was $3,000. But, besides he gets living expenses—I have to pay my own board—$673.10 ; travelling expenses, $793.64 ; cab-hire, $31.15, cablegrams, $23.73 ; exchange—I suppose that is on the exchange of money between Canada and Spain or some other country—$3.40 ; express, $1.46 ; insurance—I suppose that would be on his life—$11.43 ; parliamentry papers and hand books, $9.17 ; postage and telegrams, $56.86 ; stenographer, $5.19 ; stationery, $3.04 ; Swedish translation, $5.11 ; Travelling to Canada and return, $205. So he he had a holiday during that year. Perhaps he came over to clear himself from the accusations made against him in West Elgin, and the government pays him for coming over. If I had been in his place I would have had to pay my own expenses. Now, I find that the whole expenses amounted to $4,822.28, if I have figured it right, that he drew from the treasury of this country last year. We were told this afternoon how few immigrants have been introduced through his exertions. Now, I have not mentioned his name yet, I do not think it would be advisable to do so. Mr. Speaker, I do not bring this as an accusation against the government only in so far as that man was a played-out politician, and was a tool of this government, or of any other government who wanted to give him a job. But if he was a good man, the best man that could be selected for that place, then I would be willing to give the government credit for it notwithstanding all the money he has cost us. Now, he has an office. Of course, you see, he is travelling all the time, and I should think he would need to, by the amount of money that he has spent. But he has an office, and he has to keep that office open. Now, I contend that there is no need whatever for an immigration agent to have an office in London, or in Liverpool, or Brussel, or Paris, or anywhere else. His duty should be to go amongst the people and to instruct them as to the benefits they would derive by coming to this glorious country ; and if he would take up—not his bed and walk—but take up his map and his diagrams and go to the villages, and to the people's houses, notifying them beforehand that he was going to lecture on Canada and tell the villagers about this country —then he would be rendering Canada some service. The class of people we want are the workingmen, the husbandmen. We do

not want any man in this country or any other country who does not work, either with his hands or with his brain. We do not want idlers here, we want intelligent men, no matter from which one they come of those glorious little kingdoms, Englishmen, Irishmen, Scotchmen, Weshmen, Germans, if you please—Frenchmen do not count because they do not raise big enough families, and they have to stay at home. We want the hardy, sturdy sons of toil, not the people of towns and cities, they are of little use. We do not want to send our agents into the towns and cities, we want them to go round amongst the peasantry and show them the great advantages they would derive in coming to this country. We have been told this afternoon what the Doukhobors have done. If the Doukhobors can do it, other classes can do it, and better classes can do it. Now, Sir, I think I have said enough. I want to say to the government that I do not care how much money you spend if you spend it right, spend it so that we will get value received for it. But when you put in a man merely for the purpose of giving him a job, because he has served in some parliamentary election, for pity's sake do not come and ask our support. I say, Never do it again. Do not appoint broken-down politicians to any office. Now, I have spoken longer than I intended to speak ; I have spoken twenty minutes, and I only intended to speak ten.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Yes, go on. It may be fun for you, but it is not for me. I do not think I have made much fun to-night. I will say again, as I told you the other evening, Mr. Speaker, that I do not care who sits on those benches on the opposite side ; if they will only endeavour to work for the benefit of this country, they will have my support, I do not care who they are. Now, I thank you very much for your kind attention——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Well, some time, maybe, you will have to laugh on the other side of your mouth.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). When you find a man who is always ready to titter, his brains lay somewhere down below. But, Mr. Speaker, I never wish to stand on my feet unless I can make a point. I thank you all very much for your attention. I hope if I have said a word that will induce the members of the government, and more particularly the hon. gentleman who presides over the immigration department, to see that these men earn their money, I will be well repaid.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I would like to endorse a great deal that has been said this afternoon in regard to the success of the immigration policy that has been pursued during the last few years. I am entitled to speak with some authority upon this subject, as the district I represent has been receiving the larger proportion of the immigration. I can endorse what was said in regard to the large number of people who have come in and the still larger number who are coming in ; I can endorse what was said in regard to the suitable character of a very large proportion of those who have come and who are coming. I am sorry I cannot endorse all that was said. I am sorry that, as it appeared to me, an impression was created, or was liable to be created, by the remarks of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) that this favourable condition was resultant from a certain feature of the immigration which is taking place, that is to say, that the building up of the town of Yorkton, the building up of the city of Winnipeg, the prosperity of the district of Alberta, rested upon the immigration of Galicians and Doukhobors into that country.

Mr. McCREARY. I do not think any such inference could be drawn from my remarks. I said——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McCREARY. I have a right to explain. My words are down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McCREARY. I beg your pardon.

An hon. MEMBER. Two hon. gentlemen are standing at the same time.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not questioning what the hon. gentleman said, I am stating the impression that his words conveyed to my mind, which I presume I am entitled to do. I repeat that the impression was conveyed, whether intentionally or otherwise, that a very large proportion of the increase and of the prosperity enjoyed by the western country was resultant from that class of immigration. The House will bear me out when I make that statement. Now, I am here to protest against that construction being put upon the results of the immigration policy. I am here to say to-night that I believe the present conditions of the country would be better, our prosperity would be greater, we would have a still larger number of good settlers, if we did not have that class of immigration at all.

The idea was conveyed to the hon. members of this House that these people are occupying country that no other people will occupy. Speaking of the part of the country from which I come, and which I represent, I know more of this subject than any other hon. member of this House, bar none. The people are occupying land that is good for any people. They are occupying land that, if they were not occupying it,

would be occupied by other people, either now or in the very near future, and the fact that they are occupying this land is a deterrent to other people from occupying not only that land, but the land in their neighbourhood. Let me tell this House that, when the American settler makes inquiry as to settlement in this country, the first inquiry he makes is : What is the class of people in the locality in which he desires to settle, and I can tell you that the greatest objection that can be raised is that that part of the country has the presence of the very class of people which the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) lauded so highly this afternoon.

I am not questioning the motives of any hon. member of this House. I am not questioning any motives in respect to the policy of the government at all, but I am here to state what I know for the information of the House and of the country. It is very well for us to theorize, and to say what might, could or should be, but it is desirable that we should, in discussing this and kindred questions, come down to facts, and understand whether we are doing the very best that can be done in the circumstances or not. We all want to see the western country settle up, and it is merely a question of what is the best policy to be pursued in order to settle that country up. If it can be shown that the inducement or acceptance of a certain class of immigrants is detrimental to the best interests of that country, and to the settlement of that country, then, I say, it is time to prevent, instead of encouraging, that class of settlement. I speak strongly on this point, because I find that there is a tendency on the part of people of this part of the country, not only in parliament but out of parliament, to suppose that the prosperity, welfare and progress of that country depends upon the continuation of this tide of immigration of the character of which the hon. member for Selkirk speaks. It is so far wide of the mark that I would be altogether failing in my duty as a member of this House and as a representative of that country, if I did not call attention, in the strongest language, to the facts of the case. What that country is to-day, it is because of the exertions, the sacrifices and the abilities of the men of eastern Canada, who have spread themselves over those plains and through those mountains, who are developing the industries and resources of that country, and who are building up a nation, a Canada, such as you have here, and, we hope, better than you have here. I say they cannot do that to advantage if their efforts are handicapped by the presence in thousands and tens of thousands of a class of people who, however worthy they may be, however capable they may be as agriculturists, are not and cannot be citizens of this country, as we would wish them to be citizens, to take part with us in the building up of a civilization and a social system there which are a necessary part of success in the settlement of any country. It is not enough to produce wheat out of the ground. We do not live to produce wheat. We live to produce people, to produce a social condition, and to build up a country, and if you give us only those who can produce wheat, and who cannot take their places as citizens, you do us an injury, and you place an obstacle in the way of our progress, instead of conferring an advantage upon us.

I have heard hon. members say that these strange people, these Slavs, will assimilate with the other people. Do you know what that word 'assimilate' means ? It is a nice sounding word. Do you know that it means that if you settle on a farm on the prairies amongst them or in their neighbourhood you must depend for the schooling of your children on the tax-paying willingness and power of people who neither know nor care anything about schools ? Do you know that it means the intermarriage of your sons or daughters with those who are of an alien race and of alien ideas? That is assimilation, or else there is no assimilation. There is no assimilation, and there will be no assimilation for many, many years, and the whole country will suffer a drawback to that extent for a number of years.

Another idea that is conveyed is, that all foreign peoples are the same, that because the German people are foreigners, and because they are desirable settlers, therefore, the Galicians, being foreigners, and the Doukhobors being foreigners, are also desirable settlers. Do my hon. friends know that they could not insult a German, or a Scandinavian, as much in any other way as to compare him with a Doukhobor or a Galician ? The pride of race is as strong in these people as it is in us, and they object, and object very strongly, to being placed in the same category as a Slavic people, a people who, less than two generations ago, were serfs of the soil, and who, unfortunately, have not had the opportunities, even if they had the capability, to rise very high above that position to-day. Make no mistake, that there is no comparison between the German who comes from Galicia and a Galician who comes from Galicia, and no man will resent such a comparison more strongly than the German himself. It is not because they both wear sheepskin that they are alike. It is not because they both come from the same country. They belong to radically different races. The foundation ideas in the minds of both people are radically different. The German of Galicia is a German such as he is everywhere. He is a man of dominant race, of untiring energy, of great foresight ; he is a man of sterling honesty and reliability, whether he comes from Germany, from Galicia, or anywhere else. He is a German, and a citizen of the highest character. He is not only a producer, he is a

citizen ; but, the Galician, or the Doukhobor, who have been reared under circumstances which did not permit them to know what free government is, who know nothing of government, except that government is a tyranny, these people, let them be ever so good, cannot be citizens as we would wish them to be citizens, or as our Scandinavian and German fellow-citizens are.

As to the settlement of this western country, let me suggest that the summit of success is not reached merely by quick settlement. It would not be as beneficial to this Dominion of Canada to have the North-west fully occupied by people inside of two years, as it would to have that population grow steadily during the next twenty years. It is not after a country is filled up that we get our benefit out of it ; it is in the process of filling up that we get the benefit. It is in the steady growth that we have the advantage and not in the too rapid growth. In my estimation, it is a mistake in the mind of our friends here to presume that absolute success is achieved by the quickest possible settlement. What we want is steady growth by a class of people who will make good citizens as well as good producers. Let it not be forgotten that the good citizen is the greatest producer; that a colony of Germans or Canadians will produce more inside of two years than a similar colony of Galicians or Doukhobors will in ten years. If you want production it is just the same in farming as it is in anything else, the men of the highest intelligence and the highest character will give you the best results. My contention is this: That when we are taking measures to procure settlers for our country, it is our business to secure the best settlers and to reject those that are not the best. That is why we spend our money, and if we do not spend our money that way we mis-spend our money.

I might refer to a remark that was made by my hon. colleague from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) in regard to the settlement that was made at the Cypress Hills. The hon. gentleman said it was a settlement of Galicians. He read out the names of those settlers, and I submit that the names read were the names of Germans and not Galicians.

Mr. McCREARY. Germans from Galicia.

Mr. OLIVER. Germans from Galicia, showing that an attempt has been made to mix up the idea that the Germans, and the Galicians who come from Galicia are the same. I say they are two different peoples altogether. In regard to the settlement of Germans in the Cypress Hills, those Germans came from Galicia and there were attached to them a very few families of Galicians. When these Germans moved to the Edmonton district, the Galicians came with them, and after a time other Galicians followed from Galicia. Let me explain for the information of the House how this matter came about as it is possibly interesting. The province of Galicia was a part of the ancient Kingdom of Poland. When Poland was divided between Russia, Prussia and Austria, the province called Galicia became the share of Austria and fell under the domination of the Austrian Empire. The German is the dominant race in the Austrian Empire, and it became sound policy on the part of the Austrians to people Galicia with a German population if possible. Therefore they took measures to settle in Galicia a number of German colonies. In process of time as the Germans multiplied and as they acquired land and spread abroad in the country, they began to crowd each other and to crowd the Galicians, and the Germans being the more enterprising and knowing what to do under these circumstances, began to emigrate, and a number of them came to Canada and settled near the Cypress Hills. After being settled there for some years, many of them moved to Edmonton. Now, the Austrian government took alarm at this movement of Germans from Galicia, and seeing that it would defeat their object in settling Germans in that country, they said : If anybody has to go from Galicia we will take care that it shall be Galicians and not Germans. So they sent Professor Oleskow, a German professor in the service of the government, out to Canada to prospect for locations for Galician emigrants. He was directed to the handful of Galicians who were settled in the Edmonton district. He found it was a good country. He found that these men were doing well according to their idea. He found that the Conservative government of Canada was favourable to the location of the Galicians in our country, and forthwith a deal was consummated between the late government of Canada and the government of Austria, whereby the Galicians should get an asylum in Canada. Let it be understood that the Galician emigration to Canada is not because of inducements held out by the government of Canada, but because of the pressure behind in Galicia. I speak strongly on this subject, and for this reason. As the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) has said, and as I am given to understand, there are in Galicia between three and four millions of these people belonging to a separate race; belonging to a race which is what you might call the under race in that country, dominated by the Poles and dominated by the Austrians. They have never been fairly treated in that country, even since their emancipation from serfdom. They have been dominated as well by the landlord class, the Poles, as by the Germans who represent the Imperial authority. They feel a desire to better their condition by moving out. The Austrian government is anxious that they shall move out, and to-day the Dominion of Canada stands in danger of the wholesale re-

moval of the greater part of that three millions of Galicians to this country. Let the position be not misunderstood. Many of our friends on the other side of the House have attacked the government because of the supposed expenditure of money in inducing this Galician immigration. There is no money necessary to induce Galician immigration. It is the pressure behind the Galicians at home which induces emigration from their country. There is a population of three millions to draw from, and the pressure behind that three millions is directed towards sending the greater part of them to this country. That is the position of affairs, and it is well this House should understand it and recognize it, so as to decide whether or not this parliament is favourable to having our North-west settled by that class of people. That is the question at issue.

In regard to the Doukhobors, the position is very different. They are a religious sect belonging also to the Slavic race.

Mr. McCREARY. Slavic ?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly they are Russians and Slavs, as the Ruthenians are. The Doukhobors are Russians belonging to a certain religious sect dissenting from the Established Church of Russia. There is only a limited number of that sect, and I am given to understand that the whole of that sect is now removed to Canada. Therefore, we have all there are of them, and we do stand in danger of an overflow of that class of people. I am not in a position to speak of the Doukhobors from an intimate personal knowledge, as none of them are resident in the constituency I represent, but on the Galician question I claim to be an authority, because I believe that fully half of the whole Galician population of Manitoba and the North-west is located in the district I represent. I understand that there are some 12,000 or 14,000 in one colony. Already one local electoral district is in all probability in the hands of the Galician vote, if those people were qualified to vote. In regard to the Doukhobors, I wish to say, speaking of course without having such an intimate knowledge of them, but speaking on the general principle, that any people who are too good to conform to the laws of this country are too good to live in this country, and we do not want them at any price. I want to say for the Galicians that whatever they may be or may not be, they are at any rate anxious to become citizens, and are willing to conform to the laws and customs of the country ; whereas I am given to understand that the Doukhobors resent the suggestion of becoming citizens, and are not willing to conform to the laws and customs of the country. I certainly object to any such class of immigration, and the only redeeming feature of it is that there is not very much of it. But the Galicians are practically unlimited in number.

The great settlement of the North-west has taken place by reason of the overflow of people from these eastern provinces. The idea prevails in these provinces that if our people go to the North-west the eastern provinces thereby suffer ; and on that point I wish to say a word. There is room in these eastern provinces for more people than live here now ; but there is not room for more people under the conditions which now prevail in these provinces. The people of the eastern provinces desire only to have favourable conditions of existence, and for that reason they move out to other fields rather than submit to the conditions which would necessarily follow a further congestion of population. As a matter of fact, the people of eastern Canada have been moving out during the last thirty or forty years, and have been moving in a large degree to the United States. The last census of the United States shows that fully 1,000,000 native-born Canadians were in the United States at that time. This is a fact to which the people of eastern Canada seem to shut their eyes. If that million of Canadians were settled in the North-west, we would have three or four times the population we have there now, and four or five times the development, and we would not need to rely on any foreign people for the settlement of that country ; and what would be the result in the eastern provinces ? What do your factories depend on for their further increase, and your factory hands for employment ? An increase of markets ; and where is your increase of markets to come from ? Certainly, from the settlement of the western prairies. It is in order to get a market for the products of your factories and for your wholesale houses that you want the North-west settled with anybody or anything, so you say. But I tell you that if you want such a market, you must settle the North-west with a people who will be in sympathy with you, and upon whose industry, integrity and loyalty you can rely It is better for you and better for us that the people leaving the eastern provinces should go to the North-west rather than to the United States. What has been done cannot be helped ; but this is still a young and a growing country ; population is still increasing in these eastern provinces ; young men and old men are still looking for new fields. Then, instead of attempting to people the North-west with Slavs, with people from eastern Europe who are certainly not recognized by the rest of Europe as being equal with them—people under whose nationality and government there has never been reached that degree of liberty, civilization, progress or prosperity which we expect to attain—instead of looking to these people for the settlement of the North-west, let us look to our own people and to kindred people upon whose industry and loyalty we can depend. That is the immi-

gration policy which will appeal to the people of Canada from one end to the other.

Let me say one word to the government, and it will be a word of advice. I speak here to-night on behalf of the most populous constituency in the west ; and I have reason to believe that I speak the sentiments of the majority of the people between Lake Superior and the Rocky Mountains on this immigration question. There is no question that the people of the west feel more strongly on than this immigration question, and there is nothing that they more earnestly resent than the idea of settling up the country with people who will be a drag on our civilization and progress. We did not go out to that country simply to produce wheat. We went to build up a nation, a civilization, a social system that we could enjoy, be proud of, and transmit to our children ; and we resent the idea of having the millstone of this Slav population hung around our necks in our efforts to build up, beautify and improve that country, and so improve the whole of Canada. I say it is an unpopular policy in western Canada to encourage this Slav immigration. That may be a low ground on which to put the question ; but it is a business ground, and business is business. It may be a low ground, and yet it is a high ground ; because who are to be the judges as to what is best for the interests of the North-west except the people who have built it so far, and upon whom must rest the chief burden of building it up to the height of prosperity to which we all expect it to attain.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). Mr. Speaker, I deem this question of sufficient importance to justify an eastern man in saying something upon it. I will not presume to express my opinion so emphatically upon the general conditions of upbuilding a country as the last speaker has done. Of course, he knows more about it than I—much more. I have been in that country, and my cursory observations may not have enabled me to understand the question generally, but when we consider that less than one acre in every hundred in the Territories is at present occupied and cultivated, I submit that a few Galicians, not amounting to 20,000, cannot surely have any very injurious effect on its development. It may be all very well for the hon. member for Alberta to dilate on the great advantage of bringing out to this country people who enjoy bright tinted social positions, and who will be able to hold their own with him in all that makes up the amenities and graces of society. But for my part, I respectfully submit that the tiller of the soil, the man who produces wheat, is not a bad citizen. He may not have the social distinction of the hon. member for Alberta. He may not rise to the high plane of asthetic cultivation to which hon. gentlemen opposite have risen, but I submit that this country depends on the development of its soil, and that the man who produces wheat is as good a citizen as the best gentleman in the land. I would be glad if we had sufficient population in eastern Canada to fill that western country, and in default of that, I would like very well to bring into it a large number of Englishmen who are willing to work—not the gentlemen who come out to buy a large area of land and who fritter away their time with a lot of dogs and that sort of thing, but will not cultivate the soil. I would be also much pleased to see a number of Irishmen brought into that country —one of the best products of the old land, as they make one of the best product of this new land. But above all, I would like to see God's own elect, the Scotch, brought in there. And failing these, I want to see good honest people settle in that country who will till the soil and produce wealth. We have to admit that we cannot supply that vast country with people from eastern Canada. I do not want a man to leave the older provinces unless compelled to. That is like swapping jack-knifes from one pocket to another. I want every man in Nova Scotia to stay in that province if he can find there remunerative employment, and I want to see the same thing in the other provinces, but if there is any young man in the eastern provinces who thinks he cannot make his mark and succeed in life at home, in the name of Heaven let him go to Manitoba or the North-west in preference to the United States. But if we cannot get people from the older provinces into the Territories, what are we to do ? I submit that the great requisite to the development of this country is good citizens. The hon. gentleman will not speak of the Doukhobors. I may be wrong, but the general opinion in Manitoba and the North-west, when I was there, on one or two occasions, among opponents of the government, was, that the Galicians are fairly decent citizens, but the Doukhobors should never have been let into the country at all. Well, let me tell you one peculiar characteristic of the Galicians, and it is this. It cost less to bring out the Galician, than the Doukhobors, and it did not cost very much to bring either out, but the Galician, when he came out, had not very much coin in his pocket, and he asked the government, as he had the right to, for a small advance. The advance was given, and what was the result ? Out of the very first money he earned, he paid the government back the money he had borrowed, and I wish that Canadians, from one end of the country to the other, would pay their debts with equal regularity. I submit that a man who does that in a new country, and who does not try to live on the government, is not a bad citizen.

Do hon. gentlemen appreciate the extent of that western country ? I do not want any one to go in there who will not make

a good citizen, but the Doukhobor or Galician, who leaves a country like Austria or Russia, for the purpose of escaping imprisonment and being permitted to worship God as his conscience dictates, is the kind of citizen we want here. We can very well understand that men who are settled in the North-west may not like these people, but we are not to be the final judges after all of our surroundings. I submit there is not a gentleman in Ottawa, who has a fine residence, who would not much prefer that the small buildings which obstruct his view, and out of which the citizens go to work every morning, were taken away. No doubt he would like to see his property surrounded with fine buildings and splendid approaches, but if he is a good citizen he will admit that the poorer man is necessary, because he does honest work, and although he may not have the revenues of his rich neighbour does equally important work. Well, in this country, with its millions and millions of acres, are you to be afraid of a few Galicians or Doukhobors ? Is our civilization so effete that it cannot make good citizens out of them ? If we bring only in to this country those who enjoy all the advancement in civilization and religious training and everything that makes a gentleman and a scholar, we will never settle this country. It is because I believe in Canadian civilization that I do not fear a few Doukhobors or Galicians. There are millions of acres in the west waiting cultivation, and I care not whether our settlers be Doukhobors, Galicians or Chinamen, provided they are good citizens and keep our laws and pay their debts, and live honestly. Any man who tills the soil will eventually make a good citizen. The trouble with Canada so far is the lack of population. We have a bigger and a wealthier country than our neighbours, and yet here we are with only 6,000,000 of people, and are we going to have objections raised against any immigrant except upon moral grounds. The fact that he may not understand our language should not be a bar. Let me tell hon. gentlemen that when my grandfather came to this country he could not speak the English tongue. Should he have been prevented entering the country on that account ? My father learned English, and though I may not speak that language with all the fastidious grace of other gentlemen here, at least I have the satisfaction of knowing that in the evolution from the grandfather who spoke Gaelic to the present generation, I am a fairly decent Canadian citizen. I believe that the hon. gentleman would have been better employd if he had stated, perhaps, that certain restrictions should be placed upon foreign immigration, but I submit that it is not the proper way to people Canada with good citizens to say that these men are all wrong. Have they been convicted of crime ? Is the rate of crime amongst the Galicians and Doukhobors higher than among other citizens ? It is true that a few Doukhobors, at the instance of a miserable wretch, who has laid down certain principles that are not in accord with religious truth as believed in by myself and others, have made certain representations, but let me tell hon. members that often worse opinions have been spoken in Canada by Canadian citizens than even those given expression to by that miserable man.

This country is too big for the like of that. And when I go into the magnificent territory that the hon. member for Alberta represents, when I see in the northern part of it riches of soil untold, and when I see in the southern part of it men who have come from Salt Lake City and who believe in having more than one wife, and not a word said against them, I submit that the good citizen who leaves Austria or Russia to escape tyranny, should not be excluded or left without a welcome ; I submit that he is a better man than the man from Salt Lake City, who wants to marry more than one wife. Let us be fair to these men. Once upon a time, a man who is now dead but who should never be forgotten, brought to a part of Manitoba that would not be taken up by the ordinary settler from the east or any part of the British Empire, a race of people who came to this country, and lent them some $96,000. Of course, the same opposition was raised and the same talk was indulged in. And what has happened ? The Mennonites of Manitoba have paid back the $96,000 with interest at 4 per cent, and they are among them the wealthiest people of Manitoba to-day. And the hon. member for Alberta—no, not he, I think he has too much good sense—but men of smaller calibre, who spoke against these people, must surely feel ashamed to-day. There are Mennonites in Manitoba who are worth $20,000, $30,000—some of them even $60,000. Their habits were different from ours ; their methods were different from ours. But in less than a generation they have become good citizens, they have extended their bounds and increased their wealth. And an increase in the wealth of the citizen means an increase of the wealth of Canada and larger payments into the exchequer of the people of Canada. We cannot put on too fine airs about our surroundings. Any man must wish sometimes that he could avoid meeting this man, that man or the other. But we must not be too particular—least of all a politician who, in the course of an ordinary campaign, must meet people whom he had rather not meet on other occasions. But I am willing to let any honest man come into Canada, any man who will till the soil or work for a wage and give a fair return in labour for that wage. I call upon the civilization of our country as represented by the government and upon the higher civilization of our country as represented by our societies and churches, to join in lifting these men up and making them good

citizens of our great west. For, if we wait for population to go from the east to the west, that land will remain sterile and unproductive for centuries to come. We have six millions of people in Canada—and terror in the hearts of some of them because 7,000 Galicians have come amongst us. Dr. Robertson, of the Presbyterian Missions, relates an incident that shows what we may expect of these people. It may be a small matter, but to my mind it indicates that these Galicians will make that country a better country than it is. He was passing a school, a school that was taught by an English teacher, while the children were just beginning to learn English. He saw a little girl with blue eyes and fair hair——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FRASER. Oh, hon. gentlemen opposite need not interpose. I will relieve their feelings by saying that she was not more than that high. Dr. Robertson said to the little girl : 'You are a Galician, are you ?' 'No, sir,' said she, 'I am a Canadian.' This is one of the things to indicate what has happened in the history of every nation in the world among whom outside people have come to live—the newcomers have caught the spirit of the country and their surroundings and have become good citizens. And particularly does this happen when the newcomers come out into liberty from barbarism and oppression. There is no better way to make good citizens than to remove people from despotism and give them liberty to expand their energies. I am not afraid of these people. And why ? Because I am not afraid of myself. If I lived in the Northwest, I would not be afraid of 17,000 Galicians, I would feel humiliated if I could not take my place against ten or twenty or fifty people that could not speak my language. I hope the Dominion of Canada will be broad in this matter. I would exclude any vicious man from Canada if I could. I would put a mark on any criminal seeking to come in. But I should be ashamed of myself if I desired to keep out of Canada any man who came here to better his condition and who was willing to toil at any legitimate employment for a wage that would support himself and family. I admit that I do not know as much about that country as my hon. friend from Alberta. But the hon. gentleman is not the only one who is entitled to express an opinion on this matter. The hon. gentleman from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), who spoke this afternoon, has a different opinion from that of the hon. member from Alberta. These hon. gentlemen are equally brilliant, and, I suppose are equally entitled, so far as the possession of information is concerned, to speak on this subject. But I am aware of one fact, and that is that there is not a railway in Manitoba or the North-west Territories that has not discovered that after the first year the Galician and the Doukhobor make as good men as any from eastern Canada or any part of the world. I myself saw Doukhobors and Galicians in charge of men, and this after they had been here only two or three years. Not too bad citizens were these. I do not suppose that the railway company, which has neither soul to be saved nor body to be burned, would employ these men because they were Galicians or Doukhobors. They employ them on commercial principles and because they give the best returns for the wages paid to them. No, Mr. Speaker, what we need above all is not to be too fastidious in order to please any particular section of men. What we need in Canada is to keep in the older provinces every man we have here ; but, if conditions are such that any man feels that he must leave the east, let him go to our mighty country in the west and seek there employment, and let that country be filled with the people who for industry and morals command our admiration. At Halifax, when these Doukhobors arrived, there was a scene that will never be forgotten. As the ship came into harbour what did these people do ? I commend this particularly to hon. gentlemen opposite—as the ship came in and these immigrants fell on their knees, they sang hymns and praised the Maker of us all that they had reached in safety a land of freedom.

Shall we not now and always welcome to our shores men who recognize the higher and greater Power that rules over the destinies of men ? Shall we speak against them ? No. Shall we not rather encourage men who flee for religious and social reasons from a tyranny, and come here to enjoy the institutions underlying British freedom ? I am not afraid of the consequences to this country. Why, Mr. Speaker, 400 miles north of where my hon. friend lives, the wheat was raised that got a first-class certificate at the exhibition in Chicago. The greater part of that land is not occupied. If we remain until the people of eastern Canada go there, the sons and the daughters of members opposite, as well as others, how long shall we remain ? Shall we not rather do what we can at once to have those acres made productive—perhaps not with all the success that the best farmers of Ontario have achieved, although even they complain that they are not doing better ? But, if they do not achieve all that success, they will, at least, achieve such success as will make themselves and the country prosperous, and enable their sons to do better, in consequence of the knowledge acquired by their fathers, and to become better citizens. I approve what has been done by the government, because they have brought into that country men who, I believe, will be good citizens. They may not have all the polish, they may not be able to speak with all the correctness of an educated Englishman. But, if they have good hearts, and steady hands, and are will-

ing to work, and to take what they have to pay their honest debts, and enable themselves and their families to live, to my mind, they will constitute a great accession to this country. I do not agree with my hon. friend that a man who raises wheat should be despised. I say that the man who raises, on a given acre, more wheat than his neighbour, although his neighbour may be a gentleman of royal birth and with all the wealth in the country, is a good man and a good citizen of Canada. Whether it be wheat he raises, or oats, or pease, or currants, or anything else, if he does better than his neighbour, that man is a more useful citizen. If he makes two blades of grass grow where one grew before, he adds to the richness of earth's products, and, therefore, becomes a good citizen. I am in favour, as I said, of doing all we can to get into this country citizens who are honest, industrious, who will pay their debts. I am sorry they cannot speak the English language. Let us go to work and try as soon as possible to teach them my language. They will thereby not only increase their ability to trade with their neighbours, but will become better citizens in the all-prevailing force of our British supremacy ; they will join in the regular cavalcade that must make Canada, as it must make the nations of the world, forget the Slav, forget the Celt, forget the Scotch, forget the French, forget the everybody, in the overmastering onward march of that British supremacy that takes all nations under the sway of its mighty power, and will not be retarded by anything except those crimes that hinder the advancement of humanity.

Mr. ARTHUR W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). The forcible argument of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who has just taken his seat, would probably have had more strength if he had adapted it to the circumstances that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) outlined. His argument was based solely on the supposition that 17,000 or 18,000 foreigners, Galicians or Doukhobors, did not make much difference in a population of five or six millions, that it was comparatively easy for this country to assimilate that number of strangers. But, the point of argument of the member for Alberta, who comes from the district where these people are settled, is that that district is a sparsely-settled district, and that it already contains thousands of those foreigners, that the proportion is not one in a hundred, it is a large percentage, and that therefore, their influence, whether for good or ill, is a large influence, and is bound to be a great influence in the future social status of the North-west Territories.

Now, this immigration question has had a rather peculiar force in this country for the last few years. I notice that the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson), who introduced this subject this afternoon, was not at all at home with the subject, and did not feel that he had much free room. And I will tell you the reason why. I remember well, in fact my first recollection of the immigration policy, was the promise that we used to hear time and again previous to 1896, that we would be treated by the then Conservative government with a vigorous immigration policy. They promised the North-west that they were hatching a vigorous immigration policy. Previous to the general elections of 1896, the two parties who were appealing for power in this country were both promising the North-west a vigorous immigration policy. Certainly it is not a party question, and as the member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) stated this afternoon, neither in this country nor in the United States is it a party question, except as one party is in power and the other is not. In the United States the Democratic party is opposed to immigration, and is willing to pass all kinds of restrictive laws when they are in opposition, and the Republican party the same. It has probably been the same in Canada. Both parties have promised immigration, and I submit in all fairness that we have to acknowledge that the immigration policy of the last few years has been vigorous, and has been successful, in so far as it has induced immigrants to come into this country. As to the effect, as to the character of that immigration, there is a difference of opinion. But, we have had better value for the money, so far as the quantity is concerned, beyond doubt.

Now, as regards the Doukhobors, I think the hon. member for Lennox proved to our satisfaction to-day a remark that was once made by a celebrated American, that you cannot draw up an indictment against a whole people, and the hon. member for Lennox failed most miserably in his attempt, by charging that those Doukhobors were people of a low grade, of bad morals, or were likely to be hurtful to this country. Nobody who had seen the Doukhobors when they first arrived would be unfavourably impressed by them. Certainly, they do not speak our language or wear our dress, but that is not a crime. Though they may differ from us in those respects, they may be just as good men, and make just as good citizens as we do. But the Doukhobors, when they arrived in the North-west, were a people that any country could be proud of. They were people of superior physique, and although we could not understand their language, their every appearance told us that they were an intelligent people. I do not think that we have much to fear from the Doukhobors, if the Doukhobor can only be persuaded that he is in a good country. That, so far, has been the trouble, he does not think so. We have heard much of a protest that has been lodged by the Doukhobor people against the laws of this country. That protest virtually amounts to a charge that

they have been deceived in coming to Canada. It has been said, not only to-day, but on previous occasions, that the protest, or the appeal as it is called, was only made by one man, and that, at all events, there were only twenty-nine who supported it. I do not think that is a fair statement. I do not think that properly represents the case. I take up the appeal as it has been put out, and I find that it says :

Before everything else, we must extend to you from the communities which delegated us.

And so on. Necessarily those who are writing and who are signing the document may be few, but it states that they are speaking for the community who delegated them. Then again, they replied to the letter that has been addressed in these words :

Kamenka, Oct. 14, 1900.

Immigration Agent, Yorkton.

Delegates from the settlement of the Society of Universal Brotherhood, situated in townships 31 and 32, ranges 27 and 28, assembled to-day in Kamenka to consider your proposition, whether they will be willing to accept lands.

And so forth. The delegates assembled and these delegates themselves drew up this protest. To prove that this is so, we take the reply to these gentlemen of Mr. J. T. Turiff, the commissioner of Dominion lands. He addressed them as follows on the 7th of January, 1891 :

Ottawa, Jan. 7, 1901.

Semen, Semenoff, Vasilie Popoff and others, Village Blagodarofra :

Dear Sirs,—In further reference to your petition to the government of Canada of the 22nd of June last, I beg to say that since my interview with your head men in the month of November, I have discussed the subject-matter——

He had evidently met the head men, the delegates and he refers to this. Therefore, I submit that it is prejudicing the question to say that the protest does not come from the people at all, that it has only a few signatures and that it has been got up by somebody else altogether. Now, I am not prepared to say that the principles they are maintaining and for which they suffered are right. I do not think though, that it is sensible for me to suppose that people brought up in a different land, under different conditions, and taught different views would not come to different conclusions from those at which I have arrived. However, I do not know that I have any right to assume that I am altogether right, and that they are altogether wrong. In other words, until the Doukhobor interferes with our laws, until he becomes a factor in our political life, I am willing to allow that he may be right. Perhaps he is right. We sympathized with these people when they were in Russia, and when they were being persecuted, but I wonder how it is that the Immigration Department did not thoroughly investigate the causes of that persecution and see whether it was safe that these people should come into Canada, not only whether we should induce them to come, but whether it was safe for us to allow them to come, because it seems to me that the position now is that if we have given these people an asylum under false pretenses. The question must be considered : What are we going to do about it ? If they do not wish to be governed by our laws, what is to be done with them ? We have invited them to come here; are we going to pay their way and put them out of the country, or are we going to try, by various methods, mostly commercial, to convert them to our way of thinking ? The hon. gentleman who introduced the subject this afternoon thought fit to quote from, and likely quite properly, or to refer to the records of the Trades Congress of Canada on the question of immigration. I do not complain that he did so, but I feel that there is ground for a little complaint in that he did not go far enough but that he dropped off at 1896. I think that the position of the Trades Congress on the immigration question has always been a logical and consistent one, and that their position is not very different to-day from what it was in 1893 or 1894, except that it has been a little further developed. In 1893, referring to the Proceedings of the Trades Congress, the hon. gentleman read the resolution in which the Trades Congress condemned any governmental means of bringing in immigration that would interfere practically with industrial business; that is that would bring in immigration in bulk, that would be placed in direct competition with men who are at work or who are looking for work, or in other words that would increase the supply of the labour market and have the effect of reducing wages. In 1894 the resolution passed was practically to the same effect. And then again in 1896, after the present government came into office, the Congress met again and drew up a resolution very much on the same lines and which called for a remodelled system of immigration, a system that would result only in bringing people here to go on the land. Now, I do not see that there is any inconsistency in these resolutions at all. Then, there was another resolution on the question of immigration in 1899, which I find in the Proceedings of the Congress :

Whereas, the Trade Congress is on record as raising no objection to honest frugal and industrial agriculturists coming of their own volition and expense to Canada, and settling on our vacant lands, at the same time we do most emphatically protest against the action of the Dominion government in spending the people's money by granting assisted passages, as the present system of immigration is largely maintained in the interests of those connected with transportation, and those employers to whose profits cheap labour contributes. The right stamp of immigration is not obtained by bonusing transportation companies, as those corporations never do exercise proper judgment in selecting a desirable class of settlers.

I believe that has been recognized, and I think that even the records of the department will show that as far as possible now immigration is taken out of the hands of transportation companies and that there is no direct bonus given. I think this is in the right direction. At the same time our Immigration Department has been growing and the work, although it may now be done from other motives, is still going on. At that same congress there was another resolution passed, but, I am unfortunate in having it here in the French language, and not being able to read it, I can only give a general idea of its purport which I happen to know because this resolution was proposed by Mr. Mortimer and seconded by myself. It condemns the importation of labour in blocks, or in large quantities, because, when such is brought into the country, it interferes with the labour market and has a tendency to reduce wages. It is not a proper thing for the government to concern itself with that in view of the fact that it has taken no means whatever to in any way fix a standard of living in this country such as has been adopted in some other countries by fixing a minimum wage and a maximum number of hours to constitute a day's work. I quite believe that if this were properly provided for there would be no objection from the ordinary workingmen of this country to any kind of immigration whatever, Asiatic, European or any other. If there was a standard of living, if there was a minimum wage and a maximum hour for everybody and a fair competitive basis as far as the market is concerned, I do not think there would be any objection to immigration. This can be obtained, and is being obtained now in some countries. New Zealand by means of its arbitration laws, is fixing the minimum wage and fixing the day's work. It is doing so with the most remarkable success and its experiment has not been followed by the calamities prophesied for it. In most of the Australasian colonies the same thing is being done. The immigrant question in these colonies—in the light that objections are taken to it, not only by the labouring people of Canada but of this continent—has passed out of controversy. There is no objection to immigration as immigration on the part of any one. We all wish to see the country prosper and we all wish to see the country properly develop, but there is a decided objection to what is practically the bonusing of competition in the labour market. In 1898 there was some correspondence between the Trades and Labour Council of Winnipeg and the Minister of the Interior, dealing with this very subject of the Doukhobor and Galician immigration. It very fairly represents the opinions of both sides, and reading it over now after two years, I think it is probably one of the fairest and one of the ablest statements to hand on the immigration question as it affected the city of Winnipeg, which city is most vitally interested. I will not read all the correspondence, but I will give the House an idea of what it contains. In the summer of 1899, when the larger part of this immigration was coming into the North-west it had a most decided detrimental effect on the labour market of the city of Winnipeg at the time. With two or three thousand people laid down in the city for some months with nothing to do, you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, that the labouring men of Winnipeg at that time felt that their interests were jeopardized. They wrote to the Department of the Interior as follows :

> The Winnipeg Trades and Labour Council desire to call the attention of the government to some of the grave evils attending the large importations of Galicians and Doukhobors into this country, especially as they are at present affecting the interests of the unskilled labourers of Canada. We wish the government to clearly understand that we are not opposed to immigration into this country as such, but where public money is being spent to bring these people here, we have a right to demand that their presence should not injure the standard of life of the resident population.
>
> Now, sir, this is just where the working classes are being hurt. These immigrants have been accustomed to a mode of life which enables them to work cheaply, and are thus displacing the Canadian workman who earns his living by manual labour. Last winter hordes of Doukhobors were parading Winnipeg doing such work as wood-cutting, &c., at wages of about 30 cents per day. At other points in Manitoba their competition was equally injurious, and thus, in spite of the written assurance of the local immigration commissioner, Mr. McCreary, that they would not be allowed to compete in the labour market, but would be located on land. We will cite another instance of this injurious competition. A large number of Galicians have been drafted from Yorkton and are being employed on the railroad construction of the South-eastern Railway at rates of wages which we have reason to know are less than current. In the House of Commons recently the Hon. Mr. Blair, discussing the low rates of wages paid trackmen on the Grand Trunk Railway, said the matter was one of supply and demand, but just here the government is paying out public money to increase the supply of labour, while the demand, being normal, is crowding down the wages of the working classes to a point that will not afford even a bare subsistence.
>
> Having these facts in consideration, we therefore petition the government that railroads subsidized by public money shall pay current wages to all classes of labour which they may employ, and thus do something toward checking this unfair and dangerous competition which the working people of Canada are being subjected to.
>
> Signed on behalf of the council by
>
> J. T. MORTIMER,
> President.
>
> W. WHITE,
> Secretary.

Then the Minister of the Interior answered that letter and answered it very fully, and I believe put forward grounds that will hold good to-day. His answer was in part as follows :

I may say that when these people came in, I gave the most positive instructions that they should not, while under the charge of government officers, engage in any work that would bring them into competition with other men. I am sorry to say that owing to the difficulty of handling so many people at one time, my instructions were not in all cases literally carried out. As soon as I found this to be the case, I telegraphed positive instructions, and I have reason to believe that my instructions were carried out from that time forward.

The question of work upon railways is a difficult one to deal with, and I must admit that it has not occurred to me that labouring men in the cities would be affected by the immigrants doing work upon the railways.

This has been one of the experiences in the North-west especially in connection with competition of foreign labour on railways. And although the hon. gentleman from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) told us fairly and eloquently of the bright side of the immigration question, there is a seamy side that he could have referred to and his portrayal of which would have been of very great value to this House. Everybody knows that there must have been evil effects attendant on the immigration to the North-west during the last few years. Every one knows that there must have been a great deal of trouble and of wrong-doing perpetrated on some people, but I am glad to say that a large part of the evil possible has been averted by a thoroughly competent and wide-awake immigration commissioner. It is unfortunate, but it is true that in a large number of cases all manner of means are resorted to in one way or another, to get more value out of these people than the employers wish to give an equivalent for. That is done by various methods and in some cases by the very direct method of absolutely refusing to pay them at all. I wish to say that the immigration commissioner has in some cases, I believe, done that which he had no lawful right to do, and the result of his action was the very laudable one that some employers were obliged to act square and to pay these foreigners what they owed them. Whether they could speak English or not they got fair treatment. In this connection I would say that the Immigration Department might very well add to its other functions in the North-west and establish an employment bureau over which there would be a legal officer whose duty it would be to take hold of these frauds that are daily perpetrated on immigrants who are brought to Canada by this government, to see that they are protected, that the people who employ them pay them their proper wage, and that they should measure their work with proper measures which is often not done now. If this were done a great many of the evils that are now complained of would be abolished, and justice and right would be done. Replying to this letter of the Minister of the Interior, the Trades and Labour Council of Winnipeg stated their general position in regard to immigration, and it is for the purpose of submitting this letter to the House that I refer to the question because it will give a fair idea of the attitude taken by labour on this question :

To the Hon. Clifford Sifton,
Minister of the Interior.

Dear Sir,—We have very carefully considered your letter of the 10th inst. respecting the immigration policy of this country and the effort which you say the government has made to prevent unjust competition against the industrious classes.

You say that 'in your judgment there is no class of population which is more interested in filling up the country with an agricultural population than the labouring men of the cities and towns.'

By what process of reasoning you have arrived at that conclusion you state not; therefore, we trust you will pardon us if we call your attention to some considerations respecting this matter.

Labourers buy goods and sell labour. The welfare of the labouring classes will depend, therefore, on these two conditions, the price of goods and the wages of labour. We, therefore, ask your attention to these two factors.

First, as to the price of goods, how are they affected by the present system of indirect customs duties? Are they made cheap or made dear? Does the government send out agents to the cheapest markets in the world and offer bonuses at so much a pound, or so much a yard, to enable labourers to buy their goods at the lowest possible rate?

You know thoroughly well that not in a single instance has the slightest effort been made to enable workmen to buy cheap. It is altogether in the opposite direction. In the whole proceedings of parliament, from the day of its inception, never had any member made the first proposal or uttered the first hint that taxes should be directed to enable the labouring classes to get their goods at the cheapest possible price. Labourers are never aided to buy cheap.

And, Sir, when labouring men discuss this question of immigration, in my opinion they do right to consider it in connection with the question of the customs duty or the tariff. They can argue and argue consistently that the tariff has the effect of enhancing the price of everything they buy, and therefore of reducing the purchasing power of their earnings. The tariff makes the market high against them in what they have to buy, and the immigration policy, so far as it encourages and bonuses the immigration of labourers, brings them competition. So that their wages are reduced in the one instance by the customs tariff, and in the other their labour, which is the only thing they have to sell, is made cheap.

We now ask your attention to the act of selling. Labourers do not sell goods, they sell labour. Can any of your colleagues point out a single particular in which you enable us to sell dear? Not merely do you subject the labouring classes to the widest possible competition, but you maintain at enormous expense an immigration system whereby you intensify our competition. You crowd the labour market. Even at times when we are striking to secure

some approach to decent wages, and even when many are tramping the streets in vain search for work. When labour sells, it is not merely in a free trade market, it is in a market with competition intensified by your immigration policy.

For the labourer you have an immigration policy which compels him to sell cheap, and which enables the capitalist to buy cheap. When the labourer goes to buy, you raise the market against him, you make his market dear, and you help the capitalist to sell dear.

The immigration policy must be examined with the tariff policy. They are but two parts of the same system, and they are most ingeniously devised to swindle the workingmen for the benefit of the rich every day in the year. . . . . Whether it is the intention of the government to right these wrongs, or at least to seriously grapple with them with a view to a remedy, we do not profess to know, but we do know that justice demands the abolition of the present immigration policy. It is no more, the duty of the government to seek cheap labour for capital than it is to seek cheap goods for labour. What is clearly the duty of the government is to seek to maintain in every possible way the material prosperity of the people, which will be simply impossible as long as one class of society is enabled on every hand to rob the other.

In these letters the Trades and Labour Council of Winnipeg state more fully than the Trades Congress of Canada the position of the labouring people on the immigration policy of the country as it has been operated in the past.

Coming to the immigration department as we have it to-day, I may state that it was with considerable regret that I saw that the same amount of money was being asked this year as was asked last year for the maintenance of that department. I quite understood from the remarks of the hon. Minister of the Interior last year that high water mark had been reached, and that we might look for some reduction in this respect. I think the time has come when the expenditure and the scope of the immigration department might begin to be gradually reduced. I must say that I view with some alarm the growth of the different agencies and the machinery of that department. At some time this government will pass away and another will take its place, and if this machinery then continues to be in existence, though its parts may be changed, it will be set at work again and probably increased. We have seen by the reports from the various officers that there is now a limit to the immigration which can be expected from Great Britain and the northern countries of Europe. The officers themselves report that it matters not what effort is put forward, there is a limit to the immigration which can be expected. Therefore, our efforts and our increased expenditure are being directed to southern Europe ; and while I would not at any time or under any circumstances underrate or put a stigma upon my nation or class of people, yet we must recognize that some immigrants are desirable and that others are less desirable. We know that the most desirable immigrants come from the north of Europe, Great Britain and the United States ; and I think we are making a mistake, and even practically committing a crime against the people in the sparsely settled portions of the country who have to live with those people, in bringing such large numbers from southern Europe. As the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) said, we should not extend our operations there, but should watch the immigration that comes from there. We have already so considerable a population on the prairies from southern Europe, and there are such large reserves yet to be drawn upon, that without the immigration department spending a cent, it may be expected that that immigration will continue in the natural course, as in the United States, where, in spite of all their restrictions, immigration still continues, because people will go where their friends are. It seems to me that it would be wise to take note what class of immigrants we are getting from those countries ; and instead of spending more money, we should curtail the expenditure as far as possible and as quickly as possible, reduce the number of our immigration agencies, and get the department down to something like respectable limits, where it would no longer be looked upon as a place where room can always be made for one or two more appointments. We should begin by lopping something off. This is what the country expects ; at any rate, it is what we expect in the west. There is no doubt that our immigration policy has been successful in that it has brought immigrants into the country ; and I quite agree with what was said by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) that it is recognized by people belonging to both political parties as having been a success. He told us, for instance, of the resolution of the Winnipeg Board of Trade and about their saying that if that was the immigration policy of the government, they hoped it might continue. That may be so. The Winnipeg Board of Trade is a very honourable body; but at the same time it is a class body ; it represents the wholesalers almost exclusively. I remember when the hon. Minister of the Interior was speaking in Winnipeg on this question in the fall of 1899, when it was not a very popular question, he showed us the effect of the policy, and like the hon. member for Selkirk pointed out to-day that it was building up the city ; but the sum and substance of his remarks was this, that in five years there would not be a wholesaler in Winnipeg but would say that this policy was the best. Granted that the wholesalers may say so ; but we want some attention paid to the settler and the labourer. We feel that a government which can spend so much money on a matter of this kind, which is looked upon as outside the regular

limits of government, should give more attention to the ordinary citizen of the country and his conditions of life. The money now spent on immigration, if capitalized, would amount to $15,000,000 or $20,000,000; and if that money were put in charge of a commission and spent wisely in the North-west, it could be made a better immigrant drawing agency than we have to-day, and would not be attended with the evils of the present system. I hope, Mr. Speaker, to see a curtailing of this expenditure on immigration.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I would not have spoken on this question were it not for some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Alberta. But first I would like to refer to a few of the statements made by the last speaker (Mr. Puttee). He discussed the immigration question from a labour standpoint, as affecting the labour interests in Winnipeg. But very few of the people he spoke about are to be found in Winnipeg. No doubt, when first brought in, they might have affected the labour market for a few weeks, but after they got out to the locations, I do not see how they could have interfered with that market. No doubt these people have done a certain amount of work on our railways, but if it had not been for them we could not have constructed our railway lines because it was impossible to get Canadians to work with pick and shovel when times were so prosperous on the farm. The hon. gentleman appeared to imagine he was talking for the whole of the North-west, but certainly the people are not in accord with his view. What the people want is a larger expenditure on immigration. The more immigrants we get into the country, the better it will be for all classes. I do not think that the small amount paid by the department in promoting immigration has been badly spent. Mr. Daly, when he was Minister of the Interior, inaugurated what he called a progressive immigration policy, and according to the figures, you will find that for the last three years, before the late govment went out of office, it had brought in 79,000 people at a cost of over a half million dollars. But in the last two years this government has brought in 119,000, at a cost of only $26,000 more than the late government paid for bringing in 79,000 people. That certainly speaks well for the administration of the Immigration Department.

The hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) certainly deserves credit for having brought out the crushing reply which was administered to him by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary). In discussing the Galicians and the Doukhobors, he showed that he did not know very much about the question. I happen to know something about these people, having employed both. I have had Doukhobors working for me and now have them in my house. I have had men and women working for me and am, therefore, in a better position to judge than my hon. friend from Lennox. The hon. member for Alberta said he knew more about this question than anybody else in this House. Well, I would not like to say that I know more about it than any other hon. gentleman, because I think that the hon. member for Selkirk, who has been immigration commissioner for four years, has demonstrated this afternoon that he knew more about it than perhaps any other man in this House. The hon. member for Alberta has taken some dislike to these people, but he has no right to say that in expressing his dislike he is voicing the sentiment of the whole North-west. He has no right to speak for the people of the west, but only for those of his own constituency. The immigration of the Doukhobors was not promoted in the first place by this government, but by the late government, and in this I think they did what was right. It is unreasonable to expect that with our great territories, stretching west from the great lakes, we should wait for their development by the sons of farmers from the other provinces. In the county of Alberta there are 96,000 square miles of territory. Assiniboia is about the same extent, and the county I represent has an extent of 110,000 square miles of good agricultural lands. Are we to be asked to wait until the sons of the people of older Canada will come out and settle that country. I like to see the Galicians coming out there because they are very good settlers. If we are to wait to populate our western territories with the sons of English farmers, I am afraid that our people will find there is a terrible lot of money spent with very little result. The hon. member for Alberta spoke of millions of these people who are in Galicia and may come here in the near future. Well, 60,000 of these were accepted as desirable immigrants in the United States last year, and from my own observation they will make very desirable settlers.

The Galicians may not have much capital when they come in, but when they settle on the soil they are there for good. And, if the government advances them any money or loans them seed-grain or gives them any other assistance, the government may be very certain that it will get back that money, every dollar of it, with interest. In my own district I have a lot of Galicians. And if the Minister of the Interior can send us more Galicians they will be welcome. If my hon. friend from Alberta is not satisfied with these in his district, let him send them to my district and I will be very glad. For, those we have there are doing remarkably well. I have heard it said in this House and out of it and have seen it in the press that these people were immoral and dishonest. My knowledge of the Galicians lead me to believe that there is as high a percentage of honesty among them as there

is among any other people of the country or out of it. There are exceptions, of course ; but these exceptions are not enough to condemn a whole class. I attended an agricultural fair last fall at which several Galicians had exhibits. And one of those exhibits was the finest hog I ever saw outside of Toronto fair. The Galicians took as many prizes as any other class in proportion to the number of their entries. The hon. member for Alberta says they will not assimilate, and he went on to say that they would block the establishment of school districts. That may have happened in Alberta, but it has not happened in my district. The Galicians have a thirst for knowledge, and they want schools established. There are many ranchers in that country, Canadians and others, who would do more to prevent the starting of school districts than these Galicians would. Now, I have a few words to say with regard to the Doukhobors. I have employed them. I have had a Doukhobor woman in my house for the last year, and she is a first-class servant; and I have had her husband working for me, and he is a first-class man. They have a boy of six or seven years old, and he is attending the public schools under the direction of his parents, and he speaks English as well as my own boy does. I do not share the fear of my hon. friend from Alberta that these people will not assimilate. Why, when the Mennonites were settled here twenty-two or twenty-three years ago, exactly the same things were said about them. I do not see much difference between the Doukhobors and the Mennonites so far as the objections that are raised are concerned. The Mennonites were placed on land in Manitoba that was not considered good for anything. But let hon. gentlemen opposite go to that country and see the perfect paradise that these people have made out of the district that they have settled, and I am sure they will not criticise this class of immigration as they have been doing. The older people among the Mennonites remain in Manitoba, but the young men are moving out. Hundreds of them are coming to my district. And these young people abandon the old customs of their fathers. At Rosthern we have several thousands of Mennonites, Germans and others. They have started public school districts all over. They have built two large roller mills, and they have established a town of several hundred population, and in the seven years since they started, they have exported about half a million bushels of grain. This goes to show that these people will develop and the second generation at any rate will be all right. I think that the money that has been spent by the department in the last three years has been well spent. We see the effect in the homestead entries. In the last year of the last government, the entries numbered about 1,500, and last year they have increased to nearly 7,000. There is another class of immigration that we are receiving and concerning which very little has been said—people from the United States. The hon. member for Alberta said there were about a million Canadians in the United States, and that it was desirable to get them back. So it is. And since this government came into power these people are coming back—hundreds and thousands of them—not only into the North-west, but into Quebec and other parts of the Dominion. Those who come to the North-west are first-class settlers. The knowledge of a prairie country that they have gained in the United States fits them to do well in our country. We are getting from the United States also a great many Germans and other foreigners, many of whom have been in the United States for twenty-five or thirty years but who find that their holdings are too small for their large families of boys, and they are selling out their land where they get $40 to $50 an acre, and are moving into the North-west Territories. And they do not come empty-handed. Some of them are bringing $10,000, some of them $20,000 in hard cash to be spent in the North-west, besides all their stock and other things. We are getting thousands and thousands of these people. Hon. gentlemen opposite never give the government credit for anything of that kind; they can only howl against the Galicians and the Doukhobors. In one sense they must be glad these people have come in, for otherwise, so far as the west is concerned, hon. gentlemen opposite would have no policy. And hon. gentlemen can see by the majorities given to the Liberal candidates that the people of that country take very little stock in it all. It may have had some effect here in the east, but, so far as the North-west is concerned it had no effect. In my own district the development is something wonderful. There is an Indian reserve that had never been taken up by the Indians. It was opened up for settlement three years ago. This reserve is about ten miles square, and there is a lot of good country all around it. I passed over that track three years ago, and there was nothing there—it was a wilderness. Last fall at the time of the election I had occasion to go through it again, standing on a little hill I counted fourteen windmills on top of big bank barns. I saw houses there that were as good as any in the town in which I live. I went into one of them and found it furnished as well as a house in town. I saw ten and fifteen teams of horses working there. One man told me that he had brought in $25,000 in cash, besides his implements, horses, cattle, &c. That gentleman has a section of land under cultivation this year and next year he will have two sections. That is an example of what is going on all over the North-west, and what has been going on since the present minister took over the office and

adopted his present policy with reference to immigration. I am sorry to hear hon. members, particularly those from my own section, talk about cutting down the amount of money spent on immigration. Why, the country is large enough to sustain a population of 60,000,000, and you must spend money to populate it.

Put four or five millions of people in there: If you are getting into the public treasury something like $50,000,000 out of the five or six millions of people that we have now, you will get $80,000,000 or $90,000,000 when you have increased the population by that number. What would the $400,000 a year that we are spending on immigration amount to in comparison to that? Every good settler you put on the soil is worth thousands of dollars to the whole people of this country. The people of the east are interested in this question as well as we are, because, as the development of that country goes on, the development of the eastern part goes on. What supports the manufacturing industries of this country? The very people that consume the products that are manufactured, and we in the west are the greatest consumers in the whole Dominion of certain classes of products. Look at the amount of agricultural machinery we use in that country. We manufacture nothing, we produce grain; and I submit, with all due deference to the member for Alberta, that I do not care who it is that tears up the prairie and grows the grain, he is an accession to that country, although he may not be as cleanly as my hon. friend would have us think. With reference to the Doukhobors, there is no more cleanly people in the world, in their dress, and in their houses, or a more thrifty people. They have not been placed on the best land in the country. In my district they have been placed on the very worst portions of the land. There was a colony placed at the elbow of the Saskatchewan river, on land that no person else would take up. Even the Mennonites, the Germans, would not take it up. They have been there for two years, and they have good crops of grain. They have the finest gardens I ever saw. When I went into Battleford last fall I saw them with wagon loads of vegetables, peddling them in the town, they even had cucumbers. That town has been in existence for twenty-two years, and I do not think we ever saw a cucumber sold there until these Doukhobors came in. They are very thrifty and able-bodied men. They get work on the railroad and I want to say for the benefit of the representatives of the labour organizations in this House, that they do not cut wages, they will not work for low wages. They go and earn money, and the women and boys and the old men stay at home and do the farm work. When the men come back with their money in the fall they invest it in cattle, in sheep, in horses, horses for the purpose of breaking up the prairie and assisting in the development of the country. I say these people are getting along, and it is too bad that, for the sake of making a little cheap political capital out of this thing, it should be made a party question, and that these people should be abused as they have been abused in the party press of this country. That proclamation or manifesto that was published, and which the hon. member for Selkirk spoke about, is the work of only one crank. There are cranks amongst all classes. I venture to think you will find cranks in the city of Montreal, and other places, who will send out manifestos in favour of the Boers. That class exist all over the world, do you wonder that there is one amongst six or seven thousand Doukhobors? I know the Doukhobors well, I live pretty close to them, and I have seen them working, and I know they are satisfied and happy; they are pleased with the liberty that they have here. They are good citizens, not troublesome to any person, they earn their living and pay their debts, and any people who do that are a desirable class of people. I wish to say in conclusion, that if the Minister of the Interior has any more Galicians, and the hon. member for Alberta does not wish them sent into his district, I should be happy to see the minister send them into the district of the Saskatchewan, because I think they are going to make a very good class of people. They have already commenced to marry with other classes of people, and, I understand, that is one of the objections the hon. member for Alberta has to them. There is another class of people that I will mention, that were brought in when the hon. gentlemen were in power, that is, a class of people from France brought into Duck Lake, Saskatchewan. They came in without any money, practically, and to-day, taking them from the standpoint of Ontario and Quebec, these men would be considered wealthy. There is hardly one of them who has not fifty or sixty head of cattle all paid for, their implements paid for, raising 1,000 to 3,000 bushels of grain, owing nobody in the world. They are picking up our habits and our language. They are law-abiding citizens, and I think if the minister can promote more immigration of that kind from Normandy or Brittany, it will be a good thing for the North-west Territories. I would be pleased to welcome them, or any other hard-working man, who is willing to take off his coat and go to work.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I shall not waste much time in attempting to reply to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Davis), or to the wishy-washy speech of the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), who tried to steer to every point of the compass, but without pronouncing a definite opinion in any respect. When I was listening to the member

for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), the impression created in my mind was, that the government had made a mistake in not having made that hon. member the immigration commissioner in Europe. He has evidently missed his vocation in studying law. Judging from his speech to-night, he would have far surpassed those commissioners and agents who have been sent over by the Minister of the Interior to promote immigration from the countries of Europe. I have another fault to find with him. For more than 1800 years we had never heard from the Galatians. Since the time that the apostle Paul wrote his epistle to them, we had heard very little about them until to-night. But, the member for Guysborough has resurrected them. To-day we have the member for Guysborough giving the highest character to those Galatians. For 1,800 years we have been asking what had become of them, and now, to our surprise, the member for Guysborough brings the Galatians into our view, and gives them a certificate of character. The member for Guysborough also has a grand eulogy for these Galicians, that some persons call Galatians. There are no people in any country, apparently, to equal the Galicians and the Doukhobors, except himself, the hon. member for Guysborough. He has a sneer for the Englishman who comes to this country. It is true, he has a little eulogy for the Irishman and the Scotchman, but they are not to be compared with the Doukhobor and the Galician. I am told that the Galicians had not been a year in this country until the authorities in Winnipeg found it necessary to hang two of them for murder. That was not a very good recommendation to start with, but apparently that does not count for much with the member for Guysborough.

Mr. McCREARY. Those two men were brought in under the former Conservative government ; they were hang-dogs.

Mr. WALLACE. That is very clever, and the Minister of Customs is overwhelmed with laughter. Two Galicians were hung, and the only reply of the member for Selkirk is, that they were brought in by the Conservatives when they were in power. If the Conservatives made a mistake and brought in a few of them, what are we to say of this government, who, having known the character of their men, and having assisted to hang two of them, went to work and brought in 16,000 more of these very admirable Christian characters ? The great test, the only test, the member for Guysborough will recognize, is their ability to grow wheat. If they can grow wheat it does not matter whether they are Mormons, whether they turn their wives away, whether they break the laws of the land, whether they ever become Canadian citizens in the true sense of the word, and British subjects ; that does not matter a straw with the member for Guysborough, so long as they can grow wheat. It does not matter a straw to the hon. member for Guysborough if they can only grow wheat. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) has the same argument. He repeats in parrot-like fashion the statement of the hon. member for Guysborough. Let them grow wheat, let Mr. and Mrs. Doukhobor be good manservant and maidservant in my household and I shall ask for nothing more. I agree with the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), whose able speech to-night upon this question deserves to be read and considered by every Canadian because he has laid down the true principles which should guide the government of the people in the matter of immigration into this country. Sir, it is true that the great bulk of the population of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and latterly of the province of British Columbia, is made up of people from the eastern provinces of Canada. The proof of it, if proof were necessary, is shown in one fact that I shall state, that in the province of Ontario this year the Minister of Education, in his report, states that there are about 7,000 less children attending the public schools in Ontario than there were in the previous year. I have a letter from the Minister of Education of the province of Quebec in which he says that there are a thousand less children attending the public schools, or what are considered to be public schools in Quebec, than there were in the former year. What has become of these children ? Their parents and themselves have gone to the North-west Territories. They have built up the country very largely, together with Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchman from the old land. The hon. member for Guysborough, though he has a little word of commendation for the Irishman and the Scotchman, sneers at the Englishmen. Mr. Speaker, the time has gone by when an Englishman need be put out at the sneer of the hon. member for Guysborough. The Englishman has taken his part with the Irishman and the Scotchman in civilizing the world. That illustrious trio, not only on land but on the sea, have upheld the honour of the British flag, they have upheld the honour of the greatest nation that the world has ever seen and they have promoted the colonization and settlement of the four quarters of the globe. You cannot go to any civilized or uncivilized part of the earth to-day but the Englishman, the Irishman and the Scotchman have been there engaged in the promotion of civilization, commerce and Christianity. The sneers of the hon. member for Guysborough will not be considered of very great importance when we look at the illustrious history of the Englishman in all ages and no less than in the age in which we are living to-day. Next, the hon. gentleman speaks of the Mennonites as being an admirable example of foreigners being brought into Canada and paying their debts. He said that those men who decried and

deprecated the introduction of these men in the past will look very small to-day. In this case he has only to look at his friends around him, because they were the men, when the Conservative party were in power, who denounced and opposed the introduction of the Mennonites whom he eulogized so highly to-day. But, the hon. gentleman was, in his speech, from beginning to end, constantly harping upon the fact that the Doukhobors and Mennonites paid their debts. That was another evidence of the desirability of immigration. I would be rather of the opinion, from his constant reference to the fact that these people paid their debts, that there were some of the more desirable class of immigrants from the British Islands who did not pay their debts and that the hon. member for Guysborough was perhaps let in a little by some of these chaps. But, however that may be, the fact that a man has to pay his debts if he is worth it is only something that characterizes Canadians as a people. We all pay our debts.

An hon. MEMBER. No, we do not.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, the hon. member who interrupted and said that we do not, is evidently speaking for himself. I am sure that he is not speaking for anybody on this side of the House and I would be sorry to think that he was speaking for any of his colleagues on that side of the House, so that we will leave him as the solitary example of the men who will not pay their debts. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), this afternoon, when I was out, though I was listening to most of his speech, made some reference, I am told, to the prosperity and progress made in the town and district of Yorkton, North-west Territories, and gave my name as one who had participated in that prosperity. I have quite an intimate knowledge of that. We formed a colonization company more than eighteen years ago and it is a matter of very great pride to myself, personally, that, in the last local election, that district had more than 1,000 recorded votes at the election. We sent the settlers 100 miles in from the railway at that period. We complied as a colonization company with every condition that the government had laid down, which I do not think another company did as well as we did. At any rate, we brought in the right kind of settlers. We brought in settlers from old Canada as well as some from the old land.

Mr. McCREARY. If the hon. gentleman heard that I reflected in any way upon him or upon the company of which he has spoken, he is mistaken. 'Hansard' will show him, if he reads it to-morrow, that I merely said that the value of the land owned by that company had increased largely, owing to the fact of that immigration having gone in there. I did not refer to the colonization company of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) is president, in a disparaging manner, but simply mentioned that fact.

Mr. WALLACE. I am glad to hear that. But, I was proceeding to say that that company, and I think it is a matter of very great pride to every member of the company, turned the tide of the emigration of those young men who, in former years were making their way to the United States, and directed them to our own North-west Territories. Such men as the Merediths and other young men who went in there and have become prosperous business men and farmers, were among those whom we induced to settle there. I do not believe that there is any portion of the North-west Territories or Manitoba that is enjoying greater prosperity than the district I allude to, with which my name has been connected and to which I have devoted a large share of attention in years gone by and in all the years since. But, I say further that when the hon. member for Selkirk says that prosperity is largely due—that is as I understood him——

Mr. McCREARY. Partly due.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, partly due—to the fact that the Doukhobors are settled near there. I do not share that opinion with him. The Doukhobors are settled thirty or forty miles away from Yorkton and they are the exclusive settlers in that part. But when people say they are going into Yorkton they take objection to these Doukhobors and say: Oh, that is where the Doukhobors live. The fact that the name of Yorkton is connected with the Doukhobors, although they are forty or fifty miles away from Yorkton, has been detrimental to the whole district. Yorkton being the terminus of the Manitoba and North-western Railway, the settlers from all these districts to the north must leave the railway at Yorkton, and as people get it into their heads that the Doukhobors are settled in Yorkton the prosperity of that part of the country has been retarded. I do not believe that the Doukhobors are a desirable class of settlers. Those men who have been proved to so lightly regard the marriage tie that by their rules and regulations they discard their wives whenever they wish, and who in other respects are guilty of loose and improper conduct, are not the kind of people we want in Canada. I do not know that we want them to assimilate with our Canadian people, but anyway they do not assimilate. The government made a mistake in putting them into a separate community, where they have exclusive lordship over the soil in that whole section of the country. If they are a desirable class of settlers, they should be sent to mingle with the other people, so as to be taught Canadian instincts; the value of the liberty we enjoy, and the kind of institutions we live under. The Doukhobors will not learn

these things themselves and they apparently do not want to learn them. I regret that the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is not here to-night, as I wanted to bring something to his attention. His organ, his newspaper, as I am told, the Halifax Chronicle, pronounced an opinion about these Doukhobors which I will read for the edification of the Minister of the Interior, to show him how his colleague views these Doukhobors; if the Halifax Chronicle represents his views.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). It does not represent his views.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Nor the views of anybody else on this side of the House.

Mr. WALLACE. I am told the Minister of Finance was the editor of the Halifax Chronicle.

The PRIME MINISTER. That was a good many years ago.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Is he the editor now ?

Mr. WALLACE. I have failed to hear that the Halifax Chronicle has ceased to be the organ of the government.

Mr. KENDALL. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the Halifax Chronicle is to-day the organ of the company combines in Nova Scotia. Some of us do not recognize it as the organ of the Liberal party.

Mr. WALLACE. I am glad to have that information because to my mind it is one and the same thing as the organ of the Liberal party.

Mr. COCHRANE. Only ten times more so.

Mr. WALLACE. Referring to the immigration of the Doukhobors, the Halifax Chronicle says :

> It is well perhaps that this matter has come up in this way, at this time. Not much damage can yet be done. The few thousands of foreign riffraff so far brought into the Dominion can probably be swept out of the country or got rid of in some way without serious injury. But we want no more of it. Immigrants have recently landed in Halifax, and not a few of them, whom all that have seen them report as anything but a promising acquisition to any civilized land, and as a most probable good riddance to their native countries.

I was very much struck with the charming description which the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) gave of these good and amiable Christian people when they first saw the shores of Halifax, but I forgot that a man who was at Halifax at the time watching these Doukhobors has written an entirely different description from that given by the hon. member for Guysborough, who did not happen to be there at all.

> It is revolting in the extreme to think of blood such as this being destined to mix with our good, clean British and French Canadian blood to its certain corruption. The early filling up of our vacant lands is a small matter as compared with the preservation of the wholesomeness of our population. What would be thought of the sanity of the owner of a mansion and the father of a growing family who should go into the slums and fill his vacant chambers with their denizens to the pollution of his home and the probable ejection of his unborn children? There is no necessity for reckless haste in peopling the North-west. Better let the prairies lie fallow as they have lain since the waters receded from their face than plant them with residents who will be in but not of Canada ; and whom shall we be ashamed to acknowledge as bearers of the Canadian name. Population is desirable—but not undesirable population. If the department would permit us to address it in Latin we should say to it, ' Festina lente '—which, being interpreted, means ' go slow.'

I would refer that opinion of the candid friend, the Halifax Chronicle, to the serious attention of the Minister of the Interior, who, I hope, has an open mind upon this question, because last year he apologized for the introduction of the Galicians and the Doukhobors, and said there would be scarcely any further immigration of the Doukhobors to this country, as the supply had been exhausted. It seemed a relief to the minister (Hon. Mr. Sifton) to be able to make that announcement to the House.

Mr. McCREARY. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) tell me who is the present editor of the Halifax Chronicle.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary) that the present editor of the Halifax Chronicle——

Mr. WALLACE. Now, I must object to this kind of thing. One gentleman over there gets up to ask me a question and another one of them gets up to answer it for me. I object to that. I contend that that game won't work.

Mr. McCREARY. I merely wanted to find out if it was a certain gentleman who used to edit the Free Press at Winnipeg, a Mr. McLellan, I think.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) will have to go elsewhere for that information.

Mr. McCREARY. I thought so.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not concerned as to who is the editor of the Halifax Chronicle, I am only concerned in the wisdom of his remarks.

Mr. McCREARY. We are concerned in the west, as we know the gentleman.

Mr. WALLACE. I am concerned with the fact that there is one Liberal newspaper in the country that gives words of sound wisdom to its readers, because we do not always find that to be the case. Has the hon. member for Selkirk anything to say

against the editor of the Halifax Chronicle, even if he should turn out to be that gentleman from the Winnipeg Free Press ?

Mr. McCREARY. I say we know that gentleman, that is all. In the west he is pretty well known.

Mr. WALLACE. Merely knowing does not convey any idea to this House unless the sneer that accompanies the remark means that he is a disreputable character or an unreliable man. I would like to hear the hon. member, who knows all about him, tell us what his opinion is of this editor of the Halifax Chronicle.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Would the hon. gentleman allow me to say that he was not in Halifax when the Doukhobors arrived, and he never saw any of them, and he was not at that time an editor of the Chronicle.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to know where the hon. member gets his information as to the whereabouts of this individual.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I can give the hon. gentleman that information if he wants it.

Mr. WALLACE. Apparently every man in the Liberal party who has an independent opinion, and who is not afraid to express his independent opinion, is hooted down by the members of the Liberal party, and we have the hon. member for Selkirk and the hon. member for Victoria, N.S., both casting their sneers at this gentleman. It would be better for them to reply to his statements than to asperse the character of the man. The important matter to us is whether his statements are true and his opinions sound. In my judgment his opinions are exceedingly sound, and represent the proper and true opinion of the people of Canada. Now, the hon. member for Selkirk told us in glowing and eloquent terms what they were going to do in the future, and the great results that were going to be accomplished by this enormous expenditure on immigration, more than double the expenditure during the last years of the Conservative regime. Why did the hon. gentleman not tell us of the great results that have flowed from the policy and the acts of the government of to-day ? We were told that he was the immigration commissioner, and the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) told us that he had handled in one year $90,000 of the money of the people of Canada. Well, we would like to know where were the good results ; or had he just sown the seed and expected that the good results would follow in future years ? He was not able to point to very great improvement, although he might fairly have done so. He said there was a larger immigration into Manitoba and the Territories in the last three years than there had been in the previous three years. I have no doubt that is true, because Providence blessed the North-west during those three years with the most abundant crops perhaps which had ever been enjoyed there, and prices were fairly good, at any rate profitable. There was every inducement, therefore, for the people to go up and possess the land. The railroads had opened up the country ; the people were becoming better acquainted with the resources of the country. I think myself that any man residing in any of the older provinces who is not satisfied with the conditions which obtain there, cannot do better than seek his fortune in our own North-west and British Columbia, where there is a variety of occupation, where there is mineral wealth as well as agricultural wealth, and where there are all the conditions to make a prosperous and wealthy people. So that we cannot advertise our resources in those parts of the Dominion too much, even to our own people; and we should say to them, If you are going to change your condition, if you are going to farm, farm in our own Dominion, because the conditions are more favourable there than they are in any other part of the world for increasing the prosperity and wealth of the people. The hon. member for Selkirk eulogized the Doukhobors and Galicians, followed by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), and the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), in the same strain. There was nothing too good to be done for those people, whom I for my part consider to be an undesirable element of our population. But I was reading yesterday in one of our Ottawa papers a contrast to these eulogies in the shape of the treatment which some of our own Canadian citizens received. Here is an article in the Ottawa Evening Journal of yesterday :

The Fox Bay Settlers are Leaving Manitoba—They Claim to have been Set Down in a Swamp in the Dauphin District—Sickness and Death Followed to Many, and those who Survive will Return to the East to Find a Living.

(Special to the Journal.)

Quebec, April 11.—The Fox Bay settlers are on their way back from the Dauphin district of Manitoba, where they suffered much from typhoid and then la grippe. Twelve of their number died. They were set down in a swamp and have been nearly drowned out.

Richard Whiting has arrived with his own and his decaased brother's family, making a party of eleven.

Edward Osborne and family are on the way, making as many more. Their tale is one of hardship and loss. Asked what they intended doing and whether they contemplated returning to Anticosti, Whiting said he intended settling down in Quebec city, where his family might enjoy the privileges of civilization, and that if he and his two brothers could get a little help, he would purchase a second-hand schooner with

which they would go below and engage in fishing in the waters with which they were acquainted.

That is the treatment given to loyal Canadian citizens. I say that the treatment of these Fox Bay settlers from the Island of Anticosti forms a black period in the history of Canada. They were deprived of their homes to which by all the usages of this country they were fairly entitled. There is no part of Canada where the settler, who performs his duties as those Fox Bay settlers did for twenty-eight or thirty years, is refused permission to retain the land on which he has squatted or settled. They were fishermen, and farmers in a small way, and God-fearing, orderly citizens. They were driven out of their homes and transported—what do I hear ? The hon. member for Bellechase (Mr. Talbot) had better be careful of himself ; we know his history pretty well.

Mr. TALBOT. Why do you not tell it if you know it ?

Mr. WALLACE. I have no hesitation in telling it.

Mr. TALBOT. Speak it out.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. Make him keep order. I am speaking to the question and giving my opinions, and I hear various improper and ill-bred interruptions from that quarter.

Mr. TALBOT. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I have not made a single remark on anything he has said. I was speaking to a gentleman here.

Mr. WALLACE. I heard some improper remarks from where the hon. gentleman sits, anyway.

Mr. TALBOT. I do not care what you heard.

Mr. WALLACE. I was saying that these Fox Bay settlers were a desirable class of people to have retained in the Dominion of Canada. If they were driven from their homes by any process of law, it was a process of law which worked untold hardships on those men. After the season was over, and when it was impossible for them to cultivate the ground and earn their living, they were taken and placed in a district which was unfit for them to live in under any circumstances, and especially at a time of the year when it was impossible for them to make a living. Those men, women and children should have been the wards of the government, and those caresses and that assistance given to undesirable people should have been reserved for deserving Canadians like the Fox Bay settlers.

This government has an army of immigration agents in the old country. They have Mr. Devlin, formerly a member of this House, as immigration agent in the city of Dublin, and according to the statement of my hon. friend from Lennox he has not had very great success. Out of 45,000 emigrants who left Ireland during the past year, only 765 came to Canada, or one out of every sixty. I am sorry that Irishmen or Englishmen or any man in the British Islands, when he moves, should not come to the Dominion, because we can offer him inducements not exceeded by any other country in the world. We can offer him the freest institutions, the greatest liberty, and that variety of occupation without which no country ever became great and prosperous.

We have Mr. Preston as a kind of roving commissioner with authority over all the other agents. Is he placed over Lord Strathcona, and does he instruct that illustrious gentleman how he should conduct immigration matters in the city of London ? I presume he has the same authority over Lord Strathcona that he has over other immigration agents. We find that this roving agent has struck some new class of the population in Asia, and would like to have the fullest information from the hon. minister as to whether the government intend promoting the immigration of this class into Canada and can certify that they are a desirable class. I do hope the hon. gentleman will take warning by the mistakes his department has made in the past and try to bring out a desirable class of people—men from the northern parts of Europe, men from Great Britain, who are proved colonizers and settlers, and men like the Germans who assimilate with our people and become Canadian citizens, and are as proud of their country of adoption as of the country they left behind them. We do not want numbers regardless of any other consideration, which has been the text of the hon. member for Guysborough and other gentlemen, because population is not the great desideratum after all. If it were, China would be the greatest country in the world. What we want is the right stamp of men to lay the foundations of liberty and freedom in this country. We want those qualities which have made Canadians not inferior, but, I believe, superior to the people to be found anywhere else on the globe, and do not want those qualities to become degenerated by the importation of improper foreigners.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR Hon. Clifford Sifton). I have had occasion in this House to discuss that phase of the immigration question which has been discussed at such great length this afternoon and evening, and I should hardly deem it necessary to place again upon the records of the House the views I have already expressed at some length on a former occasion, not entertaining the same desire to repeat the same sentiments and opinions a number of times as some of my hon. friends opposite seem to have.

I have had during the past few years the pleasure of listening to the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Wallace)

upon a variety of occasions and subjects, and I have never heard him make a speech in this House which was a fair presentation of the case, even from his own standpoint. I have never heard him resume his seat without appealing to the prejudices of some class of the community, and he has this evening well sustained the reputation he has achieved of never neglecting an opportunity to strengthen himself politically by appealing to those prejudices which every statesman ought to endeavour to allay. This evening he followed his usual tactics by dragging in by the heels a reference to the case of the Fox Bay settlers, which has no relevancy whatever to the subject we are discussing. That is purely a domestic matter not connected at all with the immigration policy of this department, one which ought to be discussed fairly, in the light of all the facts, properly stated, in order that the people may have a fair and proper conception of what has been done so as to decide whether or not the government is blamable.

But that is not my hon. friend's method of discussion. His method is to seize upon some ex-parte statement and proceed to discuss it. He does not even take the responsibility himself, but reads from a newspaper, in order that an unfair and dishonest statement of the facts may go before the people. In the experience I have had in connection with the administration of the affairs of this country, I do not know of any body of people who, having no claims on the government more than any other citizens of the country, have received such liberal, such considerate, such judicious treatment as those to whom my hon. friend referred. If they have not been successful, I regret it.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. minister tell us at what time of the year they were sent up to the North-west ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not remember the exact time.

The PRIME MINISTER. If I may be allowed a word—it was in the month of July or August.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There has never been a small body of people—or a large body for that matter—who have gone as new settlers to Manitoba or the North-west Territories, who have received the same kind and constant attention at the hands of this government and the officers of this government, as those to whom the hon. gentleman has referred. I need not say anything more about that. It has nothing to do with the discussion in hand, but was dragged in by the hon. gentleman in pursuance of his ordinary policy—for I am within the judgment of the House when I say that that hon. gentleman never rises without appealing to the prejudices of the people. My hon. friend has not thought fit to be extremely careful in the statements he has made. One hon. gentleman on this side of the House said something about the Mennonites. There was no necessity for the hon. member for West York to travel outside the record to discuss the question of who brought the Mennonites into this country. He made the statement that it was the Conservative government which brought them in and the Liberals who opposed, as being the immigration of an undesirable people. The hon. gentleman's knowledge in this respect is greatly at fault. If he will look at the records of the House, he will find that the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was the man who made the loan and sent the Mennonites to the North-west amidst the denunciation of the political friends of the hon. gentleman—denunciations against his political character such as are addressed against us at this moment in reference to the Doukhobors.

Mr. WALLACE. I repeat the statement I made—I did not refer to the loan of the money—that the bringing in of the Mennonite settlers was arranged by the government of Sir John Macdonald, before they went out of office.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Mennonites were sent to Manitoba as part of a policy which involved a loan which was arranged by the government of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. At page 379 of 'Hansard,' of 1875, the hon. gentleman will find the resolution with regard to this money.

Mr. WALLACE. They were in the country long before that, and the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sifton) cannot deny it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This policy of settling these people there was met with abuse of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie for bringing them in, precisely as we are being abused now for bringing in the Doukhobors. We have been carrying out a policy of immigration which to-night for the first time has been denounced by a man sitting on the front bench of the Conservative party. For, as my hon friend from Selkirk well said, Sir Charles Tupper, when leader of his party, carefully refrained in any discussion that took place in this House, from expressing himself in any such terms as those that have been used by the hon. gentleman opposite in this debate. And, as I have shown, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) has spoken in total ignorance of the record of his own party on that question. Then, the hon. gentleman did not like the reference that was made by my hon. friend from Selkirk on the subject of the success attending the operations, in the Yorkton district, of the York Farmers' Colonization Company with which he is connected. I have sometimes been surprised at the statements made by the hon. gentleman in this House, but never so much so as at the remarks he has made in regard to that particular locality. One

would have thought from the hon. gentleman's remarks that the York Farmers' Colonization Company had peopled that country with those of British lineage and that the miserable Doukhobors and Galicians of that locality were a detriment, and prevented him from getting settlers for his lands. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the year before the Galicians went there, I drove over the York Farmers' Colonization tract, and I saw the abandoned mill, the stones of which had been taken out, and the walls of which stood tenantless, while the thousands of acres of the tract were unoccupied, the hon. gentleman not being able to dispose of the land or to get settlers for it. This will give an idea of the correctness of the information the hon. gentleman has given this House. If he knew the facts, apparently he took pains to forget them before rising to speak. But I call attention also to the spirit of the hon. gentleman's remark. There seemed to be, on his part, a desire to leave a certain impression upon the House, an impression which certainly was not justified by the facts. What justification could the hon. gentleman have for speaking of the record of the Doukhobors and Galicians and saying that they might be murderers or anything else, that we might have had to hang a couple of them, but that the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) did not care so long as they were good servants in his house ? For what purpose was this ? The hon. gentleman sought to leave upon the public mind the impression that these people were of criminal tendency, that they were not of good character morally. I make the statement here that there is not an equal number of people in the Dominion of Canada among whom, for an equal length of time, there has been a lower record of crime than among these people. There is my challenge ; let the hon. gentleman take it up. He has no right to stand up, in this House, and seek to give the people of this country the impression that any class of people in Canada are of criminal tendency or have a criminal record when such is not the case. He said that it had been necessary to hang one of the Galicians. Well, it has been necessary to hang Canadians before this. But I say that the record of these people in connection with crime is not less favourable than that of the best class nationally speaking that can be found in Canada. I was struck with the wisdom of one remark made by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson). He said that as he did not know anything about the Doukhobors he would not express any opinion. If one or two other gentlemen would entertain and act upon the same sentiment, I think a good deal of the time of the House would be saved which has now been wasted.

I quite admit the right of the member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) to have an unfavourable opinion of the Galician people. It does not disturb me much that he has that feeling and expresses himself in an adverse way whenever discussions arises upon the subject in this House. The hon. member for Alberta and I have been friends for a good many years, I have known him for a long time, but I have never heard him express unqualified admiration for anything or any individual. There seems to be something about my hon. friend's constitution which, while it does not affect the keenness of his intellect, prevents him from expressing a favourable opinion about either men or things. Possibly it is a good thing for us to have one or two gentlemen of that class in the House, it keeps us from having too high an opinion of ourselves, and possibly there may be a corrective influence in his criticisms which have a beneficial effect upon us.

I will say one or two words about the general effect of the immigration policy of the government. One would think from the statements which have been made—and I think in that respect the member for Alberta was unfair to the member for Selkirk —one would think that the whole question of immigration as we have dealt with it in the last four years was a question of Doukhobors and Galicians. My hon. friend from Alberta said that the impression left upon his mind by the remarks of my hon. friend from Selkirk was that the prosperity of the North-west in the last few years was due to the influx of Doukhobors and Galicians. Well, I think if the member for Alberta will reflect for a few moments he will not consider that as a fair criticism of the remarks made by the hon. member for Selkirk. The member for Selkirk addressed almost all his remarks, and naturally so, to the criticisms which had been made upon the policy of the government and with the execution of which he had had a great deal to do himself. But my hon. friend from Selkirk knows well, knows better than any other member of this House, the exact proportion of people that have been brought into the North-west through the efforts of this government, and he knows that the Doukhobors and Galicians are comparatively a small proportion of the people that have been brought in there. This talk about the Doukhobors and Galicians has arisen almost entirely from the fact that our friends on the other side, having had for some years past the painful experience of failure in their immigration policy, think there is an opportunity of raising national prejudice against the policy of this government by attacking us upon that question. Forgetful of the record of their own party, careless of consistency so far as that is concerned, they endeavour to attack us particularly upon these two points, and they have endeavoured to lead the public mind to the supposition that we were bringing only these two classes into the country. The very first year after our taking office, something like 700 or 800 people came from the United States into

Manitoba and the North-west Territories; last year, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the organization which we have perfected in the western states, we brought no less than 15,000 settlers from the United States into Manitoba and the North-west Territories. This year our friends from the North-west who are familiar with what is going on at the present time, tell me, and the officers of my department tell me, there will be a considerably larger number. Sir, if the whole of the nearly half million dollars which we have expended had no other result in those three years than to bring those 20,000 people from the western states into this country, it would be one of the best expenditures the Dominion of Canada ever made.

Hon. gentlemen, I presume, were not serious when they said: We will wait, wait, we won't develop the country by bringing in population, but we will wait until the sons and daughters of Canadians spread themselves over the western prairies and become tillers of the soil. My hon. friends do not take the trouble to think what they are talking about. We get a few people in the shape of farmers from the older provinces, but don't my hon. friends know that the average young Canadian to-day does not want to go out on a western farm and grub there as his forefathers grubbed in the wilderness of eastern Canada? The great majority of these young men desire a different kind of life, and they won't go there, and if you get them to go in the first place you cannot get them to stay. That has been to a large extent the experience that we have had in that western country. But, Mr. Speaker, what we should be able to do as a result of populating that country is this, we should be able to furnish those young men with profitable occupations of all kinds in the cities and towns of the west which will be built up upon the prairies, and in the cities and towns of British Columbia where mining and manufacturing interests are developing, where towns are going up upon the prairies about the Saskatchewan. We should be able in those towns and villages to furnish young Canadians occupations of a profitable character and of a class which they will be ready and willing to carry on. That will be the result. When you look over the scope of the development of our western country you will find that within the last three or four years young people from the province of Ontario have not been going to the western states as they did in former years. My hon. friend says we want people from the province of Ontario to go out on to these prairies. Why in the name of common sense did they not get people from the province of Ontario to go out on to those western prairies when they were in power? But not at all, they went to the United States, and it was not until the last two or three years that the movement was entirely stopped, and those young men are now going to Manitoba and the North-west Territories. That is the position, and as a result, thousands and thousands of young men can find a profitable occupation of a professional character, and clerical work of various kinds, all over that vast country.

Sir, I do not propose to discuss the question at greater length. I have only spoken as I did because I was impressed with the idea that the criticism of the hon. gentleman was most unfair and inaccurate, and his remarks were of such a character as to cast an aspersion upon people who had no right to be treated in that way. As I have said in this House before, I have not apologized. The hon. gentleman was not more accurate then than in the other statements he made. I did not apologize for anything the Department of the Interior done in regard to the policy of immigration. The hon. gentleman's statement in that respect was wholly inaccurate. I did not apologize, but I explained frankly to the House what had been done. I do not come before this House at any time for the purpose of saying that everything my department has done is entirely right, that everything my officers have done is absolutely and entirely right. I have spoken fully and frankly, as I always endeavour to do, of the operations of the department in respect to this work of immigration, and explained to the House in respect of the Galicians that though we were quite satisfied we could take care of a certain number of those people, we did not want unduly to increase the number, and we have made certain arrangements for the purpose of curtailing the movement and prevent it from unduly increasing. That is what I said, I did not in any way apologize, but I made a correct statement of what we have done. For my part, Mr. Speaker, so far as this particular class of people is concerned, the small proportion of them that have been taken into the North-west the last four years, I am satisfied that they are a very desirable people, and will make good citizens indeed, I have not the slightest doubt in the world about that. I fully agree with the statements which have been made by the member for Selkirk and the member for Saskatchewan in that respect.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to say a word or two, not for the purpose of detaining the House at any length, but in justice to my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Wallace). The Minister of the Interior has confined his remarks to setting forth the great value of the immigration policy pursued by him as compared with that of his predecessors, and with endeavouring to cast some fine scorn upon the member for West York. But he did not answer anything that my hon. friend from West York said. He has told us that the Galicians are guilty of less crime than any other com-

munity in Canada. I do not know whether that is the case or not, but it is no answer to what the member for West York said. It may be that what the Minister of the Interior said is absolutely correct; but I would point out to the hon. Minister of the Interior that when he makes that statement to the House it would be far better for him to give us some statistics so that we might judge as to the truth of his statement. Is he prepared to give us any statistics to bear out what he says? I will sit down and let him do so if he can give us any. Well then, if he is not capable of giving us these statistics, why does he state to the House a fact of which he can have no knowledge whatever? His ipse dixit is not to be the guide of the House unless he is able to support it by some facts. He also sneered at the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) because that gentleman read a statement from the public press and did not make it on his own responsibility. I should think that the hon. Minister of the Interior is the last person in this House to throw such a sneer at an hon. member across the floor of the House, because, when charges were made in this House which would result in either driving him from public life, or the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) from public life, his followers voted down the motion for investigation which was asked for.

Now, so far as these Doukhobors and Galicians are concerned, I am ready to welcome them to Canada in such numbers as it is likely Canada is able to assimilate, provided they are not coming here with manners and customs which are likely to do injury to the general community in this country. I do not know what the marriage customs of the Doukhobors are, but I took notice that the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), when he was dealing with this question, touched it very lightly. I would like an answer from that hon. gentleman merely for information, because I have no information on that subject myself, beyond what I see in the public press, and have heard in this House. The hon. gentleman seems to be familiar with the facts. Will he state yes or no as to the alleged custom of the Doukhobors putting away their wives without resort to any proceedings in court at all. It has been alleged in the public press, and I do not know whether it is correct or not, that this is a custom which prevails amongst them. I heard my hon. friend say that there has not been a divorce among them for a great many years, but that may be consistent with a custom such as has been referred to. I will give way to the hon. gentleman if he will make a statement on that point.

Mr. McCREARY. I thank my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) for the opportunity of probably making more plain anything which I may have omitted to say this afternoon. I have read the book called The Christian Brotherhood, of which I have a copy in my desk, but that does not explain the marriage ceremony. I have also had many conversations with Doukhobors on this question. I have questioned them very closely about their belief in regard to the after life, and I was convinced from what I learned from them that their ideas were orthodox, that they were in accord with the general ideas held by Protestant people. In regard to their marriage ceremony, as far as I could learn, when a young couple desire to marry the procedure is this: As you know they live in villages, and a great many live in the same house, the grandfather, the father and the grown-sons. There are probably twenty or thirty people living in one house. When a young couple desire to marry the question is studied very closely. Their temperament, their habits, the prospective husband's means of supporting his wife are all considered. The fathers and grandfathers are required to take some time along with the young couple to consider whether or not the couple are suitable in temperament and habits. When it has been finally decided that they are suited for one another, they have a celebration of their own, and all their friends from the village and the neighbouring villages assemble. One of their elders—they do not call them elders—but one of their leading men in the village is supposed to, and as a matter of fact, does perform a certain rite by which he marries the young man and woman. There is no great ceremony about it; a few words are uttered by which they become married. There has never been known to be but one divorce during all the time that this marriage ceremony has existed in Russia. In so far as I can learn these are about the facts. I questioned a great many people, amongst them young Tolstoi and Prince Hilkoff, and as far as I could learn that is the way the marriage ceremony is carried out. As far as leaving their wives is concerned, it is simply ridiculous. Such a thing could not exist for four years and not come under my notice or under the notice of the officials. Such a practice has not been noticed by me. In regard to the marriage ceremony, I think that all that is required is simply a change in the law by which they will be enabled to register their marriages in a little different manner from that in which the Mennonites do, and there will be no trouble whatever.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman say what he has said, and I do not believe, if the customs of the Doukhobors are such as he states, and are otherwise of the character which has been described in this House, that there can be any particular objection to their becoming citizens of this country provided

they can be properly assimilated. But, I do not understand how it happens that such a letter could have been written as seems to have been written by some one in England to one of the Doukhobors in Manitoba with respect to their marriage customs. I am taking the statement that such a letter was written from hon. gentlemen in this House, and from the public press, and if a letter of that kind was written it certainly points to a different conclusion from that which the hon. gentleman has stated. I would think that the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), or the hon. Minister of the Interior, if the customs of these people are not perfectly plain in that respect, might very well satisfy the people of the country by making some definite inquiry into the matter. Surely it is easy enough to find out what their belief is in regard to these matters, and I for one would say that if such a custom as that of divorcing a wife without resorting to the courts prevails, they are not a class of people whom it is desirable to bring into this country. I do not suggest that such is the case, and I know that the hon. member for Selkirk, who has more knowledge of this subject than any other hon. gentleman in this House, says the contrary. Still, I do not understand how it happens that such a letter could have been written.

Mr. McCREARY. I never heard of this letter until I heard of it here to-day. Who wrote this letter, and to whom was it written ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know nothing more of it than that I saw it in the public press, and that I heard what was stated about it here to-day. I do not assert that such a letter was written, nor do I suppose that the hon. member for Selkirk can assert that it was not written. It is a matter that may be inquired into by the hon. Minister of the Interior. If any such letter was written, if any such beliefs are entertained, it would be better that it should be settled once and for all in this country so that public opinion should not be disturbed by these rumours. Public opinion would be quieted by a definite statement from the government or some commission, or officer appointed by the government for the purpose of inquiring into it.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) let me interject a remark which seems to be very important ? Is he aware that the Doukhobors were endorsed and recommended by the Quakers Association of England and of the United States, and does he not think that without knowing much of the religious ceremonies we may depend a great deal upon that endorsation ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not saying a single word against the Doukhobors.

What I am suggesting is, that when these rumours are in the public press, and when they are brought to the attention of the House, the government might very well make such inquiries as would place an authoritative statement before the people of Canada that no such practices had prevailed amongst these people. It is not desirable that public opinion should be influenced by rumours of that kind, which, according to the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. McCreary), are absolutely unfounded.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will understand that it was in that spirit I presented, as an offset against these rumours, the opinion of well known and most respectable organizations in the old country, in the United States and in Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am much obliged to my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) for the suggestion, and I think it affords additional reason why, if injustice is done to these people, they should be cleared in the minds of the population of this country from all such unjust aspersions. It is not conducive to the interests of Canada that these people should be living amongst us, and have their neighbours believe these things of them unjustly. I will not detain the House further with regard to that. I would suggest to the Minister of the Interior that we would like to have an explanation from him, when his estimates come on, as to what he proposes to do with respect to the expenditure for the purpose of inducing immigration from Ireland. The hon. gentleman did not touch at all what seemed to me to be the rather strong case put forward by my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) —namely, that although this government has spent a very large sum of money in Ireland, and should have secured a fair share of the emigration from that country, yet we got only 765 people out of the 45,000 who emigrated from Ireland last year. I need not say that the Irish people are a very desirable class of immigrants for Canada. They form a very large and respectable and important element in my own constituency, and I venture to think that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) cannot expend money to better advantage than in inducing immigration from Ireland to Canada. I may say in passing, that I think, upon the whole, that it might be as well, so far as possible, to direct the best energies of the government to immigration from those countries from which the population of Canada has already been recruited. I refer to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and France, as well as Scandinavia and Germany, countries which possess people of practically the same stock as those of the British Isles. I believe that if we can supply the needs of this country, so far as population is concerned, from those

particular nations, it would be desirable to do so, and that the best efforts of the government should be directed to that end. It may not be a very desirable thing in the future that separate communities of Doukhobors and Galicians, and various other nationalities from Russia and from Central Europe, should be growing up in the middle of the North-west. It may be desirable, to some extent, to have these people, but it is far more desirable to have immigrants from the British Isles, from France and Germany and Scandinavia. I will not detain the House further, but probably when the immigration estimates come up, I will have a word or two to say further.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I desire to call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to the statement made by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), that the question of the observance of the marriage law by the Doukhobor people was discussed by him, when immigration agent, with Mr. Haultain, the Attorney General of the North-west Territories, and that Mr. Haultain took the matter under advisement as to what course should be taken. The North-west Territories has a government of its own, and Mr. Haultain is a gentleman who is fully competent to deal with the matter. I think it would be very much better left under his charge than it would be in the Department of the Interior.

The PRIME MINISTER. At this hour of the morning, I presume the House is not inclined to go into Committee of Supply, and I rise for the purpose of asking leave to withdraw the motion. Before I do so—and if it were not so late I would do it at a greater length—I wish to point out to my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) that he brought the Fox Bay settlers into this debate without any rhyme or reason, and he took occasion to make statements which were not warranted in fact, and which cannot be substantiated.

Mr. WALLACE. What was that ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Everything that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) said. When he stated that these men ought to be the wards of the nation, I would like to know from him under what law can we make any citizen of Canada a ward of the nation ?

Mr. WALLACE. I said that while we were caressing the Doukhobors, surely we could have paid a little consideration to our own people, who were in distress.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) knows very well, that what he calls caressing the Doukhobors is done under the immigration law, and he also knows very well that there is no power under the law to take people from one province into another province of the Dominion. He ought to know, if he does not know, that the Fox Bay settlers have been treated with the greatest consideration by this government ; without our being bound to do anything at all, but simply because of consideration for them. He ought to know, if he does not know, that if they were located on a swamp, as is stated in the paper which he quoted as his authority——

Mr. WALLACE. I simply read the public press.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, and what was his object in reading such statements, to which he will not give the sanction of his authority ? Is it not to raise prejudices in the minds of the community ? He is not prepared at this moment, even after he quoted the newspaper, to endorse it with his authority, but he was ready to incorporate it in his speech, so as to create the impression which I have spoken of. Let me say that if the Fox Bay settlers were settled in a swamp, they were not so settled by the Canadian government, because they were settled upon lands selected by their own friends, who fixed on the vicinity of a lake in order that these settlers, having been seafaring men all their lives, they could still engage in fishing operations. It is too late to discuss the subject at length now, but, I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) that if it pleases him at any other time, I shall be very glad to discuss this subject with him.

Mr. WALLACE. May I be permitted a word in reply. I read the article which appeared yesterday in the Ottawa Evening Journal, and I do not think that every article to which a member feels it his duty to call the attention of the government has to be certified as to its accuracy by the member reading it. The government know the facts. The government know whether these men have been placed in such a locality under such conditions and surroundings as has been stated in that paper. The government should know whether it is true that these men are returning, and that twelve of them died of disease out of a total number of—I cannot say how many, but I think sixty or seventy at the outside.

The PRIME MINISTER. Sixty-one.

Mr. WALLACE. Twelve of them died out of a total of sixty-one. Are these statements true or are they not true ? The government should have information upon these facts, and I can tell the Prime Minister that when he characterized all my statements as untrue, I made no statement myself, except to say that the allegation appeared in a despatch from the city of Quebec to the Ottawa Evening Journal. I deemed it my duty to call the attention of the government

to this matter if they had not already known it, and I would have expected that a reply would have been given, and not the wholesale denial which the right hon. the Prime Minister has made. The statement of the Prime Minister does not deny that twelve of these people died of disease during the year they were up there.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is not the fault of the government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If these large lambs in the North-west are the result of the government's paternal care, I suppose they ought to be able to exercise the same influence against disease amongst the Fox Bay settlers.

Mr. WALLACE. To find that twelve out of sixty-one of these settlers have lost their lives there, certainly does not recommend it as a healthy or proper place to send these poor people to.

Motion withdrawn.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 12.45 a.m., Saturday.

INDEX.

FIRST SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT, 1901.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remarks or debate; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-west Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y.N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italic and parentheses are those of the mover.

Alcorn, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

Nipissing Election, Validity of Writ, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Northrup*) to Com. of Sup., 3665 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (cold storage) 3023, 3030 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings (Picton) 2554, 2560 (i).

Angers, Mr. C., *Charlevoix.*

Civil Service Employees, English and French, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 815 (i).

Dairy Industry, Quebec, Development, &c. (Ques.) 5586 (ii).

Ball, Mr. G., *Nicolet.*

South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 5092, 5271, 5284 (ii).

Barker, Mr. S., *Hamilton.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 674 (i).

Financial Situation, Review, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5856 (ii).

Hamilton, Pearl Street, Post Office, &c. (M. for copies of pets.*) 1405 (i).

Hull, Mr. W., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 333 (i).

Nipissing Election, Validity of Writ, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Northrup*) to Com. of Sup., 3697 (ii).

Railways (Govt.) Expenditure in 1900–1 (Ques.) 2702 (i).

Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. 92 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2443 (i).

Shipping Casualties Investigation B. 93 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2449 (i).

Barker, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (census, circular) 3069, 3887; (Mr. Cote's letter) 3887 (ii); (Paris exposition) 994 (i).

Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (engine houses) 2643 (i); (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 2636 (i); 3556, 3737 (ii).

Wood Naphtha, Acetic Acid, &c., Quantity purchased, &c. (Ques.) 5208 (ii).

Belcourt, Mr. N. A., *Ottawa.*

Alaskan and North-western Ry. Co.'s Petition presented, 1662 (i).

Bell Telephone Co., Defective Legislation, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5402 (ii).

Can. Nurses Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 5415 (ii).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2179 (i).

Great Northern Transit Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2874 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5115 (ii).

Royal Mint Establishment B. 143 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5389 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Buildings (Victoria Memorial Museum) 5683; Roads and bridges (Des Joachims) 3526 (ii).

Railways and Canals: Cornwall (Gilbert Dredging Co., settlement) 5639, 5665 (ii).

Bell, Mr. J. W., *Addington.*

Census Commissioner for Addington, Appnmt. (Ques.) 509 (i).

Bell, Mr. A. C., *Pictou.*

Blue Hill, Str., Subsidy, Tonnage, &c. (Ques.) 3457 (ii).

Budget, The, 1515 (i).

Can. Nurses' Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 4427 (ii).

Depot Harbour, Grain Shipments to Mar. Ports (Ques.) 2397 (i).

Greenvale Postmaster, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3458.

I.C.R., Cars, &c. purchased in U.S., Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 2162 (i).

——— Steel Rails, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 2203 (i).

Lobster Packing, Licenses granted, &c. (Ques.) 1067 (i).

Pictou Harbour Commissioners *vs.* The Queen (M. for cor., *re**) 816 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3271 (ii).

——— Mail Contracts, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 1244 (i).

——— Postmasters, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 606.

Post Office Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Suther'and*) in Com., 4250 (ii).

Round Bay Canal, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2203, 2397 (i).

SUPPLY :

Insurance (supt's. salary) 323 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries at Ottawa) 284 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Baddeck, &c. to East Bay) 4788 (ii).

Militia (clothing, &c.) 3771 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (pilotage commission) 269 (i).

Post Office (mail service) 478 (i).

Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Halifax offices) 1242 (i); Ont., Ottawa (H. of C., addition, improvements, &c.) 5679 (ii); (Seybold Block) 921 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Pictou Island wharf) 3461 (ii); Que. (St. Lawrence Channel) 1180, 1204 (i).

Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (additional siding) 4148; (increased facilities) 4151; (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 3615, 5234 (ii).

Tyrian SS., Govt. Service, &c. (Ques.) 5824 (ii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*

Alien Labour Restriction Act Amt. B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2474 (i).

Anderson, Mr. Duncan C., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1999 (i).

Balsam and Lake Simcoe Division, Amount of Tender (Ques.) 819 (i).

Bank Note ($4) Imprint of American Lock (M.) to adjn., 2205 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1714 (i).

Business of the House (remarks) 99 (i).

Census Commissioner, East Simcoe (Ques.) 201 (i)

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4024, 4045 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2783, 2789, 2795 (i).

Grain Cargo received at Montreal, Size, &c. (Ques.) 201 (i).

Grain received at Can. Ports (Ques.) 66, 81 (i).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Grain Transportation through Can. Channels (prop. Res.) 1007, 1112 (i).

Judges, N.W.T. and Yukon, Salary, &c., in Com. on Res., 4073 (ii).

Judicial Appnmts. in Ont., Delay, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2821 (i).

Lumber Duty *re* Can. and U.S. (prop. Res.) 1751.

——— (remarks) 218, 1267 (i).

——— *See* 'Saw Logs.'

Midland Harbour (personal explanation) 89 (i).

Midland and Vasey Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 2570 (i).

Montreal Harbour Loan B. 142 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5124 (ii).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1999 (i).

Ottawa Buildings, Lease by Govt. (Ques.) 1583.

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. of Res., 5474 (ii).

Saw Logs Duty (prop. Res.) 218, 223 (i).

——— Logs exported (Ques.) 64 (i).

——— Logs on Indian Reserves, &c., (Ques.) 63 (i).

——— *See* 'Lumber.'

Simcoe Mail Service, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1405.

Stubbs, Mr. Wm., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1999 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (census circular) 3058; (Mr. Cote's letter) 3906, 3935, 3959; (industries, &c.) 3875, 3882; (Glasgow exhibition) 4603; (O'Brien, Col., appointment, &c.) 4605 (ii); (Paris exhibition) 984 (i).

Customs Dept. (statistical branch) 3854; Ont. (Midland port) 3847 (ii).

Dom. Lands (inspectors, agents, &c.) 1384 (i).

Indians: Ont. (medical attendance) 2753 (i).

Legislation (Provincial voters' lists) 3911 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Georgian Bay lighthouse) 4586 (ii).

Militia (rifle associations grants) 3775 (ii).

Miscellaneous: Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3814 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 246 (i); (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4584 (ii); (str. 'Shamrock') 246 (i).

Post Office (mail service) 437 (i).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (Richibucto public building) 5088; Ont. (Goderich public building) 5696; (Orillia) 2556, 2561; (Orillia armoury) 5698; Ottawa (furniture, ice, &c.) 3124 (ii); (Nagle block) 914, 923; (Seybold block) 913 (i), 3134; (repairs, &c.) 3112; (telephones, &c.) 3117; (St. Thomas drill hall) 2555; (Windsor drill hall) 2564 (i); Quebec (Lévis public building) 5690; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Amagadus Pond wharf) 5701; (Docks, &c.) 5703; Ont. (Blind River wharf) 5743; (Bruce Mines wharf) 5730; (Harwood wharf) 5757; (Hawkestone wharf) 4801, 4806; Ont. (Indian River dredging) 5732; (Parry Sound) 4816; (Penetanguishene) 4794; (dredging) 5757 (ii); (Port Colborne) 1208 (i); (Presqu'ile wharf) 5750; (private docks) 5743; (public docks) 4801; (Wendover wharf) 5749; Que. (Hull landing) 5707; (Lévis graving dock) 5709; (Murray Bay wharf) 5709 (ii); (St. Lawrence channel) 1178, 1193 (i); (wharfs, &c.) 5707 (ii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Quarantine (Stubbs, Mr., appnmt., &c.) 4612; (tuberculosis in cattle) 4611 (ii).

Railways and Canals: Canals—Cornwall (Gilbert Dredging Co., settlement) 5647, 5665; Railways—I. C. R. (coal contracts) 5303; (Lévis land expropriation) 5651; (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 3746, 5303 (ii).

Yukon Ter., Administration, &c. (salaries) 1370.

Toronto Junction Public Building, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 2403 (i).

Trent Canal, Balsam and Lake Simcoe Division, Amt. of Tender (Que.) 810 (i).

——— Kirkfield and Lake Simcoe Contract (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5442 (ii).

Bernier, Hon. M. E., (Minister of Inland Revenue) *St. Hyacinthe.*

Binder Twine, Change in Prices, &c. (Ans.) 1403.

——— Enforcement of Law *re* (Ans.) 507 (i).

Commodities, Packing for Sale (B. 117) 1°, 2456 (i); in Com., 4743, 4752 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. *Smith*, Wentworth), 4878, 4882; (binder twine) 4884; (salt) 4894; on Sen. Amts., 5829 (ii).

Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. (B. 140) 1°*, 5094; in Com., 5365 (ii).

Gas Inspection Act Amt. (B. 139) 1°*, 5094 (ii).

General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 115) 1°, 2456 (i); in Com., 3094 (ii).

——— (B. 122) 1°*, 3085; in Com., 4898.

——— *See* 'Inspection, General.'

Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 144) 1°, m., 5470; in Com., 5801; 3° m., 5825 (ii).

——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 51, 239 (i).

Inspection (General) Act Amt. (B. 115) 1° m., 2456 (i).

——— (B. 122) in Com., 4898 (ii).

——— *See* 'General.'

Lumber Culling and Inspection (B. 116) 1° m., 2456 (i).

Man. Grain Inspection Act Amt. (B. 123) 1° m., 3085; wthdn., 5472 (ii).

Potash and Ashes Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 814 (i).

Staple Commodities Packing and Sale (B. 117) 1°, m., 2456 (i).

——— *See* 'Commodities.'

Staples Inspection Act Amt. (B. 116) in Com., 3096 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (contingencies) 190 (i); (Roy, L. G., salary) 5184 (ii); Dept. (salaries) 185 (i).

Excise (salaries, &c.) 3863; (weights and measures,) 3865 (ii).

Gas and Electric Light Inspection (instruments) 5779 (ii).

Inspection of Staples (grain commission, salaries) 4937; (grain standards, &c.) 3865; (inspectors, &c.) 5779; (warehouse commissioner, gram) 4936 (ii).

Weights and Measures (gas inspection, salaries, &c.) 4935 (ii).

Tobacco Duty (Ans.) 84 (i).

Bernier, Hon. M. E.—*Con.*

Toronto Inland Rev. Collector, Name, &c. (Ans.) 3754 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Smith*, Wentworth) on Order for Com., 1792 (i).

Wood Naphtha, Acetic Acid, &c., Quantity purchased, &c. (Ans.) 5208 (ii).

Bickerdike, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Canadian Cattle imported, Schedule by Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 1004 (i).

Dom. Burglary Guarantee Co's. (B. 90) 1°*, 1881 (i).

Grain Transportation through Can. Channels, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1041 (i).

SUPPLY:

Lighthouse and Coast Service: (St. Lawrence route) 276; (salaries) 276 (i).

Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. of Sup., 3181 (ii).

——— (remarks) 2779 (i).

Birkett, Mr. Thos., *Ottawa.*

Govt. Buildings in Ottawa, Rentals, &c. (M.) for Copies, 2586 (i).

Ottawa City and C.P.R. Crossings (M. for cor.) 95 (i).

SUPPLY:

Post Office (letter carriers salaries) 5792 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa, (rentals, taxation, &c.) 3131; (Seybold block, rent, &c.) 3131 (ii).

United Empire Life Insurance Co's. (B. 60) 1°*, 1244 (i).

Blain, Mr. R., *Peel.*

Binder Twine, Change in Prices, &c. (Ques.) 1002, 1402 (i).

——— (prop. Res.) 226; on Amt. (Mr. *Oliver*) 593 (i).

——— Manufacture (Ques.) 107 (i).

——— Price for Labour, &c. (Ques.) 5585 (ii).

Commodities, Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4743 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4880 (ii).

Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 757 (i).

Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 5368 (ii).

Grain Transportation through Can. Channels, on prop, Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1095 (i).

Paris Exhibition, Printing Official Catalogue, Par. in *Free Press* (Ques.) 1265 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act (increased indemnity) Amt. B. 151 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) M. for Com. on Res., 5605 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: Census (Mr. Coté's letter) 3898, 3936-46 (ii).

Militia (Brampton, drill hall) 4350 (ii).

Miscellaneous: Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3846 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (life-saving stations) 260 (i).

Bain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (Brampton building) 3139 (ii); Ont. (Brampton armoury) 5699; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (private docks) 4818 (ii).

Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 3640, 3741 (ii).

Yukon Services (W. H. P. Clement's resignation) 2657 (i).

Blair, Hon. A. G. (Minister of Railways and Canals) *St. John City.*

Arnprior and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 55 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on Sen. amts., 5093 (ii).

Bank Note ($4) Imprint of American Lock, on M. (Mr. *Bennett*) to adjn., 2207 (i).

Bell Telephone Co., Mileage, &c. (Ans.) 4645 (ii).

B. C. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4121 (ii).

Brockville Drill Hall, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 2205.

Can. Atlantic Ry. and I.C.R., *See* 'I.C.R.'

Can. Eastern Ry., Resclutions from N.B. received by Govt. (Ans.) 3753 (ii).

——— Stmnt. to Mr. A. Gibson (Ans.) 1583 (i).

Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s incorp. B. 13 (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com., 1963, 1968 (i).

Canal Expenditure from 1897 to 1900 by Govt. (Ans.) 1750 (i).

——— Freight, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 508 (i).

——— Lock Tenders' Sunday Duties (Ans.) 4643.

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2174 (i).

Clergue's Contract for Rails, *See* 'Supply.'

Cornwall Canal, Dismissal of Mr. J. H. Ramsay (Ans.) 1584 (i).

Cowan's Bridge, Grant by Govt. (Ans.) 1748 (i).

Depot Harbour, Grain Shipments to Mar. Ports (Ans.) 2397 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 430 (i).

Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 16 (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) on M. for 2°, 1063 (i).

Financial Situation, Review, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5866, 5878.

Foster, Mr. A., Superannuation, &c. (Ans.) 1795.

Free Transportation for Members, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 536 (i).

Freight Rates for Govt. Employees, &c. (Ans.) 1586 (i).

Govt. Vessels, B.C., Tenders, &c., on M. for copies (Mr. *Prior*) 515 (i).

Grain Cargo received at Montreal, Size, &c. (Ans.) 201 (i).

——— *See* 'Depot Harbour.'

Grain Transportation through Can. Channels, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1016 (i).

G.T.R. and Montreal (Ans.) 92 (i).

——— Payments to (Ans.) 108 (i).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 7 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 1048 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 1916; M. to ref. back to Com., 1993.

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

Halifax Grain Elevator, Cost of Construction, Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 1585, 1591 (i).

I. C. R., Air Brakes, &c. (Ans.) 334 (i).

——— Campbellton Round-house, Repairs, (Ans.) 507 (i).

——— and Canada Atlantic Freight Rates, &c. (Ans.) 1590 (i),

——— Cars purchased in United States, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 2162 (i).

——— Clergue Contract for Rails, *See* 'Supply.'

——— Commission *re* Accident Claims, &c. (Ans.) 504 (i), 3753 (ii).

——— Damages to Property, French Speaking Commissioner (Ans.) 1004 (i).

——— Employees, Number, &c., from 1892 to 1900 (Ans.) 1583 (i).

——— Grades, &c., Reduction, &c. (Ans.) 1588 (i).

——— Halifax Elevator, Employees, Duties, &c.: (Ans.) 1585, 1591 (i).

——— *See* 'St. John'

——— *Herald* Offices, Montreal, Lease, &c. (Ans.) 606 (i).

——— Kingston Locomotive Works and Contract with Govt. (Ans.) 1068 (i).

——— Lévis, Purchase of Property, &c. (Ans.) 330 (i).

——— Locomotives equipped with Cleveland Cylinders (Ans.) 3642 (ii).

——— Locomotives purchased (Ans.) 331, 2162.

——— Moncton Shops, Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 815, 1004 (i).

——— Montreal and Campbellton Division, Extension, &c. (Ans.) 1999 (i).

——— Passekeag Station, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 113 (i).

——— Passenger Agents, Names, &c. (Ans.) 2399 (i).

——— Russell, Mr. E. G., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3455 (i).

——— St. John Elevator, Employees, Duties, &c.: (Ans.) 1584 (i).

——— *See* 'Halifax.'

——— Section Limits, &c. (Ans.) 1589 (i).

——— Steel Rails, Sale, &c. (Ans.) 2203 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply.'

——— Summerside and Tignish Summer Train Accommodation (Ans.) 3456 (ii).

——— Sydney Properties purchased by Govt. (Ans.) 1005 (i).

——— Trois Pistoles Station, &c. (Ans.) 504 (i).

Jones, Ralph, Payments to (Ans.) 509 (i).

Kingston Locomotive Works and Contract with Govt., Clause *re* Union wages (Ans.) 1994 (i).

——— Cor., &c. (Ans.) 112 (i).

——— Strike, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5433 (ii).

——— *See* 'I. C. R., Kingston.'

Lachine Canal, Lock Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1067.

Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. (Ans.) 109 (i)

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

Lalonde, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4194.
Man. Rys. Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5082, 5088 (ii).
Ont., Ry. Subsidies, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 5585 (ii).
Ottawa City and C. P. R. Crossing, on M. (Mr. *Birkett*) for Cor., 95 (i).
Penitentiary Act (second inspector) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 5591.
Port Colborne, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2162 (i).
——— Harbour Works, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 812.
P. E. I. increased Subsidy B. 138 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5336, 5349 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Pet. *re* Construction at O'Leary Station (Ans.) 1795 (i).
——— Service, on M. (Mr. *Hackett*) to adjn., 1500 (i).
——— Subsidies, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 5585.
——— Trainmen, &c., Number, &c. (Ans.) 4195.
——— (remarks) 4196 (ii).
——— Victoria County Branch Extension, Pets., &c. (Ans.) 2163 (i).
Prince, Wm. L., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2702 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2° 215 (i).
——— B. 77 (Mr. *Stephens*) 2° m., 2202; M. to ref. to Com., 2202 (i).
——— B. 136 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5112 (ii).
——— (B. 145) 1° m., 5470; in Com., 5787 (ii).
Ry. Bonuses by Municipalities (Ans.) 202, 329 (i).
Rys. and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 105 (i).
——— Management, &c. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 5968 (ii).
Ry. Commissioners, Board of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 862 (i).
——— corporations, bonuses to, on M. (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 88, 95 (i).
——— question, on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 156 (i).
——— Subsidies Authorization (B. 146) prop. Res., 5360; in Com. on Res., 5472, 5577; in Com. on B., 5786 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 895 (i).
Rice Lake and Port Hope Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 607 (i).
Ste. Anne's Lock, Supt., Name, &c., (Ans.) 2705.
St. John Elevator, Amount of Grain received (Ans.) 810 (i).
——— and Halifax Grain Elevators, Quantity exported, &c. (Ans.) 1998 (i).
——— *See* "I.C.R."
——— Wharf *re* Connolly's Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1581 (i).
St. Lawrence River Channel, Depth of Water, &c. (Ans.) 205 (i).
Subsidies to Rys. *See* "Railways."

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

B. 158 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5951; M. for Com. (remarks) 4066 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: Census (Mr. *Côté's* circular) 3967 (ii).
Civil Government: Railways and Canals (salaries) 187 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Atlantic Fast SS. service) 5774 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence Channel) 1190; Transportation (Port Colborne) 1210 (i).
Railways and Canals: Canals—Carillon (rebuilding guide) 5625; Chambly (repairs) 4388; St. Johns (drainage) 5632; Cornwall (dismissal of lockmaster) 4263; (enlargement) 4310; (Gilbert Dredging Co., settlement) 5635; Culbute (damages by flood) 4383; Farran's Point (enlargement) 4311; Galops, 4311; (enlargement) 5619; (North Channel, forming) 4312, 5620; Lachine (Coté St. Paul bridge) 4388; (macadamizing Coté St. Paul road) 5624; ('*Frank Perew*', Tug, repairs) 5625; (lockmen extra work on Sundays) 4390; (masonry wall) 4313; (Mill street paving) 5621; (new lock) 5620; (removal of shoals) 4381; (repairs) 4387; (slope walls) 5621; (weirs, building, &c.) 4380; Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 4383; (removing shoals) 4309; Lake St. Louis (hydrographic survey) 4309; Rapide Plat, 4311; Sault Ste. Marie (deepening, &c.) 4257; St. Lawrence (surveys, &c.) 4312, 4382; St. Peters (O'Donohue's claim) 5632; Soulanges (construction) 4306; Trent (Bobcaygeon dam) 5634; (construction) 4261, 4265, 4306; (Peterborough dam) 4314; (Young Point's dam) 4384); Welland (deepening long level) 5618; (docking renewal) 5632; (Dunnville dam and bridge) 5626; (lock breakage) 4308; (lock gates, repair) 4388; (old lock walls) 5625; (Port Colborne) 4313, 5617; (Robt. Coulter, extra services) 4389; Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen's car) 5633; (gratuity to Mrs. Chamberlain) 4387; (McKnight, S.L.T., appnmt.) 5649; (O'Leary and West Point Ry.) 4315; (Ry. Commission expenses) 5635; (repairs, working expenses) 4322; (salaries, &c.) 4318; Railways—(G.T.R. (rental) 4322; I.C.R. (additional sidings) 4145, 4379; (air brakes) 4154 (ii); (Amherst subway, damages, &c.) 2715 (i); (Bennett's cutting) 4379; (bridges, strengthening) 4123; (Canso ferry service) 4379, 5217; (car shops extension, Moncton) 4153; (Clergue papers) 5215; (coal contracts) 5298; (draw-bars, &c.) 4156; (Drummondville, road diversion) 5216; (Eastern Extension, N.B., Ry. award) 5943; (Eastern Extension, N.S., Ry. award) 5915; (Eel River station, &c.) 5226 (ii); (engine houses) 2642 (i); (exports from St. John, N. B.) 5218; (feeding, &c. places for cattle) 4218; (ferry service, Canso) 4379, 5217; (general expenses) 4387, 5650 (ii); (Halifax accommodation) 2706, 2711 (i), 5216 (ii); (Halifax, dredging, &c.) 4134; (increased facilities) 4151, 4379 (ii); (labour clause in contracts) 2646 (i); (Lévis accommodation) 4124; (Lévis land expropriation) 5651; (locomotive couplers) 4153; (McLellan, John B., sale of ties) 5634; (machinery, car shops, &c.) 4158; (Miramichi bridge spans) 4162; (Nicolet station) 5226 (ii); (original construction) 2719; (Oxford and New Glasgow land damages) 2719 (i); (Pictou accommodation) 5216; Pintsch Gas, buildings, &c.) 4158, 5217 (ii); (railway and canal collections) 2645; (Rocky

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Lake bridge) 2642 (i); (rolling stock) 4165, 4213, 4378; (St. John, freight, &c.) 5218; (St. John, increased accommodation) 4136; (St. John wharf, conveyor) 4378; (sidings, additional) 4145, 4379 (ii); (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 2628, 2719-2743 (i), 3537-3640, 3724-3752, 5225, 5228-5270, 5285-5309; (Stellarton accommodation) 5216; (Strait of Canso, wharf accommodation) 4159 (ii); (Sydney accommodation) 2716 (i), 4376 (ii); (Sydney, engine house) 2644 (i); (travelling cranes) 4378; (turntables, Mulgrave) 4158; (vestibules, &c.) 4156; (working expenses) 5672; P.E.I. Ry. (Cardigan, purchase of land) 4380; (Murray Bay Harbour branch, &c.) 4228; (sidings, &c.) 4219; (rails and fastenings) 4226, 4227, 4380; (straightening line at Blue Shank) 4224 (ii).

Telephone Co.'s Mileage, &c. (Ans.) 5585 (ii).

Toronto Junction Public Building, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 2404 (i).

Toronto, Level Crossing, Application to Ry. Com. (Ans.) 3456 (ii).

Trent Canal, Balsam and Lake Simcoe Division, Amount of Tender (Ans.) 810 (i).

——— Mr. Maingy's Rep., &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5439 (ii).

——— *See* 'Rice Lake.'

Welland Canal, Lock 24, Tenderer, &c. (Ans.) 1591 (i).

——— Quantity of Water passing through (Ans.) 1592 (i).

Borden, Hon. F. W. (Minister of Militia and Defence), *King's, N.S.*

Battalions in Active Militia, Number in Provs., &c. (Ans.) 2568 (i).

Dundas Rifle Association, Annual Grant (Ans.) 1440 (i).

General Officer Commanding, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 337 (i).

Gov. Gen.'s Foot Guards, Accoutrements, &c. (Ans.) 1587 (i).

Hutton, Gen. and Lt.-Col. S. Hughes, on M. (Mr. *Hughes*) for Cor., 417 (i).

Lévis Brigade Camp, Irregularities, &c. (Ans.) 2995 (ii).

Long Service Medals, Delay in Issue, &c. (Ans.) 2567 (i), 5213 (ii).

——— Distribution to Volunteers (Ans.) 1259 (i).

Macaulay Point, B.C., Claims for Damages, &c. (Ans.) 2570 (i).

Medals, Long Service, Delay in Issue of Forms, &c. (Ans.) 2567 (i).

Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 694.

Pensions to Headquarters Staff, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii).

Pensions for Permanent Force (B. 133) Res. prop., 3270; (M.) for Com. on Res., 4231; in Com. on B., 4738, 4743; 3°, m., 4874 (ii).

Rifle Shooting, Annual Payment, Ammunition, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1285.

St. Thomas Battalion Club Rooms, Rent, &c. (Ans.) 506 (i).

Borden, Hon. F. W.—*Con.*

S. A. War—Axes for British War Office, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1593 (i).

——— Baden-Powell's Police Force (Ans.) 107 (i).

——— 'C' Battery Pay (Ans.) 81, 84, 504 (i), 3459 (ii).

——— pay of men by Imp. Govt., &c. (Ans.) 3458 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) for Papers, 125 (i).

——— Constabulary recruiting in N.B. (Ans.) 2204 (i).

——— Graves of Can. Soldiers (Ans.) 64 (i).

——— Officers and Non-Com. Officers, Pay, &c. (remarks) 1577 (i).

Steveston, B.C., Riots, Calling out of Militia (Ans.) 328 (i).

Stoney Creek Monument, Sums voted, &c. (Ans.) 5210 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt. (Militia and Defence, contingencies) 4346 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 3406, 3430, 4346; (arms, ammunition, &c.) 5314; (Brampton drill hall) 4350; (cadet corps, rifles, &c.) 3401; (canteens) 3430, 3431; (cartridge factory) 3784; (clothing, &c.) 3771, 4350; (Dom. Rifle Association) 5313; (Esquimalt defences) 3785, 5313; (extra salaries, &c. *re* S.A. War) 4347; (Fenian raid pensions) 4639; (Fredericton barracks) 3437; (Halifax provisional garrison) 5314; (Mackenzie, Capt., pension, &c.) 3395, 4353; (military properties) 3436, 4348, 5313; (monuments for battle fields) 5314; (musketry school) 3383; (N.W. mounted rifles) 3400; (pay and allowance) 3383; (pensions to families of deceased S. A. soldiers) 3397; (properties, maintenance, &c.) 3436; (provisions, supplies, &c.) 3772; (Quebec cartridge factory) 3439; (ry. extension to Rockliffe range) 4348, 4639; (remounts for Imp. Govt.) 3441; (rifle association's grants) 3774; (rifle ranges) 3787; (Rockliffe range rates) 4348, 4639; (Royal Military College) 3782; (Royal Military College, memorial, &c.) 4352, 5314; (salaries, &c.) 3435; (Sievert, Pte., bravery, &c.) 3410; (S.A. constabulary, pensions, &c.) 3398; (S.A. contingents, difference in pay) 3405; (Govt. insurance) 3400; (increased pay) 3398; (S.A. War maps) 3787; (transportation charges) 3774, 4638; (warlike stores) 3439, 4351; (Work Point property purchase) 4352, 5314; (Zong, Pte., pay, &c.) 3396 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings (armouries, &c.) 5698.

Valleyfield Riots (Ans.) 85 (i).

——— Settlement by Govt. on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 2600 (i).

Van Wagner, Lt.-Col., Retirement, &c. (Ans.) 2568 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Halifax.*

Address, on The, 38 (i).

Alaskan Boundary, Meetings of Joint High Commission (remarks) 5961 (ii).

Alien Labour Restriction Act Amt. B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2458 (i) 4656 (ii).

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4667 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Assurance Companies Bills, Procedure, &c. (remarks) 3421 (ii).

Aud. Gen. Rep., Distribution (remarks) 104 (i).

Bond-Blaine Treaty *re* Newfoundland and Can., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5835 (ii).

B. C. Claims for increased Subsidy on M. for Com. of Sup., 4110 (ii).

Bruce, North, Election, Transfer of Mail Clerks on Ques. of Order, 1579 (i).

Budget, The (inquiry) 90 (i).

——— Notice of Amt., 1573 (amt.) 1597, 1617 (i).

Business of the House (remarks) 62, 96, 692, 1390, 2700, 2774 (i); 3085, 3365, 3453, 4405, 4938.

——— - Procedure *re* Private Bills, 2922 (i).

——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 66 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2455 (i).

Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s incorp. B. 13 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1977, 1986; on M. for 3°, 2743 (i).

Canadian Nurses' Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 4431 (ii).

C. P. R. Tax Exemption, on Amt. (Mr. *Davis*) to Com. of Sup., 2497 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup. 2529 (i).

Committees, *See* 'Sel. Coms.'

Commodities, Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com. 4749; (binder twine) 4888 (ii).

Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 707 (i).

Dinner to Opposition Leader (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4230 (ii).

Divorce Proceedings, Application to Parlt., &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Britton*) 1414 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 1056 (i).

——— B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 1391; in Com., 2809 (i); 4027, 4034, 4041, 4053, 4325, 4327 (ii).

Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Co.'s (B. 19) 1°*, 420; in Com., 2924 (i).

East River Sheet Harbour Wharf (M. for cor. *re**) 224 (i).

Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 5365 (ii).

Financial Situation, Review, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5835; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 100) 5882 (ii).

Fishing Bounty, Distribution of Cheques, on Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2777 (i).

Foresters Subsidiary Court B. 120 (Mr. *Heyd*) on M. for 3°, 4369 (ii).

Fort Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 149 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for Com., 5713 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2782, 2786, 2794, 2803 (i); 4200, 4205 (ii).

Free Transportation for Members, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 535 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2360, 2423, 2436, 2613 (i).

Government Business (remarks) 210, 1167 (i).

——— on M. to take in Mondays, 1498 (i).

——— Morning Sittings, 4647 (ii).

——— Wednesdays (remarks) 2407 (i).

——— Ry. Subsidies, &c., Mackenzie & Mann Papers, &c. (remarks) 4902.

——— *See* 'Business of the House.'

Grain Inspection at Montreal, Appnmt. of Commission (remarks) 327 (i).

Grain Transportation through Can. Channels, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1044, 1098 (i).

Grand Falls Power and Boom Co.'s petition (remarks) 1661 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 1919 (i).

Halifax-Manchester Line, Protest *re* Contract, &c. (remarks) 1501 (i).

Immigration Policy, on amt. (Mr. *Wilson*) to Com. of Sup., 2976 (i).

Indemnity, Increased, *see* 'Senate,' &c.

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 5801 (ii).

Inland Waters Seamen's Act Amt. B. 91 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2439 (i).

Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 3094 (ii).

I. C. R., Locomotives equipped with 'Cleveland' Cylinders (Ques.) 3641 (ii).

——— Net Receipts and Revenues (M. for ret.*) 1267 (i).

——— Russell, Mr. E. G., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3455 (ii).

——— St. John, Lands purchased (M. for O. C.'s *re**) 225 (i).

Joint High Commission *re* Alaskan Boundary, Meetings, &c., on M. to adjn. (remarks) 5961.

Judges of Provincial Courts Act (Vancouver) Amt. B. 150 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 5593 (ii).

Judges, N. W. T., and Supreme Court in Yukon, Salary, &c., in Com. on Res., 4072 (ii).

——— *See* 'Montreal,' &c.

King's Printer, Finances, &c., in Com. on Res., 4668 (ii).

Kingston Locomotive Works, Strike, &c., Rep. of Mr. O'Donoghue *re* Fair Wages, &c. (remarks) 5444 (ii).

Lead (refined) Bounties B. 152 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5720; in Com. on B., 5828 (ii).

Lumber Duties (remarks) 115 (i).

Mackenzie & Mann, Claim *re* Yukon Ry., on M. to print Papers, 5950 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Papers, 2611 (i); 4195, 4647 (ii).

——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

Man. Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. *Bernier*) on M. for 1°, 3085 (ii)

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Man. Rys. Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5046 (ii).

Manufacturers and Temperance and General Life Ass. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2986 (ii).

Money Lenders B. *See* 'Usury.'

Montreal District Circuit Judge, Salary, &c., in Com. on Res., 4067 (ii).

Nipissing Election, Validity of Writ, &c., on amt. (Mr. *Northrup*) to Com. of Sup., 3700, 3719 (ii).

N. W. T. Representation B. 147 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. to wthdrw., B., 5829, 5953 (ii).

Opposition Leader (remarks) 8 (i); 4230 (ii).

Ottawa and Hull Power and Manufacturing Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 2921 (i).

Pacific Cable Act Amt. B. 45 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 898, 909 (i).

Passes to Members. *See* 'Free Transportation.'

Penitentiary Act (second inspector) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 5591 (ii).

Pensions to Officers of Permanent Force B. 133 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) in Com., 4738, 4743 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 4241, 4247 (ii).

P. E. I. Claims for increased Subsidy B. 138 (Mr *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4678; in Com., 4737 ;in Com. on B., 5329, 5333, 5348, 5358 (ii).

Printing Bureau Finances, in Com. on Res., 4668.

Public Accounts Com., Organization, &c. (remarks) 196, 1390, 1661 (i); 3274 (ii).

Queen Victoria, Decease of, Address *re* (seconded) 18 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 216 (i).

——— Commissioners, Board of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 877 (i).

——— Corporations, Bonuses to, on M. (Mr. *Smith*) 89 (i).

——— Question, on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 154 (i).

——— Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. of Res., 5495, 5532; in Com. on B., 5786 (ii).

Reports, Deptl. (inquiry) 49, 51 (i).

Rifle Shooting, Annual Payment, Ammunition, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1286.

Royal Mint Establishment B. 143 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5376, 5383 (ii).

Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. 92 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on M. for 1°, 1958; in Com., 2442 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4209 (ii).

Salmon River Wharf (Ques.) 206 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act (increased indemnity) Amt. B. 151 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5603; in Com. on B., 5826 (ii).

Sel. Standing Coms. (M.) to change name, 197 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Shad and East Dover Fishing Association, Alleged Interference, &c. (M. for cor.*) 816 (i).

Shipping Casualties Investigation B. 93 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2447 (i).

South African War, Canadian Intervention, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 1361.

——— 'C' Battery Pay, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) for Papers, 128 (i).

——— Cor., &c. with Imp. Govt., on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 5889 (ii).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 5279 (ii).

Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 75 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) to adjn., 5961 (ii).

Staples Inspection Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 3096 (ii).

SUPPLY:

M. for Com. (remarks) 4066 (ii); B. 114 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 2359 (i); B. 158 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5951 (ii); Procedure, &c. (remarks) 2752 (i).

Administration of Justice (alien labour enforcement) 2648; (B.C. Supreme Court Judges, residence) 2665; (circuit allowances, *ad hoc*) 2647; Man. (travelling allowances) 2647; N.W.T. (fees for sheriff, &c.) 2647 (i).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (census circular) 3062; (Mr. Cote's letter) 3895, 3901; (expenditure) 3867, 3908; (cold storage) 3017, 3040, 3044; (cold storage on steamers) 5166; (meat supplied Imp. Govt.) 3047 (ii); (Paris exhibition) 932, 944, 977 (i).

Charges of Management (statutory increases) 174 (i).

Civil Govt.: Agriculture Dept. (salaries) 186; Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 184 (i); (Board of C. S. Examiners) 5310; Customs (salaries and contingents) 5466; Finance Dept. (contingencies) 4345 (ii); Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 178; Indian Affairs (salaries) 184; Inland Revenue (contingencies) 190; (salaries) 185 (i); Interior Dept. (Hudson Bay Reps.) conc., 5789 (ii); Public Works (salaries) 188; Sec. of State's Office, 181 (i).

Dom. Lands (extra clerks) 5450 (ii); (homestead inspectors) 1387; (inspectors, agents, &c.) 1374; (tree culture) 1388, 2672 (i); (surveys, &c.) 5450; Miscellaneous (cottage hospitals, N.W.T.) 5456; (international boundary investigations) 5455; (N.W.T. exhibit, Buffalo) 5456 (ii).

Fisheries (cold storage bait) 322: (licenses, &c.) 304; (overseers, wardens, &c.) 307; (oyster culture) 314 (i); (Quoddy River overseer) 4588 (ii).

Geological Survey (explorations for Dr. Mond) 5447; (surveys, plans, &c.) 5315 (ii)

Govt. of N. W. T. (schools) 5783 (ii).

Indian Affairs: Man. and N.W.T. (industrial schools) 5447 (ii); N.B. (miscellaneous expenses) 2761; (relief, &c.) 2761; N.W.T. (annuities) 2761; N.S. (salaries) 2758; (Ship Harbour Lake reserve) 2758; (timber cutting on reserves) 2758 (i).

Inspection of Staples (Grain Commission, salaries) 4937 (ii).

Justice: Miscellaneous (revision of the Statutes) 2668 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Legislation: H. of C. (O'Brien, Mr., increase of salary) 5466; (printing, papers, &c.) 5465.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 4586 (ii); (Halifax Harbour) 280; (maintenance and repairs) 280; (salaries at Ottawa) 284 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Atlantic Fast SS. service) 5772; (Bond-Blaine treaty) conc., 5799; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 4787; (St. John, Halifax and W. Indies) 4784; (St. John and Liverpool) 4772; (St. John and London) 4781 (ii).

Militia (arms, ammunition, &c.) 5314; (Dom. Rifle Association) 5313; (gratuities, &c.) 4355; (gratuities, Maj. Maxwell) 4356; (Halifax provisional garrison) 5315; (Mackenzie, Capt., pay, &c.) 3394; (pensions to S. A. soldiers) 4359; (pensions *re* families of deceased soldiers in S. A. war) 3396; (ry. extension to Rockliffe range) 4349; (Royal Military College, memorial, &c.) 4351; (Sievert, Pte., bravery, &c.) 3408; (Work Point Barracks, expropriation of land) 5314; (Zong, Pte., pay due) 3395 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Bank Note Co., litigation, &c.) 5457; (Can. Temperance Act) 3449; (International catalogue, &c.) 3452; Japanese Commission) 5311; Justice (litigation expenses) 4344; Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*, distribution) 3808; (salaries, printing, &c.) 4790; (N. W. Police, relief to half-breeds) 5311; (paper combine inquiry) 5784; (Paris agency, contingencies) 4342 (ii); (Yukon and B.C. boundary) 2699 (i).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. Strs., repairs, &c.) 4584 (ii).

Post Office (mail service) 454 (i); (payments for service) 4404; (private mail bag, Mr. W. C. Henly) 5459; (Sheet Harbour mail service) 5461 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, B. C. (Kamloops) 3097; Dom. (engineers, &c., salaries) 3153; (rents, heating, &c.) 3130; Generally (lighting, &c.) 4398 (ii); N.S. (Halifax offices) 1240 (i); Ont. (Paris, Gov. Gen.'s Warrant) 4391 (ii); Ottawa (additional room, H. of C.) 2553 (i); (electric lighting) 3152; (Labour Dept.) 4392; (rentals, additional room, &c.) 4393; (repairs, &c.) 3122; (telephones) 4392; Que. (Grosse Isle quarantine station) 4391; Yukon (rent, repairs, &c.) 5763; Coll. of Rev. (harbours, &c., repairs, &c.) 3535; Dredging, Ont. and Que. (new plant) 3517; (vessels, repairs, &c.) 3515; Harbours and Rivers, B.C. (Columbia River, dredging) 3514; Man. (Lake Winnipeg wharf) 3513 (ii); (St. Andrews Rapids) 1205 (i); N.B. (St. John Harbour) repairs) 4599; N.S. (Abbott's Beach) 3153; (Cheverie breakwater) 3154; (Clark's breakwater) 3163; (Comeauville breakwater) 4398; (Ingonish breakwater) 4398; (Lunenburg County breakwater) 3165; (Parker's Cove wharf) 4398; (Porter's Lake) 3166; (Salmon River wharf) 3460; Ont. (Hawkestone wharf) 4399; P.E.I. (Souris Knight's Point breakwater) 3466; Que. (Magdalen Island Pier) 3498; (Sorel wharf) 3499; (Tadousac wharf) 3500; Miscellaneous (Chief Engineer's Office) 3530; (National Art Gallery) 3530; Roads and Bridges, Ottawa (repairs, &c.) 4403; (Des Joachims) 3523; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice district) 3523; Telegraph Lines, B.C. (Ashcroft line) 3520 (ii); Transportation (Port Colborne) 1223 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Quarantine (cattle) 3084; (contingencies, &c.) 3083 (ii).

Railways and Canals: Canals—Cornwall (Gilbert Dredging Co., settlement) 5644; Lachine (Mill street paving) 5622; St. Lawrence River (surveys, buoys, &c.) 4382; Welland (Dunnville dam) 5630; Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 4145; (coal contracts) 5300; (Eastern Extension, N.B., Ry. award) 5946; (Eastern Extension, N.S., Ry. award) 5911 (ii); (Halifax accommodation) 2707 (i); (Halifax, dredging, &c.) 4134; (Lévis accommodation) 4124; (McLellan, John B., sale of ties) 5633 (ii); (Rocky Lake bridge) 2642 (i); (rolling stock) 4214 (ii); (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 2639, 2723, 2735 (i), 3547, 3680, 3750, 5247, 5300; (Strait of Canso wharf accommodation) 4159; (strengthening bridges) 4123 (ii); (Sydney engine house) 2645 (i).

Yukon Services (Judge's salary) 2651; (living allowances) 2653; (salaries) 1370; (sheriff's fees) 2652; (stenographers, salaries, &c.) 2658; (transport of prisoners) 2654; (Mr. Wade's duties) 2663; (witness fees) 2655 (i).

Toronto Junction Public Building, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 2404 (i).

Usury Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) in Com., 638.

Valleyfield Riots, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Loy*) to Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4572 (ii).

Victoria Beach Lighthouse (Ques.) 91 (i).

Victoria Day B. 33 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4255 (ii).

Virden, Qu'Appelle, &c., Town Sites (Ques. of Order) 892 (i).

Western Assurance Co., on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to receive Pet., 3177 (ii).

York, Duke of, Visit to Can., Letter from Mr. Hamilton (read) 5325 (ii).

Yukon Territory Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3086, 4877 (ii).

Bourassa, Mr. H., *Labelle.*

Bank Note ($4), Imprint of American Lock, on M. (Mr. *Bennett*) to adjn., 2210 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2273 (i).

Canada and Italy Trade Relations (Ques. of Order) 527 (i).

Canadian Officers and Imp. Commissions (M. for cor.*) 1266 (i).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 3997; on M. for 3°, 4417 (ii).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2189 (i).

Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 745 (i).

Gov. Gen. and Responsibilities of Ministers, *See* 'S. A. War, Cor. with Imp. Govt.'

Lead (refined) Bounties B. 152 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5721 (ii).

Man. Rys. Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. for Com., 4501 4526; in Com., 4962, 5079, 5085.

Bourassa, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Paris Exposition, Can. Representation (M. for cor.*) 132 (i).
P. E. I. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. on Res., 4721, in Com., 4737 (ii).
Privy Councillor, Title conferred on Prime Minister (remarks) 2348 (i).
Railway Question, on Amt. (Mr *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 165 (i).
S. A. War—Baden-Powell Police Force (Ques.) 106 (i).
——— Can. and Imp. Govts., Cor. *re* (Ques.) 106.
——— Canadian Intervention, &c., Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1290; (amt.) 1326; Neg. (Y. 3; N. 144) 1366 (i).
——— notice of motion (remarks) 1069 (i).
——— Constabulary, Cor. with Imp. Govt., Inquiry for Ret., 4409 (ii).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* S. A. Police Force, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5883 (ii).
——— Police, Recruiting in Canada (M. for cor.*) 1266 (i).
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (Plains of Abraham, purchase) 5809 (ii).

Boyd, Mr. N., *Macdonald.*
Binder Twine. Manufacture of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 235 (i).
Brandon Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 110.
C. P. R. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 4005.
Kavanagh, Mr. James. Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 110 (i).
Man. Rys. Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 4953, 5006, 5008, 5059 (ii).
Manitoba, Lake, Dredging, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 1259 (i).
Remount Stations, Govt. Aid, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5154, 5164 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Indian Affairs (live stock for N. W. Ters.) 5321 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Ottawa (rentals, additional rooms, &c.) 4395; Harbours and Rivers—Man. general repairs &c.) 4399; (Lake Man.) 4400; Ont. (transportation, &c.) 5749 (ii).

Britton, Mr. B. M., *Kingston.*
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 671 (i).
——— B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2483.
Can. National Ry. and Transport Co's. incorp. B. 13 (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com., 1976 (i).
C. P. R. Tax Exemption, on Amt. (Mr. *Davis*) to Com. of Sup., 2497 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2182 (i).
Clergue Iron and Nickel Steel Co. of Can. incorp. B. 19 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 2926 (i).
Committees Sel. Standing (M.) 4938 (ii).

Britton, Mr. B. M.—*Con.*
Divorce Proceedings, Application to Parlt., &c. (prop. Res.) 1412 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B, 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4031, 4035, 4058 (ii).
Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2361 (i).
Inland Waters Seamen's Act Amt. B. 91 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2439 (i).
Judges, N.W.T. and Yukon, Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 4077 (ii).
Locomotive Works, Kingston, Strike, &c. on M. for Com. of Sup., 5442 (ii).
Man. and North-west Loan Co.'s (B. 53) 1°* 1167.
Man. Schools Lands, Fraudulent Sales, &c. (Ques.) 336 (i).
Middleton, Lillias Relief B. 128 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 3°, 5545 (ii).
Money Lenders' Bill. *See* 'Usury.'
Ottawa, Gatineau and Western Ry. Co's. B. 44 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 3222 (ii).
Oxford House Mission Indians (Ques.) 336 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 4241 (ii).
Private Bills, Procedure, &c. (remarks) 5270 (ii).
——— Suspension of Rule 60 (M.) 4939 (ii).
Quebec Terminal and Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. *Malouin*) in Com., 5543 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5111 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5564 (ii).
Rathbun Co.'s (B 82) 1°*, 1747; in Com., 2925 (i).
Shipping Casualties Investigation B. 93 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2454 (i).
S. A. War—'C' Battery, Payments to, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) for Papers, 128 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice: Yukon (maintenance of prisoners) 4637 (ii).
Arts, &c. (census) 5785 (ii).
Immigration (agents, &c., Rev. Mr. Houston) 4854 (ii).
Indians—N. W. T. (Oxford House Indians) 4933 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.,) 282 (i); (Pilotage rules, Can. and U.S.) 5189.
Militia (Royal Militia College, memorial tablets) 5314 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (registration of shipping) 261 (i).
Post Office (mail service) 449 (i).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Kingston Military Buildings, 3534, 5697 (ii); (Royal Military College) 2547; (Toronto drill hall) 2563 (i); Contract Labour, 3160; Dredging—Ont. and Que. (new plant) 3519; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (private docks) 5755; (public docks) 4807; Miscellaneous (insufficient appropriations) 3534; (Mrs. Johnston, gratuity &c.) 5760; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice district) 5767 (ii); Transportation (Port Colborne) 1217 (i).
Railways and Canals: Canals—Cornwall (Gilbert Dredging Co., settlement) 5646; Lake St. Francis, (removing shoals) 4310; Rail-

Britton, Mr. B. M.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

ways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 4147; (Eastern Extension, N.B., Ry. award) 5948; (Eastern Extension, N.S., Ry. award) 5936; (Kingston locomotive works, contract) 4177 (ii).

Usury Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) in Com., 635 (i).

Valleyfield Labour Strike, Settlement by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Com., 2603 (i).

Brock, Mr. W. R., *Centre Toronto.*

Australian Commonwealth, Can. Representation (Ques.) 68 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1850 (i).

Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 5370 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. H. D., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 508 (i).

Montreal Harbour Loan B. 142 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5120; in Com. on Res., 5128 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5476 (ii).

Royal Mint Establishment B. 143 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5387 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Plains of Abraham, purchase) 5816 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Woodstock post office) 5692; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto harbour) 3512 (ii).

Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (Eastern Extension, N.S., Ry. award) 5919; (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 5236, 5267, 5285 (ii).

Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3259.

Whitechurch Post Office, Dismissal of Postmaster (Ques.) 508 (i).

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*

Address, on The, 43 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2261 (i).

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2416 (i).

Grain Transportation through Can. Channels, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1100 (i).

Mulloy, Trooper (remarks) 43 (i).

Pan-American Exposition, Sunday Closing (Ques.) 2400 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Interior (Hudson Bay Reps) conc., 5790 (ii).

Williamsburg Canal, Supt., Salary, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 3179 (ii).

Bruce, Mr. F. C., *Hamilton.*

Queen's Birthday, Perpetuation, &c. (Ques.) 333.

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Burlington Channel) 5731 (ii).

Bruneau, Mr. A. A., *Richelieu.*

Bills reserved for Queen's Pleasure (Ques.) 3178.

Criminal Code Act Amt. (B. 132) 1° m., 4323 (ii).

Experimental Farm Report, Translation, &c. (Ques.) 2705 (i).

Gagne, Mr. Justice, Charges against, (Ques.) 4646 (ii).

Post Offices, established since 1896 (Ques.) 2704 (i).

Richelieu River Beacons, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 2775, 2989 (ii).

Ste. Anne's Lock, Supt., Name, &c. (Ques.) 2705.

Ste. Anne de Sorel Ice Guards, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2775 (i).

Sorel Post Office, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 2705 (i).

Three Rivers, &c., Govt. Offices, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 2775 (i).

Bureau, Mr. M. J., *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2178 (i).

Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3346.

Calvert, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*

Can. National Bank of Can. incorp. B. 109 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4014 (ii).

Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s incorp. B. 13 (Mr. *Maclean*) in conc., 1972 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 49) 1°*, 1167 (i).

Calvin, Mr. H. A., *Frontenac.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2335 (i).

Inland Waters Seamen's Act Amt. B. 91 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2440 (i).

Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. 92 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2441 (i).

Shipping Casualties Investigation B. 93 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2448 (i).

SUPPLY:

Dom. Lands (inspectors, agents, &c.) 1382 (i).

Miscellaneous (Plains of Abraham, purchase) 5822 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (St Lawrence Channel) 1187; Transportatio (Port Colborne) 1240 (i).

Cargill, Mr. H., *East Bruce.*

Binder Twine Machinery, admitted free of Duty (Ques.) 606 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Guthrie* on M. for 3°, 2393 (i).

Lumber Duty, on prop. Res (Mr. *Bennett*) 1781.

SUPPLY:

Post Offices (partisanship offences) 494 (i).

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (Seybold block, rent, &c.) 3141 (ii).

Carroll, Mr. H. G., *Kamouraska.*

Can. Nurses Association B. 88 (M.) to refund Fees, 4078 (ii).

Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 113) 1°*, 2347 (i).

Carscallen, Mr. A. W., *North Hastings.*
Coe Hill and Apsley Mail Service (Ques.) 2989, 3179 (ii).
Madoc Mail Contract, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1441 (i).
Toronto Inland Rev. Collector, Name, &c. (Ques.) 3754 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard, K.C.M.G., (Minister of Trade and Commerce) *South Oxford.*
Blue Hill, Str., Subsidy, Tonnage, &c. (Ques.) 3457 (ii).
Budget, The, 1490, 1501 (i).
Butter, Cheese, &c., imported in the United Kingdom (Ans.) 1255 (i).
Can. and France SS. Subsidy (B. 141) prop. Res., 4022; in Com. on Res., 5096 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ocean, &c.'
Canada and Italy Trade Relations, Cor. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Copies, 521 (i).
Chinese and Japanese Immigration, Tax collected (Ans.) 328 (i).
Cold Storage, West Indian Strs. (Ans.) 334 (i).
Commercial Agents, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4753 (ii).
Found's Mill to Emerald Junction Mail Service (Ans.) 5212 (ii).
Grain Inspection at Montreal, Appnmt. of Commission (remarks) 327 (i).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 5970 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Receipts, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Stmnt., 2572 (i).
Napanee Postmaster, Payment of Salary, &c. (Ans.) 5209 (ii).
Ocean SS. (Can. and France) Subsidies Act Amt. (B. 141) in Com., 5389 (ii).
——— *See* 'Can. and France.'
P.E.I. increased Subsidy B. 138 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5331 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act (increased indemnity) Amt. B. 151 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5827 (ii).
S. A. War, Cor. with Imp. Govt., on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 5888 (ii).
Supreme Court Vacancy (remarks) 5972 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and G. B.) 4789; (Atlantic Fast SS. Service) 5769; (Baddeck and East Bay) 4788; (Can. and S. Africa) 4788; (G. B. and Can.) 4771; (Halifax and Canso) 5776; (Halifax, Newfoundland and Liverpool) 4772; (mail subsidies) 5768; (Montreal and Manchester) 5768; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 4787, 5776; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 5767; (Quebec, Murray Bay and River Ouelle) 5777; (St. John, Dublin and Belfast) 4773; (St. John and Glasgow) 4773; (St. John, Halifax and W. Indies) 4783; (St. John and Liverpool) 4772; (St. John and London) 4781; (St. Stephen, N.B., Black Bay, &c.) 5767; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 5768; (Victoria, B.C., and San Francisco) 4787 (ii).
Trade and Commerce Rep., on inquiry for, 239 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. T. C., *Montmorency.*
Alien Labour Restriction Act Amt. B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2461 (i).
I.C.R., Lévis, Purchase of Property, &c. (Ques.) 330 (i).
Paquet, Jos., Pilot, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2204 (1).

Champagne, Mr. L. N., *Wright.*
Debates, Official, 1st Rep., conc. (M.) 102 (i).
——— 2nd Rep., conc. (M.) 5711 (ii).
E. B. Eddy Co.'s (B. 70) 1°*, 1496 (i).
Ottawa and Gatineau Ry. Co.'s Change of Name (B. 44) 1°*, 893 (i).
Ottawa and Hull Power and Manufacturing Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 420; in Com., 2921 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk.*
Alien Labour Restriction Act Amt. B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2465, 2468, 2485 (i).
Beet Root Sugar Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 351 (i).
Business of the House, Procedure *re* Private Bills, 2922 (i).
Clergue Iron and Nickel Steel Co. of Can. incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 2925 (i).
Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 712 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 30) 1° m., 424 (i).
Eastern Can. Savings and Loan Co.'s B. 19 (Mr *Borden, Halifax*) in Com., 2924.
Imports from U. S., Dutiable, &c. during 1901 (Ques.) 4020 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties paid by Govt. (remarks) 1173 (i).
Kootenay and Arrow Head Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. *Galliher*) in Com., 3223 (ii).
London Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. *Hyman*) in Com., 2923 (i).
Lumber Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1761.
Man. Ry. Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 4688, 4903, 4940, 5078 (ii).
Pan-American Exposition, Sunday Closing (Ques.) 2401 (i).
Private Bills, Business of the Hse., Ques. of Order, 4939, 5078 (ii).
Railway Question, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 59 (i).
Rathbun Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Britton*) in Com., 2925.
S. A. War, Canadian Intervention, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c. (M.) for Sel. Com., 73 (i).
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous: Labour Gazette (*Labour Gazette*) 3816 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (Rideau Hall) 3151; (Seybold block) 3146; Contract Labour, 3162 (ii).
Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3240.

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*

Man. Rys. Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5020 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act (increased indemnity) Amt. B. 151 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5610 (ii).

Clancy, Mr. J., *Bothwell.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 661 (i).

——— B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4657.

Binder Twine Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 588 (i).

B. C. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4086, 4120 (ii).

Budget, The, 1476 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order, 1743 (i).

Business of the Hse., Procedure *re* Private Bills, 2922 (i).

Canal Freight, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 508 (i).

Can. Cattle Quarantine, &c., Agreement with U. S. (remarks) 1797 (i).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 4003.

Commodities Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com. (binder twine) 4885 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 15) 1° m., 323; 2°, 1061 (i).

——— B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4029, 4054, 4061 4325, 4337 (ii).

Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 16 (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) on M. for 1°, 324 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. 2792, 2801 (i).

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2372, 2409, 2421, 2427, 2434, 2616 (i).

Judges, N. W. T. and Yukon, Salary, &c., in Com. on Res., 4074-5 (i).

Le Progres, Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 3458.

Mutton imported, &c. (Ques.) 335 (i).

Ottawa and Hull Power and Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 25 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 2751.

Pacaud, Mr. A., Application for Govt. Position (Ques.) 3457 (ii).

——— Lease of Windsor Govt. Buildings (Ques.) 2775 (i).

P. E. I. Claims for increased Subsidy B. 138 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4685, 4733; in Com., 5332 (ii).

Public Accounts Com., Postponed Meetings (remarks) 3175, 3275 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5495, 5502 (ii).

Reports, Deptl. (inquiry) 51 (i).

Rice Imports for 1900 from G. B., &c. (Ques.) 2600 (i).

Royal Mint Establishment B. 143 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5388; in Com. on B., 5716 (ii).

Saw Logs Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 224.

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (aid to agricultural societies) 2837 (i); (bonuses to creameries) 3051; (Can. Exhibits at Imp. Institute, London) 5180 (ii); (census) 2862 (i); (census circular) 3085; (industries, &c.) 3879; (Mr. Cote's circular) 3907, 3958, 3970; (cold storage) 3027, 3036, 3043, 4609, 5168; (dairying interests) 3055 (ii); (evidence of Com., distribution, &c.) 2860; (experimental farms) 2839 (i); (fumigating stations) 4607; (Glasgow exhibition) 4603 (ii); (Paris exhibition) 943; (*Patent Record*) 2827 (i); (Quebec Cold Storage Co.) 5179 (ii); (tree culture) 2839; (Winnipeg hospitals) 2871; (*Year Book*) 2834 (i), 5182 (ii).

Charges of Management (printing Dom. notes, &c.) 177 (i).

Civil Govt.: Aud. Gen.'s Office (Hudson, Reid and Kearns, Messrs., salaries) 5182 (ii); Finance (contingencies) 189; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 179 (i); Marine and Fisheries (Fraser, B. H., salary) 5183 (ii); Post Office Dept. (clerical assistance) 191; Trade and Commerce Dept. (contingencies) 193 (i).

Customs: Miscellaneous (Nelson & Sons, refund, &c.) 4627, 5468; (statistical staff, extra allowance) 4627; (statistical branch) 3854; Yukon (expenditure) 3863 (ii).

Dom. Lands (extra clerks) 1388; (forest rangers) 2695; (homestead inspectors) 1387; (inspectors, agents, &c.) 1376 (i); (international boundary fence) 5452 (ii); (tree culture) 2672, 2690 (i); Miscellaneous (half-breed claims commission) 4929; (litigation, Qu'Appelle *vs.* The King) 5454 (ii).

Excise (salaries, &c.) 3864; (weights and measures, salaries, &c.) 3864 (ii).

Fisheries (cold storage bait) 315; (inspectors, &c.) 296, 308 (i).

Immigration (agents, &c., Mr. Houston) 4854; (agents, salaries, &c., W. T. R. Preston) 4827, 4544 (ii).

Indians: B. C. (agents, dismissed) 2272; (industrial schools) 2772; Man. (maintenance, &c.) 2761; (saw mills) 2771; (supplies) 2770; N.W.T. (salaries, &c.) 2764 (i); (Six Nation tribe, Dr. Secord's report) 5319 (ii); (Walpole Island, medical attendance) 2755 (i), 4930; Que. (Caughnawaga mission house), 5319 (ii).

Inspection of Staples (grain standard, &c.) 3865 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 195.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Stag Island lightkeeper) 279 (i).

Miscellaneous: Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3824; (Paris agency) 3449; (printing bureau plant) 5456 (ii).

Militia (Ry. transportation to Rockliffe range) 4349; (transportation charges) 3773 (ii).

North-west Mounted Police (S. A. volunteers, pay of transportation, &c.) 4623; (yearly service) 4623 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (lobster investigations) 269; (maintenance of Govt. steamers) 242; (pilotage commission) 270 (i); (steamers, construction, &c.) 5186 (ii); (tidal surveys) 263.

Post Office (mail service) 444, 469 (i); (train porters) 5462 (ii).

Public Works: Bourinot quoted *re* reflections against members, 3481; Buildings—Ottawa (Rideau Hall) 3150; (Seybold block, rent, &c.) 3142; (contract labour) 3154; Dredging, Ont. and Que. (new plant) 3518; Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Man. outlet) 3513; N.B. (Back Bay wharf) 3472; (Campobello

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

breakwater) 3475; N.S. (Cheverie breakwater) 3154; (Neil's breakwater) 3163; (Parrsboro' Beach) 3163; (Porter's Lake) 3174; (Scott's Bay) 3174; (Windsor Harbour dams) 3175; Ont. (Bruce Mines wharf) 5730; (Goderich Harbour) 3505; (Leamington pier) 3507; (Parry Sound) 4816; (Point Pelee wharf) 3509; (Rondeau Harbour) 3511; (Sydenham Harbour) 3506, 5753; P. E. I. (Cascumpec Harbour) 3461; (Miminegash breakwater) 3463; (New London breakwater) 3465; (Rustico pier) 3465; (Souris Knight's Point breakwater) 3470; (West Point pier) 3472; (Public Docks) 4809; Que. (Hull pier) 3498; (Rivière aux Renards) 3498; (St. Lambert protection wall) 3499; (repairs to bridges) 3498; (St. Jerome wharf) 3499; (Lewes and Yukon River improvements) 4289; Miscellaneous (Chief Architect's office) 3531; (telegraph service, salaries and dismissals) 3533; Roads and Bridges (Des Joachims) 3527; Yukon (account books, &c.) 4291; Yukon—Telegraph Lines (Qusnelle to Atlin) 4276, 4283; (working expenses) 4304 (ii).

Quarantine (public health) 5182; (regulations with U. S.) 4613; (tuberculosis in cattle, prevention, &c.) 4613 (ii).

Railways and Canals: Canals—Cornwall (Gilbert Dredging Co., settlement) 5635; Lake St. Francis (removing shoals) 4309; St. Lawrence (surveys, &c.) 4312; Soulanges (construction) 4307; Railways—I.C.R. (drawbars) 4156; (Eastern Extension, N.B., Ry. award) 5942; (Eastern Extension, N.S., Ry. award) 5898, 5902-3 (ii); (engine houses) 2643 (i); (St. John, freight, &c) 5222 (ii); (steel rails) 2635, 2720, 2733 (i), 3625, 3725, 3750, 5229, 5246, 5254, 5292; (strengthening bridges) 4124.

Staples Inspection (chief inspector) 5781 (ii).

Thames River, Obstruction to Navigation, on M. (Mr. *Stephens*) to adjn., 2780 (i).

Trade and Nav. Rets. (inquiry) 210 (i).

Usury Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) on M. for 2°, 618; in Com., 639 (i).

Clare, Mr. G. A., *South Waterloo.*

Alien Labour Act. Amt. (B. 5) 1°*, 105; 2° m., 646 (i).

Alien Labour Law, Enforcement, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 332 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1874 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—Census (Mr. Cote's letter) 3972 (ii).

Post Office (mail service) 481 (i).

Thompson, Mr. J. R., Homestead Inspector, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 5212 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., *West Toronto.*

Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (Ques.) 111 (ii).

Australian and Imperial Trade with Can. Par. in *London Times re* Mr. Mulock's Conference, &c., 5326 (ii).

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 671, 680 (i).

——— B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2460; (amt.) 2484 (i); 4650-4666; on M. for 3°. (amt.) 5095; Neg. (Y. 37; N. 66) 5096 (ii).

Clarké, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Alien Restriction Bill and Labour Organizations (Ques.) 2705 (i).

Bell Telephone Co., Defective Legislation, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5394, 5402.

——— (B. 101) 1°m., 2202 (i).

Bell Telephone Cos., Mileage, &c. (Ques.) 4645 (ii).

Buies' Pamphlet, Printing, &c. (Ans.) 1265 (i).

Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s incorp. B. 13 (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com., 1964; on M. for 3°, 2384; on M. for 3°, 2743; (M.) to ref. back to Com., 2743 (i).

Canadian Nurses Association incorp. (B. 88) 1°*, 1881; (M.) for Com., 4371; in Com., 4424, 5412, 5579 (ii).

Candidates, Defeated, &c., Appnmt. to Offices Ques.) 199 (i).

Coal and Wood Tenders (M. for ret.*) 225 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2879 (i).

Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 800 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4326 (ii).

Foresters Subsidiary Court B. 120 (Mr. *Heyd*) on M. for 3°, 4370 (ii).

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 503; in Com., 2408 (i).

Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) for Morning Sittings, 4647 (ii).

Handbook of Canada, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 814 (i).

Immigrants entered and settled in Can., 1899–1900 (Ques.) 202 (i).

Imperial Trade between Can. and Australia, Par. in *London Times*, 5326 (ii).

Kingston Locomotive Works and Contract with Govt. (Ques.) 1068 (i).

Labour Organizations and Alien Bill (Ques.) 2705 (i).

——— Clause *re* Wages (Ques.) 1994 (i).

Long Service Medals, Delay in Issue, &c. (Ques.) 1067, 2567 (i); 5213 (ii).

Man. Rys. Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. for Com., 4532; in Com., 4948 (ii).

Medals, Long Service, Delay in Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 5213 (ii).

——— Delay in issuing Form, &c. (Ques.) 2567.

Members, &c., Appnmt. to Offices (Ques.) 199 (i).

Montgomery, Gen'l., Monument to in Quebec City (Ques.) 5211, 5587, 5824 (ii).

Newfoundland, Admission into Confederation (Ques.) 332 (i).

Paris Exhibition, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 337 (i).

——— Printing Buies' Pamphlet, &c. (Ques.) 1265 (i).

——— Printing of Official Catalogue, &c. (Ques.) 1007 (i).

Pensions to Officers of Permanent Force B. 133 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) on prop. Res., 4237; on M. for 3° (amt.) 4875 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Postal Delivery, Rural (Ques.) 68 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Sutherland*, Oxford), on M. for 1°, 2878 (i); in Com., 4242 (ii).

Preferential Clauses *re* German Goods (Ques.) 508 (i).

Preferential Tariff, Certificate of Production, &c. (Ques.) 1252 (i).

——— Goods of Foreign Origin, &c. (Ques.) 1002 (i).

——— Percentage Values, &c. (M. for O.Cs.*) 1267 (i).

P.E.I. Claims for increased Subsidy B. 138 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4687; in Com., 5329 (ii).

Printing Bureau, Additions, &c. to (remarks) on M. to conc. in 5th Rep. of Printing Com., 5205 (ii).

Printing, Govt., Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 114.

Ry. Com., Privy Council, Application from Toronto *re* Level Crossings, &c. (Ques.) 3456 (ii).

Reports, Printing of (Ques.) 92 (i).

Royal Military College Extension, &c., Letter of Robt. W. Saul (remarks) 4873 (ii).

Royal Mint Establishment B. 143 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5382 (ii).

S. A. War, 'C' Battery Pay, Application to Rhodesian Govt. (Ques.) 504 (i).

——— Pay by Can. Govt., &c. (Ques.) 81 (i); 3459 (ii).

——— Pay of Men by Imp. Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3458 (ii).

——— (M. for papers) 123 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2056 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 5276 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (alien labour law) 194 (i).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: Census (Mr. Cote's letter) 3893, 3899 (ii); (Paris exhibition) 928 (i).

Charges of Management (bank commissions) 175; (printing, advertising, &c.) 176; (printing Dom. notes) 175 (i).

Civil Govt.: Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 178; High Commissioner's Office (rents, &c.) 189; Indian Affairs (salaries) 184 (i); Marine and Fisheries (Capt. Bernier's expedition) conc., 5790 (ii); Post Office (contingencies) 191; Sec. of State's Office, 181; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 193 (i).

Geological Survey (compilation of maps, &c.) 5315; (reports, &c.) 5315 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 195; (Sergeant-at-Arms estimate) 196 (i).

Militia (Halifax provisional garrison) 5315; (increased pay to first contingent) 3397; (salaries, &c.) 3435; (S.A. constabulary pay) 3399; (S.A. contingents, difference in pay) 3404 (ii).

Miscellaneous: Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3804 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (steamers, construction, &c.) 5186 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (letter carriers) 492 (i); (letter carriers, salaries) conc., 5793 (ii); (mail service) 481 (i).

Public Works: Buildings—B.C. (Nelson) 3097; (Vancouver drill hall) 3100; Ont., Ottawa (steel shelving) 5692; (Victoria Memorial Museum) 5681; (Toronto drill hall) 2562–64, 2566; (Toronto drill hall, cor., &c.) 3101, 5697 (ii); (Windsor drill hall) 2565 (i); Dredging—Ont. and Que. (new plant) 3519; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood harbour) 3501; (Goderich harbour) 3506 (ii); (Kaministiquia River) 1205 (i); (private docks, &c.) 5757 (ii); (St. Lawrence channel) 1174, 1197 (i); (Toronto harbour) 5737 (ii); Transportation (Port Colborne) 1214, 1224 (i).

Scientific Institutions and Hydrographic Surveys (str. to replace *Bayfield*) 5191; (Capt. Bernier's expedition, and Govt. aid) 5191, 5193; (Polson Co., Toronto, &c.) 5191 (ii).

Staples Inspection (chief inspector) 5779 (ii).

Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (engine houses) 2643; (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 2731 (i).

Tariff Act, Amt. *re* German goods (Ques.) 333 (i).

Telephone Cos., Mileage, &c. (Ques.) 5585 (ii).

Toronto Level Crossing, Application to Ry. Com., &c. (Ques.) 3456 (ii).

——— Post Office, Station 'B,' Lease, Rent, &c. (Ques.) 1995 (i).

Transportation Question, *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3301.

Valleyfield Riots, Affidavits, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to Com. of Sup., 4548 (ii).

Women of Canada, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 337 (i).

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland.*

Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s incorp. B. 13 (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com., 1977 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4048–51, 4061 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2791 (i).

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2376, 2415, 2623.

Govt. Vessels, B.C., Tenders, &c., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) for Copies, 513 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 1920 (i).

Kootenay and Arrow Head Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. *Galliher*) in Com., 3225 (ii).

Ottawa, Gatineau and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 3222 (ii).

P.E.I. Claims for increased Subsidy B. 138 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5335, 5343 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: Census (Mr. Cote's circular) 3955 (ii); (Paris exhibition) 994 (i).

Fisheries (protection service) 302 (i).

Justice: Miscellaneous (revision of the Statutes) 2668 (i).

Militia (rifle association grants) 3778 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont., Ottawa (rentals, &c.) 3129, 3134; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Presqu'Isle wharf) 5750; (Sault Ste. Marie harbour) 5732 (ii); Transportation (Port Colborne) 1233 (i).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Railways and Canals: Canals—Welland (Dunnville dam) 5630; Railways—I.C.R. (St. John terminals) 5222; (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 5232, 5245 (ii).

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*
Canadian Patriotic Fund incorp. (B. 34) 1°*, 605.
Coronation Oath, Address to His Majesty (M.) 431; (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 694, 783; agreed to (Y. 125, N. 19) 805 (i).
Grand Falls Power and Boom Co.'s (B. 89) Petition presented, 1660, 1662; 1°*, 1881 (i); on M. for Com., 3454 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5526 (ii).

Cowan, Mr. M. K., *South Essex.*
Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s (B. 13) 1°*, 238; in Com. (Mr. *Maclean*) 1984; 3° m., 2384 (i).
Credit Foncier du Bas-Canada (B. 99) M. to refund Fees, 5471 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5475 (ii).
Shipping Casualties Investigation B. 93 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2447 (i).
Sibbald, Eudora, Patent Relief Bill (M.) to receive Pet., 5471 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (Halifax accommodation) 2715 (i).

Culbert, Mr. J., *Brockville.*
Commodities Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com. (salt) 4897 (ii).
Moore, Wm., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1403 (i).

Davies, Hon. Sir Louis H. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *West Queen's, P.E.I.*
Alberton, P.E.I., Sandy Island, Removal of Stones, &c. (Ans.) 1993 (i).
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M for 2°, 661, 668; on M. for 2°, 676 (i).
Arnprior and Pontiac incorp. B. 55 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on Sen. Amts., 5092 (ii).
Back Bay Wharf, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 5210 (ii).
Black Rock Lighthouse, B.C. (Ans.) 200 (i).
B. C. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4082, 4111 (ii).
——— Fisheries, Provincial Jurisdiction, &c. (Ans.) 3459 (ii).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 2700 (i), 4405 (ii).
——— Private Bills (remarks) 5825 (ii).
Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 66 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2455 (i).
Canadian Flag in Foreign Ports (remarks) 4649.
Canadian Nurses Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Com., 4371; in Com., 4430, 5413 (ii).
Cascumpec Harbour Improvements (Ans.) 208 (i).
——— Harbour Lights (Ans.) 207 (i).

Davies, Hon. Sir Louis H.—*Con.*
Chinese and Japanese Labour on Govt. Steamers, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) 2350 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2189 (i).
Collin, Elzéar, Fishery Guardian, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 5213 (ii).
Cornwall and York, Duke of, Visit to Canada (remarks) 1001 (i).
Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 739 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4332 (ii).
Easter Adjournment (remarks) 2202 (i).
Eastern Extension Award. *See* 'N. S.' &c.
Fishing Bounties, Queen's Co., P.E.I., Distribution, &c. (Ans.) 2777 (i).
Govt. Vessels, B.C., Contracts, Specifications, &c., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) for copies, 510 (i).
Grand Falls Water Power and Boom Co.'s B. 89 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for Com. 3454 (ii).
Green Islet, B.C., Lighthouse, &c. (Ans.) 2407.
Inland Waters Seamen's Act Amt. (B. 91) 1° m., 1957; in Com., 2439 (i).
Jennie May, Schr., Investigation *re* Loss, &c. (Ans.) 2778 (i).
Juan de Fuca Straits, Sailing Directions (Ans.) 2407 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4673 (ii).
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. *Galliher*) in Com., 3225 (ii).
Lobster Fishery Regulations, P.E.I. (Ans.) 2571.
——— Packing, Licenses granted, &c. (Ans.) 1067.
Marine, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 51 (i).
Mealey, Mr. J. W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 810 (i).
Money Lenders B., *see* 'Usury.'
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Allowances, &c. (Ans.) 3178, 3270 (ii).
Myers, Mr. Geo., Fishery Guardian, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 335 (i).
N. S. Claims against Govt., on M. (Mr. *Haggart*) to print Ret., 2610 (i).
Ottawa, Gatineau and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 3222 (ii).
Ottawa and Hull Power and Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 25 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 2750 (i).
Pacific Cable Act Amt. B. 45 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 908 (i).
Pensions to Officers of Permanent Force B. 133 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) in Com., 4740 (ii).
P. E. I. Claims for increased Subsidy, B. 138 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4677, 4679; in Com. on B., 5328-5359 (ii).
——— East Queen's Election Petition, Rep. of Judges (M.) 693 (i).
——— Mail Service, Winter Communication (remarks) 3275 (ii).

Davies, Hon. Sir Louis H.—*Con.*

Richelieu River Beacons, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 2775, 2989 (ii).

Rocky Point, P.E.I. Breakwater, Extension, &c. (Ans.) 2571 (i).

Round Bay Brook, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2203, 2398 (i).

St. Lawrence (Lower) Navigation, Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 4231 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4197 (ii).

Safety of Ships Act Amt. (B. 92) 1° m., 1958; in Com., 2440 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4207 (ii).

Shipping Casualties Investigation (B. 93) 1° m., 1958; 2° m., 2443; in Com., 2445 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government—Aud. Gen's Office (salaries) 5183; Marine and Fisheries, 4345; (Anderson, W. P., salary, &c.) 5183; (Fraser, B. H., salary) 5183 (ii).

Fisheries (B. C. protection service) 312; (Can. exhibit) 314; (cold storage bait) 315 (i); (fishery overseers, inspectors, &c.) 4587; (Georgian Bay, biological observatory) 5198 (ii); (hatcheries, &c.) 310 (i); (hatcheries, B. C.) 4588 (ii); (legal expenses) 313 (i); (legal expenses *re* sealing vessels) 5197 (ii); (licenses, &c.) 299; (Mr. Fraser's report *re* cold storage) 315; (overseers, &c., salaries) 294; (overseers, wardens, &c.) 307; (oyster culture) 314; (protection service) 295 (i); (Whitefish hatchery, N.W.T.) 5197 (ii).

Justice—Miscellaneous (revision of the Statutes) 2669 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, contingencies) 279 (i); (aids to navigation) 4585 (ii); (construction) 282, 286; (Halifax Harbour) 280 (i); (Lower Traverse pier) 5187 (ii); (Lurcher Shoal lightship) 282, 285; (maintenance and repairs) 280 (i); (Middle Ground lighthouse) 5187; (pilotage rules, Can. and U. S.) 5189 (ii); (repairs to wharfs) 289; (retiring allowances) 277; (St. Lawrence route) 274 (i) 5188 (ii); (salaries) 270; (salaries at Ottawa) 284 (i).

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions (Bond-Blaine treaty) conc., 5797 (ii).

Marine Hospitals (inspection, &c.) 5194 (ii); (sick seamen) 293 (i).

Ocean and River Service (Biological stations) 266; (Cape Tormentine and Summerside) 253; (cattle inspection) 266 (i); (Govt. Strs., repairs, &c.) 4584 (ii); (life-saving rewards) 260, 268; (lobster investigation) 268 (i); (Long Point Life saving station) 5187 (ii); (Magdalen Island service) 252; (maintenance Govt. steamers) 240; (masters and mates) 260; (*Minto*, Str.) 240; (Pilotage Commission) 269; (registration of shipping) 262; (*Shamrock*, Str., 246 (i); (steamers, construction, &c.) 5185 (ii); (tidal surveys) 263; (winter mail service) 242, 265; (wreck investigations) 261 (i).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Ottawa, ventilation) 3123; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Parrsboro' Beach) 3163; (wharfs, docks) 5704; P.E.I. (Rustico pier) 3465; (Skinner's Pond) 3465; (Souris Knight's Point breakwater) 3466 (ii).

Post Office (mail service) 465 (i).

Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (Eastern Extension, N.S. Ry. award) 5939; P. E. I. Ry. (dismissals, &c.) 4225; (sidings, &c.) 4223; (straightening lines) 4225 (ii).

Davies, Hon. Sir Louis H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Scientific Institutions, &c. (Capt. Bernier's expedition and Govt. aid) 5191 (ii); (charts, &c.) 291; (hydrographic surveys) 291 (i); (Sulphur Mountain, Banff Observatory, 5196; (Str. to replace 'Bayfield') 5190 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection (fog alarms) 294; inspectors' salaries) 294; (meteorological service) 289; (Toronto Observatory) 289 (i).

Yukon Services (Mr. Wade's duties) 2662 (i).

Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3277.

Trout, Speckled, Exportation of (Ans.) 2402 (i).

Usury Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) on M. for 2°, 613, 627; in Com., 636 (i).

Valleyfield Riots, Affidavits, &c. on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to Com. of Sup., 4572 (ii).

Victoria Beach Lighthouse (Ans.) 91 (i).

Victoria Day B. 33 (Mr. *Horsey*) in Com., 2201.

——— (remarks) on Adjnmt., 5093 (ii).

W. C. Edwards Co.'s B. 61 (Mr. *Rosamond*) in Com., 3227 (ii).

York, Duke of, *see* 'Cornwall.'

Yukon Territory Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3088 (ii).

Davis, Mr. T. O., *Saskatchewan.*

Binder Twine Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 598 (i).

Can. Nurses Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 5415 (ii).

C. P. R. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 3687; on M. for 3°, 4413 (ii).

——— Land Grants, Taxation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) 5429 (ii).

——— Tax Exemption, Ref. to Supreme Court (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2492 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup. 2499-02, 2541 (i).

——— (notice of motion) 1168 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2199 (i).

Crow's Nest Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 57) wthdn., 5711 (ii).

Dom. Election Officials, Non-payment of, on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 2351, 2356 (i).

Fort Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 149 (Mr. *Douglas*) on Amt., 5713 (ii).

——— on M. for Com., 5713 (ii).

Free Transportation to Members, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 533 (i).

Great North West Central Ry. Lands, &c. (Ques.) 809 (i).

Immigration Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Wilson*) to Com. of Sup., 2955 (i).

Kootenay and Arrow Head Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. *Galliher*) in Com., 3223 (ii).

Lumber Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1755.

Passes to Members. *See* "Free Transportation."

Railway Commissioners, Board of (prop. Res.) 816, 872 (i).

Davis, Mr T. O.—*Con.*
Regina, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Lands, &c. (Ques.) 808 (i).
Remount Stations, Govt. Aid, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5156 (ii).
Sibbald, Eudora Patent Relief (B. 154) 2° m., 5713 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (census circular) 3079 (ii).
Dom Lands (tree culture) 2682, 2691 (i).
Railways and Canals: Cornwall (Gilbert Dredging Co., settlement) 5672 (ii).
Vancouver, Westminster, Northern and Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 73) 1°*, 1496 (i).

Dechêne, Mr. A. M., *L'Islet.*
I. C. R., Montreal and Campbellton Division, Extension, &c. (Ques.) 1999 (i).
——— Passenger Agents, Names, &c. (Ques.) 2399 (i).

Demers, Mr. L. P., *St. John and Iberville.*
Aliens' Estates, Convention between G. B. and U. S. (remarks) 4755 (ii).
Alien Labour Restriction Act Amt. B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2481 (i).
Bills of Exchange (French version) Act Amt. (B. 100) 1° m., 2161 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2180 (i).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Carroll*) in Com., 5410 (ii).
Union Ry. Co.'s (B. 78) 1°*, 1663 (i).
Usury Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) on M. for 2°, 621 (i).

Dobell, Hon. R. R., *West Quebec.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2075 (i).
Grain Transportation through Can. Channels, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1021, 1032 (i).
Plains of Abraham, Sale, &c. (Ans.) 2992, 3641.
St. Lawrence Lloyd's incorp. (B. 43) in Com., 2923 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence Channel) 1183 (i).
Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3213.

Douglas, Mr. J. M., *East Assiniboia.*
C. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 3990, 3998 (ii).
Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 798 (i).
Dom. Election Officials, Non-payment of, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) 2353 (i).
Fort Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s (B. 54) 1°*, 1167 (i).
——— (B. 149) M. for Com., 5713 (ii).
Man. and N. W. T. Colonization Lands, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 1249 (i).

Dugas, Mr. F. O., *Montcalm.*
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2194 (i).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *Algoma.*
Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 81) 1°*, 1663 (i).
Algoma Iron and Nickel Steel Co.'s (B. 19) in Com., 2927 (i).
Clergue Iron and Nickel Steel Co. of Can. incorp. (B. 19) in Com., 2925 (i).
——— (B. 51) 1°*, 1167 (i).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 108) 1°*, 2347 (i).
Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 95) 1°*, 2055 (i).
St. Mary's River Bridge Co.'s (B. 89) 1°*, 1663 (i).
SUPPLY:
Railways and Canals: I. C. R. (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 3552, 3611 (ii).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., *Russell.*
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2184 (i).
Lumber Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1765.
Ottawa and Gatineau Ry. Co.'s Change of Title B. 44 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 3220 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings (Victoria Memorial Museum) 5684 (ii).
Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3206.

Emmerson, Mr. H. R., *Westmoreland.*
Canadian Nurses' Association B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 5583 (ii).
Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costgian*) to Com. of Sup., 729, 732, 799 (i).
Foresters, Independent Order of (B. 6) 1°*, 198.
Royal Mint Establishment B. 143 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5387 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Railways and Canals: I. C. R. (Eastern Extension, N.B., award) 5948 (ii).

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2192 (i).
Debates, Official, French Translation, Delay in Printing (Ques.) 1994 (i).
——— Remarks, 1882 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*
Alien Restriction Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on Order for 2°, 1792 (i).
Assurance Companies Bills, Procedure, &c. (remarks 3421 (ii).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. Distribution (remarks) 104 (i).
——— on inquiry, 97 (i).
——— (presented) 103 (i).
Banking Act, Amt. *re* Inspection (Ans.) 814 (i).
——— Amt. *re* Saving Banks (Ans.) 814 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Bank Note ($4) Imprint of American lock, on M. (Mr. *Bennett*) to adjn., 2208 (i).

Beet Root Sugar Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 364, wthdn. (remarks) 1793 (i).

——— *See* "Ways and Means."

Binder Twine Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 595 (i).

B. C. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4086, 4099 (ii).

Budget, The, Financial Statement, 1441 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order, 1742 (i).

——— (remarks) 61, 95, 239, 1070 (i); 3085, 3867, 4323, 4405 (ii).

——— Procedure *re* Estimates (remarks) 2778 (i).

Can. National Bank incorp. B. 109 (Mr. *German*) on Order for Com., 3909; in Com., 4014 (ii).

C. P. Ry. Land Grants Taxation B. 17 (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) on M. for 2°, 1153 (i).

——— Tax Exemption, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 2500 (i).

Carillon Canal, Rebuilding Guide Pier (Ans.) 2989 (ii).

Chartered Banks of Canada, Rep. (presented) 2056 (i).

Chinese and Japanese Labour on Public Works, &c. (Ans.) 1593 (i).

Coins mutilated (Ans.) 66 (i).

Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 742 (i).

Crows Nest Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 57 (Mr. *Galliher*) in Com., 3418; Order for 3°, 3908 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. (B. 156) 1°*, 5809 (ii).

Daggett, Mr. M. G., Anticosti Island, License granted by Govt. (Ans.) 1591 (i).

Dom. Election's Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Henderson*) on Order for Com., 1791 (i).

——— B. 18 (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) on Order for 2°, 1792 (i).

Eastern Extension Award, Charged to Capital Account, &c. (Ans.) 2162 (i).

——— *See* "Supply, Rys.," "Nova Scotia."

Estimates, The (presented) 50 (i).

——— (1901) Suppl. (presented) 136, 2628 (i) 5094.

——— (1902) Suppl. (presented) 4898, 5546 (ii).

Financial Situation, Review, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5845 (ii).

Financial Statement, 1441 (i).

——— *See* 'Budget.'

Foresters Subsidiary High Court B. 120 (Mr. *Heyd*) in Com., 4018 (ii).

Free Transportation to Members, &c., on Order called for resuming adjnd. deb., 1794 (i).

Govt. Employees, Classification, Remuneration, &c. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 5969 (ii).

Govt. Vessels, B.C., Tenders, &c., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) for Copies, 513, 2586 (i).

Hawk Island Lighthouse, N.S., Contracts, &c., (Ans.) 1582 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

I. C. R. Joughins, Mr. G. R., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3180 (ii).

——— Prince, Wm. L., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3180 (ii).

——— Rivière du Loup, Foremen's Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 2989 (ii),

——— Rivière du Loup, Newspapers, Sales, &c. (Ans.) 2988 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties, paid by Govt. (remarks) 1170 (i).

King's Printer, Finances, &c., prop. Res., 4535; in Com. on Res. 4667; (B. 137) 1° m., 4874 (ii).

Lead Bounties (B. 152) M. for Com. on Res., 5716; in Com. on Res., 5728; 1°* of B., 5729; in Com., 5828 (ii).

Magdalen Island SS. Service, Accommodation, &c. (Ans.) 1796 (i).

Manufacturers and Temperance and General Life Ass. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2986 (ii).

Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., Lapses, &c., (Ans.) 1262 (i).

Mint, Can. (Ans.) 65 (i).

——— *See* 'Royal.'

Montreal Harbour Loan (B. 142) Res. prop., 4870; M. for Com. on Res., 5117; in Com. on Res., 5142; in Com. on B., 5472 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust Bonds, &c. (Ans.) 203.

——— on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Stmnt., 2583 (i).

Nova Scotia Claims against Federal Govt., Papers *re* (remarks) 1790 (i).

——— *See* "Eastern," &c.

Order (Ques. of) *re* Telegram from Mr. McGregor, 3371 (ii).

Ottawa Public Buildings, conc., 2347 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply.'

Paris and Buffalo Exhibitions, conc., 2349 (i).

Passes to Members. *See* "Free Transportation."

Pensions to Officers of Permanent Force B. 133 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) in Com., 4739 (ii).

Preferential Clauses *re* German goods (Ans.) 508.

P. E. I., Claims *re* Maintenance of Steam Communication (B. 138) Res. prop., 4535; M. for Com., 4675; in Com., 4737; 1°*, 4874; in Com., 5326-5359 (ii).

——— West Prince Returning Officer, Payments to (Ans.) 1006 (i).

——— Winter Communication with Mainland, &c. (Ans.) 1585 (i).

Printing Bureau Finances, *See* 'King's Printer.'

Public Accounts Rep. (presented) 50 (i).

——— Com. Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1390, 1661, 1799 (i), 3175 (ii).

Railways (Govt.) Expenditure in 1900-1 (Ans.) 2703 (i).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5478; in Com. on B., 5786 (ii),

Reports, Deptl., on inquiry, 49 (i).

Returning Officers, Deputy, Mileage Allowances, &c. (Ans.) 1589 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Royal Mint, Location, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4755 (ii).

——— Establishment (B. 143) Res. prop., 4535; in Com. on Res., 5374; 1°* of B., 5389; 2° m., 5715; in Com., 5716 (ii).

——— *See* "Mint."

St. Maurice Slides and Booms, conc., 2349 (i).

Saw Logs Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 221.

Sibbald, Eudora Patent Relief (B. 153) 1°*, 5711.

Supply (B. 114) 1° m., 2359 (i).

——— (B. 158) in Com., 5951 (ii).

——— Conc. (M.) 2349 (i); 5788 (ii).

——— Procedure, &c. (remarks) 240, 2753 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice: 194 (i).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Can. Exhibit at Imp. Institute) 5180; (census) 5785 (ii).

Charges of Management (bank commissions) 175; (Dom. Notes, printing) 173 (i); (Dom. Notes, redemption) 4344 (ii); (statutory increases) 173 (i).

Civil Govt.: Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 184 (i); (Hudson, Reid and Kearns, salaries) 5182; (Board of Examiners) 5310 (ii); Finance and Treasury Board, 184 (i); (chief clerk, appnmt.) 5184 (ii); (contingencies) 189 (i); 4345; (Finance and Treasury Board) conc., (amt.) 5788 (ii); Gov. Gen's. Sec's. Office, 177 (i); 4345 (ii); High Commissioner's Office, 189; (contingencies) 189 (i); Inland Rev. (contingencies) 4342 (ii); (salaries) 185; Interior Dept. (deputy's salary) 182; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 187 (i); conc., 5789; Post Office Dept. (Northrup, B. M., promotion) 5184; Printing and Stationery (salaries) 3909 (ii); Public Works (salaries) 188 (i); Sec. of State (clerical assistance) 5309 (ii); Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 193 (i).

Customs: Miscellaneous (leather combine) 4631; (paper combine, &c.) 4628; (refund to Nelson & Sons) 5468; Yukon (expenditure) 3862 (ii).

Dom. Lands (extra clerks) 1389 (i); Miscellaneous (Micmac dictionary) 5456 (ii).

Fisheries (account keeping) 4587 (ii).

Govt. of N. W. T. (schools) 5783 (ii).

Immigration (remarks) 3768 (ii).

Insurance (Supt's. salary) 323 (i).

Legislation—House of Commons (debates) 195 (i); (newspapers) 5464; (printing, paper, &c.) 5465; (provincial voter's lists) 3911; (voter's lists) 3910; Franchise Act (printlng voters' lists) 5310; Senate (Hon. *J. J. Ross*, indemnity) 5781; (salaries) 5782 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Atlantic fast SS. service) 5771 (ii).

Militia (Govt. cartridge factory) 5892 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 3452; (assay office, B. C. and Yukon) 5783; (Bank Note Co. litigation, &c.) 5457; (*Canada Gazette*) 3448; (Can. Temperance Act) 3449; (distressed Canadians, relief, &c.) conc., 5794; (Dom. and Provl. arbitration) 3452; (gratuity to J. Beatty) 5312; (International catalogue) 3453; Justice (litigation expenses) 4344; Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3813; N. W. Police (relief to half-breeds) 5311; (paper combine inquiry) 5783; ('Parliamentary Guide') 5457; (Plains of Abraham, purchase) 5821; (printing bureau, plant) 5456; (printing, &c.) 3448; (superannuation fund, interest on amounts, &c.) 5312; (Duke of York's visit) 5457 (ii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office: conc., 5791 (ii); (mail service) 469 (i).

Printing and Stationery (binding and distributing laws) 3910 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Arichat, reconstruction) 5687 (ii); (Halifax offices) 1241 (i); N. W. T. (registry office) conc., 5794; Ont., Ottawa (H. of C. additions, improvements, &c.) 5677; (observatory) 5767; (rentals, repairs, &c.) 4397; (Royal Mint) 5673; (Woodstock post office) 5692; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Lunenburg harbour) 3172; (Porter's Lake) 3167, 3174; (wharfs, docks) 5705; Roads and Bridges, Ottawa (repairs, &c.) 4403 (ii).

Rys. and Canals: Canals (Cornwall) conc., 5794; Railways, I.C.R. (coal contracts) 5306; (Eastern Extension, N.B. Ry, award) 5941; (Eastern Extension, N.S., award) 5900, 5920; (Halifax, blasting rock, &c.) 4135; (locomotives, &c.) 4171, 4187; (St. John, increased accommodation) 4137; (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 2740 (i) 3566, 3567, 3574, 3578, 3587, 3738, 5230, 5232, 5237, 5287, 5306 (ii).

Superannuation (extra allowance, Mr. *Wallace*) 4342 (ii).

Tariff Act, Amt. *re* German goods (Ans.) 333 (i).

Trade and Commerce Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1390 (i).

Trade and Nav. Rets., on inquiry, 239 (i).

Union Mutual Life Insurance Co., Govt. Deposits (Ans.) 1589 (i).

Victoria Beach Lighthouse (Ans.) 91 (i).

Ville Marie Bank, Relief to Depositors, &c. (Ans.) 332 (i).

Ways and Means (Res. for Com.) 50, 2349 (i).

——— The Tariff (prop. Res.) 5802 (ii).

——— in Com., 5802 (ii).

——— (beet root sugar machinery) in Com. on Res., 5802 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Smith Wentworth*) on Order for Com., 1791.

Western Assurance Co's. B. 124 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4014 (ii).

——— *See* "Assurance."

Williamsburg Canal, Supt., Salary, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 3179 (ii).

York, Duke of, Visit to Can., Communications *re* Arrival at Halifax, 5325 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A. (Minister of Agriculture), *Brome.*

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 51 (i).

Anderson, Mr. Duncan C., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2000 (i).

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amt. (B. 127) 1°*, 3753; in Com., 4667 (ii).

Bubonic Plague, Reports, &c., Precaution against (Ans.) 3642 (ii).

Burpee, Hon. Charles, Appnmt. (Ans.) 110 (i).

Can. Cattle imported, Imp. Scheduling, &c. (Ans.) 1005 (i).

——— Quarantined, Agreement with U.S. (remarks) 1798, 1962, 2354 (i).

Census, Circular issued by T. Coté, &c. (Ans.) 2993 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Census Commissioner for Addington, Appnmt. (Ans.) 509 (i).

——— Charlotte (Ans.) 94 (i).

——— East Elgin (Ans.) 65, 1263 (i).

——— Commissioners and Enumerators, Allowances, &c. (Ans.) 812 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply.'

Cold Storage on Steamships, Papers respecting laid on Table, 3537 (ii).

Couture, J. A., Vet. Surgeon, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4194 (ii).

Exhaust Fans on Strs. *See* "Ventilation."

Experimental Farms Rep. (presented) 892 (i).

——— Translation, Distribution, &c. (Ans.) 2705.

Forestry Protection in P. E. I. (Ans.) 1439 (i).

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation (B. 32) 1° m., 502; in Com., 2360, 2409-32, 2433-38; M. or 3° wthdn., 2611; M. to recom., 2611; in Com., 2611-2627 (i).

Grosse Isle Station. *See* 'Supply,' 'Tuberculine.'

Handbook of Canada, Printing, &c. (Ans.) 815.

Horses for British Army, Com. from C. W. Peterson, &c. (Ans.) 1997 (i).

Kinsman, Mr., Appnmt. as Horticulturist, &c. (Ans.) 1439 (i).

Mennonites, Loan to (Ans.) 67 (i).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1999 (i).

Pacaud, Mr. A., Lease of Windsor Govt. Building (Ans.) 2776 (i).

Pan-American Exposition, Sunday Closing (Ans.) 2400 (i).

Paquet, Jos., Pilot, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2204 (i).

Paris Exhibition, Honorary Decorations, &c. (Ans.) 1005 (i).

——— Payments (Ans.) 114 (i).

——— Printing of Buies' Pamphlet (Ans.) 1265.

——— Printing of Official Catalogue, &c. (Ans.) 1007, 1265 (i).

Patent Branch, Revenue, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1257.

Poultry Fattening Stations, P.E.I., &c. (Ans.) 2704 (i).

Quarantine Regulations between U. S. and Can., Papers laid on Table, 1962 (i).

——— *See* 'Can., &c.'

Remount Stations, Govt. Assistance, &c., on M. for Com, of Sup., 5162 (ii).

Ste. Anne de Sorel Ice Guards, Construction (Ans.) 2775 (i).

Southampton Harbour Improvements (Ans.) 2778 (i).

Stubbs, Mr. Wm., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1999 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice: Yukon (maintenance of prisoners) 4637 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Agriculture, evidence of Com., distribution, &c.) 2858; (aid to agricultural societies) 2837 (i); (archives) 4607; (bonuses to creameries) 3051 (ii); (bulletins, printing, &c.) 2858 (i), 4591 (ii); (Can. Exhibit at Imp. Institute, London) 5179 (ii); (census, &c.) 2862 (i), 3867-3904, 3912-3976; (census, circular) 3059; (expenditure) 3868; (industries, &c.) 3873; (Mr. Coté's letter) 3893 (ii); (Chinese lepers) 2868; (classifying patents) 2862 (cold storage) 2682 (i), 3016-3055 (ii); (Fruit Inspection Act) 5165; (compensation for slaughtered cattle) 3084; (creameries produce in, N.W.T., sale to Griffith & Co.) 5176; (dairying interests) 3055 (ii); (experimental farms) 2839 (i); (experimental fruit farm) (4596 ii); (fumigating stations) 2865 (i), 4606 (ii); (Glasgow exhibition) 4601; (meat supplied Imp. Govt.) 3047 (ii); (Paris exposition) 928, 963; (*Patent Record*) 2825 (i); (patents, &c.) 4610; (Quebec Cold Storage Co.) 5179 (ii); (St. Boniface hospitals) 2870 (i); (salaries, &c.) 4591 (ii); (San José Scale) 2865; (Mr. Stewart's position) 2845; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 2867; (tree culture) 2839; (*Year Book*) 2828 (i), 4607, 5182; (*Year Book*, New Zealand) 4608 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Messrs. Chittick and Powell, salary, &c.) 5165 (ii); (salaries) 186 (i).

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions (cattle slaughtered at Irish ports) 4774 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (census staff) 920; (Seybold Block) 916 (i).

Quarantine (cattle) 3084; (tuberculosis) 4611; (salaries and contingencies) 3083; (public health) 4610, 5182; (regulations with U.S.) 4614; (Stubbs, Mr., appnmt., &c.) 4612; (tuberculosis, prevention, &c.) 3084 (ii).

Three Rivers, &c., Govt. Offices, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 2775 (i).

Tuberculine Test, Grosse Isle (Ans.) 85 (i).

Ventilation on Ocean Steamers (Ans) 70, 505 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. C. (Solicitor General) *Quebec County.*

Aliens' Estates, Convention between G. B. and U. S. (remarks) 4757 (ii).

Alien Labour Restriction Act Amt. B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2461 (i), 4661 (ii).

Binder Twine Manufacture (Ans.) 108, 1002 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 568, 580, 590 (i).

Canada Evidence Act Amt. (B. 66) 1°*, 1424; in Com., 2455 (i).

C. P. R. Land Grants Taxation B. 17 (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) on M. for 2°, 1137 (i).

Criminal Code Act Amt. (B. 148) in Com., 5801.

Demise of the Crown *re* Judges (B. 153) 1°*, 5711.

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 64) 1°, 1391; in Com., 2809-2813 (i); 4022-66, 4197, 4323-41 (ii).

Franchise Act (1898) Amt. (B. 63) 1°*, 1391; in Com., 2782-2808 (i); 4199 (ii).

Gagne, Mr. Justice, Charges against (Ans.) 4646.

Interpretation Act Amt. (B. 134) 1°*, 4535; in Com., 4674 (ii).

Judges, N.W.T. and Yukon, Salary, in Com. on Res., 4068 (ii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon C.—*Con.*

Judges of Provincial Courts (B. 131) 1°*, 4322; in Com., 4672 (ii).

——— *See* 'Montreal.'

Montreal District Circuit Court Judge, Salary, &c. (prop. Res.) 3460; in Com. on Res., 4066.

——— *See* 'Judges,' (B. 131).

Nipissing Elections, Validity of Writ, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Northrup*) to Com. of Sup., 3658 (ii).

N.W.T. Supreme Court, Chief Justice, &c. Increase of Salary (prop Res.) 3460 (i).

Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 80 (i).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. (B. 157) 1° m., 5823 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. (B. 136) 1° *, 4752; in Com., 5111 (ii).

Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. 92 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2443 (i).

Statutes, Dom., Revision (Ans.) 66 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Alien labour, enforcement) 2648; (B.C. Supreme Court Judges, residence) 2664; (circuit allowances *ad hoc*) 2648 (i); Exchequer Court, conc., 5792; (legal expenses) 4634 (ii); (travelling allowances, &c.) 2647 (i); Miscellaneous (Divorce Court Judge, N.B.) 5778; (maintenance of prisoners) 5778 (ii); N.W.T. (sheriffs' fees, &c.) 2647 (i); Supreme Court (R. G. Davis, promotion) 5778 (ii).

Dominion Police (canal protection service) 4636 (ii).

Legislation (Mr. Thornton's indemnity) 4640 (ii).

Miscellaneous: Justice (litigation expenses) 4342; (Law Library, London) 4637; (Plains of Abraham purchase) 5809 (ii); (revision of the Statutes) 2667 (i).

Penitentiaries: Dorchester (salaries) 2650; Kingston, 2649 (i); (McKay, John, account *re* investigation) 4635 (ii); Regina Jail, 2650; St. Vincent de Paul (assault on ex-Warden) 2650 (i); (Lussier's claim) 4636 (ii); (salaries) 2649 (i).

Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (Eastern Extension, N.S., Ry. award) 5908; (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 3594 (ii).

Yukon Services (Judge's salary) 2650; (law books, freight, &c.) 2658; (living allowances) 2653; (prisoners, maintenance of) 2654; (i), 4637 (ii); (transport) 2654; (Sheriff's fees) 2652; (stenographer's salaries, &c.) 2658; (witness' fees, &c.) 2655 (i).

Ticket-of-Leave Act (Ans.) 107 (i).

Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3301 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B., *Yarmouth.*

C.P.R. Co.'s B. 26 on Ques. of Order (ruling) 4008 (ii).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2171 (i).

Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 766 (i).

Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Co.'s B. 19 (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2924 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B.—*Con.*

Foresters, Subsidiary High Court B. 120 (Mr. *Heyd*) M. to suspend Rule, 2701 (i); on M. for 3°, 4368 (ii).

Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Carroll*) in Com., 5407, 5890 (ii).

Order, Question of *re* Telegram of Mr. McGregor, &c., 3371 (ii).

Printing Bureau, Additions to, &c. (remarks) on M. to conc. in 5th Rep. of Com., 5205 (ii).

Private Bills Com., Extension of Time (M.) 419 (i).

——— (M.) *re* St. John City Bill, 3536 (ii).

Shipping Casualties Investigation B. 93 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2447 (i).

SUPPLY:

Marine Hospitals (Louisburg, N.S.) 5194 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (members remarks checked) 5749; Ques. of Order (Mr. *Clancy*) 3480, 3481 (ii).

Usury Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) on M. for 2°, 623; in Com. 635 (i).

Weights and Measures (size of fruit baskets) Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 1059 (i).

Fortin, Mr. T., *Laval.*

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. *Talbot*) on M. for 2°, 731 (i).

C.P.R. Co.'s (B. 26) 1° *, 420 (i); in Com., 3687, 4003; 3° m., 4409 (ii).

Cinqmars *vs.* Senecal (M. for papers *) 225 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries (prop. Res.) 2164 (i).

Cote St. Paul Bridge, Cost of Construction, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 2587 (i).

Exchequer Court, Cases from 1896-1900, &c. (Ques.) 3178 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Receipts, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Stmnt., 2576 (i).

Quebec Central Ry., Train Service, &c. (Ques.) 4643 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Dep. Warden's Duties, &c. (Ques.) 5823 (ii).

Transportation Question, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Rosamond*)—(ruling) 3210 (ii).

Usury Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) on M. for 2°, 614 (i).

Fowler, Mr. G. W., *King's, N.B.*

Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 792 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Amt. in Com., 4327 (ii).

Eastern Extension Award, Charged to Capital Account, &c. (Ques.) 2162 (i).

Fenwick, J. A., *See* 'Millstream.'

Franchise Act (1898) Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4199 (ii).

I.C.R. Campbellton Round-House, Repairs, &c. Ques.) 507 (i).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
I. C. R., Moncton Shops, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 815, 1004 (i).
——— Passekeag Station, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 113 (i).
King's County Fishery Warden, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 335 (i).
——— Voters' List (Ques.) 2571 (i).
Long Wharf, St. John, Contracts, &c. (M. for copies) 1266 (i).
McAuley, Mr. John, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 113.
Millstream, N.B., P.O. (Ques.) 209 (i).
Mispec, N.B., Breakwater, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 808 (i).
Myers, Mr. Geo., Fishery Warden, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 335 (i).
Pensions for Permanent Force, on Prop. Res. (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 4240 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5530 (ii).
Rothesay Voters List, Fraudulent Names, &c. (Ques.) 2571 (i).
Servis Railroad Tie Plates, Quantity purchased (M. for Ret.*) 1267 (i).
S. A. War, Constabulary recruiting in N.B. (Ques.) 2204 (i).
Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3266.
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c. W. T. R. Preston) 4841 (ii).
Indians: N.B. (medical attendance) 2760; (salaries) 2759; (seed grain) 2760; Que. (charges *re* Chief Marcil) 2754 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 276 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 3435; (cartridge factory) 3785; (Fredericton barracks) 3437; (gratuities, compensations, &c., Capt. T. McKenzie) 4353; (musketry school) 3390; (properties, maintenance, &c.) 3437; (rifle association grants) 3778; (rifle ranges) 3787; (Royal Military College) 3783 (ii).
N.W. Mounted Police (clothing, arms, &c.) 3445; (pay of force) 3444 (ii).
Post Office (mail service) 459, 468 (i).
Public Works: Buildings (coal tenders) 3483; Ottawa (Seybold block, rent, &c.) 3139; Harbours and Rivers, Mar. Provs. (Kennebecasis wharf) 3496; N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 5705; (Campobello breakwater) 3483; (Dalhousie wharf) 5706; Que. (Anticosti) 5710 (ii).
Railways and Canals: Railways—I.C.R. (Eel River station, &c.) 5226; (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 3736, 3750; (P. E. I. Ry., Norton Station accident, &c.) 4227; (sidings, &c.) 4224 (ii).
Voters' List, King's County (Ques.) 2571 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough.*
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 656 (i).
Binder Twine Manufacture, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 580 (i).
B.C. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4082 (ii).
British Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 40) 1°, 893 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Con.*
Canadian Nurses' Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr *Clarke*) in Com., 4426 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 428 (i).
Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2422 (i).
Immigration Policy of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Wilson*) to Com. of Sup., 2939 (i).
Klondike Mines Survey Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 893 (i).
Man. Rys. Leases B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. for Com., 4531; in Com., 5046, 5059 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Loan B. 146 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5138 (ii).
Nova Scotia Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 104) in Com. 5091 (ii).
P.E.I. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. on Res., 4713, 4715 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 607, 1962 (i).
——— (M.) to refer Pub. Accts. to Sel. Com., 197 (i).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5486, 5499 (ii).
Supply B. 158 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5952 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 4855, 4857 (ii).
Miscellaneous: Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3830 (ii).
Post Office (Sheet Harbour mail service) 5462.
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (wharfs, docks, &c.) 5705 (ii).
Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (coal contracts) 5302; (Eastern Extension, N.S. Ry., award 5900; (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 5302.
Steamboat Inspection (fog alarms) 294 (i).
Yukon Services (living allowances) 2654 (i).
Victoria Day B. 33 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4256 (ii).
Yukon Territory Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com. 3090 (ii).

Gallery, Mr. D., *Montreal, Ste. Anne.*
Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3212.

Galliher, Mr. W. A., *Yale and Cariboo.*
Alien Labour Restriction Act Amt. B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2482 (i).
Columbia and Kootenay Ry. and Navigation Co.'s (B. 56) 1°*, 1244 (i).
Crow's Nest Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 57) 1244 (i); in Com., 3420 (ii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 72) 1°*, 1496.
——— (B. 98) 1°*, 2161 (i).
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 58) 1°*, 1244 (i); in Com., 3223 (ii).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 83) 1°*, 1747 (i).
Railway Commissioners, Board of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 848 (i).
Similkameen and Keremeos Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 59) 1°*, 1244 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: Census (Mr. Cote's circular) 3975 (ii).

Ganong, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte.*

Back Bay, N.B., Wharf, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 5209 (ii).
Census Commissioner, Charlotte (Ques.) 93 (i).
Hopewell Cape Wharf, Contractors, &c. (Ques.) 810 (i).
I. C. R., Halifax Elevator, Employees, Number, &c. (Ques.) 1585 (i).
——— St. John Elevator, Employees, Number, duties, &c. (Ques.) 1584 (i).
Mealey, Mr. J. W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 809 (i).
St. John Elevator, Amount of Grain received (Ques.) 810 (i).
——— Harbour Works, *re* Connolly's Contract (Ques.) 1581 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: Census (Mr. Cote's circular) 3912 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Back Bay wharf) 3473; (Campobello breakwater) 3473; Telegraph Lines (Belle Island and St. Lawrence) 3529; (Deer Island) 3529.
Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (additional sidings) 4147; (St. John, increased accommodation) 4137, 4143 (ii).
Yukon Govt. (administration, &c.) 4920 (ii).

Telegraph Line to Dawson, Date of Commencement, &c. (Ques.) 4021 (ii).
Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3256.
Woodstock, N.B., Mail Contract, &c. for 1900 (Ques.) 4230 (ii).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

Couture, J. A., Vet. Surgeon, &c., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4193 (ii).
Freight Rates for Govt. Employees (Ques.) 1586.
I. C. R., Commission *re* Accident Claims, &c. (Ques.) 504, 1004 (i); 3753 (ii).
——— Joughins, G. R., Supt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3179 (ii).
——— Rivière du Loup, Foremen's Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 2989 (ii).
——— Rivière du Loup, Newspapers Sales, &c. (Ques.) 2938 (ii).
——— Trois Pistoles Station, &c. (Ques.) 504 (i).
Returning Officers, Deputy, Mileage Allowances, &c. (Ques.) 1589 (i),
Union Mutual Life Insurance Co., Deposits with Govt. (Ques.) 1589 (i).

Geoffrion, Mr. V., *Chambly and Verchères.*

G. T. Ry. Co.'s (B. 7) 1°*, 198 (i).
——— (B. 8) 1°*, 198; in Com., 1431 (i).
Le Crédit Foncier du Bas-Canada Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 2161 (i).
St. Lawrence Lloyds incorp. (B. 43) 1°*, 893 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 106) 1°*, 2347 (i); in Com., 5092, 5274 (ii).
Usury B. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) on Order for Com., 1432.

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 687 (i).
Business of the Hse., Procedure *re* Private Bills, 2922 (i).
Canadian National Bank incorp. (B. 109) 1°*, 2347 (i).
Canada National Ry. and Transport Co.'s incorp. B. 13 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 3°, 2747 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on. prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2185 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. (B. 76) 1°m., 1574.
Grain Transportation through Can. Channels, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1024, 1045 (i).
Man. Rys. Leases B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 4695, 4698 (ii).
Mather Bridge and Power Co.'s (B. 35) 1°*, 693.
Nipissing Election, Validity of Writ, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Northrup*) to Com. of Sup., 3718 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Transportation (Port Colborne) 1216 (i).
Railways and Canals: I. C. R. (Amherst subway, damages) 2716 (i); (Eastern Extension, N.S,, Ry. award) 5940 (ii); (steel rails Clergue's contract) 2727 (i).

Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3324.
Welland Canal, Water Power Leases, &c. (M. for Ret.) 2609 (i).

Gilmour, Mr. J., *East Middlesex.*

Canadian Nurses' Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 4434 (ii).
Foresters Subsidiary Court B. 120 (Mr. *Heyd*) on M. for 3°, 4367 (ii).
Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2381, 2426, 2431, 2436 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (dairying interests) 3057 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (London drill hall) 2552 (i).
Quarantine (compensation for slaughtered cattle) 3085 (ii).

Gould, Mr. I. J., *West Ontario.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (armouries) 5698 (ii).

Gourley, Mr. S. E., *Colchester.*

B. C. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4086 (ii).
Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s incorp. B. 13 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1990 (i).
Canada and Newfoundland, Negotiations *re* (Ques.) 1260 (i).
Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2364 (i).
Great Northern Transit Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2873 (i).

Gourley, Mr. S. E.—*Con.*

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 1919 (i).

Lead (refined) Bounties B. 152 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5728 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act (increased indemnity) Amt. B. 151 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5610 (ii).

Shipping Casualties Investigation B. 93 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2445 (i).

SUPPLY:

Indians: Man. (annuities) 2764; N.W.T. (annuities) 2762; N. S. (medical attendance) 2760; (seed grain) 2758 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 3427; (canteens, &c.) 3427, 3429 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Yukon and B. C. boundary) 2699 (i).

N. W. Mounted Police (clothing, arms, &c.) 3446 (ii).

Railways and Canals: I. C. R. (engine houses) 2644 (i).

Yukon Services (living allowances) 2654; (sheriff's fees) 2652; (stenographers, salaries, &c.) 2659 (i).

Transportation Question, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3218 (ii).

Valleyfield Labour Strike, Settlement by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 2606 (i).

Yukon Territory Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3089 (ii).

Guthrie, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 21 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1702 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 23) 1°*, 420; in Com., 1914 (i).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 420.

Hackett, Mr. E., *West Prince, P.E.I.*

Alberton, P. E. I., Postmaster, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 1404 (i).

——— Sandy Island, Removal of Stones, &c. (Ques.) 1993 (i).

Amelia SS., Tonnage, &c. (Ques.) 1795 (i).

Binder Twine Manufacture, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 548 (i).

Brennan, J. Albert, Payment of Fishing Bounty, &c. (M. for copies of cor.) 1424 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2057 (i).

Cascumpec Harbour Improvements (Ques.) 207 (i).

——— Harbour Lights (Ques.) 206 (i).

Can. Nurses Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 5414 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2810, 2812 (i); 4055-57, 4198, 4328 (ii).

Fishing Bounties, Queen's Co., P.E.I., Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 2777 (i).

——— Tignish Co., Payments, &c. (M. for copies of cor.) 1424 (i).

Forestry Protection in P.E.I. (Ques.) 1439 (i).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Found's Mill to Emerald Junction Mail Service (Ques.) 5211 (ii).

Gallant, Mr. B., Returning Officer, West Prince, P.E.I. (Ques.) 1006 (i).

——— Mr. F., Travelling Fees, &c. (Ques.) 1404.

Higgins' Shore, Pier, &c., Pet. from Settlers (Ques.) 4195 (ii).

Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4900 (ii).

I.C.R., Summerside and Tignish Train Accommodation (Ques.) 3456 (ii).

Jennie May, Schr., Investigations *re* Loss, &c. (Ques.) 2777 (i).

Kinsman, Mr., Appnmt. as Horticulturist, &c. (Ques.) 1438 (i).

Magdalen Island SS. Service, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1795 (i).

Pacific Cable Act Amt. B. 45 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 907 (i).

Postmasters, Safes furnished by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1404 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 4245, 4248 (ii).

Poultry Fattening Stations, P.E.I., &c. (Ques.) 2703 (i).

P.E.I., Claims for Increased Subsidy B. 138 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4717; in Com., 5355 (ii).

——— Exports to G.B., Cold Storage, &c. (Ques.) 1438 (i).

——— Mails (remarks) 100 (i).

P. E. I. Ry., Pet. *re* Construction at O'Leary's Station (Ques.) 1795 (i).

——— service, Tel. read, 1498 (i).

——— trainmen, &c., Number, &c. (Ques.) 4194.

——— (remarks) *re* Question, 4196 (ii).

——— Tignish and Nail Pond Mail Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3269 (ii).

——— West Prince Returning Officer, Payments to (Ques.) 1006 (i).

——— Winter Communication with Mainland, Repairs of Piers, &c. (Ques.) 1585 (i).

——— reps. from Boards of Trade, &c., on M. for copies (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1276 (i).

——— Winter Mail Service (remarks) 3276 (ii).

Prince, Wm. L., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2702 (i).

Queen's Co., P.E.I., Distribution of Bounty Cheques (Ques.) 2777 (i).

Safes for Postmasters, &c. (Ques.) 1404 (i).

Sandy Island, Alberton Harbour, P.E.I., Removal of Stores, &c. (Ques.) 1993 (i).

Skinner's Pond Harbour (Ques.) 68 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: Census (Mr. Cote's circular) 3916; (cold storage) 302 (ii); (Paris exposition) 939, 961 (i); (patents) 4610.

Customs: Miscellaneous (printing and stationery) 4626 (ii).

Dom. Lands (inspector's agents, &c.) 1383 (i).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Fisheries (hatcheries, &c.) 4590 (ii) ; (protection service) 306 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (P.E.I. and G.B.) 5776 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 3433 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Biological stations) 267 ; (Cape Tormentine and Summerside) 252 (i),

Penitentiaries : Kingston (McKay's account) 4636 (ii).

Post Office (P.E.I. mail service) 5463 (ii).

Public Works : Dredging, P.E.I. (plant, &c.) 3521 ; Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I. (Cascumpec Harbour) 3461 ; (Miminegash breakwater) 3462 ; (Skinner's pond) 3464 ; (Souris Knight's Point breakwater) 3466 ; (Tignish breakwater) 3472 ; (West Point Pier) 3472 ; Roads and Bridges (Des Joachims) 3525 (ii).

Railways and Canals : Miscellaneous (O'Leary and West Point Ry.) 4314 ; (surveys and inspections) 4314 ; Railways—I.C.R. (Eastern Extension, N.B., Ry. award) 5948 ; (Eastern Extension, N.S., Ry. award) 5898, 5930 ; (Miramichi bridge spans) 4162 (ii) ; (steel rails) 2640 (i) ; P.E.I. Ry. (dismissals, &c.) 4225 ; (machinery for shops) 4247 ; (Murray Harbour branch, &c.) 4228 ; (sidings, &c.) 4219 ; (straightening line at Blue Shank) 4224 (ii).

Tignish Breakwater (Ques.) 105 (i).

West Prince Election Ballots (Ques.) 83 (i).

York, Duke of, Arrival at Quebec or Halifax (remarks) 5214 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*

Alien Labour Restriction Act Amt. B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4653 (ii).

Aud. Gen. Rep. (remarks) 99 (i).

Bank Note ($4), Imprint of American Lock on M. (Mr. *Bennett*) to adjn., 2212 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1900 (i).

Can. and France SS. Service, *See* 'Ocean SS. Subsidy.'

C.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 3984, 4004 (ii).

C.P.R. and Coal Bearing Lands, Disposal by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2776 (i).

Clergue Contract, &c., Inquiry for Papers, 4902, 5213 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply.'

Clergue Iron and Nickel Steel Co. of Canada incorp. B. 19 (Mr. *Dymont*) in Com., 2936 (i).

Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 737 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 429 (i).

Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 5373 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2784 (i).

French SS. Service. *See* "Ocean," &c.

Govt. Vessels, B.C., Tenders, &c., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) for Copies, 514 (i).

Haggart, Hon, J. G.—*Con.*

Grain Transportation through Can. Channels, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1036 (i).

I.C.R., Locomotives, Rolling Stock, &c. purchased (Ques.) 331 (i).

——— Locomotives furnished by Kingston Locomotive Works (M. for Copies of O. C., &c.) 816 (i).

Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 3095 (ii).

——— *See* "Staples."

Judges of Provincial Courts Act (Vancouver) Amt. B. 150 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 5595 (ii).

Kootenay and Arrow Head Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. *Galliher*) in Com., 3224 (ii).

Lachine Canal Lock, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1067.

Man. Railways Agreement B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. for 2°, 2987 ; in Com., 4997 (ii).

Mint. *See* "Royal."

Montreal Harbour Loan B. 142 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5119 ; in Com. on Res., 5137, 5150 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Works, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1068 (i).

——— Malone & Co.'s Contract, Specifications, &c. (M. for copies*) 1406 (i).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts, Receipts, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Stmnt., 2582 (i).

Nipissing Election, Validity of Writ, &c.; on Amt. (Mr. *Northrup*) to Com. of Sup., 3714 (ii).

N.S. Claims against Govt. (M.) to print Papers, 2610 (i).

Ocean SS. (Can. and France) Subsidies Act Amt. B. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 5390.

Ottawa, Gatineau and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 3221 (ii).

Pacific Cable Act Amt. B. 45 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 903 (i) ; in Com. on B., 5393 (ii).

Penitentiary Act (second inspector) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 5593 (ii).

P. E. I. Claims for increased Subsidy B. 138 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4683, in Com., 4727 ; in Com. on. B., 5331, 5339, 5352 (ii).

Pontiac County Ry. Indebtedness, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Henderson*) 5612 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 1°, 2878 (i) ; in Com., 4242 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5111 (ii).

Railways and Canals Dept, Criticism of Management, &c. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 5966 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5473, 5494 (ii).

Royal Mint Establishment B. 143 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5388 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Canals, Contract Changes, &c. (M. for O.C.*) 815 (i).

St. Lawrence River Channel, Ques. of Order, 205 (i).

Saw Logs Duty, on Prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 221.

Sorel Harbour Works, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1067 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 5283 (ii).

Staples Inspection Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 3096 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Conc. (remarks *re* procedure) 5950 (ii).

Administration of Justice (Supreme Court, R. G. Davis) 5777 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: Census (Mr. Coté's circular) 3874, 3979; (expenditure) 3869; (industries, &c.) 3874, 3886 (ii).

Civil Govt. (Finance and Treasury Board) conc., 5789; Printing and Stationery (salaries) 3909; Railways and Canals (McKnight, S. L. T., appnmt.) 5649 (ii).

Dom. Lands (boundary fence) 5452; (maps, printing, engraving, &c.) 5452; Miscellaneous (half-breeds claims commission) 5453; (surveys, &c.) 5450 (ii).

Justice: Exchequer Court, conc., 5792; Supreme Court, conc., 5792 (ii); Miscellaneous (revision of the Statutes) 2670 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Bond-Blaine Treaty) conc., 5794; (Can. and S. Africa) 4788; (St. John, Liverpool and G.B.) conc., 5794 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (St. Lawrence, winter navigation) 266 (i).

Post Office (mail service) 435, 442, 456 (i).

Printing and Stationery (binding and distributing laws) 3910 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (H. of C., addition, improvement) 5674; (military store) 4390; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (private docks) 5755; (Miminegash breakwater) 3465; (St. Lawrence channel) 1174, 1181 (i); Miscellaneous (chief engineer's office) 5762; (clerical assistance) 5758; Yukon (accounts, &c.) 4293; (rents, lighting, &c.) 4304; Yukon Telegraph Lines (Quesnelle to Atlin) 4275, 4285; (working expenses, &c.) 4303 (ii).

Railways and Canals: Canals, Carillon (rebuilding guide) 5625; Chambly (repairs) 4388; (St. John drainage) 5632; Cornwall (dismissal of lockmaster) 4264; (enlargement) 4310; conc., 5794; (Gilbert Dredging Co., settlement) 5643, 5669; conc., 5800; Culbute (damages by floods) 4383; Farran's Point (enlargement) 4311; Galops, 4311; (enlargement) 5619; (North Channel) 4312, 5620; Generally (repairs, operating expenses) 4322; Lachine (*Frank Perew*, tug, repairs) 5625; (macadamizing Cote St. Paul road) 5624; (masonry wall) 4313; (Mill street paving) 5621; (new lock) 5627; (repairs) 4388; (slope walls) 5621; (weirs, &c.) 4380; Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 4383; (removing of shoals) 4309; Lake St. Louis (hydrographic survey) 4309; Rapide Plat, 4311; Sault Ste. Marie (deepening, &c.) 4257; St. Lawrence (surveys, buoys, &c.) 4312, 4382; St. Peters Canal (O'Donohue's claim) 5632; Soulanges (construction) 4306; Trent (construction) 4265; (Peterborough dam) 4314; (Young's Point dam) 4384; Welland (deepening long levels) 5618; (docking renewal) 5632; (Dunnville dam) 5626; (old lock walls) 5625; (Port Colborne) 4313, 5617; (repairs) 4313; (Robt. Coulter, extra pay) 4389; Miscellaneous (Gov. General's car) 5633; (gratuity to Mrs. Chamberlain) 4386; (salaries, &c.) 4318; Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes) 4155; (Amherst subway, damages) 2716; (Canso ferry service) 5217; (coal contracts) 5298; (draw-bars, &c.) 4156; (Eastern Extension, N.S., Ry. award) 5899, 5937; (Eel River station) 5226 (ii); (engine houses) 2642 (i); (exports from St. John, N.B.) 5218; (feeding, &c., places for cattle) 4218; (ferry service, Canso) 4379; (general expenses) 4387, 5650 (ii); (Halifax accomodation) 2706 (i); 5216; Halifax, dredging, &c.) 4134; (increased facilities) 4151, 4379; (Kingston locomotive works, contract, &c.) 4169, 4188; (Levis accomodation) 4126; (loccmotive couplers) 4153; (Miramichi bridge spans) 4164; (Nicolet station) 52-6 (ii); (original construction) 2719 (i); (Pictou accomodation) 5217; (Pintsch gas equipment) 4158 (ii); (railway and canal tolls) 2645; (Rocky Lake bridge) 2642 (i); (rolling stock) 4165, 4213, 4378; (St. John, freight, &c.) 5218; (St. John, increased accomodation) 4136; (St. John wharf, conveyer) 4378 (ii); (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 2628, 2719 (i) 3579, 3622, 3634-38, 3725-52, 5218, 5225, 5228, 5270, 5285, 5309; (Clergue contract, papers *re*) 5213; (travelling cranes) 4378; (turntables, Mulgrave) 4158; (vestibules, &c.) 4156; P.E.I. Ry. (machinery for shops) 4227; (steel rails, &c.) 4226, 4380; (straightening line at Blue Shank) 4224 (ii).

Yukon Services (Judge's salary) 2652; (living allowances) 2654; (witness fees) 2658 (i).

Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3291.

W. C. Edwards Co.'s B. 61 (Mr. *Rosamond*) in Com., 3227 (ii).

Yukon Territory Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3092 (ii).

Halliday, Mr. J., *North Bruce.*

Southampton Harbour Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 2778 (i)

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. *Talbot*) on M. for 2°, 731 (i).

Binder Twine Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 565 (i).

Budget, The, Ques. of Order, 1812 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2292 (i).

Bruce, North, Election, Transfer of Mail Clerks, Par. in Newspaper (remarks) 1595 (i).

Butter, Cheese, &c., exported to G. B. (Ques.) 1256 (i).

Butter, Cheese, &c., imported in the United Kingdom (Ques.) 1255 (i).

Cattle and Animals exported to G. B. and U. S., (Ques.) 1254 (i).

Commodities, Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4743, 4747; on Amt. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4882; (binder twine) 4885 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 9) 1° m., 198 ; 2° m., 1051 ; on Order for Com., 1791 (i).

——— B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2809 (i) ; 4198, 4324 (ii).

Financial Situation, Review, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com of Sup., 5870 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2798, 2807 (i) ; 4203 (ii).

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°,502 ; in Com., 2360, 2417, 2611 (i).

Great Northern Transit Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2874 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 1916, 2385 ; on M. for 3°, 2392 (ii).

Hogs, Lard, &c., imported from U.S., (Ques.) 1255 (i).

Indian Corn Imports, &c., (Ques.) 84 (i).

Mint, *See* 'Royal'.

Montreal Harbour Loan B. 142 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5148 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts. (Ques. of Order) 2578 (i).

Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Rys. Co.'s B. 95 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 5091 (ii).

Ottawa and Hull Power and Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 25 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 2752, 2920 (i).

Pig Iron, Bounty, Total Amount, &c. : (Ques.) 1253 (i).

Pontiac County, Ry. Indebtedness (Ques. of Order) 5612 (ii).

P.E.I., Claims for increased Subsidy (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4723 (ii).

——— Ry. Subsidies, Amount paid, &c. ; (Ques.) 5584 (ii).

Privilege(Ques. of) *re* Vote on Coronation Oath, 895 (i).

Royal Mint Establishment B. 143 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5385 (ii).

S. A. War—'C' Battery Pay (Ques.) 84 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) for Papers, 127 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 5275, 5282, 5406 (ii).

Supply B. 158 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5952 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice : Yukon (maintenance of prisoners) 4637 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (aid to agricultural societies) 2837 ; (Buffalo Exhibition) 1000 ; (census) 2862 (i), 5785 ; (cold storage on steamers) 5175 ; (creameries in N.W., sales to Griffith & Co., 5175 (ii) ; Paris exposition (ques. of order) 963 (i).

Charges of Management (printing of Dom. notes) 176 (i).

Civil Govt. : Interior Dept., (deputy's salary) 181 (i).

Customs : Miscellaneous (leather combine) 4632.

Dom. Police (canal protection service) 4636 (ii).

Geological Survey (reports, &c.) 5317 (ii).

Indians : Ont. and Que. (blankets, &c.) 2754 (i).

Legislation : House of Commons (debates) 195 (i).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Bronte lighthouse) 288 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (cattle embargo in G.B.) 4777 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries (Capt. Bernier's expedition) conc , 5791 (ii).

Miscellaneous (*Canada Gazette*) 3448 (ii).

Post Office : (deficits, &c.) 499 (i).

Public Works : Buildings, Ont., (Clinton post office) 5695 (ii) ; (generally) 2557 ; (London drill hall) 2551 (i) ; Ottawa (furniture, repairs, &c.) 3127 ; (Victoria Memorial Museum) 5682 (ii) ; (Sarnia) 2555 (i) ; Dredging, Ont. and Que. (new plant) 3518 ; Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campobello breakwater) 3479 ; N.S. (wharfs, docks) 5705 (ii) ; Ont. (Bronte harbour) 288 (i), 5729 ; (Indian River dredging) 5732 ; (Oakville pier) 5743 ; (Presqu'ile wharf) 5753 ; Que. (Ile aux Grues wharf) 5708 ; Roads and Bridges (Des Joachims) 3528 ; Yukon, Telegraph Lines (Quesnelle to Atlin) 4284 (ii).

Supreme Court Vacancy (remarks) 5971 (ii).

Tobacco Duty (Ques.) 84 (i).

Victoria Day (remarks) on Adjnmt., 5093 (ii).

Ways and Means : The Tariff (beet root sugar) in Com. on Res., 5804 (ii).

Weights and Measures (size of fruit baskets) Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 1058 (i).

Heyd, Mr. C. B., *South Brant.*

Binder Twine Manufacture, on prop. Res., (Mr. *Blain*) 557 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1725 (i).

C.P.R. Land Grants Taxation B. 17 (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) on M. for 2°, 1161 (i).

Clergue Iron and Nickel Steel Co. of Can. incorp. B. 19 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 2926 (i).

Commodities Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com. (binder twine) 4885 (ii).

Foresters, High Court (B. 120) M. to receive Pet., 2382 ; 1°*, 2702 (i) ; 2° m., 3220 ; 3° m., 4360, 4365 (ii).

Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 135 (Mr. *McCarthy*) Extension of Time for Private Bills, 4534 ; 1°* of B., 4535 (ii).

Man. Rys. Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5002, 5046 (ii).

Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 2382 (i).

Railway Question, on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 160 (i).

SUPPLY :

Miscellaneous : Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3818, 3841 (ii).

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence Channel) 1202 (i).

Holmes, Mr. R., *West Huron.*

Business of the House (remarks) 99 (i).

Commodities, Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com. (salt) 4894 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. of Sup., 4050

Holmes, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2426, 2612 (i).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Guthrie*) on M. for 3°, 2395 (i).
Lumber Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1786.
Printing Bureau, Additional Accommodation, on M. to conc. in 5th Rep. of Com., 5203.
Railway Commissioners, Board of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 845 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: (census circular) 3079, 3972; (experimental farm bulletins) 4595 (ii).
Customs: Miscellaneous (leather combine) 4635.
Immigration: (expenditure, &c.) 4861 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (generally) 2558 (i).
Quarantine (Stubbs, Mr., appnmt., &c.) 4613.

Horsey, Mr. E. H., *North Grey.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont., (Presqu'ile wharf) 5750 (ii).
Railways and Canals: I. C. R. (locomotives, &c., contract) 4185 (ii).
Victoria Day Perpetuation (B. 33) 1°*, 503; 2° m., 1432 (i).
——— Statement from Govt. (remarks) 5214 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. J. J., *King's, P.E.I.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2032 (i).
Ontario, Ry. Subsidies, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 5585 (ii).
P.E.I. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com., 4704 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Bivers, P.E.I., (Souris Knight's Point breakwater) 3466 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. S., *North Victoria, O.*
Australian Commonwealth, Congratulary Telegram, &c. (remarks) 4873 (ii).
Bolsover P.O. (Ques.) 208 (i).
Bowman & Porter, Dredging Contract, &c. (Ques.) 204 (i).
Can. and France SS. Subsidy B. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 5110 (ii).
Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s incorp. B. 13 (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com., 1969 (i).
Canadian Nurses Association B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 5584 (ii).
Crow's Nest Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 57 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. to wthdrw., 5712 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Ingram*) on M. for 2°, 212 (i).
——— B. 9 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 1054 (i).
——— B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4034, 4050 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2807 (i).
French SS. Service. *See* 'Can. and France.'
General Officer Commanding, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 337 (i).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Grain Transportation through Can. Channels, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1109 (i).
Hackett, Dredge, Names of Owners, &c. (Ques.) 204 (i).
Hamilton Field Battery and Col. Van Wagner's Retirement (M. for cor.*) 1267 (i).
——— *See* 'Van Wagner.'
Hutton, Gen., and Lt.-Col. S. Hughes (M. for Cor., &c.) 368, 418 (i).
——— (remarks) 115 (i).
Indemnity, Increase. *See* 'Sen. and H. of C.'
I. C. R., Air Brakes, &c. (Ques.) 334 (i).
——— Grades from Montreal to Halifax, Moncton to St. John, &c. (Ques.) 1588 (i).
Japanese Restrictions and B. C. Legislation (Ques.) 5586 (ii).
Judicial Committee of Privy Council, Can. Representation (Ques.) 2401 (i).
Lead (refined) Bounties B. 152 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5720 (ii).
McGirr, Mr. J. *See* 'Bolsover.'
Man. Rys. Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 4999 (ii).
Militia Officers Training (remarks) *re* Notice of Motion, 1070 (i).
Ontario Legislation, Ques., &c. (remarks) 5825 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredge and Construction Co., Names, &c. (Ques.) 204 (i).
Pacific Cable Act Amt. B. 45 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 904, 909 (i).
Patent Branch, Revenue, Cost, &c. (Que.) 1257 (i).
Penitentiaries Act (second inspector) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 5588 (ii).
Pensions to Headquarters Staff, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).
Pensions to Permanent Force B. 133 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) on M. for 3°, 4875 (ii).
Pontiac County, Ry. Indebtedness, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Henderson*) 5612 (ii).
Quebec Terminal Ry. Co's B. 67 (Mr. *Malouin*) in Com., 5541 (ii).
Railway Bonuses by Municipalities (Ques.) 202, 329 (i).
Railway Question, on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. on Sup., 172 (i).
——— Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5482, 5513, 5517, 5556 (ii).
Rifle Shooting, Annual Payment, Ammunition, &c. (prop. Res.) 1281, 1286 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act (increased Indemnity) Amt. B. 151 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5826 (ii).
South African War—Canadian Intervention, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. on Sup., 1353 (i).
———'C' Battery Pay, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) for Papers, 131 (i).
———Correction of Speech in Hansard, 1797 (i).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
South African War, Cor. with Imp. Govt., on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 5890 (ii).
———Officers and Non-Com. Officers, Rank, &c. (remarks) 1576 (i).
———Pay of Contingents, Par. in London *Times*, 911 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 5279 (ii).
Staff College Course Imperial Books, Data, &c. (prop. Res.) 1287 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris exposition) 976 (i).
Civil Government Customs Dept. (salaries) 185 (i).
Fisheries (protection service) 300 (i).
Immigration (agents in Ireland) 4917 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and S. S. Subventions (cattle slaughtered at Irish ports) 4773; (St. John and Belfast) 4773 (ii).
Militia (gratuities, Maj. Maxwell) 4357 (ii).
Miscellaneous: Labour Dept. (salaries, printing, &c.) 4791; (Plains of Abraham, purchase) 5812 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (ar[illegible]ouries) 5699; (Ottawa, telephones) 4392; (Toronto, mail room at station) 4392; (Victoria County drill hall) 3104; Dredging (Scugog River) 4402; Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John Harbour) 5106; Ont. (Bruce Mines wharf) 5731; (Cobourg pier) 3500; (Parry Sound) 4805; Que. (Anticosti) 5710 (ii); (St. Lawrence Channel) 1177, 1192 (i); (Sorel wharf) 4800 (ii).
Railways and Canals: Canals—Trent (Chemong Lakebridge) 5626; Welland (Bobcaygeon dam) 5635; Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes) 4155; (rolling stock) 4165; (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 5234, 5288; (turntables, Mulgrave) 4158 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (meteorological charts) 290 (i).
Van Wagner, Lt. Col., Retirement, &c. (Ques.) 2568 (i).
———(M. for cor. *) 1267 (i).
———on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5890 (ii).

Hyman, Mr. C. S., *London.*
Budget, The, 1540 (i),
Foresters Subsidiary B. 120 (Mr. *Heyd*) on M. for 3° (amt.) 4361 (ii).
London Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s (B. 12) 1° *, 238; in Com., 2923 (i).
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1496.
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 65 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 1°, 1397 (i).
Pensions to Headquarters Staff, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3013 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 654 (i).
——— B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4666.
Armoury: *See* 'St. Thomas.'
Binder Twine Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 596 (i).
Census Commissioner for East Elgin, &c. (Ques.) 65, 1263 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Coins mutilated (Ques.) 66 (i).
Commodities Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) on Amt. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4879 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 2) 1° m., 20; 2° m., 94, 211; in Com., 1051 (i).
——— B. 9 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 1055.
——— B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2809 (i); 4022, 4045 (ii).
Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 5365 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2785, 2788, 2795, 2798 (i); 4204 (ii).
Foresters Subsidiary High Court B. 120 (Mr. *Heyd*) in Com., 4015; (M.) 6 m. h, 4018 (ii).
Free Transportation for Members, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 543 (i).
Indemnity, increased, *See* "Sen. and H. of C."
Jones, Ralph, Payment to (Ques.) 509 (i).
Mint, Can., (Ques.) 65 (i).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Carroll*) in Com., 5892 (ii).
O'Donoghue, D. J., Appnmt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1588 (i).
Passes to Members, *See* "Free Transportation."
Port Bruce Harbour, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 507 (i).
Port Burwell Harbour, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 506 (i).
Port Colborne Harbour, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1404, 2161 (i).
Port Stanley Harbour, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 506 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Kendry*) *re* Telegram of Mr. McGregor, 3371 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5519 (ii).
St. Thomas Armoury, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 505 506 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act (increased Indemnity) Amt. B. 151 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5827 (ii).
S. A. War, Graves of Can. Soldiers (Ques.) 64 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (aid to agricultural societies) 2838; (census) 2864 (i); (census, circular) 3063, 3072; (Mr. Cote's letter) 3895, 3904, 3947, 3954, 3962; (cold storage) 3019 (ii) (tree culture) 2850; (*Year Book*) 2831, 2838.
Fisheries (cold storage bait) 322; (legal expenses) 313; (protection service) 296, 301 (i).
Geological Survey (reports, &c.) 5317 (ii).
Immigration (agents salaries, &c., W. T. R. Preston) 4832, 4856; (contingencies, foreign agencies) 4869 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Port Burwell light) 279; (St. Lawrence route) 276 (i).
Militia (cadet corps, rifles, &c.) 3401 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Japanese Commission) 5311; Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3830, 3838; (organization, salaries, &c.) 3790 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (life saving rewards) 260; (tidal surveys) 264 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works: Buildings (contract labour) 3159; (H. of C., addition, improvement, &c.) 5674; (Seybold block, rent, &c.) 3136; (St. Thomas armoury) 3104, 3109, 5693; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (private docks) 5703; (Port Burwell Harbour) 3160 (ii); (St. Lawrence Channel) 1203; Transportation (Port Colborne) 1238 (i); Yukon (Lewes and Yukon River improvements) 4290 (ii).

Quarantine (compensation for slaughtered cattle) 3084 (ii).

Railways and Canals: Canals—Welland (Dunnville dam) 5631; (Port Colborne entrance) 5618; Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 4150; (air brakes, &c.) 4155; (coal contracts) 5299, 5306; (draw-bars, &c.) 4156; (locomotives, &c.) 4166, 4173, 4187; (locomotive couplers) 4154; (machinery, car shops, &c.) 4158 (rolling stock) 4165; (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 3743, 5291, 5299, 5306 (ii).

Technical Education and Govt. Jurisdiction (Ques.) 1263 (i).

Wabash Locomotive Repairs (Ques.) 64 (i).

Johnston, Mr. A., *Cape Breton.*

Can. Nurses' Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 5411 (ii).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 3°, 4421 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Atlantic Fast SS service) 5775 (ii).

Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (coal contracts) 5301; (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 5243, 5301 (ii).

Sydney and East Bay Ry., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 1266 (i).

Sydney Indian Reserve, Possession, &c. (Ques.) 1264 (i).

Johnston, Mr. R., *Cardwell.*

Binder Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 233 (i).

Census Commissioner for Cardwell, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 329 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act (increased indemnity) Amt. B. 151 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5607 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Post Office (mail service) 483 (i)

Johnston, Mr. T. G., *Lambton.*

SUPPLY:

Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (Eastern Extension N.S., Ry. award) 5941 (ii).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*

Bond-Blaine Treaty, *re* Newfoundland, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5830 (ii).

Canadian Flag in Foreign Ports, Orders issued from Admiralty Office (remarks) 4648, 5970 (ii).

Daggett, Mr. M. G., Anticosti Island, License granted by Govt. (Ques.) 1591 (i).

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2368, 2414 (i).

Montreal Harbour Loan B. 142 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5125 (ii).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E.—*Con.*

Newfoundland Treaty: *See* 'Bond-Blaine.'

Pensions for Permanent Force, on prop. Res., (Mr. *Borden, Kings*) 4238 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 4252 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5570, 5571 (ii).

Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. 92 (Sir *Louis Davies* in Com., 2441 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4208 (ii).

Shipping Casualties Investigation B. 93 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on M. for 2°, 2445; in. Com., 2451 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: Census (industries, &c.) 3914; (cold storage) 3045 (ii).

Indians: N.S. (medical attendance) 2759 (i).

Interior Dept.: Geological Survey (bacteriological dept.) 5456 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and G.B.) 4789; (St. John, Halifax and W. Indies) 4783; (St. John and London) 4782.

Militia (annual drill) 3424; (musketry school) 3390; (properties, Lunenburg) 3439 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Lunenburg post office) 4390; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Battery Point retaining wall) 3163; (Hiltz Narrows breakwater) 3164; (Lunenburg harbour) 3167; (Mill Cove breakwater) 3164; (Parrsboro Beach) 3163; (Petite Rivières breakwater) 3164; (Porter's Lake) 3167 (ii).

Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (steel rails) 2631 (i); Miscellaneous (N.S. Southern Ry.) 4315.

Kemp, Mr. A. E., *East Toronto.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1686 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Mr. Chamberlain, 1464 (i).

Canada Atlantic and I.C.R. Freight Rates, &c. (Ques.) 1590 (i).

Commercial Agents, Emplymt by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 4753 (ii).

German Discriminatiou, Cor. *re* (Ques.) 85 (i).

Grain Transportation through Can. Channels, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1088 (i).

Halifax Grain Elevator, Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 1590 (i).

I.C.R. and Canada Atlantic Freight Rates, &c. (Ques.) 1590 (i).

P.E.I., Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. on Res., 4711 (ii).

St. Lawrence River Channel, Depth of Water, &c. (Ques.) 205 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Toronto harbour) 5735 (ii).

Toronto Harbour (M. for rep. *re**) 77 (i).

Transportation Question, *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3340.

Kendall, Mr. A. S., *Cape Breton.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 691 (i).

Alien Labour Law, Enforcement *re* Dom. Steel Works (Ques.) 200 (i).

Kendal, Mr. A. S.—*Con.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2339 (i).

Coronation Oath, Address to His Majesty, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., (seconded) 698 (i).

Dom. Steel Works : *See* ' Alien Labour.'

Govt. Employees, Classification, Remuneration, &c. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 5969 (ii).

Railway Commissioners, Board of, on prop Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 862 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (cold storage) 3044 (ii) ; (Paris exposition) 960 (i).
Fisheries (cold storage bait) 320 (i).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Lunenburg County breakwaters) 3166; (Porter's Lake) 3174 (ii).
Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 5247, 5256 (ii).

Transportation Ques, *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3359 (ii).

Kendry, Mr. J., *West Peterborough.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2222 (i).

Privilege (Ques. of), Tel. *re* Auburn Mills, 3365.

Trent Valley Canal, Port Hope Harbour, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5441 (ii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 650, 689 (i).

Brockville Drill Hall, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 2205.

——— Suspension of Supt. (Ques.) 2398 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2020 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4026 (ii).

E. B. Eddy Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 3413 (ii).

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2613 (i).

Manhood Suffrage Registration, Remuneration to Municipalities (Ques.) 2204 (i).

Port Colborne Harbour Works, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 811 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 4) 1° m., 103 ; 2° m., 213 (i).

St. Catharines Water Supply (Ques.) 109 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: Census (Mr. Cote's circular) 3952 ; (industries, &c.) 3883.

Water Levels of Great Lakes, &c. (Ques.) 94 (i).

Welland Canal, Lock 24, Tenderer, &c. (Ques.) 1591 (i).

——— Quantity of Water passing through (Ques.) 1592 (i).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher.*

Canada and Italy Trade Relations, Cor. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for copies, 525 (i).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.—*Con*

C.P.Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 4011.

Commodities, Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4745, 4747 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act (Ques.) 66 (i).

——— South-eastern Man., Survey (Ques.) 82 (i).

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2365, 2410, 2413, 2419, 2426, 2429-31 (i).

Grand Falls Water Power and Boom Co.'s B. 89 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 5270 (ii).

Great North-western Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 693.

Horses for British Army, Com. from C. W. Peterson, &c. (Ques.) 1995 (i).

Mails in H. of C., Delay (remarks) 100 (i).

Man. Rys. Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5030, 5087 (ii).

Man. School Lands, Inquiry for Ret., 2205 (i).

——— Rep. of Judge Prendergast, Inquiry for Papers, 4196 (ii).

——— Commission, Inquiry for Rep., 5714 (ii).

——— *See* "School Lands."

Mennonites, Loan to (Ques.) 67 (i).

Rosseau River Indians (Ques.) 82 (i).

Saskatchewan and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 893 (i).

School Lands, Man., Sale, &c. (M. for lists) 71.

——— Transfer of (M. for pets.) 88 (i).

——— *See* ' Manitoba.'

Settlers in Man., Loans to (Ques.) 107 (i).

Statutes, Dom., Revision (Ques.) 66 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (census, circular) 3073 (ii).
Dom. Lands (extra services) 1389 (i) ; Miscellaneous (half-breed claims commission) 5454 ; (international boundary investigations) 5454 (ii) ; (surveys, printing, &c.) 1371 (i), 5451 (ii).
Geological Survey (explorations, &c.) 3768 (ii).
Govt. of N. W. T. (insane patients) 1367 (i).
Legislation (voters' lists) 3910 (ii).
Miscellaneous : Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3803, 3819 ; (Paris agency) 3452 (ii).

Ticket-of-Leave Act (Ques.) 107 (i.)

Usury Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) on M. for 2°, 622 (i).

Winnipeg Letter Carriers (Ques.) 105 (i).

Yukon Territory Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3092 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G., *East Quebec.*

Address, on The, 43 (i).

——— consdn. (M) 7, 20 (i).

Agricultural Committee, Meeting, &c. (remarks) 4754 (ii).

Alaskan Boundary Dispute, Cor. *re* Map sent to Paris Exposition, 4408 (ii).

——— Joint High Commission, Meetings, &c., (remarks) 5962 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 648, 650 (i).
——— (B. 47) 1° m., 1066: 2° m., 2456; in Com., 2458, 2472, 2488 (i); 4649–4666; 3° m., 5095 (ii).
——— Enforcement, Amount expended (Ans.) 332 (i).
——— Labour Organizations (Ans.) 2706 (i).
Anticosti Island, Cor. with Imp. Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) for Copies, 1411 (ii).
Ascension Day, Adjournment (M.) 5094 (ii).
Ash Wednesday Adjnmt. (M.) 137 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (Ans.) 111 (i).
Australian Commonwealth, Can. Representation (Ans.) 69 (i).
——— Congratulation of Can. Govt. (remarks) 4873, 5961–2 (ii).
——— Preferential Tariff, Par. in *London Times re* Mr. Mulock's Conference, 5326 (ii).
Bell Telephone Co., Defective Legislation, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., (remarks) 5397 (ii).
Bernier, Capt., *See* 'Polar.'
Bills reserved for Queen's Pleasure (Ans.) 3178.
Binder Twine, Manufacture of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 2347 (i).
——— Price for Labour, &c. (Ans.) 5586 (ii).
Bond-Blaine Treaty, *See* 'Newfoundland.
B.C. Claims *re* Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 3459 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4104 (ii).
Budget, The, on amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1618.
Business of the House (remarks) 96, 2872 (i); 3453 (ii).
——— Procedure, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Charlton*) 4940 (ii).
——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'
Can. and France SS. Subsidy B. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 5103 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ocean.'
Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s incorp. B. 13 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1964, 1988 (i).
Canada and Newfoundland, Negotiations, &c. (Ans.) 1260 (i).
Can. Nurses' Association B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 5579 (ii).
C.P.Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 3994, 4013 (ii).
——— Land Grants, Taxation B. 17 (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) on M. for 2°, 1130 (i).
——— Tax Exemption, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 2533 (i).
Can. Temperance Act, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 337.
——— Res. of H. of C., &c. (Ans.) 3754 (ii).
Candidates, Defeated, &c., Appnmt. to Offices (Ans.) 199 (i).
'C' Battery, Pay, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 2056.
Census Commissioner for Dorchester, Appnmt. of (Ans.) 897 (i).
Chinese and Japanese Immigration Commission (Ans.) 3641 (ii).
Civil Service List (presented) 239 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Coal and Wood Tenders, on Inquiry for Ret., 2879 (i).
Committee, Sel. Standing (M.) 7 (i).
——— Sel. Standing, to prepare Lists (M.) 52 (i).
——— conc. (M.) 102 (i).
Cornwall and York, Duke of, Visit, &c. (remarks) 509, 807, 1070 (i).
——— Par. in *Victoria Times* (remarks) 1290.
——— *See* 'Royal Highnesses,' 'York, Duke of.'
Coronation Oath, on prop. Address (Mr. *Costigan*) remarks, 432 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 700, 782 (i).
Crown. *See* 'Demise.'
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Co.'s B. 57 (Mr. *Davis*) on M. to wthdrw., 5712 (ii).
Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. (B. 148) 1°*, 5577.
Dansereau, Mr. Lionel, Appnmt. (Ans.) 111 (i).
Dawson Buildings, Cost of Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1586 (i).
Debates, Official, Sel. Com. (M.) 81 (i).
——— French Translation, Delay in Printing (Ans.) 1994 (i).
Demise of the Crown Provision (B. 119) 1°*, 2567 (i); 2° m., 3086 (ii).
Dinner to Opposition Leader (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4230 (ii).
——— *See* 'Opposition.'
Divorce Proceedings, Application to Parlt., &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Britton*) 1422 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Ingram*) on M. for 2°, 94; 211; in Com., 1051 (i).
——— B. 9 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 1055 (i).
——— B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) on M. for 2°, 1061 (i).
——— B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4028, 4053, 4338 (ii).
Dom. and Nova Scotia Arbitration, &c., Papers laid on Table, 3753 (ii).
Easter Adjnmt. (M.) 2408 (i).
Eastern Extension Ry., Arbitration, &c. (Ans.) 203 (i).
——— on Inquiry for O. C., 1962 (i).
——— *See* 'Supply.'
Exchequer Court Cases from 1896 to 1900, &c., (Ans.) 3178 (ii).
Foresters, Subsidary High Court B. on M. (Mr. *Flint*) to suspend Rule, 2701 (i).
Fort Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 149 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for Com., 5713 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2800 (i).
Free Transportation for Members, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 537 (i).
Gallant, Mr. F., Travelling Fees, &c. (Ans. 1404 (i).
German Discrimination, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 85 (i).
Govt. Business (remarks) 1167 (i).
——— (M.) for Morning Sittings, 4646 (ii).
——— Precedence on Mondays, 1497 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*

Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 2407 (i).
——— Precedence on Thursdays, 893 (i)
——— Ry. Subsidies, &c. (remarks) 4902 (ii).
——— *See* 'Business.'
Govt. Vessels, B.C.. Tenders, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) for copies, 516 (i).
Grain Exportation, Rep. of Royal Commission (remarks) 1798 (i).
Grand Falls Power and Boom Co.'s Petition (remarks) 1661 (i).
Great Northern Ry. Co. of Can. B., on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to receive Pet., 4407 (ii).
Great Northern Transit Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. to recom., 2348, 2873 (i).
Hastings, West, Vacancy, Notification, &c. (Ans.) 4644 (ii).
Immigration Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Wilson*) to Com. of Sup., 2981 (i).
Increased Indemnity, *See* 'Senate.'
Japanese Restrictions and B. C. Legislation (Ans.) 5587 (ii).
Joint High Commission. *See* 'Alaskan.'
Judges, N. W. T. and Yukon, Salary, &c., in Com. on Res., 4070, 4075 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4669 (ii).
——— (Vancouver) Amt. (B. 150) in Com. on Res., 5593; 1°* of B., 5599 (ii).
Judicial Appnmts. in Ont., Delay, &c., on M. (Mr. *Bennett*) for Com. of Sup., 2823 (i).
Judicial Business, Que., Montreal Districts, &c., (Ans.) 3178 (i).
Judicial Com. of Privy Council, Can. Representation (Ans.) 2401 (i).
Labour Organizations and Alien B. (Ans.) 2706.
Lachine Canal, New Locks, Contracts, &c., (Ans.) 1405 (i).
Lead Bounties B. 152 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 5599; on M. for Com. of Res., 5723 (ii).
Le Progres Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 3458.
Library of Parliament, Joint Com. (M.) 102 (i).
——— Joint Rep. (presented) 8 (i).
Long Service Decorations, Distribution, &c. (Ans.) 1067 (i).
Lumber Duties, &c. (remarks) 115, 1267 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 218 (i).
Mackenzie & Mann, Claim *re* Yukon Ry., Papers laid on Table, 5949 (ii).
——— (M.) to print Ret., 5950 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 4195 (ii).
Manhood Suffrage Registration, Remuneration of Municipalities (Ans.) 2205 (i).
Man. and Can. Northern Ry. Co.'s Agreement B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. for 1°, 2347 (i).
Man. Rys. B. 102 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. to refund Fees, &c., 4193 (ii).
——— B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. for Com., 4516; in Com., 5045, 5081 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*

Members, &c., Appnmt. to Offices (Ans.) 199 (i).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 9 (i).
Militia Officers Training, on Notice of Motion (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1070 (i).
Mines, Bureau of, Res. of B. C. Mining Association, &c. (Ans.) 2406 (i).
Montgomery, Genl., Monument to in Quebec City (Ans.) 5211, 5587, 5824 (ii).
Montreal Electoral Lists, Printing, &c. (Ans.)331.
——— Harbour Loan (B. 142) 1°*, 5215 (ii).
——— Turnpike Trust, Receipts, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 545 (i).
Moore, Wm., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1403 (i).
Newfoundland, Admission into Confederation (Ans.) 332 (i).
——— Bond-Blaine Convention, Ratification, &c., on M. to adjn., 3982 (ii).
Nipissing Election, Validity of Writ, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Northrup*) to Com. of Sup., 3708.
North-west Mounted Police Rep. (presented) 510.
North-west Territories Act Amt. (B. 147) 1°*, 5577; wthdn., 5829, 5953 (ii).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°* *pro formâ*, *5* (i).
Ocean SS. (Can. and France) Subsidies Act Amt. B. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 5392.
O'Donoghue, D. J., Appnmt. by Govt., Salary &c. (Ans.) 1589 (i).
Ontario Legislation, Question, &c. (remarks) 5825.
Opposition Leader, Congratulations, &c., 7 (i) 4230 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings leased by Govt. (Ans.) 1583 (i).
Pacific Cable Act Amt. B. 45 (Mr. *Mulock*) prop. Res. 431 (i); in Com. (amt.) 5393 (ii).
——— Res. respecting (remarks) 866 (i).
Passes to members, *see* 'Free Transportation.'
Penitentiaries Act (second inspector) Amt. (B. 155) in Com. on Res., 5588; 1°*, 5715 (ii).
Pensions for Permanent Force (B. 133) 1°*, 4342.
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Prior*) 1281 (i).
Polar Expedition, Equipment by Govt (remarks) 1798 (i).
Port Colborne, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 1405 (i).
P. E. I. Claims for increased Subsidy, B. 138 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res. 4685; in Com. on B., 5329, 5345 (ii).
P. E. I. Winter Communication with Mainland (Ans.) 1585 (i).
——— reps. from Boards of Trade, &c. *re*, on M. for copies (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1280 (i).
Printing Bureau, Addition to, &c. (remarks) on M. to conc. in 5th Rep. of Com., 5202 (ii).
Printing Com., Joint (M.) 102 (i).
Printing, Govt., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 114.
Private Bills (remarks) 5824 (ii).
——— Com. (M.) to add names, 1961 (i).
——— – on M. (Mr. *Flint*) to extend Time, 420 (i).
——— Suspension of Rule 60, on Objection (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) 4939 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Privy Councillor, Title conferred on Prime Minister (remarks) 2348 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Organization, &c. (remarks) 197 (i).
——— Delay in Meeting (remarks) 3275 (ii).
Public Health Inspection, Appnmt. of Com, (Ans.) 332 (i).
Queen's Birthday Bill (remarks) 3271, 3537 (ii).
——— (M.) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 3983 (ii).
——— Perpetuation (Ans.) 333 (i).
——— Decease of, Address *re* (M.) 9, 20, 81 (i).
——— Mess. from Colonial Office *re* Address, 3454 (ii).
——— *See* 'Victoria.'
Quebec Election Law, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5615 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 157 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5952 (ii).
Quebec Terminal and Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. *Malouin*) in Com., 5540 (ii).
Railways and Canals Dept., Criticism by Opposition, on M. to adjn., &c. (remarks) 5962 (ii).
Railway Committee (M.) to substitute name, 1961.
Railway Mail Clerks, Insufficient Number, &c. (Ans.) 4020 (ii).
Ry. Question, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 56.
Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5472, 5575 (ii).
Reports, Deptl., on inquiry, 51 (i).
——— Printing of (Ans.) 92 (i).
Rothesay Voters' List, Fraudulent Names, &c. (Ans.) 2571 (i).
Royal Highness, Duke of Cornwall and York, Visit to Canada (remarks) 434 (i).
——— *See* 'York.'
St. Catharines Water Supply (Ans.) 109 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Dep. Warden's Duties, &c. (Ans.) 5824 (ii).
Saw Logs Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 224.
School Lands, Man. Transfer of, on M. (Mr. *Lariviere*) for Pets., 88 (i).
Secretary of State, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 136.
Securities, List of (presented) 51 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act (increased indemnity) Amt. (B. 151) M. for Com. on Res., 5600; 1°*, 5715; in Com., 5826 (ii).
Sibbald, Eudora Patent Relief B., on M. (Mr. *Cowan*) to receive Pet., 5471 (ii).
S. A. War, Canadian Intervention, &c. on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 1326 (i).
——— Can. and Imp. Govts., Cor. *re* (Ans.) 106.
——— Constabulary, Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4409 (ii).
——— Scrip to Contingents (Ans.) 93 (i).
——— Victorian Contingent for S. Africa (remarks) 135 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 5277, 5282 (ii).
Speaker, Election (M.) 1 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Speaker, Deputy, Election (M.) 49 (i).
Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 76 (i).
Standing Coms. (M.) to add Names, 2702 (i).
Stephens, Mr. Justice, Infirmity, &c. (Ans.) 5586.
SUPPLY:
M. for Com. (remarks) 4066 (ii).
B. 114 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 2359 (i).
B. 158 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. 5951 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—Census (Mr. Cote's circular) 3899, 3926 (ii).
Civil Govt: Marine and Fisheries (Capt. Bernier's expedition) conc, 5790; Privy Council) 4345 (ii); Sec. of State's Office, 181 (i).
Customs (salaries, &c.) 4625 (ii).
Justice—Exchequer Court, conc., 5792; (Privy Council reorganization) 4636 (ii).
Legislation—House of Commons (clerical assistance) 195 (i).
Mail Subsidies (Bond-Blaine treaty) conc., 5795; (St. John, Liverpool and G. B.) conc., 5795 (ii).
Militia (gratuities, Maj. Maxwell) 4357 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Australian representative of Can.) 4638; (Japanese commission) 5311; Justice (litigation expenses) 4343; (N.W. Police, relief to half-breeds) 5311; (Paris agency) 3449, 4342; (Plains of Abraham, purchase) 5809 (ii).
N.W. Mounted Police (buildings, &c.) 3447; (clothing, arms, &c.) 3444; (compensation allowance) 3447; (Surgeon W. E. Thompson, pay, &c.) 4625; (yearly service) 4622; (Yukon force) 3447 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ottawa (Rideau Hall) 3152; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Parry Sound) 4813; Que. (Sorel wharf) 4798.
Railways and Canals—Canals, Cornwall (dismissal of lockmaster) 4265; Welland (Dunnville dam) 5629; Railways—I.C.R. (Eastern Extension, N.S., Ry. award) 5892; (Lévis land expropriation) 5663; (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 3561, 3569, 3752 (ii).
Technical Education and Govt. Jurisdiction (Ans.) 1263 (i).
Thames River, Obstructions to Navigation, on M. (Mr. *Stephens*) 2780 (i).
Toronto Junction Public Building, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 2405 (i).
Transportation Question (remarks) 2779 (i).
Valleyfield Riots, on Amt. (Mr. *Loy*) to Com. of Sup., 3765 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor. *re*, 2604 (i).
Vancouver Drill Hall, &c. (Ans.) 1751 (i).
Victoria Day B. 33 (Mr. *Horsey*) on M. for 2°, 1438 (i); in Com., 4255 (ii).
——— Statement by Govt. (Ans.) 5214 (ii).
——— *See* 'Queen's,' &c.
Water Levels of Great Lakes, &c. (Ans.) 94 (i).
Weights and Measures (size of fruit baskets) Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 1061; on Order for Com., 1432 (i).
Western Assurance Co., on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to receive Pet., 3176 (ii).
West Prince Election Ballots (Ans.) 83 (i).
Willamette, Str., Wreck off Denman's Island, &c. (remarks) 3643 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
York, Duke of, Arrival at Halifax or Quebec (Ans.) 5214 (ii).
——— Programme *re* Visit (remarks) 4874 (ii).
——— *See* 'Cornwall,' &c.
Yukon Ry., Mackenzie and Mann's Claim (Ans.) 1261 (i).
——— Ter., Magistrates' Salaries (prop. Res.) 5094 (ii).

Lavell, Mr. J. R., *Leeds and Grenville.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2244 (i).

Lavergne, Mr. L., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
Mail Clerks in South Africa, Promotions, &c. (Ques.) 1439 (i).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A., *East Prince, P.E.I.*
Abram's Village, &c., Postal Service (Ques.) 2163 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4340 (ii).
Gordon Point, P.E.I., Pet. for Pier, &c. (Ques.) 2163 (i).
Kensington and French River, P.E.I., Mail Service, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 809 (i).
Lobster Fishery Regulations, P.E.I. (Ques.) 2571 (i).
P. E. I. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. on Res., 4677, 4702.
——— Mails (remarks) 100 (i).
——— Mail Service, Winter Communication, &c. on Orders of the Day being called, 3271; on M. to go into Sup., 3271 (ii).
——— Postal Service, from Abram's Village to Higgins Road (Ques.) 2163 (i).
——— Pet. from Victoria County for Branch (Ques.) 2163 (i).
——— Ry. Trainmen, &c. (remarks) checked, 4197 (ii).
——— Winter Communication, Reps. from Boards of Trade (M. for copies) 1268 (i).
Rocky Point Breakwater, Extension, &c. (Ques.) 2571 (i).
Stanley, Str. and Winter Mail Service with P. E. I., Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 544 (i).
Summerside Harbour (Ques.) 83 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice, 194 (i).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (cold storage on steamers), 5169 (ii); (Paris exposition) 958 (i).
N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 3442 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (winter mail service) 265 (i).
Post Office (mail service) 488 (i).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I. (Gordon's Point wharf) 5746; (Hurd's Point pier) 3462; (Summerside breakwater) 3471(ii).

Legris, Mr. J. H., *Maskinonge.*
Beet Root Sugar Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 356 (i).
Printing Bureau, Addition to (remarks) on M. to conc. in 5th Rep. of Printing Com., 5200 (ii).

Lemieux, Mr. R., *Gaspé.*
Arnprior and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 55) 1°*, 1167 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2187 (i).
Great Northern Transit Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2876 (i).
Judicial Business, Que., Montreal Districts, &c., (Ques.) 3177 (ii).
Legislation *re* Members elected to Legislative Assembly, Que. (remarks) 5616 (ii).
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. Lapses, &c., (Ques.) 1262 (i).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Carroll*) in Com., 5410, 5891 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Receipts, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Stmnt., 2573 (i).
Paris Exposition, Honorary Decorations, &c., (Ques.) 1005 (i).
P. E. I. Claims for increased Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 4729 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (Plains of Abraham, purchase) 5816 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Magdalen Islands service) 251 (i).
Usury Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) on M for 2°, 625 (i).
Valleyfield Riots, Affidavits, &c. (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4552 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H., *West Simcoe.*
Alliston and Rosemount Mail Contracts, &c (Ques.) 1591 (i).
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 665 (i).
——— B 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2476.
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1939 (i).
Census Commissioner for Simcoe, Appnmt. (Ques.) 336 (i).
Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 784 (i).
McDonald, James Ward, Relief (B. 130) 1°*, 4406 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: Census (Mr. Coté's circular) 3948 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Indian River dredging) 5732; (Toronto Harbour) 5742 (ii).
Railways and Canals: I. C. R. (steel rails. Clergue's contract) 3729, 3737 (ii).

Logan, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland.*
Bank Note ($4), Imprint of American Lock, on M. (Mr. *Bennett*) to adjn., 2209 (i).
C. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 4000,
Preferential Tariff, Direct Importation (prop. Res.) 2608 (i).
St. Lawrence Co.'s incorp. (B. 69) 1°*, 1496 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (gratuities, Major Maxwell) 4360 (ii).
Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (coal contracts) 5305; (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 5305 (ii).

Logan, Mr. H. J.—*Con.*
Valleyfield Labour Strike, Settlement by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 2599 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4581 (ii).

Loy, Mr. G. M., *Beauharnois.*
Valleyfield Riots, (remarks) 3754; Affidavits read, 3756 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4548, 4562 (ii).

MacLaren, Mr. A. F., *North Perth.*
Stratford P. O. (Ques.) 90 (i).

Maclaren, Mr. W. S., *Huntingdon.*
Remount Stations, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5164 (ii).
Speeches of Members, Number, &c. (M.) to adjn., 5954 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *East York.*
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 653 (i).
——— B. 11 (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) on M. for 1°, 199 (i).
——— B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2476.
Bank Note ($4), Imprint of American Lock, on M. (Mr. *Bennett*) to adjn., 2210 (i).
Bell Telephone Co., Defective Legislation, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5398 (ii).
B. C. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4085, 4117 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1815 (i).
——— Inquiry for, 1431 (i).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 95, 104 (i).
Can. and France SS. Service. *See* 'Ocean,' &c.
Can. and Italy Trade Relations, Cor. *re* on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Copies, 522 (i).
C. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 3996, 4006 (ii).
——— Land Grants, Taxation B. 17 (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) on M. for 2°, 1133, 1147 (i).
Can. National Ry. and Transport incorp. Co.'s B. 13 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1963, 1970; (amt.) 2749 (i).
C.P.R. Tax Exemption, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2498 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Davis*) to Com. of Sup., 2496 (i).
Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 764 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Co.'s B. 57 (Mr. *Davis*) on M. to wthdrw., 5711 (ii).
Divorce Proceedings, Application to Parlt., &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Britton*) 1421 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 1053 (i).
——— B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 1391 (i); in Com., 4022, 4029, 4038, 4051, 4063, 4198 (ii).
Dom. Lands B. 30 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 430 (i).
Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 5366, 5371 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Free Transportation for Members, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 532, 541 (i).
Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2411, 2433 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) for Morning Sittings, 4647 (ii).
Govt. Vessels, B.C., Tenders, &c., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) for copies, 515 (i).
Grain Transportation through Can. Channels, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1071 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 7 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 1048 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Bernier*) on M. for 3°, 5825 (ii).
Judges, N.W.T. and Yukon, Salary, &c., in Com. on Res., 4068, 4073, 4076 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4671 (ii).
King's Birthday (remarks) 503 (i).
King's Printer, Finances, &c., in Com. on Res. 4668 (ii).
Lead (refined) Bounties B. 152 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5720; in Com. on Res., 5728; in Com. on B., 5828 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 65 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 1°, 1401 (i).
Middleton, Lilias, Relief (B. 128) 3° m., 5545 (ii).
Mint. *See* 'Royal.'
Montreal District Circuit Judge, Salary, &c., in Com. on Res., 4067 (ii).
Ocean SS. (Can. and France) Subsidies Act Amt. B. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 5392.
Ottawa and Hull Power and Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 25 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 2750.
Pacific Cable Act Amt. B. 45 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 899, 909 (i); in Com. on B., 5393.
Passes to Members. *See* 'Free Transportation.'
P.E.I. Claims for increased Subsidy B. 138 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4682, 4713; in Com. on Res., 4722; in Com. on B., 5326, 5345 (ii).
Printing Bureau Finances. *See* 'King's Printer.'
Queen's Birthday Bill, &c. (remarks) 3271, 3537.
——— *See* 'Victoria Day.'
Quebec Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 67 (Mr. *Malouin*) in Com., 5540 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 5471 (ii).
Ry. Question (M. to adjn.) 52 (i).
——— (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 137, 154 (i).
——— *See* 'Van Horne.'
Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5486, 5501, 5520, 5529, 5547, 5563 (ii).
Royal Mint Establishment B. 143 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5376, 5384; on M. for 2°, 5715; in Com. on B., 5716 (ii).
Saw Logs Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 223.

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Shipping Casualties Investigation B. 93 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on M. for 2°, 2444; in Com., 2445.
S. A. War—'C' Battery Pay, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) for papers, 130 (i).
Supply,—Procedure, &c. (remarks) 2753 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice: Miscellaneous (Divorce and Matrimonial Court Judge, N. B.) 5778; Yukon (maintenance of prisoners) 5778.
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (census) 5785; (experimental farm bulletins) 4594 (ii).
Charges of Management (letter carriers) 174 (statutory increases) 173 (i).
Customs: Miscellaneous (paper combine) 4628; (printing and stationery) 4626; (statistical staff, extra allowances) 4627 (ii).
Dom. Lands (patent branch, extra clerks) 4922; (surveys) 4926 (ii).
Fisheries (overseers, guardians, &c.) 4587 (ii).
Govt. of N. W. T. (schools grants) 1368 (i).
Indians: Ont. and Que. (blankets, &c.) 2753 (i).
Justice: Administration (legal expenses) 4634.
Legislation: H. of C. (Mr. Thornton's indemnity) 4640; Senate (Hon. J. J. Ross, indemnity) 5782 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Atlantic Fast SS. service) 5770; (Bond-Blaine treaty) conc., 5795 (ii).
Miscellaneous (astronomical observatory, telescope) 5784; (Australian representative of Canada) 4638; (paper combine inquiry) 5783 (Plains of Abraham, purchase) 5810 (ii).
N. W. Mounted Police (yearly services) 4624 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston, McKay's account) 4635 (ii).
Post Office (mail service) 446 (i).
Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (Seybold Block) 919 (i); Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Depot Harbour breakwater) 5731; (Toronto Harbour) 5741 (ii).
Quarantine (tuberculosis in cattle, prevention, &c.) 4622 (ii).
Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (air brakes) 4155 (ii); (Halifax accommodation) 2714 (i); (rolling stock, &c.) 4216 (ii); (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 2720, 2728 (i); 3558, 3570 (ii); (Sydney accommodation) 2718 (i).
Staples Inspection (chief inspector) 5780 (ii).
Weights and Measures (gas inspection, salaries, &c.) 4936 (ii).
Thornton, Mr., 4022, 4640 (ii).
Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3266, 3314 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ry. Question.'
U.S. Trade Relations, Par. in N. Y. *Tribune* on M. to adjn. (remarks) 133 (i).
Van Horne's Stmnt. *re* Railways (personal explanation) 209 (i).
Victoria Day B. 33 (Mr. *Horsey*) on M. for 2°, 1437 (i).
——— *See* 'Queen's,' &c.
Weights and Measures Act (size of fruit baskets) Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 1060 (i)
Western Assurance Co.'s B. 124 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4014 (ii).
W. C. Edwards Co.'s B. 61 (Mr. *Rosamond*) in Com., 3228 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G., *North Simcoe.*
Bell Telephone Co., Defective Legislation, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5401 (ii).
British American Insurance Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 3268; (M.) to receive Pet., 3177 (ii).
C.P.R. Land Grants Taxation B. 17 (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) on M. for 2°, 1159 (i).
——— on amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 2537 (i).
Criminal Code (Copyright) Act Amt. (B. 39) 1°, 693 (i).
Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 5371 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. Co. of Can. (M.) to receive Pet., 4406 (ii).
Nipissing Election, Validity of Writ, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Northrup*) to Com. of Sup., 3681, 3715 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Vote on Coronation Oath, 895 (i).
SUPPLY:
Dom. Lands (forest rangers) 2697 (i).
Fisheries (hatchery, Georgian Bay) 4590 (ii).
Miscellaneous: Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3828 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (steamers, construction, &c.) 5186 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (docks, Simcoe county) 5703; (Collingwood Harbour) 3503 (ii); Transportation (Port Colborne) 1230 (i).
Western Assurance Co.'s (B. 124) M. to receive Pet., 3176; 1°*, 3238 (ii).

McColl, Mr. J. B., *West Northumberland, O.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Harwood harbour) 5757 (ii).

McCormick, Mr. G., *Muskoka and Parry Sound.*
Depot Harbour Breakwater, Construction of Dock, &c. (Ques.) 1251 (i).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5570 (ii).
S. A. War—Scrip to Contingents (Ques.) 93 (i).

McCreary, Mr. W. F., *Selkirk.*
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 652 (i).
——— B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2467.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 75) 1°*, 1574.
Can. Nurses Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 4429, 5416, 5580 (ii).
C.P.Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 3988; Order for Com., 3908; in Com., 4001 (ii).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2176 (i).
Commodities, Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4746 (ii).
Dom. Election Officials, Non-payment of, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) 2352 (i).
Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2364 (i).
Immigration Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Wilson*) to Com. of Sup., 2895, 2977 (i).

McCreary, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Montreal Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Carroll*) in Com., 5890 (ii).
Northern Pacific and Manitoba Ry. Co.'s Amalgamation (B. 87) 1°*, 1880 (i).
Railway Commissioners, Board of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 857 (i).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5576 (ii).
Speeches of Members, Difficulty of Hearing, on M. to adju. (remarks) 5965 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (experimental farms) 2856; (Winnipeg hospitals) 2870 (i).
Dom. Lands (inspectors, agents, &c.) 1384; (surveys, &c., printing) 1373; (tree culture) 2679 (i).
Govt. of N.W.T. (school grants) 1369 (i).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c., W. T. R. Preston) 4842; (expenditure, &c.) 4861 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Winnipeg, dredging) 4399 (ii).
Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 5230 (ii).
Yukon Services (Mr. Wade's duties) 2661 (i).

McEwen, Mr. G., *South Huron.*
Commodities Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com. (salt) 4896 (ii).
Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2370, 2432 (i).
SUPPLY:
Dom. Lands (surveys, printing, &c.) 1373 (i).
Post Office (mail service) 499 (i).

McGowan, Mr. J., *Centre Wellington.*
Alma Mail Contract, Date of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 811 (i).
Cattle entering U.S., Tuberculine Test, Complaints against (remarks) 2354 (i).
Drayton, Postmistress, Date of Appnmt. (Ques.) 1439 (i).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 1918 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act (increased indemnity) Amt. B. 151 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5608 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (cold storage) 3031; (cold storage on steamers) 5172; (creameries in N.W.T., sale, &c.) 5178; (Griffith & Co.'s sale of creamery produce to in N.W.T.) 5178 (ii); (*Year Book*) 2831 (i).
Indians: N.W.T. (salaries, &c.) 2766 (i).
Post Office (mail service) 470 (i).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence channel) 1204 (i).
Quarantine (compensation for slaughtered cattle) 3084 (ii).
Tuberculine Test, Grosse Isle (Ques.) 85 (i).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F., *Antigonish.*
Man. Railways Lease (B. 102) 1° m., 2346 (i); 2° m., 2986 (ii).
——- (B. 103) 1°*, 2346 (i); (M.) for Com., 4372.
Nova Scotia Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 104) 1°*, 2347 (i).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F.—*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campobello breakwater) 3488 (ii).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2328 (i).
Can. Nurses Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 5415, 5577; (M.) 6 m. h., 5579.
Drainage across Railways (B. 77) 1° m., 1576 (i).
SUPPLY:
Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (McLellan, John B., sale of ties) 5634; (Strait of Canso, wharf accommodation) 4160 (ii).

McLeod, Mr. A., *North Ontario.*
Rama Indians (Ques.) 93, 200 (i).
Severn River Floods, Removal of Obstructions, &c. (Ques.) 201 (i).
Simcoe Lake Lowering, Papers *re* (M. for ret.*) 224 (i).
Washago Dam, Removal of Obstructions, &c. (Ques.) 201 (i).

Madore, Mr. J. A. C., *Hochelaga.*
Usury Act Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 20; 2° m., 607; in Com., 637 (i).

Malouin, Mr. A., *Centre Quebec.*
Quebec Terminal and Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 67) 1°*, 1438 (i).
Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 86) 1°*, 1747.

Marcil, Mr. C., *Bonaventure.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 31 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1800 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2198 (i).
Dom. Election Officials, Non-payment of, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) 2357 (i).
Nipissing Election, Validity of Writ, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Northrup*) to Com. of Sup., 3677 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Addition to, &c., on M. to conc. in 5th Rep. of Com., 5202 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5538 (ii).

Martineau, Mr. P. R., *Montmagny.*
Census Commissioners and Enumerators, Allowances, &c. (Ques.) 812 (i).
Collin, Elzéar, Fishery Guardian, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 5213 (ii).
I.C.R. Sections, Limits, &c. (Ques.) 1589 (i).

Matheson, Mr. J., *Richmond, N.S.*
SUPPLY:
Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (Port Hawkesbury and Canso wharf) 4161 (ii).

Maxwell, Mr. G. R., *Burrard.*
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. *Galliher*) in Com., 3223 (ii).
Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 52) 1°*, 1167 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 648 (i).
——— B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2463, (i); 4659 (ii).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., on inquiry, 99 (i).
Binder Twine Manufacture, on prop. Res., 581.
Bruce North, Election, Transfer of Mail Clerks, on Ques. of Order, 1580 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2082 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order, 1742 (i).
——— (remarks) 239 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 96, 2872 (i), 3175, 3867, 4192, 4640 (ii).
——— Private Bills, &c. (remarks) 5824 (ii).
Can. and France SS. Subsidy B. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 5100, 5108 (ii).
Canada and Italy, Trade Relations, Cor. *re* (M.) for Copies, 518 (i).
Can. Nurses Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 4431 (ii).
Canals, Lock Tenders' Sunday Duties (Ques.) 4643 (ii).
C.P.R. Tax Exemption, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 2523, 2536 (i).
Carillon Canal, Rebuilding Guide Pier (Ques.) 2988 (ii).
Century Life Ins. Co.'s (B. No. 14) 1°*, 238 (i).
——— (remarks) 731 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2188, 2193 (i).
Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 752 (i).
Côte St. Paul Bridge, Cost of Construction (M. for Cor., &c.) 2586 (i).
Debates Com. (M.) to add name, 238 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. of Sup., 4051, 4058 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 2814 (i).
Easter Adjournment (remarks) 2202 (i).
Franchise Act (1898) Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2783, 2787, 2793, 2805 (i), 4207 (ii).
Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2611, 2615 (i).
Game Preservation (Unorganized Ters.) B. 46 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 2°, 2821 (i).
Govt. Vessels, B.C., Tenders, &c., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) for Copies, 511 (i).
Grain Exportation, Rep. of Royal Commission (remarks) 1798 (i).
G.T.R. and Montreal (remarks) 61, 92 (i).
——— Payments to (Ques.) 108 (i).
I.C.R., Montreal *Herald*, Lease of Offices (Ques.) 605 (i).
——— Prince, Wm. L., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3180 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4668 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Judicial Appointments in Ont., Delay, &c., on M. (Mr. *Bennett*) to Com. of Sup., 2825 (i).
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. *Galliher*) in Com., 3226 (ii).
Lachine Canal, New Lock, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1405 (i).
——— *See* 'Côte St. Paul Bridge.'
Lalonde, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4194.
Longueuil Ordnance Lands, Rent, &c. (Ques.) 1796 (i).
Money Lenders B. *See* "Usury."
Montreal City, Electoral Lists, Printing, &c. 331 (i).
——— Harbour Commissioners, Allowances, &c. (Ques.) 3178, 3270 (ii).
——— Harbour Loan B. 142 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5129 (ii).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Carroll*) in Com., 5890 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust Bonds, &c. (Ques.) 203.
——— (M.) for Ret., 545, 2571 (i).
Nipissing Elections, Validity of Writ, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Northrup*) to Com. of Sup. 3678 (ii).
Nova Scotia Claims against Federal Govt., Papers *re* (remarks) 1790 (i).
Polar Expedition, Equipment by Govt. (remarks) 1798 (i).
P.E.I. Claims for increased Subsidies (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4732 (ii).
Quebec Election Law, Disallowance, Pet., &c. (remarks) 5715 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5613 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2, 217 (i).
——— B. 136 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5112 (ii).
Ry. Bonuses, on M. (Mr. *Wilson*) for ret., 87 (i).
——— Mail Clerks, Insufficient Number, &c. (Ques.) 4019 (ii).
——— Question, on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 161 (i).
——— Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5576 (ii).
St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s (B. 129) 1°*, 4406 (ii).
St. Lawrence (Lower) Navigation, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 4231 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4197 (ii).
Safety of Ships B. 92 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on Sen. Amts., 4209 (ii).
S. A. War, Axes for British War Office, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1593 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 5092 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (alien labour enforcement) 2648 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (census) 2864 (i); (expenditure) 3869 (ii); (cold storage, &c.) 2861 (i), 3042 (ii); (experimental farms) 2845 (i); (experimental fruit farm) 4598; (umigating stations) 4606; (Glasgow Exhibition) 4602 (ii); (Mr. Stewart's position) 2845; (tree culture) 2845; (Winnipeg hospitals) 2870; (*Year Book*) 2829 (i), 4607 (ii); (*Year Book*, New Zealand) 4608 (ii).

Charges of Management (printing Dom. notes) 175 (i).

Civil Govt.—Customs (clerical assistance) 109; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 178; Indian Affairs (salaries) 184; Post Office (contingencies) 193; (printing, &c.) 193 (i).

Customs: N.S. (contingencies) 3847; (salaries, &c.) 4625; (statistical branch) 3855; Yukon (expenditure) 3862 (ii).

Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 2694; (tree culture) 2684 (i).

Dominion Police (canal protection service) 4626.

Excise (salaries, &c.) 3863 (ii).

Fisheries (Gaspé hatchery) 4588; (legal expenses *re* sealing vessels, claims) 5197 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5190; (Lower Traverse pier) 5188 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Quebec, Murray Bay, &c.) 5777 (ii).

Militia (transportation, &c.) 4638 (ii).

Miscellaneous: Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3812, 3844; (Plains of Abraham, purchase) 5812 (ii).

N. W. Mounted Police (yearly services) 4623 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (maintenance of Govt. Strs.) 241; (repairs to Govt. Steamers) 241.

Penitentiaries: St. Vincent de Paul (assault on ex-Warden) 2649 (i); (Lussier's claim) 4636.

Post Office (letter carrier) 490; (mail service) 436, 470 (i).

Public Works: Buildings, B.C. (Nelson) 3097; (New Westminster) 3099; (William's Head) 3106; Generally (experimental farms) 3106; (resident clerks of works) 3106 (ii); Ont. (London drill hall) 2551 (i); Ottawa (rentals, accommodation, &c.) 4396; (repairs, &c.) 3112; (Rideau Hall) 3147; (Rideau Hall, damage by fire) 4391; (Seybold block, rent, &c.) 3146; Que. (Montreal custom-house, alterations) 5691; (Montreal post office) 5688; (Montreal public buildings, repairs, &c.) 5690; (Peribonka immigrant building) 4391; (St. Hyacinthe drill hall) 5690; (St. Laurent) 4392 (ii); (Victoriaville) 2547 (i); Dredging (Que. and Ont.) 4400; (Pointe Claire) 4400; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Porter's Lake) 3174; Que. (Murray Bay wharf) 5709; (Ste. Emilie wharf) 4399; (wharfs, docks, &c.) 5708; Miscellaneous (clerical assistance) 5760.

Railways and Canals—Canals (Chambly, repairs) 4388; Lachine (Côté St. Paul bridge) 4388; (lockmen on Sundays, extra services) 4389; (repairs, &c.) 4387; Trent (dredging, &c.) 4386; Railways—I. C. R. (air brakes) 4154; (car shops, Moncton) 4153; (Lévis accommodation) 4125; (locomotive couplers) 4153; (machinery, carshops, &c.) 4158; (Miramichi bridge spans) 4162; (Murray Bay Harbour Branch, &c.) 4191; (rolling stock) 4166, 4175; (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 3543, 3578, 3623, 3724; (vestibules) 4156 (ii).

Scientific Institutions, &c. (Capt. Bernier's expedition) 5191, 5791 (ii).

Staples Inspection (chief inspector, salary) 5781.

Yukon Services (Judge's salary) 2651; (stenographers, salaries, &c) 2659 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3230.

Usury Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) on M. for 2°, 619; in Com., 639 (i).

Valleyfield Labour Strike, Settlement by Govt. &c. (M. for cor.) 2588, 2601 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Loy*) to Com. of Sup., 3754, 3758 (ii).

——— Affidavits read, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4536 (ii).

Ville Marie Bank, Relief to Depositors, &c (Ques.) 332 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on Order for Com., 1792 (i).

W. C. Edwards Co.'s B. 61 (Mr. *Rosamond*) in Com., 3229 (ii).

Yukon Ter. Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com. on Res., 5215 (ii).

Morin, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester, Q.*

Cayouette, Elizabeth, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1405 (i).

Census Commissioner for Dorchester (Ques.) 807.

Coleraine Indian Lands, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3457 (ii).

I.C.R. Employees, Number from 1892 to 1900 (Ques.) 1582 (i).

Levis Brigade Camp, Irregularities, &c. (Ques.) 2994 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: Census (Mr. Côté's circular) 3912 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Plains of Abraham, purchase) 5810 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (life-saving rewards) 268; (unforeseen expenses) 268 (i).

Public Works: Buildings, Que. (Levis public building) 5690; Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Ile aux Grues wharf) 5708 (ii); Transportation (Port Colborne) 1223 (i).

Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (Levis accommodation) 4126 (ii).

Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3348.

Yukon, Mining Regulations (Ques.) 114 (i).

Morrison, Mr. A., *New Westminster.*

Alien Labour Restriction Act Amt. B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2477 (i); 4654 (ii).

Arnprior and Pontiac Ry. Co. incorp. B. 55 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on Sen. Amts., 5092 (ii).

B. C. Fisheries, Provincial Jurisdiction, &c. (Ques.) 3459 (ii).

——— Govt. Claims *re* Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 3459.

Bubonic Plague, Reports, &c., Precaution against (Ques.) 3642 (ii).

Chinese and Japanese Immigration Commission (Ques.) 3641 (ii).

Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 22) 1°*, 420.

Iron and Steel Bounties paid by Govt. (remarks) 1168 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act (Vancouver)

Morrison, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Amt. B. 150 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier)* in Com. on Res., 5594 (ii).
Penitentiary Act (second inspector) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 5589 (ii).
Steveston, B.C., Riots, Calling out of Militia (Ques.) 328 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works: Buildings (Supreme Court Building) 5686 (ii).

Mulock, Hon. Wm. (Postmaster General) *North York, O.*
Alien Labour Law and White Horse Works (Ans.) 813 (i).
——— Enforcement *re* Dom. Steel Works (Ans.) 200 (i).
Alma Mail Contract, Date of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 811 (i).
Bolsover P. O. (Ans.) 208 (i).
Craig, John, Dismissal (Ans.) 91 (i).
Hull, Mr. Wm., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 333 (i).
Henderson, Mr. H. D., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 508 (i).
Kensington and French River, P.E.I., Mail Service, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 809 (i).
Mails in H. of C., Delay (remarks) 101 (i).
Millstream, N.B., P.O. (Ans.) 209 (i).
Pacific Cable Act Amt. (B. 45) M. for Com. on Res., 896, 903 ; 1°*, 910 (i).
——— Agreement *re*, Papers laid on Table, 806.
Pictou County Postmasters, Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 606 (i).
Postal Delivery, Rural (Ans.) 68 (i).
Post Office Rep. (presented) 50 (i).
P.E.I. Mails (remarks) 100 (i).
Rama Indians (Ans.) 93 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.: Post Office (clerical assistance) 192 ; (salaries) 188 ; (letter carriers) 491 ; (mail service) 435 ; (miscellaneous) 501 ; (Yukon mail service) 501 (i).
Yukon, Ogilvie, Mr., Resignation (Ans.) 93 (i).

Murray, Mr. T., *Pontiac.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2315 (i).
Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 111) 1°*, 2347 (i).
Pontiac Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 62) 1°*, 1244 (i).
Pontiac County, Ry. Indebtedness, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5611 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5555 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act (increased indemnity) Amt. B. 151 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5608 (ii).
Transportation Question, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3363 (ii).

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*
Alien Labour Restriction Act Amt. B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2481 (i), 4661 (ii).
Binder Twine Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 577 (i).
Census, Circular issued by Mr. Côté, &c. (Ques.) 2992 (ii).
Cornwall and York, Duke of, Information *re* Visit (Ques.) 509 (i).
Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt., (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 770 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. of Sup., 4060, 4065 (ii).
——— (B. 96) 1° m., 2055 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2787, 2791 (i).
Hastings, West, Vacancy, Notification, Issue of Writ, &c. (Ques.) 4644 (ii).
Nipissing Election, Validity of Writ, &c. (M.) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 3643 ; (amt.) 3654 ; Neg. (Y. 51 ; N. 94) 3722 (ii).
Plains of Abraham, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 2989, 3641 (ii).
S. A. War, 'C' Battery Pay, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) for Papers, 130 (i).

Oliver, Mr. F., *Alberta.*
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 85) 1°*, 1747 ( ).
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1747 (i).
Binder Twine Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 584 (i) ; (amt.) 587 ; agreed to (Y. 155 ; N. 0) 604 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1885 (i).
C. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com , 3992, 3998 ; on M. for 3°, 4420 (ii).
——— Land Grants Taxation B. 17 (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) on M. for 2°, 1148 (i).
——— Ref. to Judicial Courts, on Amt. (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) 5426 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 2526 (i).
Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup , 794 (i).
Dom. Election Officials, Non-payment of, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) 2353 (i).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 48) 1°*, 1167 (i).
Great Northern Transit Co.'s (B. 38) M. to recom., 2347, 2873, 2876 (i).
Hudson's Bay and North-west Ry. Co.'s Change of Title (B. 38) 1°*, 693 (i).
Hudson Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 71) 1°*, 1496 (i).
Immigration Policy of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Wilson*) to Com of Sup., 2931 (i).
Lead (refined) Bounties B. 152 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5725 (ii).
Man. Rys. Leases B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. for Com., 4492 (ii)
Railway Commissioners, Board of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 844 (i).

Oliver, Mr. F.—*Con.*
Remount Stations, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5157.
SUPPLY :
Geological Survey (explorations, &c.) 5449 (ii).
Militia (canteens, &c.) 3432 ; (N. W. Mounted Rifles) 3400 ; (S. A. Constabulary, pensions, &c.) 3398 (ii).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*
Alien Labour Restriction Act Amt. B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2487 (i).
Binder Twine, Manufacture of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 236 (i).
Budget, The, 1468 (i).
Can. and France SS. Subsidy B. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 5109 (ii).
Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 794 (i).
Debenture and Securities Corporation of Can. incorp. (B. 110) 1°*, 2347 (i).
Keewatin Bishopric incorp. (B. 37) 1°*, 693 (i).
Man. and N. W. T. Settlers, Issue of Scrip, &c. (Ques.) 1253 (i).
Manufacturers and Temperance and General Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 97) 1°*, 2161 (i).
Pacific Cable Act Amt. B. 45 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 906 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5113 (ii).
Ry. Commissioners, Board of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 880 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Can. Exhibit at Imp. Institute, London) 5181 ; (cold storage on steamers, &c.) 5168 (ii).
Fisheries (whitefish hatchery, N W.T.) 5197 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lower Traverse pier) 5188 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (maintenance, &c., Govt. steamers) 259 (i) ; (steamers, construction, &c.) 5187 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Kingston Military Buildings) 5697 ; Ottawa (Queen's statue) 3163; (Victoria Memorial Museum) 5682 ; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Toronto Harbour) 5734 (ii).
Quarantine (public health) 5182 (ii).
Railways and Canals: Canals—Cornwall (Gilbert Dredging Co. settlement) 5670 ; Trent Canal, 5621 ; Welland (Dunnville dam) 5630 ; Railways—I. C. R. (additional sidings) 4149 ; (increased facilities) 4152 ; (Kingston Locomotive Works, contract) 4181 ; (locomotive couplers) 4153 ; (Miramichi bridge spans) 4165 ; (Pintsch gas equipment) 4158, 5217 ; (St. John, increased accommodation) 4137, 4141 (ii) ; (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 2724, 2727, 2735 (i), 3572, 3729-3743, 5235 (ii).
Usury Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) on M. for 2°, 634 (i).
Virden, Qu'Appelle, &c., Town Sites (M.) for Ret., 881, 887, 890 (i).

Parmelee, Mr. C. H. *Shefford.*
Oxford Mountain Ry. Co.'s (B. 31) 1°*, 502 (i).
Printing Committee, Joint, 5th Rep. (presented) 5093 ; on M. to conc. in 5th Rep., 5199 (ii).
——— 6th Rep. (presented) 5712 (ii).

Paterson, Hon. Wm. (Minister of Customs) *Wentworth and North Brant.*
Animals and Cattle exported to G. B. and U. S. (Ans.) 1254 (i).
Binder Twine Machinery, Duties collected (Ans.) 607 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2106 (i).
Butter, Cheese, &c., exported into G. B. (Ans.) 1256 (i).
Germany, Exports, &c., from 1897 to 1900 (Ans.) 1797 (i).
Grain received at Can. Ports (Ans.) 66, 82 (i).
Hodge, Mr. D., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1795 (i).
Hogs, Lard, &c. imported from U. S. (Ans.) 1256 (i).
Imports from U. S., Dutiable, &c., for 1901 (Ans.) 4020 (ii).
Indian Corn Imports, &c. (Ans.) 84 (i).
McInnis, Mr., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2703 (i).
Mutton imported (Ans.) 335 (i).
Pacaud, Mr. A., Application for Govt. Position (Ans.) 3457 (ii).
Pig Iron Bounty, &c., Amount paid (Ques.) 1255 (i).
Preferential Tariff, Certificate of Production (Ans.) 1252 (i).
——— Goods of Foreign Origin, &c., (Ans.) 1002.
Rice Imports for 1900 from G. B., &c. (Ans.) 2000 (i).
Saw Logs exported (Ans.) 64 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.: Customs (clerical assistance) 190 ; (salaries) 185 (i) ; B. C. (salaries, &c.) 3848 ; (inspectors, salaries, &c.) 3850 ; Miscellaneous (Gibson, Jas., claim, &c.) 4627 ; (Nelson & Sons, refund, &c.) 4726, 5468 ; (printing and stationery) 4626 ; (statistical staff, extra pay, &c.) 4627 ; (contingencies) 3847 ; Ont. (Midland Port) 3847 ; (salaries and contingencies) 5466 ; (salaries at different ports) 4625; (secret service) 3861 ; (statistical branch, &c.) 3850 ; Yukon (expenditure) 3862 (ii).
Indian Affairs (Six Nation tribe, Dr. Secord's report) 5320 (ii).
Legislation: H. of C. (printing, paper, &c.) 5465 (ii).
Railways and Canals: I. C. R. (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 5263, 5267 (ii).
Tobacco Duty (Ans.) 84 (i).
Tomatoes imported, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 1003.
Trade and Nav. Rets., on inquiry, 63, 211 (ii).
Tyrian, SS., Govt. Service, &c. (Ans.) 5824 (ii).
Wabash Locomotives, Duty, &c. (Ans.) 65 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff (beet-root sugar machinery) in Com. on Res., 5806 (ii).
West Bay Sub-collector of Customs, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2703 (i).

Pope, Mr. R., *Compton.*
Clarenceville and Lacolle Mail Carrier, Extra Pay, &c. (Ques.) 1248 (i).
Financial Situation, Review, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5873 (ii).

Pope, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris exposition) 929.

Post Office (mail service) 480 (i).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont., (private docks) 5746; Transportation, &c., 5747 (ii).

Railways and Canals: I. C. R. (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 3627, 3628 (ii).

Prefontaine, Mr. R., *Maisonneuve and Terrebonne.*

Banking Act, Amt. *re* Inspection (Ques.) 814 (i).

——— Amt. *re* Savings Banks (Ques.) 814 (i).

Potash and Ashes, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 814 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 5278 (ii).

Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3249.

Trout, Speckled, Exportation of (Ques.) 2401 (i).

Pringle, Mr. R. A., *Cornwall and Stormont.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2321 (i).

Cornwall Canal, Overseer, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1584 (i).

Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 760 (i).

Ramsay, Mr. J. H., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1584.

SUPPLY :

Railways and Canals: Canals, Cornwall (dismissal of lockmaster) 4261; Railways, I.C.R. (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 3585 (ii).

Prior, Hon. E. G., *Victoria, B.C.*

Alaskan Boundary Dispute, Cor. *re* Map sent to Paris Exposition, 4407 (ii).

Alien Labour Law and White Horse Works (Ques.) 813 (i).

Ashcroft and Cariboo, Mail Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1440, 2398 (i), 4194 (ii).

Black Rocks Lighthouse, B.C. (Ques.) 200 (i).

B. C. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4078 (ii).

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 420 (i).

Brotchie's Ledge, &c., Fog Signal (Ques.) 2407.

Cariboo and Ashcroft Mail Service (Ques.) 1261.

Chinese and Japanese Immigration, Tax collected, &c. (Ques.) 328 (i).

——— Labour on Govt. Steamers, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 2349 (i).

——— on Public Works, &c. (Ques.) 1592 (i).

——— *See* 'Mongolian.'

Cornwall and York, Duke of, Visit, &c. (remarks) 807, 1001, 1069 (i).

——— Par. in Victoria *Times* (remarks) 1289 (i).

——— *See* 'Royal Highnesses.'

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4042 (i).

Entrance Island, Dismissal of Robt. Grey (M. for cor.*) 1267 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2783 (i).

Prior, Hon. E. G.—*Con.*

Gov. Gen.'s Foot Guards, Accoutrements, &c. (Ques.) 1587 (i).

Govt. Vessels, B.C., Contracts, Specification, &c. (M.) for copies, 510, 2586 (i).

Green Islet, B.C., Lighthouse, &c. (Ques.) 2407.

Grey, Robt., Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1267.

Hill, Arthur E. B., Claims, &c. (Ques.) 4641 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties paid by Govt. (remarks) 1171 (i).

Juan de Fuca Straits, Sailing Directions, &c. (Ques.) 2407 (i).

Judges, N. W. T. and Yukon, Salaries, &c., in Com. on Res., 4069 (ii).

Kamloops and Atlin Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 105) 1°*, 2347 (i).

Lumber Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1759.

Macaulay Point, B.C., Claims for Damages, &c. (Ques.) 2570 (i).

Medals, Long Service, Delay in Issue of Forms, &c. (Ques. wthdn.) 2568 (i).

Militia, Permanent, &c.: *See* Pensions.'

Mineral Resources, B.C., Advertisement, &c. (Ques.) 1749 (i).

Mines, Bureau of, Res. of B.C. Mining Association, &c. (Ques.) 2406 (i).

Mining Industries, B.C., Rep. of Interview in *Province* (Ques.) 1749 (i).

Mint. *See* 'Royal.'

Mongolian Immigration, Cor. *re* (M. for copy*) 224 (i).

Nakusp and Slocan Ry. Co.'s (B. 20) 1°*, 420 (i).

N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 3443 (ii).

Pensions to Headquarters Staff, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2994 (ii).

Pensions for Permanent Corps, &c. (prop. Res.) 1281, 2608 (i).

Pensions to Officers of Permanent Force B. 133 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) on prop. Res., 4237; in Com., 4738, 4743 (ii).

Ry. Lands, B.C., Sale, &c. (Ques.) 4752 (ii).

Railway Subsidies (inquiry) 4405 (ii).

Rifle Shooting, Annual Payment, Ammunition, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1285.

Royal Highness, Duke of Cornwall and York, Par. in Newspapers *re* Visit (remarks) 433 (i).

——— *See* 'Cornwall,' &c.

Royal Mint, Location, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4754 (ii).

Sechelt Island Lighthouse (Ques.) 200 (i).

South African Constabulary, Uniforms, &c. (remarks) 1580 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (aid to agricultural societies) 2837; (census) 2863 (i); (census circular) 3066 (ii); (Chinese lepers) 2867; (Paris exposition) 1000 (i).

Charges of Management (letter carriers) 174; (statutory increases) 174 (i).

Civil Govt.: Post Office Dept. (salaries) 189 (i).

Customs: B. C. (salaries, &c.) 3848 (ii).

Dom. Lands (inspectors, agents, &c.) 1385 (i).

Prior, Hon. E. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Fisheries (B. C. protection service) 312; (licenses, B. C.) 305; (protection service) 295, 305 (i).

Geological Survey (explcrations, &c.) 3770 (ii).

Indians: B. C. (industrial schools) 2773; (medical attendance) 2772; (Songhees reserve) 2773 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (retiring allowances 277 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Victoria, B.C., and San Francisco) 4787 (ii).

Militia (annual drill, pay, &c.) 3406, 3421; (canteens, &c.) 3421; (cartridge factory) 3785; (clothing, &c.) 3771, 4350; (Esquimalt defences) 3785; (Mackenzie, Capt., pension, &c.) 3395; (musketry school) 3384; (pay, &c.) 3384, 3398; (properties, repairs, &c.) 3438; (provisions, supplies, &c.) 3772; (Quebec cartridge factory) 3440; (ry. extension to Rockcliffe range) 4348; (rifle associations) 3774; (Royal Military College) 3782; (salaries, &c.) 3436; (S. A. war maps) 3787; (warlike stores) 3440; (Work Point property, purchase) 4352.

Miscellaneous (*Canada Gazette*) 3448; (printing) 3448 (ii).

N. W. Mounted Police (clothing, arms, &c.) 3444; (pay of force) 3443; (Yukon Territory) 3447 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, B.C. (Nelson) 3097; (New Westminster) 3097, 4392; (Vancouver drill hall) 3100; (Williams Head) 3106; Ont. (London drill hall) 2550 (i); Ottawa (military stores) 4390 (ii); (renovating, &c.) 2554 (i); Dredging, B.C. (Victorla harbour) 4402 (ii); Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence channel) 1174 (i).

Scientific Institutions (hydrographic survey) 292 (i).

Steamboat Inspection (fog alarms) 294 (i).

Vancouver Drill Hall, &c. (Ques.) 1750 (i).

White Horse Boat Building, and Alien Labour (Ques.) 813 (i).

Willamette, Str., Wreck at Denman Island (remarks) 3643, 3983 (ii).

Yukon, Houston Permit (remarks) 1266 (i).

Puttee, Mr. A. W., *Winnipeg.*

Alien Labour Restriction Act Amt. B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2466 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2338 (i).

C.P.R. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 4014; on M. for 3°, 4419 (ii).

——— Land Grants Taxation B. 17 (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) on M. for 2°, 1162 (i).

Commodities, Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4879 (ii).

Free Transportation for Members, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 530 (i).

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2362 (i).

Govt. Contracts and Workmen's Claims, Unsettled, &c. (Ques.) 3180 (ii).

Immigration Policy of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Wilson*) to Com. of Sup., 2945 (i).

Puttee, Mr. A. W.—*Con.*

Locomotive Works, Kingston, Strike, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5433 (ii).

Lumber Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1788.

Man. Railways Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. for 2°, 2986; on M. for Com., 4372, 4436, 4520; in Com., 5047, 5072 (ii).

Ottawa and Hull Power and Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 25 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 2751.

Passes to Members. *See* "Free Transportation."

Railway Commissioners, Board of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 850 (i).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5507 (ii).

St. Andrews Rapids Improvements and Labour Clause (M. for papers*) 1266 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (alien labour enforcement, &c.) 2648 (i).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (*Year Book*) 2835 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 3426 (ii).

Miscellaneous: Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3805; (salaries, &c.) 3787, 3805 (ii).

N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 3444 (ii).

Post Office (letter carriers, increases) 5460; (Ry. mail service, H. A. McGrady, increase of salary) 5460; (train porters) 5462 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (St. Andrews Rapids) 1205 (i).

Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (contracts, labour clause) 2646 (i).

Valleyfield Riots (Ques.) 85 (i).

——— Labour Strike, Settlement by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 2595 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Loy*) to Com. of Sup., 3761.

Reid, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*

SUPPLY:

Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (Eel River station, &c.) 5227 (ii).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *South Grenville.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 668, 677 (i).

Freight and Passenger Rates on Rys. Regulation (B. 28) 1° m., 420 (i).

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2424, 2433 (i).

Shipping Casualties Investigation B. 93 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2450 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Glasgow exhibition) 4605 (ii).

Post Office (mail service) 485 (i).

Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (rents, heating, &c.) 3130; (repairs, furniture, &c.) 3121, 3125; (Rideau Hall) 3150; (Seybold block) 3141 (ii).

Railways and Canals: Canals (Sault Ste. Marie deepening, &c.) 4258 (ii).

Richardson, Mr. R. L., *Lisgar.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2040 (i).

Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s incorp. B. 13 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1972, 1982 (i).

Richardson, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

C.P.R. Charter, Judicial Interpretation *re* Exemption Clause (Ques.) 3459 (ii).

C.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 3995, 3998, 4012 (ii).

——— Land Grant (B. 17) 1° m., 325; 2° m., 1116, 1155 (i).

——— Land Grant, Taxation, Ref. to Judicial Courts, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5417; Neg. (Y. 12, N. 99) 5432.

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2169 (i).

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 326; on Order for 2°, 1792 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Ingram*) on M. for 2°, 212 (i).

Easter Adjournments (remarks) 2408 (i).

Free Transportation to Members, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 531 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 2389 (i).

Judges, N.W.T. and Yukon, Salary, &c., in Com. on Res., 4073 (ii).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. *Galliher*) in Com., 3224 (ii).

Man. and Canada Northern Ry. Co.'s Agreement B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. for 1°, 2347 (i); on M. for Com., 4448, 4451, 4515; in Com., 5006, 5015, 5035, 5045, 5048, 5089 (ii).

N.W.T. Representation B. 74 (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) on M. for 1°, 1497 (i).

Passes to Members. *See* 'Free Transportation.'

P. E. I. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com., 4688 (ii).

Private Bills, Suspension of Rule 60 (objection) 4939 (ii).

Railway Act (expropriation) Amt. (B. 94) 1° m., 1960 (i).

——— Commissioners, Board of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 829, 861 (i).

——— Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5483 (ii).

Remount Stations, on M. for Com. of Sup, 5164.

SUPPLY:

Post Office (mail service) 487 (i).

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (additional rooms, &c.) 4395; (coal tenders) 3484 (ii).

Robinson, Mr J., *West Elgin.*

Binder Twine, Enforcement of Law *re* (Ques.) 507 (i).

——— Manufacture of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 233 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2048 (i).

——— Vote respecting (remarks) 2349 (i).

C.P.R. Land Grants Taxation B. 17 (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) on M. for 2°, 1158 (i).

Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 796 (i).

Drainage across Ry. Lands (B. 16) 1° m., 324; 2° m., 1062 (i).

Robinson, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Financial Situation, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5881 (ii).

Foresters Subsidiary B. 120 (Mr. *Heyd*) on M. for 3°, 4365 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2784, 2788 (i).

Free Transportation to Members, &c. (prop. Res.) 528; on Order called for resuming adjnd. deb., 1793 (i).

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2413, 2427 (i).

Game Preservation Act (Unorganized Ter.) Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 2°, 2821 (i).

Immigration Policy of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Wilson*) to Com. of Sup., 2927 (i).

Indemnity, Increased. *See* 'Senate, &c.'

Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Subsidy (Ques.) 109 (i).

Locomotive Works, Kingston, Strike, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5434 (ii).

Man. Rys. Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. for Com., 4525 (ii).

Money Lenders B. *See* 'Usury.'

Passes to Members. *See* 'Free, &c.'

Pensions for Permanent Force, on prop. Res., 4239 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 4248 (ii).

Public Health Inspection, Appnmt. of Com. (Ques.) 322 (i).

Railway Commissioners, Board of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 847 (i).

——— Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5502, 5506, 5552 (ii).

Rooms in H. of C. (Ques.) 69 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act (increased indemnity) Amt. B. 151 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5606 (ii).

South African War, Canadian Intervention, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com of Sup., 1359.

Speeches of Members, Number, &c., on M. (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) to adjn., 5958 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: Census (Mr. Côté's circular) 3934; (cold storage) 3039; (experimental farm bulletins) 4593 (ii); (Glasgow exhibition) 933 (i), 4602 (ii); (*Year Book*) 2830 (i).

Dom. Lands (inspectors, agents, &c.) 1382 (i).

Govt. of N.W.T. (school grants) 1368 (i).

Immigration (agents, salaries, &c., W. T. R. Preston) 4828 (ii).

Indians: Man. (schools) 2763 (i).

Mail Subsidies (cattle embargo in G.B.) 4778.

Militia (annual drill) 3426; (Quebec cartridge factery) 3440 (ii).

Miscellaneous: Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3835; (Plains of Abraham, purchase) 5814 (ii).

Post Office (mail service) 484 (i).

Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Elgin County) 2559 (i); Ottawa (H. of C., addition, improvements, &c.) 5677; (rentals, accommodation, &c.) 4397; Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campobello breakwater) 3482; Ont. (Port

Robinson, Mr. J.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Burwell) 3509 (ii); Transportation (Port Colborne) 1222 (i).
Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 3734 (ii).
Usury Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) in Com., 645.
York, Duke of, Programme *re* Visit (remarks) 4873 (ii).

Robinson, Mr. J., *Northumberland, N.B.*
Canada Eastern Ry., Res. from N.B. received by Govt. (Ques.) 3753 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W., *Halifax.*
Binder Twine Manufacture, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 555 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1834 (i).
C.P.Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com , 4005.
Grain Transportation through Can. Channels, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1038 (i).
Halifax Shore Fisheries, Rules, &c. (M. for copies*) 1267 (i).
Pacific Cable Act Amt. B. 45 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 905 (i).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5532 (ii).
Safety of Ships B. 92 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on Sen. Amts., 4212 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (Astronomical observatory, telescope) 5784 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Porter's Lake) 3167 (ii).
Usury Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) in Com., 640 (i).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*
Agricultural Implements exported, Rebate, &c. (M. for ret.*) 133 (i).
Baking Powder condemned, Circulars from Dept. of Inland Rev. *re* (M. for copies*) 815 (i).
Binder Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 230 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1734 (i).
Craig, John, Dismissal (Ques.) 91 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2811 (i), 4039, 4043 (ii).
Goodlands, Man., Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2776 (i).
Man. Rys. Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5033 (ii).
N.W.T. Representation (B. 74) 1° m., 1496 (i).
Scarth, Mr. W. F., Dismissal (Ques.) 1261 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Post Office (dead letter branch) 192 (i).
Dom. Lands (forest rangers, &c.) 2692; (homestead inspectors) 1387; (inspectors, agents, &c.) 1375; (surveys, printing, &c.) 1372 (i); Miscellaneous (Half-breed claims commission) 5454 (ii).
Indian Affairs: Man. (Elkhorn school, printing plant) 2766 (i), 5321 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Post Office (Strathclair post office) 489 (i).
Public Works: Dredging, Man. (plant, &c.) 3522 (ii).
Virden Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1261.

Roddick, Mr. T. G., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*
Medical Council in Can., Establishment (B. 65) 1°, 1392 (i).
Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3199.

Rosamond, Mr. B., *North Lanark.*
Abell, John, Patent Relief (B. 107) 1°*, 2347 (i).
Edwards, W. C. Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 1244 (i).
Middleton, Lilias, Relief (B. 128) 1°*, 4406 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Railways and Canals: Welland (Dunnville dam) 5631 (ii).
Transportation Question, Ques. of Order, 3210.
Victoria Day B. 33 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4256 (ii).

Ross, Mr. W., *South Ontario.*
Alien Labour Restriction Act Amt. B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2478 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1858 (i).
Commodities, Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com. 4746; (binder twine) 4888; (salt) 4895; on Amt. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4879.
Foresters, Subsidiary Court B. 120 (Mr. *Heyd*) on M. for 3°, 4363 (ii).
Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2361 (i).
Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4899 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5114 (ii).
Royal Mint Establishmeut B. 143 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5387 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Chinese lepers) 2869 (i).
Public Works: Buildings (general) 2559 (i).

Ross, Hon. Wm., *Victoria, N.S.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2254 (i).
Can. and France SS. Subsidy B. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 5106 (ii).
Can. Nurses Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 5414 (ii).
Commodities, Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4743; (binder twine) 4887; (salt) 4896 (ii).
Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 750 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2810 (i), 4059 (ii).
Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2424, 2432 (i).
Indemnity, Increased. *See* 'Senate,' &c.

Ross, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (Vancouver) Amt. B. 150 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res. 5591 (ii).
Pensions to Headquarters Staff, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 4248 (ii).
P.E.I. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. on Res., 4712 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5474 (ii).
Safety of Ships B. 92 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on Sen. Amts., 4208 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act (increased indemnity) Amt. B. 151 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5827 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (cold storage) 3023, 3039; (ii) (*Year Book*) 2836 (i); (*Year Book*, New Zealand) 4608 (ii).
Customs (preventive service) 3861 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 270 (i).
Militia (gratuities, Maj. Maxwell) 4358; (rifle association grants) 3781 (ii).
Miscellaneous: Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3813; (Plains of Abraham, purchase) 5817.
N. W. Mounted Police (Yukon force) 3447 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Amagadus wharf) 5702; (Lunenburg County breakwaters) 3166; Ont. (Bruce Mines wharf) 5731 (ii); (St. Lawrence Channel) 1201 (i).
Railways and Canals: Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 4216; (St. John terminals) 5221 (ii).
Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3265.

Russell, Mr. B., *Hants.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1663 (i).
Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s incorp. B. 13 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1981 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2196 (i).

Schell, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*
Can. Nurses Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 5414 (ii).
Free Transportation for Members, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 534 (i).
Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2377 (i).
Lumber Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1774.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (bonuses to creameries) 3053 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (Rideau Hall) 3151 (ii).

Scott, Mr. W., *West Assiniboia.*
Binder Twine Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 691 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2000 (i).
C.P.R. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 3983, 3999, 4002; on M. for 3°, 4409 (ii).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*
C.P.Ry., Land Grants, N.W.T. and Man. (Ques.) 5207 (ii).
—— Taxation B. 17 (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) on M. for 2°, 1163 (i).
—— Tax Exemption, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 2502, 2509, 2543 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4041-3 (ii).
Dom. Elections Officials, Non-payment of, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 2356 (i).
Land Grants to C. P. Ry. in Man., and N.W.T. (Ques.) 5207 (ii).
Lumber Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1776.
N. W. Ter., Financial and Constitutional Status, &c. (prop. Res.) 2608 (i).
Pensions for Permanent Force, on Prop. Res., 4240 (ii).
Railway Commissioners, Board of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 840 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (bulletins, printing, &c.) 2858 (i).
Dom. Lands (Cypress Hills district) 1387 (i).

Sherritt, Mr. J., *North Middlesex.*
Binder Twine Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 582 (i).
Grand Bend Survey, &c. (Ques.) 335 (i).
—— Improvements, &c., Tels., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 1406 (i).
Long Service Medals, Volunteers, &c. (Ques.) 1259 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C. (Minister of the Interior), *Brandon.*
Alaska and Can. International Boundary, Rep of Messrs. King and Tittmann laid on Table, 5587 (ii).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 2774 (i).
Canada and Italy Trade Relations, Cor. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for copies, 524 (i).
C.P.R., Charter, Judicial Interpretation *re* Exemption Clause (Ans.) 3460 (i).
—— Coal-bearing Lands, Disposal, &c., by Govt. (Ans.) 2776 (i).
—— Land Grants, Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 5207 (ii).
—— Land Grants Taxation B. 17 (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) on M. for 2°, 1144 (i).
—— Lands, Taxation, &c., Ref. to Judicial Courts, on Amt. (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) 5419, 5424 (ii).
—— Tax Exemptions, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 2516 (i).
—— on Amt. (Mr. *Davis*) to Com. of Sup., 2494.
Coleraine Indian Lands, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3457.
Dawson City, Gov. Gen.'s Visit, O. C.'s, &c. (Ans.) 1260 (i).
—— Theatres and Gambling Houses, Papers laid on Table, 1580 (i).
—— *See* 'Yukon.'

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*

Devlin, Mr. C. R., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 5611 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 29) 1° m., 421; in Com., 2813-20 (i).

——— B. 30 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 429 (i).

——— Pre-emptions, Grazing Leases, &c., Ret. (presented) 3454 (ii).

——— Reduction of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 66 (i).

——— South-eastern Man., Survey (Ans.) 82 (i).

——— *See* 'School.'

Doukhobors, Pet. to Govt. *re* Canadian Tyranny (Ans.) 1748 (i).

Forest Rangers, Number employed, &c. (Ans.) 1264 (i).

Games Preservation Act (unorganized Ters.) Amt. (B. 46) 1° m., 1002; 2° m., 2820 (i).

Geological Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2778 (i).

Great Northern Transit Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2877 (i).

Great North-west Central Ry. Lands, &c. (Ans.) 809 (i).

Immigration, on Amt. (Mr. *Wilson*) to Com. of Sup., 2970 (i).

Immigrants entered and settled in Can. during 1899-1900 (Ans.) 22, 86, 202 (i).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 50 (i).

Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 3095 (ii).

Interior Rep. (presented) 50 (i).

Jurisdiction of Min. of Int. (Ans.) 67 (i).

Kavanagh, Mr. James, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 110.

Land Grants to C.P.R. in Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 5207 (ii).

——— *See* 'C.P.R.'

Longueuil Ordnance Lands, Rents, &c. (Ans.) 1796 (i).

McAuley, Mr. John, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 113 (i).

Man. and N.W.T. Colonization Lands, Sale, &c. (Ans.) 1249 (i).

——— Settlers, Issue of Scrip, &c. (Ans.) 1253 (i).

Man. Railways Agreement B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. for 2°, 2986 (d); in Com., 4983 (ii).

Man. School Lands, Fraudulent Sales, &c. (Ans.) 336 (i).

——— Rep. of Judge (presented) 3454 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for Rep., 5714 (ii).

——— *See* 'School,' &c.

Manufacturers and Temperance and General Life Ass. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2985 (ii).

Mineral Resources, B.C., Advertisement, &c. (Ans.) 1750 (i).

Mining Industries, B.C., and Rep. of Interview in *Province* (Ans.) 1749 (i).

Musquash Island, Lightkeeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1251 (i).

Oxford House Mission Indians (Ans.) 336 (i).

Penitentiary Act (second inspector) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 5592 (ii).

Rama Indians (Ans.) 93, 200 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*

Regina, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Lands, &c. (Ans.) 808 (i).

Rosseau River Indians (Ans.) 82 (i).

Saw Logs Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 222.

Saw Logs on Indian Reserves (Ques.) 63 (i).

School Lands, Man. Sale, &c., on M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Lists, 72 (i).

——— *See* 'Manitoba,' &c.

Settlers in Man., Loans to (Ans.) 107 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (B.C. Supreme Court Judges) 2666 (i).

Civil Govt.: Auditor General's Office (salaries) 184; Geological Survey (salaries) 188; Indian Dept. (salaries) 184 (i); Interior (Hudson Bay Reps.) conc., 5790 (ii); (Deputy's salary) 181.

Dom. Lands (compensation to Mr. Purdy) 4928 (ii); (Cypress Hills district) 1387 (i); (demarcation and astronomical work) 4928 (ii); (extra clerks) 1388 (i) 5450 (ii); (forest rangers) 2692 (i); (inspectors, agents, &c.) 1374, 1387, 2692-2695; (international boundary fence) 5451; (maps, printing, engraving, &c.) 5452; Miscellaneous (cottage hospitals, N.W.T.) 5456; (half-breed claims commission) 4930, 5453; (international boundary investigations) 5454; (litigation, Qu'Appelle *vs.* The King) 5454; (N.W.T. exhibit, Buffalo) 5456; (seed grain to settlers) 4927; Dom. Lands (outside service, extra clerks) 4925; (patent branch, extra clerks) 4922 (ii); (surveys, &c.) 1372 (i), 4925, 5450 (ii); (tree culture) 1388, 2670, 2695.

Geological Survey (bacteriological dept.) 5456; (compilation of maps, &c.) 5315; (explorations, &c.) 3769; (explorations for Dr. Mond) 5447; (reports, &c.) 5316, 5447 (ii).

Govt. of N.W.T. (insane patients) 1367 (i); (exhibit at Buffalo exposition) 4918; (school, &c.) 1367, 1368 (i), 5782 (ii).

Govt. of the Yukon (administration, &c.) 4918 (ii).

Immigration (agents, &c., Rev. Mr. Houston) 4853; (agents in Ireland) 4917; (agents' uniforms) 4857; (contingencies, foreign agencies) 4869; (gratuity to Mrs. D. L. Cavan) 4916; (Lake St. John Ry. Colonization) 4857; (remarks) 3768; (salaries, agents, &c., W. T. R. Preston) 4819-4870 (ii).

Indians: B.C. (industrial schools) 2772; (medical attendance) 2772; (miscellaneous) 2773; (Songhees reserve) 2773 (i); Dept. (legal expenses) 5320 (ii); Man. (agricultural implements) 2762; (Elkhorn school, printing plant) 2767 (i), 5322 (ii); (grist mills) 2771; (maintenance, &c.) 2761; (schools) 2763, 2767; (supplies) 2770; (timber inspector) 2774; N.B. (medical attendance) 2760 (i), 4932 (ii); (salaries) 2760; (seed grain) 2760 (i); N.W.T. (allowance to J. A. Macrae) 4935 (ii); (annuities) 2761; (industrial schools) 2767 (i), 5447; (live stock for N.W.T. reserves) 5320; (Oxford House Indians) 4934 (ii); (salaries, &c.) 2764; (medical attendance) 2759, 2760; (salaries) 2758; (seed grain) 2758; (timber cutting on reserve) 2758; Ont. and Que. (blankets) 2753; (land management fund) 2755; (medical attendance) 2753; (medical attendance, Walpole Island) 2755 (i), 4930 (ii); (St. Regis lock-up) 2756 (i); (Six Nation reserve, Dr. Secord's report) 5319 (ii); (surveys) 2755 (i); Que. (Caughnawaga mission house) 5319 (ii); (charges *re* Chief Marcil) 2754; (Oka Indians, removal) 2754 (i); Yukon (education, &c.) 5450 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous (astronomical observatory, telescope) 5784 (ii); (Banff roads and bridges) 2698; (distressed Canadians, &c.) 2698; (Keewatin Govt.) 2698; (Keewatin lunatics, maintenance) 2698; (litigation, Int. Dept.) 2699; (Yukon and B.C. boundary, &c.) 2699.

Railways and Canals: I. C. R. (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 3599, 3614 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (hydrographic survey, Lake Winnipeg) 5782 (ii).

Yukon Ter., Administration (salaries) 1369; (W. H. P. Clement's position) 2657; (stenographers, salaries, &c.) 2659; (witness fees, &c.) 2656 (i).

Sydney Indian Reserve, Possession, &c. (Ans.) 1265 (i).

Thompson, Mr. J. R., Homestead Inspector, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 5212 (ii).

Virden, Qu'Appelle, &c., Town Sites, on M. (Mr. *Osler*) for Ret., 886, 891 (i).

Winnipeg Letter Carriers (Ans.) 106 (i).

Yukon Territory Act Amt. (B. 118) 1°*, 2567 (i); in Com., 3086, 4876–4878, 5215 (ii).

——— Administration of Public Affairs on M. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) for reps. &c., 132 (i).

——— Constitution of Courts, Appeals, &c. (remarks) 2384 (i).

——— Expenditure, Salaries, Population, &c. (remarks) 5213 (ii).

——— Gambling Houses, &c., Cor. *re* (Ans.) 1252 (i).

——— Houston Permit, &c. (Ans.) 1257 (i).

——— (remarks) 1266 (i).

——— Hydraulic Mining Leases (Ans.) 109 (i).

——— Liquor imported by Atlin Brewing Co. (Ans.) 1257 (i).

——— quantity shipped (Ans.) 813 (i).

——— regulations (Ans.) 1069 (i).

——— Lockyer, H. J., Liquor Permit, &c. (Ans.) 1250 (i).

——— Mining Regulations (Ans.) 114 (i).

——— Murray and Ross Liquor Permits (Ans.) 1250 (i).

——— Ogilvie's Resignation (Ans.) 93 (i).

——— Road and Bridge Construction (Ans.) 1252 (i).

Smith, Mr. E. D., *South Wentworth.*

Binder Twine Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 550 (i).

Budget, The, 1549 (i).

Can. and France SS. Subsidy B. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 5100, 5106 (ii).

Canal Expenditure from 1897 to 1900 by Govt. (Ques.) 1750 (i).

Cold Storage, West India Strs. (Ques.) 334 (i).

Commodities, Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com. (amt.) 4743, 4879 (ii).

Dundas Rifle Association, Annual Grants, &c. (Ques.) 1440 (i).

Exhaust Fans, &c. (Ques.) 70, 334, 505 (i).

Smith, Mr. E. D.—*Con.*

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2360 (i).

Germany, Exports from 1897 to 1900 (Ques.) 1797.

Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4819 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 217 (i).

Stoney Creek Moument, Sums voted, &c. (Ques.) 5210 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (cold storage on steamers) 5170; (experimental farm bulletins) 4592; (fruit farm) 4596; (fumigating stations) 4607; (grapes in cold storage, &c.) 5179; (patents, &c.) 4609 (ii).

Dom. Lands (inspectors' agents, &c.) 1381 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and G.B.) 4789; (St. John, Halifax and W. Indies) 4784; (St. John and London) 4782.

Post Office (mail service) 487 (i).

Tomatoes imported, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1003.

Ventilation on Ocean SS. (Ques.) 70, 334, 505 (i).

Weights and Measures Act (fruit packages) Amt. (B. 10) 1° m., 198; 2° m., 1057; on Order for Com., 1432, 1792 (i).

Winona Postmaster, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2400 (i).

Smith, Mr. R., *Vancouver.*

Alien Labour Restriction Act Amt. (B. 11) 1° m., 199 (i).

——— B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2489.

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2233 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Kendry*) *re* Telegram of Mr. McGregor, 3365 (ii).

Ry. Corporations, Bonuses to (M. for list) 88, 94, 132 (i).

Valleyfield Labour Strike, Settlement by Govt. on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Com., 2605 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Loy*) to Com. of Sup., 3759.

——— on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to Com. of Sup., 4576.

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. L. P. Brodeur), *Rouville.*

Address to His Ex., Reply (read) 1167 (i).

Adjournments of the House (remarks) 52, 133 (i).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. *Talbot*) on M. for 2°, 732 (i).

Bank Note ($4), Imprint of American Lock, on M. (Mr. *Bennett*) to adjn., 2209 (i).

——— Ques. of Order, 2213 (i).

Bell Telephone Case *re* Discussion of Bill on Order Paper (ruling) 5396, 5404 (ii).

Bills, Royal Assent, Mess. from His Ex., 2984, 2999 (ii).

Bruce, N., Electoral Division (Notification of Vacancy) 326, 2610 (i).

——— Certificate of Judges (presented) 323, 326.

——— Par. in Newspaper (ruling) 1578 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) (ques. of order) 1741 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order, 1812 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

Business of the House, Procedure *re* Private Bills, 2922 (i), 3219 (ii).

——— Procedure, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Charlton*) 4940 (ii).

Canada and Italy Trade Relations, Cor. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for copies, 520 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order, 527 (i).

Canadian Order of Nurses Bill, on M. (Mr *Sproule*) to introduce, 1881 (i).

C.P.R., Land Grant B. 17 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 1°, 326; (ruling) 1162 (i).

——— Taxation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*)—(ruling) 5419 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 2541 (i).

Controverted Elections, North Bruce, Judges' Certificate (presented) 323 (i).

Cornwall and York, Duke of, *re* Visit to Canada, Remarks ruled out of Order, 1289 (i).

Coronation Oath, on Amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) remarks, 783 (i).

——— Ques. of Order (ruling) 724 (i).

Debates, Official, Translation, on Ques. (Mr. *Ethier*) ruling, 1882 (i).

Dom. Election Officials, Non-payment of, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) Ques. of Order, 2356 (i).

Durham, West, Controverted Election, Supreme Court Judgment (read) 5802 (ii).

East Queen's. *See* 'P.E.I.'

Grain Transportation through Can. Channels, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1077 (i).

Grand Falls Water Power and Boom Co.'s B. 89 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. (remarks) 5270 (ii).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Guthrie*) on M. for 3° (ruling) 2395 (i).

Hastings, West, Notification of Vacancy, 2567.

Internal Economy Com., 9 (i).

Man. Rys. Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. for 1°, 2347 (i); on M. for Com., Members' remarks checked, 4517, 4518; Unparliamentary Language, 4527 (ii).

Members' remarks checked, 3768, 4872, 5435, 5967, 5969 (ii).

Mess. from His Ex. (read) 9, 50, 136, 1167, 2628 (i), 2984, 4898, 5546 (ii).

——— *re* Declaration Oath (read) 5970 (ii).

Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s B. 112 (Mr. *Carroll*), in Com. (ruling) *re* Procedure, 5411 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) 2578 (i).

Nipissing Electoral District, Certificate of Trial Judges (notification) 3177 (ii).

Opening, Mess. from Black Rod (read) 4 (i).

Order, Ques. of *re* Tel. of Mr. McGregor (remarks) 3367, 3371 (ii).

Pontiac County, Ry. Indebtedness, Ques. of Order (ruling) 5612 (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

P.E.I., East Queen's Election, Judges' Certificate (read) 136 (i).

——— Ry. Service, Ques. of Order, 1498 (i).

——— Winter Mail Service, Ques. of Order (remarks) 3271 (ii).

Private Bills, Procedure (remarks) 5270; (ruling) 4939 (ii).

Procedure *re* Bills on Order Paper, Printing, &c., 731 (i).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 5949 (ii).

Queen's, P.E.I., Return of Member (notification) 2567 (i).

Queen Victoria, Decease of, Mess. from Senate (read) 80 (i).

Questions, Discussions on (remarks) 63 (i).

Royal Assent. *See* 'Bills.'

St. Lawrence River Channel, on Ques. of Order, 206 (i).

S. A. War—Officers, &c., returned from active service: Ques. of Order, 1577 (i).

——— Inquiry for Cor., &c., Member asked to wthdrw. Statements *re* Gov. Gen., 5887 (ii).

Speaker, Election (remarks) 3 (i).

Speech from the Throne (read) 5 (i).

SUPPLY:

Legislation—House of Commons (debates) 195 (i); (newspapers) 5464; (O'Brien, A. H., increase of salary) 5466; (printing, paper, &c.) 5464 (ii); (Sergeant-at-Arms estimate) 196 (i).

Thames River, Obstruction on Bar, on M. (Mr. *Stephens*) to adjn., 2779 (i).

Toronto Junction Public Building (Ques. of Order) 2402 (ruling) 2404 (i).

Vacancy, Notification, 326 (i).

——— West Hastings Electoral District (notification) 2567 (i).

Valleyfield Riots, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 3756, 4570 (ii).

Speaker, Dep. (Mr. Peter Macdonald), *East Huron.*

Canadian Nurses Association B., on M. (Mr. *McLennan*) 6 m. h. (ruling) 5579 (ii).

Man. Rys. Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., Members' remarks checked, 5370 (ii).

Mess. from His Ex. (read) 5095 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res. (ruling) 5507, 5519, 5554 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c.: Paris Exposition (Ques. of Order) 962 (i).

Public Works: Building (H. of C., addition, improvements, &c.) 5678 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 649 (i).

——— B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2458, 2490 (i), 4665 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Australian Commonwealth, Congratulation of Can. Govt. (remarks) 5960 (ii).

Bank Note ($4), Imprint of American Lock, on M. (Mr. *Bennett*) to adjn., 2212 (i).

Beet Root Sugar Bounty (prop. Res.) 337; amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) agreed to (Y. 59, N. 50) 367; wthdn., 1792 (i).

Binder Twine, Manufacture of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 236 (i).

Bond-Blaine Convention. *See* 'Newfoundland.'

Bruce, North, Election, Transfer of Mail Clerks (remarks) 1578, 1593 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2137.

——— on Ques. of Order, 1743 (i).

Business of the House (remarks) 96 (i), 3536 (ii).

Can. and France SS. Subsidy B. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 5099, 5102, 5110 (ii).

Canada and Italy Trade Relations, Cor. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Copies, 528 (i).

Canadian Order of Nurses Bill (M.) to introduce, 1881 (i).

——— B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 5579 (ii).

Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s incorp. B. 13 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1964, 1978; on M. for 3°, 2744 (i).

C. P. R., Land Grants, Taxation B. 17 (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) on M. for 2°, 1140 (i).

——— Tax Exemption, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 2524 (i).

Census Commissioner, Grey County, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 335 (i).

Clergue Iron and Nickel-Steel Co. of Can. incorp. B. 19 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 2925 (i).

Committees, Meetings during Session of Hse. (remarks) 4938, 5198 (ii).

Commodities, Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4879; (binder twine) 4884 (ii).

Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 775 (i).

Crow's Nest Line, Coal Lands, &c. (Ques.) 4644.

Crow's Nest Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 57 (Mr. *Galliher*) in Com., 3418; on M. to wthdrw., 5712 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Ingram*) on M. for 2°, 211 (i).

——— B. 9 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 1056 (i).

——— B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2811 (i), 4048-53, 4326, 4339 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 2815 (i).

E. B. Eddy Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 3411 (ii).

Foresters, Subsidiary High Court B., on M. (Mr. *Flint*) to suspend Rule, 2701 (i); in Com., 4018; on M. for 3°, 4365 (ii).

Fort Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 149 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for Com., 5713 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Franchise Act (1898) Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4206 (ii).

French SS. Service. *See* 'Can. and France.'

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Sale B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 503; in Com., 2612.

Govt. Vessels, B.C., Tenders, &c., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) for Copies, 515 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 1922 (i).

Increased Indemnity. *See* 'Senate,' &c.

Judges' Salaries, Increase, &c. (remarks) 4902 (ii).

King's Printer, Finances, &c., in Com. on Res., 4668.

Lead (refined) Bounties B. 152 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5723 (ii).

Lumber Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1769.

Mackenzie & Mann, Claim *re* Yukon Ry., on M. to print Papers, 5950 (ii).

Man. Rys. B. 102 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. to refund Fees, &c., 4193 (ii).

——— B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 4972 (ii).

Micmac Indians and Alex. Marchel, Duties of Agent, &c. (M. for cor.*) 816 (i).

Montreal Harbour Loan B. 142 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5119; in Com. on Res., 5134; in Com. on B., 5472 (ii).

Newfoundland, Bond-Blaine Convention, Ratification, &c., on M. to adjn., 3982 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) *re* Tel. of Mr. McGregor, 3367.

Pacific Cable Act Amt. B. 45 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 905 (i).

Penitentiary Act (second inspector) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 5589 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 4243 (ii).

P. E. I. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. on Res., 4678, 4686 (ii).

Printing Bureau Finances. *See* 'King's Printer.'

Printing Com., 6th Rep., on (M.) to conc., 5712.

Private Bills, on M. (Mr. *Flint*) to extend Time, 419 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Kendry*) *re* Telegram of Mr. McGregor, 3368 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 216 (i).

——— B. 136 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5113 (ii).

——— B. 145 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5787 (ii).

——— Commissioners, Board of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 851 (i).

——— Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5472, 5504, 5515, 5553, 5557; in Com. on B., 5786 (ii).

Saw Logs Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 220.

Senate and House of Commons Act (increased indemnity) Amt. B. 151 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*); in Com., 5826 (ii).

Similkameen and Keremeos Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Galliher*) in Com., 3697 (ii).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 5092, 5275, 5283, 5285 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Speeches of Members, Number, &c., on M. (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) to adjn., 5960 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (alien labour enforcement) 2649; (circuit allowances *ad hoc*) 2648; Man. (travelling allowances, &c.) 2647 (i); Yukon (maintenance of prisoners) 5778 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Agriculture Com., distribution, &c.) 2858 (i); (archives) 4607 (ii); (bulletins, printing, &c.) 2858 (i) 4591; (Can. Exhibit at Imp. Institute, London) 5180; (census) 5785; (Mr. Côté's circular) 3912; (industries, &c.) 3875; (expenditure) 3869; (Ques. of Order) 3932 (ii); (Chinese lepers) 2869; (classifying patents) 2862 (i); (cold storage) 5167 (ii); (experimental farms) 2848; (fumigating stations) 2865 (i), 4606; (Glasgow exhibition) 4602 (ii); (Paris exposition) 934; *(Patent Record)* 2825; (St. Boniface Hospital) 2870; (San José Scale) 2856, 2865; (tree culture) 2848, 2852; *(Year Book)* 2828 (i), 4609 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Aud. Gen.'s Office (Hudson, Reid and Kearns, Messrs., salaries) 5182; Finance Dept. (chief clerk, appnmt.) 5184; (Finance and Treasury Board) conc., 5788; Marine and Fisheries (Anderson, W. P., salary) 5183 (ii).

Coll. of Rev.: Public Works (telegraph lines, working expenses) 3536 (ii).

Customs: Miscellaneous (Gibson, Jas., claim, &c.) 4627; (leather combine) 4629; (statistical staff, extra pay, &c.) 4628 (ii).

Dom. Lands (extra clerks, patent branch) 4921; (outside service, extra clerks) 4925; Miscellaneous (astronomical and demarcation work) 4928; (seed grain to settlers) 4927; (surveys) 4926 (ii); (tree culture) 2686, 2689 (i).

Fisheries (B.C. protection service) 312; (Can. exhibit) 314; (cold storage for bait) 319 (i); (Georgian Bay biological observatory) 5197 (ii); (hatcheries, &c.) 310 (i); (hatcheries, B.C.) 4588; (legal expenses *re* sealing vessels) 5197 (ii); (overseers, &c., salaries) 294; (protection steamers) 295 (i).

Gas and Electric Light Inspection (instruments, &c.) 5778 (ii).

Govt. of N. W. Ter (exhibit at Buffalo exhibition) 4918; (schools) 5782 (ii).

Immigration (agents, salaries, &c., W. T. R. Preston) 4823, 4850; (contingencies, foreign agencies) 4869 (ii).

Indians: Man. (agricultural implements, &c.) 2762; (grist mills) 2771; (industrial schools) 2767 (i); N.B. (medical attendance) 4932; N.W.T. (allowance to J. A. Macrae) 4935 (ii); Que. (St. Régis lock-up) 2756; (charges *re* Chief Marcil) 2754; (Oka Indians, removal) 2754 (i).

Justice: Miscellaneous (law library, London) 4638 (ii); (revision of the statutes) 2667 (i).

Legislation (voters' lists) 3910; (provincial voters' lists) 3911 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aid to navigation) 4585; (Lower Traverse pier) 5187 (ii); (Lurcher Shoal) 285; (maintenance and repairs) 280; (repairs to wharfs) 289; (St. Lawrence route) 274; (salaries) 270; (salaries at Ottawa) 284; (Thornbury lighthouse) 287 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and G.B.) 4789; (Fast Atlantic SS. service) 5769; (Halifax and Canso) 5777; (Quebec, Murray Bay and River Ouelle) 5777; (St. Stephen, N.B., and Black Bay) 5768 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine Hospitals (Louisburg, N.S.) 5194 (ii); (sick seamen) 293 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 3408, 3424, 4346; (canteens, &c.) 3424; extra salaries, &c., *re* S. A. War) 4347; (Fenian raid pensions) 4639; (Govt. cartridge factory) 5892; (gratuities, &c.) 4353; (ry. extension to Rockliffe range, rates, &c.) 4349, 4639; (remounts purchased for Imp. Govt.) 3440; (S. A. second contingent, Govt. [insurance) 3399 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provl.) 3452; (assay office, B.C. and Yukon) 5783; (astronomical observatory, telescope) 5784; (Australian representatives of Can.) 4638; (International catalogue) 3453; Justice (litigation expenses) 4342; Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3803, 3819; (organization, &c.) 3789, 3802; (salaries, printing, &c.) 4790; (paper combine inquiry) 5783; (Paris agency) 3450; (Plains of Abraham, purchase) 5815; (printing) 3449 (ii); (Yukon and B.C. boundary) 2700 (i).

N. W. Mounted Police (clothing, arms, &c.) 3445 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 268; (life-saving stations) 260 (i); (life-saving stations, Long Point) 5187 (ii); (masters and mates) 259; (repairs and maintenance) 249 (i); (steamers, construction) 5185 (ii).

Penitentiaries: Dorchester (salaries) 2650 (i); Kingston (McKay's account) 4635 (ii); (Regina Jail) 2650; (salaries) 2649 (i).

Post Office (mail service) 436, 452 (i).

Public Works: Buildings—N. B. (Marysville post office) 5688; N.S. (Halifax drill hall) 5687; (general vote, armouries) 5697 (ii); Ont. (London drill hall) 2547 (i), 5691 (ii); Ottawa (H. of C., addition, improvement) 2553 (i), 5676; (Major's Hill Park) 5695; (observatory) 5767 (ii); (Seybold Block) 922 (i); (steel shelving) 5692; (Victoria Memorial Museum) 5682 (ii); (St. Thomas drill hall) 2555 (i); (Toronto Junction) 5691 (ii); (Windsor drill hall) 2564; (Woodstock post office) 2566 (i), 5692; Que. (Grosse Isle quarantine station) 5689; (immigrant sheds) 5688; (Montreal custom-house, alterations) 5691; Yukon (public buildings) 4268; (Mr. Tache's accounts) 4290, 4300; Dredging, Ont. and Que. (new plant) 3516; Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Fraser River channel) 3514; (Skeena River) 3515; N. B. (Campobello breakwater) 3482, 3487; N.S. (private docks) 5704; Ont. (Cobourg pier) 3500; (Collingwood harbour) 3500; (Colpoy's Bay) 3504; (Goderich harbour) 3504; (Leamington pier) 3507; (Meaford harbour) 3508, 5757; (Owen Sound) 3509; (Penetanguishene dredging) 5757; (Port Arthur breakwater) 5687; (Port Burwell harbour) 3510; (Presqu'ile wharf) 5750; (Providence Bay wharf) 3510; (Rainy River dam) 5686; (Sheguiandah pier) 3511; (South Nation River) 3512; (Wiarton pier) 3513; Que. (Father Point Landing pier) 3497; (Lévis graving dock) 5709; (Magdalen Islands breakwater) 3498 (ii); (St. Lawrence channel) 1177, 1188 (i); (Sorel wharf) 4792; Yukon (Lewes and Yukon River improvements) 4290; Miscellaneous (Chief Architect's office) 3531; (Chief Engineer's office) 3530; (telegraph service, salaries and dismissals) 3532; Roads and Bridges (Des Joachims) 3523; Telegraph Lines, B.C. (Quesnelle-Atlin branch) 5687; (Atlin to Quesnelle) 4276 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Quarantine (public health) 4611; (tuberculosis, prevention, &c.) 4619 (ii).

Railways and Canals: Canals (construction) 4305; Lachine (Mill street paving) 5623; (*Frank Perew*, tug, repairs) 5624; (Lake St. Francis, removing shoals) 4310, 4381; (Lake St. Louis, hydrographic survey) 4309; (Sault Ste. Marie canal, deepening, &c.) 4260; Trent (Chemong lake bridge) 5625; (construction) 4266; Welland (Dunnville dam) 5626; (deepening long levels) 5619; (Welland lock breakage) 4308; Miscellaneous (salaries, &c.) 4319; Railways—G.T.R. (rental) 4321; I.C.R. (Eastern Extension, N.S., Ry. award) 5939; (general vote) 5650; (locomotives, &c.) 4180, 4183 (ii); (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 2630, 2725, 2740 (i), 3559, 3581, 3724, 3728 (ii); (Sydney accommodation) 2716 (i), 4376 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (Capt. Bernier's expedition, and Govt. aid) 5194 (ii); (charts, &c.) 290 (i); (hydrographic survey, Lake Winnipeg) 5782 (ii); (meteorological service) 289 (i); (str. to replace *Bayfield*) 5191; (Sulphur Mountain Observatory, Banff) 5196 (ii); (Toronto observatory) 289 (i).

Staples Inspection (chief inspector, salary) 5780; (grain commissioner) 4937 (ii).

Yukon Ter. Govt. (administration, &c.) 4918 (ii); (Judge's salary) 2650; (living allowances, &c.) 2653; (maintenance of prisoners) 2654; (sheriff's fees) 2652; (Mr. Wade's duties) 2656, 2660; (witness fees) 2655 (i).

Trade and Nav. Rets. (inquiry) 239 (i).

Valleyfield Riots, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Loy*) to Com. of Sup., 3766 (ii).

——— (Ques. of Order) 4570 (ii).

Victoria Day B. 35 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 220 (i), 4256 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff (beet-root sugar machinery) in Com. on Res., 5802 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act (size of fruit baskets) Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 1060; on Order for Com., 1791 (i).

Yukon Territory Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4877 (ii).

Stephens, Mr Geo., *Kent, Ont.*

Binder Twine Manufacture, &c., on prop. (Mr, *Blain*) 565 (i).

Commodities Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com. (binder twine) 4884 (ii).

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Sale B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2412, 2416, 2420, 2432, 2433 (i).

Robertson, Mr. Justice, Infirmity, &c., (Ques.) 5586 (ii).

Thames River, Obstruction to Navigation (M.) to adjn., 2779 (i).

Sutherland, Hon. James (acting Postmaster-General) *North Oxford.*

Alberton, P. E. I., Postmaster, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 1404 (i).

Allison and Rosemount Mail Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1591 (i).

Sutherland, Hon. J.—*Con.*

Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Service (Ans.) 1261, 1440, 2398 (i), 4194 (ii).

Assurance Companies Bills, Procedure, &c. (remarks) 3421 (ii).

Bruce, North, Election, Transfer of Mail Clerks: Par. in Newspaper (remarks) 1595 (i).

Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s incorp. B. 13 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1963, 1984; on M. for 3°, 2384, 2744 (i).

Canadian Nurses Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Com., 4371; in Com., 4423, 5582 (ii).

C. P. Ry. Lands, B.C., Sale, &c. (Ans.) 4753 (ii).

Cayouette, Elizabeth, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1405.

Census Commissioner for Cardwell, Appnmt. (Ans.) 329 (i).

——— Simcoe, Appnmt. (Ans.) 336 (i).

——— East Simcoe, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 201 (i).

——— Grey County, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 335 (i).

Central Railway and Mail Contract with Govt. (Ans.) 1593 (i).

Clarenceville and Lacolle Mail Carrier, Extra Pay, &c. (Ans.) 1248 (i).

Coe Hill Mines and Apsley Mail Service (Ans.) 2989, 3179 (ii).

Commodities, Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com. (salt) 4897 (ii).

Crow's Nest Coal Lands, &c. (Ans.) 4644 (ii).

Dairy Industry, Quebec, Development, &c. (Ans.) 5586 (ii).

Doukhobors, Date of Arrival, Bonuses paid, &c. (Ans.) 1998 (i).

Drayton Postmistress, Date of Appnmt. (Ans.) 1439 (i).

E. B. Eddy Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 3411 (ii).

Foresters Subsidiary Court B. 120 (Mr. *Heyd*) on M. for 3°, 4370 (ii).

Fort Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 149 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for Com., 5713 (ii).

Gananoque Letter Collection, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 2704 (i).

Goodlands, Man., Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2777 (i).

Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) for Morning Sittings, 4648 (ii).

Govt. Contracts and Workmen's Claims undetermined, &c. (Ans.) 3180 (ii).

Great Northern Transit Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2875 (i).

Greenvale Postmaster, Salary, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 3458 (ii).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 1918; on M. for 3°, 2393 (i).

Immigration Policy of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Wilson*) to Com. of Sup., 2979 (i).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. *Galliher*) in Com., 3223 (ii).

Sutherland, Hon. J.—*Con.*

Locomotive Works, Kingston, Strike, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5435, 5445 (ii).

Madoc Mail Contracts, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1441 (i).

Mail Clerks in South Africa, Promotion, &c, (Ans.) 1439 (i).

Man. Rys. B. 102 (Mr. *McIsaac*) M. to refund Fees, &c., 4192 (ii).

——— B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. for 2° 2986 ; on M. for Com., 4519 ; in Com., 4972, 5047 (ii).

Manufacturers and Temperance and General Life Ass. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2986 (ii).

Midland and Vasey Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 2570 (i).

Napanee Postmaster, Resignation of Mr. Bogart, &c. (Ans.) 3269 (ii).

Ottawa, Gatineau and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 3221 (i).

Ottawa and Hull Power and Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 25 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 2750.

Ottawa Supply Co., Names of Firm, &c. (Ans.) 1794 (i).

Paris Exhibition, Printing of *Women of Canada* (Ans.) 337 (i).

Pictou Mail Contracts, Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 1244 (i).

Pontiac Colonization Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *Murray*) M. to refund Fees, 4752 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. (B. 121) 1° m., 2878 (i) ; in Com., 4241 (ii).

Post Offices established since 1896 (Ans.) 2704 (i).

P.E.I., Postal Service from Abram's Village to Higgins Road (Ans.) 2163 (i).

——— Tignish Mail Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3269.

Private Bills, Posting, &c. (M.) 5094 (ii).

Quebec Central Ry., Mail Service, &c, (Ans.) 4644 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5553, 5560 (ii).

Royal Military College, Extension, &c. (remarks) 4872 (ii).

Safes furnished by Govt. to Postmasters (Ans.) 1404 (i).

Scarth, Mr. W. F., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1261.

Simcoe Mail Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1405 (i).

Sorel Post Office, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 2705 (i).

Supply—Procedure, &c. (remarks) 2753 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics : Census (Mr. Côté's circular) 3975 (ii).

Civil Govt. : Post Office (contingencies) 4791 ; (Northrup, W. B., promotion) 5184 (ii).

Miscellaneous : Labour Dept. (general statement) 3796 ; (*Labour Gazette*) 3802 ; (salaries, &c.) 3788, 4789 (ii).

Post Office (B. J. Hanlon's salary) 5459 ; (letter carriers, increase) 5460 ; conc., 5793 ; (London postmaster, increase of salary) 5458 ; (McGrady, H. A., increase of salary) 5460 ; (mileage to Ry. clerks) 4405 ; (payments, &c., for service) 4404 ; (postmasters, salaries, commissions, &c.) 5459 ; (P.E.I. mail service) 5463 ; (Sheet Harbour mail service) 5462 ; (train porters) 5462 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (St. Thomas armoury, letter read from Mr. Green) 3479 ; Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campobello breakwater) 3478 ; Ont. (private docks) 5745 (ii).

Railways and Canals : I.C.R. (rolling stock, locomotives, &c.) 4168, 4182 (ii).

Toronto Post Office, Station 'B,' Lease, Rent, &c. (Ans.) 1995 (i).

Valleyfield Labour Strike, Settlement by Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 2591, 2597 (i).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4548, 4566 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) 3755, 3766.

Winona Postmaster, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2401 (i).

Woodstock, N.B., Mail Contract, &c. for 1900 (Ans.) 4230 (ii).

Sutherland. Mr. R. F., *North Essex.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 663 (i).

——— B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2484.

Canadian Mutual Aid Society Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 1167 (i).

Judges, N.W.T. and Yukon, Salary, &c., in Com. on Res., 4076 (ii).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 27) 1°*, 420 ; 2° m., 731 (i).

Canadian Nurses Association B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. (amt.) 5582 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5520 (ii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Malouin*) wthdn., 5584 (ii).

Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3350.

Tarte, Hon. J. I. (Minister of Public Works), *Montreal, St. Mary.*

Brockville Drill Hall, Suspension of Supt. (Ans.) 2398 (i).

C.P.R. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 3694, 3987, 3996 (ii).

Can. and France SS. Subsidy B. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 5101, 5105 (ii).

Depot Harbour Breakwater, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1251 (i).

Gordon Point, P.E.I., Pets. for Pier, &c. (Ans.) 2163 (i).

Grand Bend Survey, &c. (Ans.) 336 (i).

Hackett, Dredge, Names of Owners, &c. (Ans.) 204.

Higgins Shore, Pier, &c., Pet. from Settlers (Ans.) 4195 (ii).

Hill, Arthur E. B., Investigation *re* Claim, &c., (Ans.) 4642 (ii).

Hopewell Cape Wharf, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 810.

Long Wharf, St. John, Contracts, &c., on M. for Copies (Mr. *Fowler*) 1266 (i).

Tarte, Hon. J. I.—*Con.*

Manitoba Lake Dredging, Pets., &c. (Ans.) 1260.

Mispec, N.B., Breakwater, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 808 (i).

Montreal Harbour Loan B. 142 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5121; in Com. on Res., 5130, 5136, 5146, 5152 (ii).

Montreal Harbour, Works, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1068 (i).

Owen Sound Dredge and Construction Co., Names, &c. (Ans.) 204 (i).

Port Bruce Harbour, Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 507 (i).

——— Burwell Harbour, Expenditure (Ans.) 506.

——— Colborne Harbour Works, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 811 (i).

——— Hope Harbour, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 807 (i).

——— Stanley Harbour, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 506 (i).

P. E. I., Claims for increased Subsidy (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4726 (ii).

Printing Bureau, Addition to, &c. (remarks) on M. to conc. in Printing Com. Rep., 5200 (ii).

Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 51 (i).

Rooms in H. of C. (Ans.) 69 (i).

Royal Military College Extension, &c. (remarks) 4873 (ii).

St. Thomas Armoury, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 506 (i).

Salmon River Wharf (Ans.) 206 (i).

Severn River Floods, Removal of Obstructions, &c. (Ans.) 201 (i).

Seybold Block, Rentals, &c., by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 4764 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply, Buildings Ottawa.'

Skinner's Pond Harbour (Ans.) 68 (i).

Sorel Harbour Works, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1068 (i).

Stratford P. O. (Ans.) 91 (i).

Summerside Harbour (Ans.) 83 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: census (Mr. Côté's letter) 3897, 3905, 3919, 3921 (ii); (Paris exposition) 931; (President Loubet's reception) 935 (i).

Ocean and River Service (tidal surveys) 265 (i).

Public Works: Coll. of Rev. (Harbours, &c., repairs, &c.) 3535; (telegraph lines, working expenses) 3536; Income—Buildings, B.C. (Kamloops) 3097; (Nelson) 3097; (New Westminster) 3097, 4392; (Rossland) 3099; Vancouver drill hall) 3100; (William's Head) 3106; Generally (armouries) 5697; (contract labour) 3154; (engineers, salaries) 3153; (experimental farms) 3106; (heating, repairs) 3130; (lighting, &c.) 4398; (resident clerks of works) 3106; N.B. (Marysville post office) 5688; (Richibucto public building) 5688 (ii); (St. John immigration shed) 1242 (i); N.S. (Halifax drill hall) 5687 (ii); (Halifax offices) 1241 (i); (Lunenburg post office) 4390: Ont. (Brampton armoury) 5699; (Brockville drill hall, overseer) 3111; (Clinton post office) 5695 (ii); (Deseronto) 2547 (i); (Gananoque public buildings) 5697; (Kingston drill hall) 3535; (Kingston military buildings) 5697 (ii); (Royal Military College) 2547; (London drill hall) 2547 (i) 5691; Ottawa (coal tenders) 3483; (electric lighting, &c.) 3152 (ii); (H. of C. addition and improvements) 2553 (i), 5673 (ii); (Labour Dept.) 4392; (Major's Hill Park) 5695 (ii); (military stores, 1173 (i), 4390; (observatory) 5767 (ii); (rentals) repairs, &c.) 2554 (i), 3112, 3133, 4393, 4394; (Rideau Hall), 3149; (Rideau Hall, damage by fire) 4391; (Royal Mint) 5672 (ii); (Seybold block) 911 (i); (steel drawers, shelves, &c.) 5692; Surveyor Gen.'s offices, furnishing, &c.) 5700; (telephones, &c.) 3119, 4392; (ventilation, &c.) 3123; (Victoria Memorial Museum) 5681; Ont. (Paris, Gov. Gen.'s Warrant) 4391 (ii); (Picton) 2554, 2560 (i); (Sault Ste. Marie public building, 5692 (ii); (St. Thomas drill hall) 2555 (i), 3104, 3110, 5693 (ii); (Sarnia) 2555; (Toronto drill hall) 2562 (i), 3103; (Toronto, mail room) 4392 (ii); (Toronto Junction) 3107, 5691, 5701; (Windsor drill hall) 2564; (Woodstock post office) 2566 (i), 5692 (ii); Que. (Buckingham post office) 1243 (i); (Grosse Isle quarantine station) 4391, 5689; (Levis post office) 5690; (Montreal custom-house alteration) 5691; (Montreal post office) 5689; (Montreal public buildings, repairs, &c.) 5690; (Peribonka immigrant building) 4391; (Que., immigrant shed) 5688; (post office improvements) 5688; (St. Hyacinthe drill hall) 5690; (St. Laurent) 4392 (ii); (Victoriaville) 2547 (i); Dredging, B.C. (repairs) 3516; (Victoria harbour) 4402; Man., (plant) 3522; Mar. Provs. (plant, &c.) 3521; (plant, &c.) 5758; (Ont. and Que., new plant) 3516; (Que., Point Claire) 4401; (Que. and Ont.) 4400; (Scugog River) 4402; (vessels, repairs, &c.) 3515; Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Columbia River improvements) 3514; (Fraser River channel) 3514; (Skeena River) 3515; Man. (general repairs, &c) 4399; (Lake Man. outlet) 3513; (Lake Winnipeg wharf) 3513 (ii); (St. Andrew's Rapids) 1205 (i), 4400; Mar. Provs. (Kennebecasis wharf) 3496; N.B. (Back Bay wharf) 3473; (Bay du Vin wharf), 3473; (Burnt Church wharf) 3473; (Campbellton wharf), 5705; (Campobello breakwater) 3473; (Dorchester breakwater) 5705 (ii); (Negro Point breakwater) 3495; (repairs, &c.) 3496; (River St. John) 3495; (St. John Harbour) 4399, 5707; N.S. (Abbott's Beach) 3153; (Amagadus Pond Wharf) 5701; (Beaver Wharf) 3153; (Big Bras d'Or wharf) 3154; (Boularderie wharf) 3154; (Can. Creek breakwater) 3154; (Cape Negro Island breakwater) 3154; (Chebogue harbour) 3154; (Cheverie breakwater) 3154; (Clark's breakwater) 3163; (Comeauville breakwater) 4398; (Ingonish breakwater) 4398; (Lunenburg harbour) 3168; (Lunenburg County breakwaters) 3165; (Neil's breakwater) 3163; (Parker's Cove wharf) 4399; (Parrsboro Beach) 3163; (Pictou Island wharf) 3461; (Porter's Lake) 3166; (Salmon River shed) 3460; (Scott's Bay pier) 3174; Windsor Harbour dams) 3175; Ont. (Blind River wharf) 5743; (Bronte harbour) 5729; (Bruce Mines wharf) 5730; (Burlington channel) 5731; (Cobourg pier) 3500; (Collingwood harbour) 3500; (Colpoy's Bay) 3504; (Goderich harbour) 3504; (Hawkestone wharf) 4399; (Indian River, dredging) 5732 (ii); (Kaministiquia River) 1205 (i); Leamington pier) 3507; (Meaford harbour) 3507, 5757; (Napanee River) 4401; (Oakville pier) 5743; (Parry

Tarte, Hon. J. I.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Sound) 4806, 4812; (Penetanguishene) 4794; (Penetanguishene, dredging) 5757; (Point Pelee Island wharf) 3509; (Port Arthur breakwater) 5687; (Port Burwell harbour) 3510, 4399; (Presqu'ile wharf) 5750; (private docks) 5743; (Providence Bay wharf) 3510; (public docks) 4804; (Rainy River dam) 5686; (Rondeau harbour) 3511; (Sault Ste. Marie harbour) 5733; (Sheguiandah pier) 3511; (South Nation River) 3512; (Sydenham harbour) 5733; (Sydenham River) 3506; (Toronto harbour) 3512, 5734; (transportation, &c.) 5747; (Wendover wharf) 5749; (Wiarton pier) 3513; P.E.I. (Cascumpec harbour) 3461; (Gordon's Point wharf) 5746; (Hurd's Point pier) 3462; (Miminegash pier) 3462; New London breakwater) 3465; (plant, &c.) 3521; (Souris, Knight's Point breakwater) 3466; (Summerside breakwater) 3471; (Tignish breakwater) 3472; (West Point pier) 3472; (Wood Island breakwater) 3472; Que. (Anticosti) 5710; (Father Point landing pier) 3497; (Hull pier) 3498, 5707; (Ile aux Grues wharf) 5708; (Lake Temiscamingue dredging) 5709; (Lévis graving dock) 5709; (Magdalen Island pier) 3498; (Murray Bay wharf) 5709; Rivière aux Renards) 3498; (St. Alexis pier) 3498; (Ste. Emilie wharf) 4399; (St. Jerome wharf) 3498; (St. Lambert protection wall) 3499 (ii); (St. Lawrence River ship channel) 1173 (i); (Sorel wharf) 3499, 4791; (Tadousac wharf) 3500; (Three Rivers wharf) 5709; (wharfs, &c.) 5707; Yukon (Lewes and Yukon River improvements, engineer's salary) 4289, 5764; Roads and Bridges, Ottawa (Maria Street bridge) 3528; (repairs, &c.) 4402; Que. (Des Joachims) 3523; (repairs) 3498; Miscellaneous (Chief Architect's office) 3531; (Chief Engineer's office) 3530, 5761; (clerical assistance) 5758; (Mrs. Johnston's gratuity) 5760; (National Art Gallery) 3530; (surveys and inspections) 3530, 4403; (Telegraph service, salaries and dismissals) 3532; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice district) 3523, 5767; Telegraph lines (Ashcroft line) 3520; (land lines) 5687; (Quesnelle branch) 5687; (Quesnelle to Atlin) 4274; (St. Lawrence and Belle Isle) 3528; Yukon Roads and Trails (construction, &c.) 4289, 5764; (public buildings) 4268; (Dawson public building) 5672; (rents, repairs, &c.) 4304, 5763; Telegraph lines (working expenses, &c.) 4303; (Mr. Taché's accounts) 4289 (ii); (St. Maurice River) 927; Transportation (Port Colborne) 1207 (i).
Railways and Canals: Trent (Bobcaygeon dam) 4386 (ii).
Scientific Institutions, &c. (Capt. Bernier's expedition and Govt. aid) 5192 (ii).
Telegraph Line to Dawson, Date of Commencement, Tariff, &c. (Ans.) 4021 (ii).
——— on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) for ret., 121 (i).
Thames River, Obstructions to Navigation, on M. (Mr. *Stephens*) to adjn., 2781 (i).
Tignish Breakwater (Ans.) 105 (i).
Toronto Junction Public Building, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 86, 2401 (i).
Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3330.
Valleyfield Labour Strike, Settlement by Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 2592 (i).
——— (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4558.

Tarte, Hon. J. I.—*Con.*
Yukon Telegraph Construction (Ans.) 67 (i).
——— on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to ref. Papers to Pub. Accounts Com., 1880 (i).

Taylor, Mr. Geo., *South Leeds.*
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) on M. for 2°, 658 (i).
——— B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2464.
Anticosti Island, Cor. with Imp. Govt., &c. (M. for Copies) 1406 (i).
Bogart, Mr., Postmaster at Napanee, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 3269 (ii).
Budget, The, Vote respecting (remarks) 2349 (i).
Can. Temperance Act, Res. of H. of C., &c. (Ques.) 3754 (ii).
Dansereau, Mr. Lionel, Appnmt. (Ques.) 111 (i).
Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 5367 (ii).
Foster, Mr. A., Superannuation, &c. (Ques.) 1795.
Fruit Inspection and Marking for Sale B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2612 (i).
Gananoque Letter Collections, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 2704 (i).
Hodge, Mr. D., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1794 (i).
House of Commons Mail Service, Delays, &c. (remarks) 1050 (i).
Leonard, Dr. R. A., Postmaster at Napanee, Payment of Salary (Ques.) 5209 (ii).
Napanee Postmastership, Resignation of Mr. Bogart, &c. (Ques.) 3269 (ii).
——— Payment of Salary (Ques.) 5209 (ii).
Ottawa Supply Co., Goods purchased, &c. (Ques.) 1794 (i).
Paris Exhibition, Payments (Ques.) 114 (i).
Seybold Block, Govt. Buildings, &c., Rental, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (amt.) 4758; Neg. (Y. 48, N. 93) 4770 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 4196 (ii).
——— Remarks *re*, postponed, 4256 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (census, circular) 3080; (Mr. Côté's circular) 3939, 3950, 3965; (industries, &c.) 3876 (ii); (tree culture) 2854.
Civil Govt.: Interior Dept. (salaries) 183; Post Office (contingencies) 192 (i).
Immigration (agents, &c., Rev. Mr. Houston) 4853 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 4788 (ii).
Miscellaneous: Justice (litigation expenses) 4343 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (maintenance and supplies of Govt. Strs.) 257 (i).
Post Office (Athens post office) 496; (mail service) 467; (Marble Rock post office) 472 (i).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Portsmouth dock) 4811; Que. (Sorel wharf) 4793 (ii); (St. Lawrence channel) 1203 (i); Buildings—Ont. (Brockville drill ha loverseer) 3111; (Gananoque public building) 5697 (ii); Ottawa (census staff) 920 (i); (furnishing Surveyor Genl.'s offices) 5700; (rentals, &c.) 3113, 3127, 4393, 4396; (Seybold Block, rental) 3136; (contract labour) 3162; Yukon (account

Taylor, Mr. Geo.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
books, &c.) 4291, 4298; Telegraph Lines (Quesnelle to Atlin) 4271 (ii).
Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 2727 (i), 3726 (ii).
Yukon Ter.: Administration (salaries, &c.) 1369 (i).

Thompson, Mr. A. T., *Haldimand and Monck.*
Dom. Election Officials, Non-payment of, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) 2353 (i).
Militia Retiring Allowance, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3373 (ii).
Pensions to Headquarters Staff, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3008 (ii).
Rifle Shooting, Annual Payment, Ammunition, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1283.
SUPPLY:
Post Office (mail service) 485 (i).
Public Works: Buildings (Toronto drill hall) 2564 (i).

Tisdale, Hon. D., *South Norfolk.*
Alien Labour Restriction Act Amt. B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2461 (i).
Bank Note ($4), Imprint of American Lock, on M. (Mr. *Bennett*) to adjn., 2209 (i).
Budget, The, Inquiry, 894 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 96 (i).
Can. National Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 13 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1964, 1974 (i).
C.P.R. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) in Com., 4007 (ii).
——— Land Grants Taxation B. 17 (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) on M. for 2°, 1142 (i).
Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 767 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2799, 2806 (i).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 1917, 2391 (i).
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. *Galliher*) in Com., 3225 (ii).
Man. Rys. Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5002 (ii).
Railway Commissioners, Board of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 834 (i).
Rifle Shooting, Annual Payment, Ammunition, &c. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1284 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 5280 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (census, circular) 3065 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 3407, 3423; (canteens, &c.) 3423, 3432; (cartridge factory) 3784; clothing, &c.) 3773; (musketry school) 3383; (pay and allowance) 3383: (Quebec cartridge factory) 3439; (rifle association grants) 3779; (rifle ranges) 3787; (salaries) 3436; (warlike stores, &c.) 3439 (ii).
Railways and Canals: I. C. R. (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 3588, 5249, 5262 (ii).

Tisdale, Hon. D.—*Con.*
Usury Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) in Com., 635 (i).
Yukon Territory Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3087 (i).

Tucker, Mr. J. J., *St. John, N.B., City and Co.*
St. John City Foreshores (B. 126) 1° *, 3537 (ii).

Turcot, Mr. Geo., *Megantic.*
Kinnear's Mills (M. for rep. *re*) 86 (i).

Turgeon, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (*Mr. Borden, Halifax*) 2214 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert, K.C.M.G., *Pictou.*
Anderson, Mr. Duncan C., Appnmt. by Govt. (remarks) 2000 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Distribution (remarks) 103 (i).
Bennett and Dawson Telegraph Lines (M. for Ret.) 116, 122 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 101, 692 (i).
Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s incorp. B. 13 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com, 1963 (i).
Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj. on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 788 (i).
Dawson City, Gov. Gen.'s Visit, O.C.'s, &c. (Ques.) 1260 (i).
Dawson Public Buildings, Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1586 (i).
——— *See* 'Yukon.'
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 423 (i).
Eastern Extension Ry., Arbitration, &c. (Ques.) 203 (i).
——— Inquiry for O. C., 1961 (i).
——— *See* 'Nova Scotia.'
Free Transportation to Members, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1794 (i).
Govt. Business (remarks) 101, 692 (i).
Govt. Vessels, B.C., Tenders, &c., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) for Copies, 512 (i).
Hawk Island Lighthouse, N.S., Contracts, &c., (Ques.) 1582 (i).
I. C. R., Sydney Properties purchased by Govt. (Ques.) 1005 (i).
Jurisdiction of Min. of Int. (Ques.) 67 (i).
Kingston Locomotive Works, Cor., &c. (Ques.) 111 (i).
MacInnis, John, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2703 (i).
Nova Scotia Claims against Federal Govt., Papers, *re* (remarks) 1790 (i).
Passes to Members. *See* 'Free Transportation.'
Public Accounts Com., Delay in Meeting (remarks) 607, 1798, 1962 (i).
——— (M.) to ref. Papers *re* Yukon Liquor Permits, 1065 (i).
Returns (inquiry) 694, 1961 (i).
Russell, Mr. W. A., Dismissal, &c. (M. for reps., &c.*) 816 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H.—*Con.*

Shipping Casualties Investigation B. 93 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on M. for 1°, 1959 (i).
Speaker, Election (remarks) 3 (i).
Sydney Ry. Yard Improvements, Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 1267 (i).
Supply, Order for Procedure, 240 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice, 194 (i).
Charges of Management (Dom. notes, printing, &c.) 176 (i).
Civil Govt.: Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 184; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 178; Interior Dept. (salaries) 183; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 186; Post Office Dept. (contingencies) 192.
Fisheries: (Can. exhibit) 314; (licenses, &c.) 299, 303 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (clerical assistance) 194 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Brocton lighthouse) 287; (construction, &c.) 282, 287; (Lurcher Shoal) 282, 284; (repairs to wharfs) 289; (retiring allowances) 279; (salaries) 272.
Ocean and River Service (biological stations) 266; (cable ship) 244; (Govt. steamers) 240; (life-saving rewards) 260; (lobster investigation) 268; (*Minto*, Str.) 240; (pilotage commissions) 269; (tidal surveys) 262; (wrecks, investigation) 261 (i).
Post Office (mail service) 450; (Yukon mail service) 473 (i).
Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (Seybold Block) 912 (i).
Scientific Institutions (hydrographic survey) 291 (i).
Steamboat Inspection (inspectors' salaries) 294.

Thompson, J. R., Emplymt. by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 77 (i).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on Order for Com., 1791 (i).
West Bay, Sub-Collector of Customs, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2703 (i).
Yukon—Administration of Public Affairs (M. for reps. &c.) 132 (i).
——— Constitution of Courts, Appeals, &c. (remarks) 2382 (i).
——— Dawson City, Address to His Ex. by city (M. for copy*) 80 (i).
——— construction of bridge (M. for cor.*) 80 (i).
——— govt. offices (M. for cor.*) 80 (i).
——— Dom. Lands Act, Irregularities, &c. (M. for reps. &c.*) 133 (i).
——— Gambling Houses, &c. Cor. *re* (Ques.) 1251.
——— Houston Permit, &c. (Ques.) 1256 (i).
——— Hydraulic Leases (M. for copies*) 224 (i).
——— (Ques.) 108 (i).
——— Liquor Importation by Atlin Brewing Co. &c. (Ques.) 1256 (i).
——— Liquor Permits (M. for stmnt.) 72 (i).
——— Liquor Permits, Ret. *re* (remarks) 210 (i).
——— quantity shipped (Ques.) 813 (i).
——— Liquor Permit to H. J. Lockyer (Ques.) 1250 (i).
——— Liquor Regulations (Ques.) 1069 (i).
——— Mackenzie and Mann's Claim, &c. (Ques.) 1260 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H.—*Con.*

Yukon, Mining Laws, &c., Telegram of Sir W. Laurier (M. for cor. *re**) 225 (i).
——— Mining Regulations, Appeals, &c. (M. for ret.) 131 (i).
——— Murray and Ross Liquor Permits (Ques.) 1250 (i).
——— Ogilvie; Reps., (M. for copies) 73 (i).
——— resignation (Ques.) 93 (i).
——— Road and Bridge Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1252 (i).
——— Rourke, Wm., Contracts *re* Offices (M. for cor.*) 80 (i).
——— Telegraph Construction, Papers to be submitted to Pub. Accounts Com., 1880 (i).
——— Telegraph Construction (Ques.) 67 (i).
——— Bennett and Dawson (M.) for Ret., 116, 122 (i).
——— Yukon Ter., Requirements, *re* Memorial to His Ex. (M. for copy*) 816 (i).

Vrooman, Mr. A. E., *South Victoria, Ont.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1866 (i).
Can. Nurses' Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 4436 (ii).
Cowan's Bridge, Grant by Govt. (Ques.) 1748 (i).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s (B. 79) 1°ˢ, 1663 (i).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5561 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Dredging (Scugog river) 4401 (ii).
Railways and Canals: Trent (Bobcaygeon dam) 4384, 5631, 5634 (ii).

Wade, Mr. F. B., *Annapolis.*

B. C. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4082 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1924 (i).
Can. and France SS Subsidy B. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 5109 (ii).
Can. Nurses Association incorp. B. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com., 5413, 5415 (ii).
Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 788, 797 (i).
E. B. Eddy Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Champagne*) in Com., 3413 (ii).
Fruit Inspection and Marking for Sale B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2362, 2411, [2417, 2420 (i).
Quebec Terminal and Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. *Malouin*) in Com., 5541 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5481, 5516 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: Census (Mr. Côté's circular) 3952; (cold storage) 3039 (ii).

Wade, Mr. F B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous : Justice (litigation expenses) 4343 (ii).

Railways and Canals : I.C.R. (steel rails, Clergue's contract) 5249 (ii).

Usury Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) on M. for 2°. 627 (i).

Wallace, Mr. N. Clarke, *West York.*

Alaskan Boundary and Joint High Commission (remarks) on M. to adjn., 5964 (ii).

Aud. Gen's. Rep. *See* 'Reports.'

Bank Note ($4), Imprint of American Lock, on M. (Mr. *Bennett*) to adjn., 2210 (i).

Battalions in Active Militia, Number in Provs., &c. (Ques.) 2568 (i).

Beet Root Sugar Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 364 (i).

Bell Telephone Co., Defective Legislation, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5404 (ii).

Binder Twine Manufacture, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 600 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1632 (i).

Can. and France SS Service. *See* 'Ocean.'

Canada and Italy Trade Relations, Cor. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for copies, 525 (i).

Canada Eastern Ry., Stmnt. to Mr. A. Gibson (Ques.) 1583 (i).

Can. National Bank of Can. incorp. B. 109 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4014 (ii).

Canada National Ry. and Transport Co.'s B. 13 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 3°, 2745 (i).

C.P.R. Tax Exemption, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 2539 (i).

Commodities, Packing and Sale B. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com. (binder twine) 4886 (ii).

Coronation Oath, Address to His Maj., on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 717 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick* in Com., 4336 (ii).

Dom. Election Officials, Non-payment of, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 2357 (i).

Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 5368 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2796 (i).

Free Transportation to Members, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 537 (i).

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Sale B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2361 (i).

Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) for Precedence on Thursdays. 894 (i).

Govt. Vessels, B.C. , Contracts, Specifications, Tenders, &c., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) for copies, 511 (i).

Immigration Policy of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Wilson*) to Com. of Sup., 2960, 2981 (i).

Increased Indemnity. *See* 'Senate, &c.'

Wallace, Mr. N. Clarke—*Con.*

Iron and Steel Bounties paid by Govt. (remarks) 1172 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act (Vancouver) Amt. B. 150 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 5594 (ii).

Lead (refined) Bounties B. 152 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com. on Res., 5719, 5726 (ii).

Locomotive Works, Kingston, Strike, &c., on M. for Com of Sup., 5435 (ii).

Mail Service, P.E.I., Winter Communication (remarks) 3276 (ii).

Man. Rys. Lease B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5003 (ii).

Manufacturers and Temperance and General Life Ass. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., (amt.) 2985 (ii).

Militia, Active. *See* 'Battalions.'

Mint. *See* 'Royal.'

Montreal District Circuit Judge, Salary, &c., in Com. on Res., 4067 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Loan B. 142 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5141 (ii).

Newfoundland, Admission into Confederation (remarks) 332 (i).

——— Bond-Blaine Convention, Ratification, &c., on M. to adjn., 3982 (ii).

Ocean SS. (France and Can.) Subsidies Act Amt. B. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 5389.

Passes to Members. *See* 'Free, &c.'

Pensions to Officers of Permanent Force B. 133 (Mr. *Borden, King's*), on prop. Res., 4236 ; on M. for 3°, 4876 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Sutherland*) 4244 (ii).

P.E.I. increased subsidy B. 138 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5335 (ii).

Printing Bureau. Addition to, &c., on M. to conc. in 5th Rep. of Printing Com., 5206 (ii).

Railway Question, on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 168 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 57 (i).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., on Res., 5498, 5547 (ii).

Reports, Deptl. (inquiry) 49, 51, 62, 97, 103 (i).

Royal Military College, Extension, &c., Letter from Robt. W. Saul (read) 4871 (ii).

Royal Mint Establishment B. 143 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5376 (ii).

Saul, Robt. W. *See* 'Royal Military College.'

Senate and House of Commons Act (increased indemnity) Amt. B. 151 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res , 5602 (ii).

S. A. War, Contingents for S. Africa, Par. *re* Australian Contingents (remarks) 135 (i).

Speeches of Members, Number, &c., on M. (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) to adjn., 5959 (ii).

Supply B. 114, in Com., 2359 (i).

Supply, Procedure, 2753 (i).

Wallace, Mr. N. Clarke—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (census, circular) 3074 ; (expenditure) 3870 ; (industries, &c.) 3873 ; (Mr. Côté's circular) 3916, 3980 ; (cold storage) 3018 ; (dairying interests) 3057 (ii) ; (Paris exposition) 929, 951 (i).

Civil Govt : Finance Dept. (contingencies) 4346 (ii) ; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s office, 179 (i).

Customs (inspectors, expenses, &c.) 3848 ; (salaries and contingencies) 5466 ; (preventive service) 3859 ; (refund to Nelson & Sons) 5468 ; (secret service) 3861 ; (statistical branch, &c.) 3848 ; Yukon (expenditure) 3862 (ii).

Dom. Lands : Miscellaneous (Mr. Bull's claim) 4928 ; (surveys, &c.) 4925 (ii).

Immigration (agents in Ireland) 4917 ; (agents, salaries, &c., W. T. R. Preston) 4820, 4836 ; (agents, salaries, &c., Rev. Mr. Houston) 4855 ; (Que. and Lake St. John Colonization Ry.) 4857 (ii).

Indian Affairs (legal expenses) 5320 (ii) ; Ont. (surveys) 2755 ; Que. (Oka Indians, removal) 2755 (i).

Legislation : Franchise Act (printing voters' lists) 5310 ; H. of C. (printing, paper, &c.) 5465 (ii).

Mail Subsidies (Bond-Blaine treaty) conc., 5795 ; (cattle embargo in G. B.) 4779 ; (G. B. and Can.) 4771 ; (Halifax, Newfoundland and Liverpool) 4773 ; (P. O. subsidy) 5768 ; (St. John, Dublin and Belfast) 4773 ; (St. John and Liverpool) 4772 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 4346 ; (extra salaries, *re* S. A. War) 4347 ; (Royal Military College, memorial, &c.) 4352 ; (warlike stores) 4351 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Bank Note Co., litigation expenses) 5457 ; Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3826 ; (Plains of Abraham, purchase) 5810 (ii).

Post Office (letter carriers, increase) 5460 ; (London, postmaster's salary) 5458 (ii) ; (mail service) 437 (i).

Public Works : Buildings—Generally (armouries, &c.) 5698 ; Ont. (Toronto Junction) 3107 ; (public building) 5701 ; Ottawa (electric lighting) 3152 ; (H. of C., addition, improvement, &c.) 5673 ; (repairs, &c.) 3118 ; (rents, &c.) 3146 ; (Rideau Hall) 3149, 3152 ; (Royal Mint) 5672 (ii) ; (Seybold block) 917 (i) ; (Victoria Memorial Museum) 5681 ; Yukon (Dawson public building) 5672 ; (rents, repairs, &c.) 5763 ; Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Dorchester breakwater) 5705 ; N. S. (Can. Creek breakwater) 3154 ; Ont. (Indian River dredging) 5732 ; (Parry Sound) 4811 ; (public docks) 4811 ; Que. (Sorel wharf) 4792, 4797 ; Yukon (Lewes and Yukon River improvements, engineer's salary) 5764 ; Miscellaneous (chief engineer's office) 5761 ; (clerical assistance) 5759 ; Roads and Trails, Yukon (construction, &c.) 5764, 5766 (ii).

Railways and Canals : Canals—Cornwall (Gilbert Dredging Co., settlement) 5669 ; Railways—I. C. R. (coal contracts) 5299, 5307 ; (Eastern Extension, N.S., award) 5908, 5931 ; (Eel River station) 5227 (ii) ; (steel rails) 2635, 2721 (i), 3607, 3725, 5265, 5299, 5307 (ii).

Weights and Measures (gas inspection, salaries, &c.) 4936 (ii).

Yukon Govt. (administration, &c.) 4920 (ii).

Thames River, Obstruction to Navigation, on M. (Mr. *Stephens*) to adjn., 2781 (i).

Toronto Junction Public Building, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 86, 2401 (i).

—— (M. to adjn.) 2402 (i).

Wallace, Mr. N. Clarke—*Con.*

Trade and Nav. Rets. (inquiry) 62 (i).

—— *See* 'Reps.'

Victoria Day B. 33 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4256 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff (beet-root sugar machinery) in Com. on Res., 5803 (ii).

Ward, Mr. H. A., *East Durham.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4035 (ii).

Port Hope Harbour, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 807 (i).

Rice Lake and Port Hope, Survey, &c. (Ques.) 607 (i).

Trent Valley Canal, Mr. Maingy's Rep., &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5436 (ii).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's, N.B.*

Burpee, Hon. Charles, Appnmt. (Ques.) 110 (i).

Central Ry. and Mail Contract with Govt. (Ques.) 1593 (i).

Musquash Island Lightkeeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1251 (i).

SUPPLY :

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (repairs, &c.) 3497 ; (River St. John) 3495 ; (St. John harbour) 5707 (ii).

Railways and Canals : I.C.R. (St. John, increased accommodation) 4138 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox.*

Agricultural Committee, Meeting, &c. (remarks) 4754 (ii).

—— on M. to meet during sessions of House (remarks) 4938 (ii).

Alaskan and North-western Ry. Co.'s Petition (remarks) 1662 (i).

Can. Temp. Act, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 337 (i).

Devlin, Mr. C. R., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5611 (ii).

Doukhobors, Date of Arrival, Bonus paid, &c. (Ques.) 1998 (i).

—— Pet. to Govt. *re* Canadian Tyranny (Ques.) 1748 (i).

Forest Rangers, Number employed, &c. (Ques.) 1264 (i).

Govt. Vessels, B.C., Tenders, &c., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) for copies, 518 (i).

Grain Elevators, Halifax and St. John (M. for ret.*) 89 (i).

—— *See* 'St. John.'

Immigration Agents, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 79 (i).

—— (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2879 (i).

Immigration during 1900 (Ques.) 86 (i).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Bernier*) ; in Com., 5801 (ii).

Napanee River Survey (M. for reps.*) 80 (i).

Ry. Bonuses (M. for ret.) 87 (i).

—— Subsidies Authorization B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5473, 5547 (ii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 895, 1432 (i).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

St. John and Halifax Elevators, Grain Exports, &c. (Ques.) 1998 (i)-

——— *See* 'Grain, &c.'

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (aid to agricultural societies) 2837; (bulletins, printing, &c.) 2859; (census) 2862; (evidence of Agricultural Com., distribution, &c.) 2859; (experimental farms) 2843(i); (Glasgow exhibition) 4603 (ii); (Paris exposition) 995; (tree culture) 2843; (Winnipeg hospitals) 2871; (*Year Book*) 2832, 2837 (i).

Civil Govt.: Finance (contingencies) 4346 (ii); Interior Dept., 182 (i).

Dom. Lands (inspectors, agents, &c.) 1375; (surveys, printing, &c.) 1374; (tree culture) 2670 (i).

Geological Survey (reports, &c,) 5316 (ii).

Govt. of N.W.T. (school grants) 1368; (schools in unorganized districts) 1367 (i).

Immigration (agents' uniforms) 4857; (expenditure, &c.) 4859; (remarks) 3768; (salaries, &c., W. T. R. Preston) 4818, 4822, 4845 (ii).

Indians: N.S. (seed grain) 2758 (i).

Legislation: H. of C. (newspapers) 5464; Senate (salaries) 5782 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 4788 (ii).

Miscellaneous: Labour Dept. (*Labour Gazette*) 3803; (salaries, printing, &c.) 4789; (Paris agency) 3451; (Plains of Abraham, purchase) 5820; (printing, &c.) 3448 (ii).

Post Office (B. J. Hanlon, salary increase) 5458; (postmasters' salaries, commissions, &c.) 5458 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Generally (lighting, &c.) 4398 (ii); N.B. (St. John immigration shed) 1242: N.S. (Halifax offices) 1242; Ont. (Deseronto public buildings) 2547 (i), 5692; (London drill hall) 5691 (ii); Ottawa (rentals, &c.) 4393; (Picton) 2554 (ii); (Windsor drill hall) 2564 (i); Que. (Buckingham post office) 1243 (i); Que. City (immigrant buildings) 4391; Dredging (Napanee harbour) 4401; (Que. and Ont.) 4400; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Hawkestone wharf) 4399; (Port Burwell harbour) 4399 (ii); Transportation (Port Colborne) 1240 (i); Yukon (rents, lighting, &c.) 4395 (ii).

Railways and Canals: Trent (Chemong Lake bridge) 5626; Welland (lock breakage) 4308.

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Wright, Mr. A. A., *South Renfrew.*

Alien Labour Restriction Act Amt. B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2488 (i).

B. C. Claims for increased Subsidy, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4109 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 113) 1° m., 2348 (i).

Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 5365 (ii).

Fruit Inspection and Marking for Sale B. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 2415, 2426, 2433, 2623 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (cold storage) 3034 (ii).

Dom. Lands (tree culture) 2689 (i).

Transportation Question *re* St. Lawrence Route, on M. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) to Com. of Sup., 3262.

Ways and Means—The Tariff (beet-root sugar) in Com. on Res., 5803 (ii).

INDEX—PART II

SUBJECTS

ABBOTT'S BEACH, PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).

Abell, John, Patent Relief B. No. 107 (Mr. *Bell, Addington*) 1°*, 2347; 2°*, 2923 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3455 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 88.)

ABRAHAM. *See* 'Plains of.'

ABRAMS VILLAGE MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 488 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2163 (i).

ACADEMY OF ARTS: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).

ADDITIONAL JUDGE, YUKON, SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2650 (i).

ADDITIONAL ROOMS IN HOUSE OF COMMONS: in Com. of Sup., 2553 (i), 5673 (ii).

ADDITIONAL SIDINGS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4145, 4379 (ii).

ADDRESS, THE, IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'s SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Guthrie*) 21; seconded (Mr. *Marcil*) 31 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 38; (Mr. *Broder*) 43; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 43 (i).

——— Consdn. M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 20 (i).

——— REPLY: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1167 (i).

——— CONDOLENCE TO HIS MAJESTY ON DECEASE OF QUEEN VICTORIA (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 17, 20 (i).

ADJOURNMENTS OF THE HOUSE: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 133 (i).

ADJOURNMENTS:

ASCENSION DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5094.

——— ASH WEDNESDAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 137 (i).

——— EASTER: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 2202 (i).

——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2408 (i).

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 2647 (i), 5777 (ii).

——— LEGAL EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4634.

——— *See* 'Justice.'

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, YUKON TERRITORY: in Com. of Sup., 2650 (i), 4918, 5773 (ii).

——— SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1369 (i).

——— ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS: M. for reps., &c. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 132 (i).

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 5; *pro forma.*

AGENTS, IMMIGRATION, IN IRELAND, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (ii).

AGENCIES, INDIAN, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2761 (i).

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS EXPORTED, REBATE, &c. M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 133 (i).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS:

AGRICULTURAL COM., H. OF C., DISTRIBUTION OF EVIDENCE: in Com. of Sup., 2858 (i).

——— MEETINGS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) 4754.

——— ON M. TO MEET DURING SITTINGS OF HSE.: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) 4938 (ii).

——— SOCIETIES, AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 2837.

AGRICULTURE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 186, 2825 (i), 3016, 3867-3908, 4591, 5165 (ii).

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 51.

ANDERSON, MR. DUNCAN C., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1999 (i).

ARCHIVES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4607 (ii).

BUBONIC PLAGUE, REPS., &c., PRECAUTION AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3642 (ii).

BUFFALO EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 928; conc., 2349 (i).

CAN. CATTLE QUARANTINED, AGREEMENT WITH U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 1797 (i).

CAN. EXHIBIT AT IMPERIAL INSTITUTE, ENGLAND: in Com. of Sup., 5179 (ii).

CANADIAN PATENTS, CLASSIFICATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2862 (i).

CATTLE, EMBARGO IN G.B.: in Com. of Sup., 4777.

——— ENTERING U.S., TUBERCULINE TEST, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Remarks (Mr. *McGowan*) 2354 (i).

——— INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 266 (i).

——— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 4611 (ii).

——— COMPENSATION FOR SLAUGHTER: in Com. of Sup., 3084 (ii).

——— SLAUGHTERED AT IRISH PORTS: in Com. of Sup., 4773 (ii).

——— *See* 'Quarantine.'

CENSUS, ADDITIONAL AMOUNT: in Com. of Sup., 5785 (ii).

——— CIRCULARS ISSUED, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3058 (ii).

——— ISSUE OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 2991.

——— *See* 'Circular.'

——— COMMISSIONER, ADDINGTON, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Addington*) 509 (i).

——— CARDWELL: Ques. (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 329 (i).

——— CHARLOTTE, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 93.

——— DORCHESTER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 807 (i).

——— EAST ELGIN: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1263 (i).

——— EAST SIMCOE.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 201 (i).

——— GREY COUNTY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 335 (i).

——— SIMCOE: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 336 (i).

——— ENUMERATORS, INSTRUCTIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3867 (ii).

——— ALLOWANCES TO, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martineau*) 812 (i).

——— INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3873 (ii).

CHINESE LEPERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2867 (i).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

CIRCULAR FROM MR. CÔTÉ TO CENSUS ENUMERATORS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3874, 3976 (ii).
COLD STORAGE FOR BAIT: in Com. of Sup., 315 (i), 3016, 4609 (ii).
——— Memorandum *re* Bait Freezers by Mr. Fraser (read) 315 (i).
COLD STORAGE ON STRS.: in Com. of Sup., 5165.
——— Paper laid on Table (Mr. *Fisher*) 3537 (ii).
COLD STORAGE *re* FRUIT INSPECTION BILL: in Com. of Sup., 5165 (ii).
COLD STORAGE, WEST INDIA STRS.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 334 (i).
COUTURE, J. A., VET. SURGEON, &C., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4193 (ii).
CREAMERIES, BONUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3051 (ii).
CREAMERIES IN N.W.T., SALE OF PRODUCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5175 (ii).
DAIRYING INTERESTS: in Com. of Sup., 2861 (i), 3055 (ii).
EXHAUST FANS ON OCEAN STEAMERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 70, 334, 505 (i).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 2839 (i).
——— BULLETINS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2858 (i), 4591 (ii).
——— REPS., PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2705 (i).
EXPERIMENTAL FRUIT STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4596 (ii).
FABRE, HECTOR, FURNISHING OF APARTMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 953, 993 (i).
——— *See* 'Paris.'
FUMIGATING STATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2865 (i), 4606 (ii).
GLASGOW EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 4601 (ii).
GRAPES IN COLD STORAGE FOR EXPORT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5179 (ii).
GRIFFITH & CO., SALES OF N. W. T. CREAMERIES PRODUCE: Par. in Nelson *Tribune*, 5175 (ii).
GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 5689 (ii).
——— *See* 'Tuberculine.'
JARDINE, MR., PARIS COMMISSIONER: in Com. of Sup., 984, 993 (i).
KINSMAN, MR., APPNMT. AS HORTICULTURIST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1438 (i).
KNOWLTON, MR. H. C.: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
LOUBET, PRESIDENT, RECEPTION AT PARIS EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 3530.
N. W. T., BUFFALO EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4918, 5456 (ii).
O'BRIEN, MR. W. E., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1999 (i).
OCEAN SS. VENTILATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 70 (i).
——— *See* 'Exhaust,' &c.
PAN-AMERICAN EXHIBITION, SUNDAY CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2400 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2401 (i).
——— EXHIBIT FROM N. W. T. GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 4918, 5456 (ii).
——— MAP OF QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1000.
PARIS AGENCY: in Com. of Sup., 3449, 4342 (ii).
PARIS EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 928; conc., 2349 (i).
——— AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 114 (i).
——— 'BUIES'' PAMPHLET, PRINTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1265 (i).
——— CAN. REPRESENTATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 132 (i).
——— HONORARY DECORATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1005 (i).
——— PRINTING OF OFFICIAL CATALOGUE, PAR. IN 'FREE PRESS': Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1265 (i).
——— PRINTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 337 (i).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

PARIS EXPOSITION, PRINTING OF OFFICIAL CATALOGUE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1007 (i).
PATENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4609 (ii).
——— BRANCH, DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 4921 (ii).
——— REVENUE, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1257 (i).
——— *See* 'Can. Patents.'
'PATENT RECORD': in Com. of Sup., 2825 (i).
PINEAU, MR., AND RUMOURED APPNMT. TO PARIS EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 940, 958 (i).
POULTRY FATTENING STATIONS, P. E. I. NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2703 (i).
PUBLIC HEALTH: in Com. of Sup., 4610, 5182 (ii).
——— APPNMT. OF COM.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 332 (i).
QUARANTINE, CATTLE IN N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 3084 (ii).
QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 4610, 5182 (ii).
——— REGULATIONS WITH U.S.: in Com. of Sup., 4613 (ii).
——— Papers laid on Table, 1962 (i).
——— *See* 'Cattle,' &c.
QUEBEC COLD STORAGE CO.: in Com. of Sup., 5179 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Angers*) 5586 (ii).
SAN JOSÉ SCALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2865 (i).
STUART, MR., COMMISSIONER TO PARIS: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
STUBBS, WM., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1999 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 2867 (i).
TREE CULTURE: in Com. of Sup, 2839 (i).
TUBERCULINE TEST AT GROSSE ISLE: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 85 (i).
TUBERCULOSIS IN CATTLE: in Com. of Sup., 3084, 4611 (ii).
VENTILATION ON OCEAN STEAMERS: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 70, 334, 505 (i).
'YEAR BOOK': in Com. of Sup., 2828 (i), 4607, 5182 (ii).

AIR BRAKES (I. C. R.) FREIGHT CARS: in Com. of Sup., 4154 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 334 (i).
ALASKAN BOUNDARY DISPUTE, COR. *re* MAP SENT TO PARIS EXPOSITION: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 4407.
——— *See* 'CAN. and Alaska.'
ALASKAN AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO.'S PETITION: Presented (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1662 (i).
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 85 (Mr. *Oliver*). 1°*, 1747; 2°*, 2200 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3421 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 44.)
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 84 (Mr. *Oliver*). 1°*, 1747; 2°*, 1993 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3421 (ii). (1 *Edward VII., c.* 45).
ALBERTON, P.E.I., POSTMASTER, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1404 (i).
——— SANDY ISLAND, REMOVAL OF STONES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1993 (i).
ALGOMA AND C. P. RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5575 (ii).
Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 81 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 1663; 2°*, 2200 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII., c.* 46.)
ALGOMA CENTRAL AND HUDSON BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5565 (ii).

ALIENS' ESTATES, CONVENTION BETWEEN G. B. AND U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 4755 (ii).

ALIEN LABOUR ENFORCEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 2648 (i).

——— AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 332 (i).

——— ENFORCEMENT *re* DOM. STEEL WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 200 (i).

ALIEN LABOUR AND WHITE HORSE WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 813 (i).

Aliens Restriction Act Amt. B. No. 5 (Mr. *Clare*) 1°*, 105; 2° m., 646, 1792 (i).

——— **B. No. 11** (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 1° m., 199.

——— **B. No. 47** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1° m., 1066; 2° m., 2456; in Com., 2458 (i), 4649; 3° m., 5095 (ii). (1 *Edward VII., c.* 13.)

——— B. 47 AND LABOUR ORGANIZATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2705 (i).

ALLISTON AND ROSEMOUNT MAIL CONTRACTS, DATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1591 (i).

ALMA MAIL CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 470 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 811 (i).

AMAGADUS POND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5701.

'AMELIA' SS., TONNAGE, FREIGHT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett* 1795 (i).

AMHERST SUBWAY, LAND DAMAGES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2715 (i).

AMMUNITION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3774, 3784, 3787.

——— *See* 'Militia.'

ANDERSON, MR. DUNCAN C., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1999 (i).

ANDERSON, W. P., SALARY, INCREASE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii).

'ANIMALS OF CANADA,' PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1265 (i).

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. No. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1°*, 3753; 2°*, 4667; in Com., 4667; 3°*, 4667 (ii).

ANNAPOLIS AND G. B. SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4789 (ii).

ANNUAL DRILL FOR MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 3406, 3421, 4346 (ii).

ANTICOSTI ISLAND, COR. WITH IMP. GOVT., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Taylor*) 1406 (i).

——— FOX BAY SETTLERS: in Com. of Sup., 2968, 2981 (i).

——— LICENSE FOR LOBSTER PACKING, AGENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1591 (i).

APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF MIN. OF INT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 67 (i).

ARBITRATION, DOM. AND PROVINCIAL: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).

——— *See* 'Eastern Extension.'

ARCHIVES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4607 (ii).

ARICHAT, N.S., PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5687 (ii).

ARMOURIES, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 5697.

ARMOURY. *See* "St. Thomas."

ARMS, AMMUNITION, &c: in Com. of Sup., 5314 (ii).

Arnprior and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 55 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1°*, 1167; 2°*, 1431; in Com., and 3°*, 2200 (i); Sen. Amts., 5092 (ii). (1 *Edward VII., c.* 47.)

ARSENAULT, MR., HOMESTEAD INSPECTOR, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1383 (i).

ARTS, AGRICULTURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2825 (i), 3016, 5165 (ii).

——— *See* 'Agriculture."

ASCENSION DAY, ADJNMT.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5094 (ii).

ASHCROFT AND CARIBOO MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1261, 1440, 2398 (i), 4194 (ii).

ASH WEDNESDAY, ADJNMT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 137 (i).

ASSAY OFFICE, EQUIPMENT, B.C., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (ii).

ASSURANCE CO.'S BILLS, PROCEDURE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Sutherland*, *3rd*) 3421 (ii).

ASTRONOMICAL AND DEMARCATION WORK: in Com. of Sup., 4928 (ii).

ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 5767 (ii).

——— PURCHASE OF TELESCOPE: in Com. of Sup., 5784 (ii).

ATHENS, POSTMASTER, COMPLAINT AGAINST: in Com. of Sup., 496 (i).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. No. 27 (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 1°*, 420; 2° m., 731; in Com., and 3°*, 2384 (i). (1 *Edward VII., c.* 48.)

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5768.

AUD. GEN.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 184 (i), 5182.

AUD. GEN.'S REP. DISTRIBUTION: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 103 (i).

——— Inquiry for, 49, 51 (i).

——— MSS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 111 (i).

——— Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 103 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 95 (i).

AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH, CAN. REPRESENTATION: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 68 (i).

——— CONGRATULATORY TELEGRAM, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 4873 (ii).

AUSTRALIAN AND IMPERIAL TRADE WITH CAN., PAR IN LONDON *Times re* MR. MULOCK'S CONFERENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5326 (ii).

AUSTRALIAN REPRESENTATIVE OF CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 4638 (ii).

AXES SUPPLIED TO BRITISH WAR OFFICE FOR S.A., CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1598 (i).

BACK BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 5209 (ii).

BACTERIOLOGICAL DEPT. IN CONNECTION WITH GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com of Sup., 5456 (ii).

——— *See* 'Interior,' &c.

BADDECK, &c., TO EAST BAY SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4788 (ii).

BAIT FOR DEEP SEA FISHERMEN: in Com. of Sup., 315 (i).

BAKING POWDER CONDEMNED, CIRCULARS FROM DEPT. OF INLAND REV. : M. for copy* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 815 (i).

BALLOT BOXES, WEST PRINCE : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 83.

—— *See* 'West Prince.'

BALSAM AND LAKE SIMCOE DIVISION, AMOUNT OF TENDER : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 810 (i).

BANFF HOT SPRINGS, ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 2698 (i).

—— *See* 'Interior, Sulphur Mountain.'

BANKING ACT, AMT. *re* INSPECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 814 (i).

—— AMT. *re* SAVINGS BANKS : Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 814 (i).

BANK NOTE ($4) IMPRINT OF AMERICAN LOCK : M. (Mr. *Bennett*) to adjn., 2205 (i).

Debate (Mr. *Blair*) 2207 ; (Mr. *Fielding*) 2208 ; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 2209 ; (Mr. *Logan*) 2209 ; (Mr. *Speaker*) 2209 ; (Mr. *Maclean*) 2210 ; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 2210 ; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2210 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2212 ; (Mr. *Haggart*) 2212 ; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ques. of Order) 2213 (i).

BATTALIONS IN ACTIVE MILITIA, NUMBER, &C., IN PROVS. : Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 2568 (i).

BATTERY POINT RETAINING WALL : in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).

BAY DU VIN WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3473 (ii).

BEATTY, MR. J., GRATUITY, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5312 (ii).

BEAVER WHARF, EXTENSION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).

BEET ROOT SUGAR BOUNTY : Prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 337 ; Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) to adjn. Deb., agreed to (Y. 59, N. 50) 367 ; wthdn., 1792 (i).

—— SUGAR MACHINERY : in Com. on Ways and Means, 5802 (ii).

Bell Telephone Co. of Can. B. No. 101 (Mr. *Clarke*) 1° m., 2202 (i).

BELL TELEPHONE CO. OF CAN., DEFECTIVE LEGISLATION, &C. : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5394 (ii).

—— RULING (Mr. *Speaker*) 5396, 5404 (ii).

—— MILEAGE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4645 (ii).

BENNETT AND DAWSON TEL. LINE, REPS., &C. : M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 116 (i).

BENNETT'S CUTTING, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 4379.

BERNIER, CAPT., EXPEDITION *re* NORTH POLE, GOVT. AID, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5191 ; on conc., 5790.

BIG BRAS D'OR WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).

Bills of Exchange Act (1890) Amt. B. No. 100 (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1° m., 2161.

BILLS RESERVED FOR QUEEN'S PLEASURE : Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3178 (ii).

—— ROYAL ASSENT, 2984, 2999 (ii).

BILLS :

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)

1°*, 5 ; *pro formâ.*

BILL (No. 2) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)

1° m., 20 ; 2° m., 94, 211 ; M. for Com., 1051 (i).

BILL (No. 3) Respecting Money Lenders.—(Mr. *Madore.*)

1° m., 20 ; 2° m., 607 ; in Com., 635 ; ref. to Sel. Com., 1432 (i).

BILL (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act.—Mr. *Lancaster.*)

1° m., 103 ; 2° m., 213 (i).

BILL (No. 5) To amend the 'Act to restrict the importation and employment of aliens.'—(Mr. *Clare.*)

1°*, 105 ; 2° m., 646, 1792 (i).

BILL (No. 6) Respecting the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters, and to change its name to the Independent Order of Foresters. —(Mr. *Emmerson.*)

1°*. 198 ; 2°*, 327 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1244 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 100.)

BILL (No. 7) Relating to the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada.—(Mr. *Geoffrion.*)

1°*, 198 ; 2°*, 327 ; in Com., 1048 ; 3°*, 1050 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 60.)

BILL (No. 8) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada.—(Mr. *Geoffrion.*)

1°*, 198 ; 2°*, 327 ; in Com., 1431 ; 3°*, 1431 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 61.)

BILL (No. 9) To amend 'The Dominion Elections Act.'—(Mr. *Henderson.*)

1° m., 198 ; 2° m., 1051 ; Order for Com., 1791 (i).

BILL (No. 10) To amend 'The Weights and Measures Act.'—(Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*).

1° m., 198 ; 2° m., 1057 ; M. for Com., 1432, 1791 (i).

BILL (No. 11) Further to amend the 'Act to restrict the importation and employment of aliens.'—(Mr. *Smith, Vancouver.*)

1° m., 199 (i).

BILL (No. 12) Respecting the London Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Hyman.*)

1°*, 228 ; 2°*, 328 ; in Com., 2923 ; 3°*, 2924 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 103.)

BILL (No. 13) Respecting the Canada National Railway and Transport Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)

1°*, 238 ; 2°*, 731 ; in Com., 1963 ; 3° m., 2384, 2743 ; agreed to (Y. 62 ; N. 45) 2749 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 51.)

BILL (No. 14) To incorporate the Century Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Monk.*)

1°*, 238, 731 ; 2°*, 807 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1993 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 93.)

BILL (No. 15) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Clancy.*)

1° m., 323 ; 2° m., 1061 (i).

BILL (No. 16) Respecting Drainage across Railway Lands.—(Mr. *Robinson, Elgin.*)

1° m., 324 ; 2° m., 1062 (i).

BILL (No. 17) Respecting the land grant of the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. *Richardson*, Lisgar.)

1° m., 325 ; 2° m., 1116 ; 6 m. h., 1130 ; agreed to (Y. 104 ; N. 8) 1166 (i).

BILL (No. 18) To amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. *Richardson*, Lisgar.)
1° m., 326; Order for 2°, 1792 (i).

BILL (No. 19) Respecting the Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Borden*, Halifax.)
1°*, 420; 2°*, 731; in Com., 2924; 3°*, 2924 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 96.)

BILL (No. 20) Respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—(Mr. *Prior.*)
1°*, 420; 2°*, 731; in Com., and 3°*, 1540 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c., 75.)

BILL (No. 21) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Prior.*)
1°*, 420; 2°*, 731; in Com., and 3°*, 2200 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 49.)

BILL (No. 22) Respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 420; 2°*, 731 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3697 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 56.)

BILL (No. 23) Respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Guthrie.*)
1°*, 420; 2°*, 731; in Com., 1914, 1993, 2385; on M. for 3°, 2392; agreed to (Y. 76; N. 41) 2396 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 64.)

BILL (No. 24) Respecting the South Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. *Guthrie.*)
1°*, 420: 2°*, 731; in Com., and 3°*, 1430 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 85.)

BILL (No. 25) To incorporate the Ottawa and Hull Power and Manufacturing Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Champagne.*)
1°*, 420; 2°*, 731; in Com., 2750, 2920; 3°*, 2922 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 108.)

BILL (No. 26) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fortin.*)
1°*, 420; 2°*, 731 (i); in Com., 3687; Order for 3°, 3908; ref. back to Com., 3983; 3° m., 4409; 6 m. h., 4413; 3°*, 4423 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 54.)

BILL (No. 27) Respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.—(Mr. *Marcil*, *Bonaventure.*)
1°*, 420; 2° m., 731; in Com., and 3°*, 2384 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 48.)

BILL (No. 28) To regulate freight and passenger rates on railways.—(Mr. *Reid*, Grenville.)
1° m., 420 (i).

BILL (No. 29) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1° m., 421; 2°*, 2813; in Com., 2813; 3°*, 2820 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 20.)

BILL (No. 30) To further amend 'The Dominion Lands Act.'—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1° m., 424 (i).

BILL (No. 31) Respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. *Parmelee.*)
1°*, 502; 2°*, 807; in Com., and 3°*, 1430 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 79.)

BILL (No. 32) To provide for the marking and inspection of packages containing fruit for sale.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
1° m., 502; 2°*, and in Com., 2360, 2408; ref. back to Com., 2611; 3° m., 2611, 2627; 3°*, 2706 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 27.)

BILL (No. 33) Respecting Victoria Day.—(Mr. *Horsey.*)
1° m., 503; 2° m., 1432; in Com., 2201 (i); (remarks) 3537, 3983, 5212; in Com., 4255; 3°*, 4256 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 12.)

BILL (No. 34) To incorporate the Canadian Patriotic Fund Association.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°*, 605; 2°*, 1205: in Com., and 3°*, 2200 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 92.)

BILL (No. 35) Respecting the Mather Bridge and Power Company.—(Mr. *German.*)
1°*, 693; 2°*, 1050; in Com., and 3°*, 1914 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 106.)

BILL (No. 36) Respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *LaRivière.*)
1°*, 693; 2°*, 1050; in Com., and 3°*, 1914 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 63.)

BILL (No. 37) To incorporate the Bishop of Keewatin.—(Mr. *Osler.*)
1°*, 693; 2°*, 1050; in Com., and 3°*, 2927 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 102.)

BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Hudson's Bay and North-west Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Great Northern Transit Company.'—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 693; 2°*, 1050; M. to ref. back to Com., 2347, 2872 (i).

BILL (No. 39) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1° m., 693 (i).

BILL (No. 40) Respecting the British Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fraser.*)
1° m., 893; 2°*, 1244; in Com., and 3°*, 2200 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 50.)

BILL (No. 41) Respecting the Saskatchewan and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *LaRivière.*)
1°*, 893; 2°*, 1205 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3220 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 83.)

BILL (No. 42) Respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fraser.*)
1°*, 893; 2°*, 1205; in Com., and 3°*, 1914 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 69.)

BILL (No. 43) To incorporate 'The St. Lawrence Lloyds.'—(Mr. *Geoffrion.*)
1°*, 893; 2°*, 1205; in Com., 2923 (i); 3°*, 2984 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 110.)

BILL (No. 44) Respecting the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Ottawa, Gatineau and Western Railway Company.'—(Mr. *Champagne.*)
1°*, 893; 2°*, 1244 (i); in Com., 3220; 3°*, 3223 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 80.)

BILL (No. 45) To amend 'The Pacific Cable Act, 1899.'—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
Res. prop., 431; in Com. on Res., 806; 1°* of B., 910 (i); 2°, and in Com., 5393; 3°*, 5394 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 5.)

BILL (No. 46) To amend the Unorganized Territories Game Preservation Act, 1894.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1° m., 1002; 2°*, 2820; in Com., 2820; 3°*, 2821 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 21.)

BILL (No. 47) To amend the Act to restrict the importation and employment of Aliens.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1° m., 1066; 2° m., 2456; in Com., 2458 (i), 4649; 3° m., 5095 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 13.)

BILL (No. 48) Respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 1167; 2°*, 1431; in Com., and 3°*, 1914 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 57.)

BILL (No. 49) Respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
1°*, 1167; 2°*, 1431; in Com., and 3°*, 2200 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 76.)

BILL (No. 50) Respecting the Canadian Mutual Aid Society.—(Mr. *Sutherland, Essex.*)
1°*, 1167; 2°*, 1431 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3454 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 91.)

BILL (No. 51) To incorporate the Clergue Iron and Nickel-Steel Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 1167; 2°*, 1431; in Com., 2925; 3°, 2927 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 89.)

BILL (No. 52) Respecting the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company.—(Mr. *Maxwell.*)
1°*, 1167; 2°*, 1431 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3220 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 86.)

BILL (No. 53) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwest Loan Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Britton.*)
1°*, 1167; 2°*, 1431 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2984 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 104.)

BILL (No. 54) To incorporate the Fort Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. *Douglas.*)
1°*, 1167; 2°*, 1431; in Com., and 3°*, 2200 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 58.)

BILL (No. 55) To incorporate the Arnprior and Pontiac Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lemieux.*)
1°*, 1167; 2°*, 1431; in Com., and 3°*, 2200 (i); Sen. Amts., 5092 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 47.)

BILL (No. 56) Respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Galliher.*)
1°*, 1244; 2°*, 1431 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3220 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 55.)

BILL (No. 57) To incorporate the Crow's Nest Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher.*)
1°*, 1244; 2°*, 1431 (i); in Com., 3418; Order of 3°, 3908; wthdn., 5711 (ii).

BILL (No. 58) To incorporate the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher.*)
1°*, 1244; 2°*, 1431 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3227 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 70.)

BILL (No. 59) To incorporate the Similkameen and Keremeos Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher.*)
1°*, 1244; 2°*, 1431 (i); in Com., and 3°, 3697 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 84.)

BILL (No. 60) To incorporate the United Empire Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Birkett.*)
1°*, 1244; 2°*, 1540; in Com., and 3°*, 1993 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 115).

BILL (No. 61) Respecting W. C. Edwards & Co. (Limited).—(Mr. *Rosamond.*)
1°*, 1244; 2°*, 1431 (i); in Com., 3227; 3°*, 3421 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 98.)

BILL (No. 62) To incorporate the Pontiac Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. *Murray.*)
1°*, 1244; 2°*, 1540 (i); wthdn., 4752 (ii).

BILL (No. 63) To amend the Franchise Act, 1898.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 1391; 2°*, 2782; in Com., 2782 (i); 4199; 3°*, 4341 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 15.)

BILL (No. 64) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 1391; 2°*, 2809; in Com., 2809 (i), 4022, 4197, 4323; 3°, 4341 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 16.)

BILL (No. 65) To provide for the establishment of a Medical Council in Canada.—(Mr. *Roddick.*)
1° m., 1392 (i).

BILL (No. 66, from the Senate) Further to amend the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 1424; 2°*, and in Com., 2455; 3°*, 2455 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 36.)

BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the Quebec Terminal and Railway Company.—(Mr. *Malouin.*)
1°*, 1438; 2°*, 1790 (i); in Com., 5540; 3°*, 5545 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 81.)

BILL (No. 68) Respecting the McClary Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. *Hyman.*)
1°*, 1496; 2°*, 1790; in Com., and 3°*, 2927 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 107.)

BILL (No. 69) To incorporate the St. Lawrence Power Company.—(Mr. *Logan.*)
1°*, 1496; 2°*, 1790 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 111.)

BILL (No. 70) Respecting the E. B. Eddy Company.—(Mr. *Champagne.*)
1°*, 1496; 2°*, 1790 (i); in Com., 3411; 3°*, 3418 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 97.)

BILL (No. 71) Respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 1496; 2°*, 1790; in Com., and 3°*, 2397 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 65.)

BILL (No. 72) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher.*)
1°*, 1496; 2°*, 1790 (i).

BILL (No. 73) Respecting the Vancouver, Westminster, Northern and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 1496; 2°*, 1790 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3697 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 87.)

BILL (No. 74) To amend the law respecting Elections in the North-west Territories.—Mr. *Roche*, Marquette.)
1° m., 1496 (i).

BILL (No. 75) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 1574; 2°*, 1993 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3421 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 52.)

BILL (No. 76) To amend the Criminal Code of 1892.—(Mr. *German.*)
1° m., 1574 (i).

BILL (No. 77) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Stephens.*)
1° m., 1576; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2202 (i).

BILL (No. 78) To incorporate the Union Railway Company.—(Mr. *Demers, St. Johns and Iberville.*)
1°*, 1663; 2°*, 1924 (i).

BILL (No. 79) Respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. *Vrooman*).
1°*, 1663; 2°*, 1993 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3421 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 72.)

BILL (No. 80) To incorporate the St. Mary River Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 1663; 2°*, 1993 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 112.)

BILL (No. 81) Respecting the Algoma Central Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.'—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 1663; 2°*, 2200 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 46.)

BILL (No. 82) Respecting the Rathbun Company.—(Mr. *Britton.*)
1°*, 1747; 2°*, 1993; in Com., 2925; 3°*, 2925 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 109.)

BILL (No. 83) To incorporate the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher.*)
1°*, 1747; 2°*, 1993 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3421 (ii.) (1 *Edward VII*, c. 71.)

BILL (No. 84) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 1747; 2°*, 1993 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3421 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 45.)

BILL (No. 85) To incorporate the Alberta Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 1747; 2°*, 2200 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3421 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 44.)

BILL (No. 86) Respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—(Mr. *Malouin.*)
1°*, 1747; 3°*, 2201 (i); wthdn., 5584 (ii).

BILL (No. 87) To amalgamate the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company, the Winnipeg Transfer Railway Company (Limited), the Portage and North-western Railway Company and the Waskada and North-eastern Railway Company, under the name of the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 1880; 2°*, 2201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3697 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 73.)

BILL (No. 88) To incorporate the Canadian Nurses Association.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 1881; 2°*, 2201 (i); M. to refund Fees, 4078; M. for Com., 4371; in Com., 4423, 5411, 5577.

BILL (No. 89) Respecting the Grand Falls Water Power and Boom Company.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°*, 1881; 2°*, 2397 (i); Order for Com., 3454, 5270; in Com., and 3°*, 5270 (ii). (1 *Edward VII.*, c. 99.)

BILL (No. 90) Respecting the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)
1°*, 1881; 2°*, 2201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3455 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 95.)

BILL (No. 91) To amend the Inland Waters Seamen's Act.—(Sir *Louis Davies.*)
1° m., 1957; 2°*, and in Com., 2439; 3°*, 2440 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 33.)

BILL (No. 92) To further amend the Act respecting the safety of ships.—(Sir *Louis Davies.*)
1° m., 1958; 2°*, and in Com., 2440; 3°*, 2443 (i); Sen. Amts., 4207 (ii). (1 *Edward VII.*, c. 34.)

BILL (No. 93) Respecting inquiries and investigations into shipping casualties.—(Sir *Louis Davies.*)
1°*, 1958; 2° m., 2443; in Com., 2445; 3°*, 2628 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 35.)

BILL (No. 94) To amend the Railway Act.—Mr. *Richardson*, Lisgar.)
1° m., 1960 (i).

BILL (No. 95) Respecting the Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 2055; 2°*, 2397 (i); in Com., 5091; 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 78.)

BILL (No. 96) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Northrup.*)
1° m., 2055 (i).

BILL (No. 97) To incorporate the Manufacturers and Temperance and General Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Osler.*)
1°*, 2161, 2°*, 2397 (i); in Com., 2984; 3°*, 2986 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 105.)

BILL (No. 98) Incorporating the Kettle Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher.*)
1°*, 2161, 2°*, 2397 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 68.)

BILL (No. 99) Respecting Le Crédit Foncier du Bas-Canada.—(Mr. *Geoffrion.*)
1°*, 2161; 2°*, 2923 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3909; wthdn., 5471 (ii).

BILL (No. 100) To amend the Bills of Exchange Act, 1890.—(Mr. *Demers, St. Johns and Iberville.*)
1° m., 2161 (i).

BILL (No. 101) Respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1° m., 2202 (i).

BILL (No. 102) Respecting a Lease of certain Railways in Manitoba.—(Mr. *McIsaac.*)
1°*, 2346 (i); 2° m., 2986 (b); wthdn., 4192 (ii).

BILL (No. 103) Relating to an agreement between the Government of Manitoba and the Canadian Northern Railway Company respecting certain railways.—(Mr. *McIsaac.*)

1°m., 2346 (i) 2°*, 2987; M. for Com., 4372, 4436; in Com., 4534, 4688, 4902, 4940; 3°m, 5084; amt. (6 m. h.) 5085; Neg. (Y. 5; N. 107) 5090 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 53.)

BILL (No. 104) To incorporate the Nova Scotia Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fraser.*)

1°*, 2347; 2°*, 2923 (i) in Com., and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 77.)

BILL (No. 105) To incorporate the Kamloops and Atlin Railway Company.—(Mr. *Prior.*)

1°*, 2347; 2°*, 2923 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 67.)

BILL (No. 106) Respecting the South Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. *Geoffrion.*)

1°*, 2347; 2°*, 2923 (i); in Com., 5092, 5271, 5406; 3°*, 5407 (ii).

BILL (No. 107) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of John Abell.—(Mr. *Bell, Addington.*)

1°*, 2347; 2°*, 2923 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3455 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 88.)

BILL (No. 108) Respecting the Manitoulin North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)

1°*, 2347; 2°*, 2923 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 74.)

BILL (No. 109) To incorporate the Canadian National Bank.—(Mr. *German.*)

1°*, 2347; 2°*, 2923 (i); Order for Com., 3909; in Com., 4014; 3°*, 4014 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 114.)

BILL (No. 110) To incorporate the Debenture and Securities Corporation of Canada.—(Mr. *Osler.*)

1°*, 2347; 2°*, 2923 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3909 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 94.)

BILL (No. 111) To incorporate the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Murray.*)

1°*, 2347; 2°*, 2923 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 66.)

BILL (No. 112) Respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *Carroll.*)

1°*, 2347; 2°*, 2923 (i); in Com., 5407; ref. back to Sel. Com., 5411; in Com., 5890; 3°*, 5892 (ii).

BILL (No. 113) In further amendment of the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Wright.*)

1° m., 2348 (i).

BILL (No. 114) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending 30th June, 1901.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 2349; 1°*, 2°*, 2359; in Com., 2359; 3°*, 2359 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 1.)

BILL (No. 115) To amend the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Bernier.*)

1° m., 2456 (i); 2°*, 3094; in Com., 3094; 3°*, 3096 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 24.)

BILL (No. 116) Respecting the culling of Lumber and the inspection of Staples.—(Mr. *Bernier.*)

1° m., 2456 (i); 2°*, 3096; in Com., 3096; 3°*, 3096 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 30.)

BILL (No. 117) Respecting the packing or sale of certain staple commodities.—(Mr. *Bernier.*)

1°m., 2456 (i); 2° and in Com., 4743, 4878; 3°*, 4898; Sen. Amts., 5829 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 26.)

BILL (No. 118, from the Senate) To amend the Yukon Territory Act and to make further provision for the administration of justice in the said Territory.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)

1°*, 2567 (i); 2°*, 3086; in Com., 3086, 4876; in Com. on Res., 5214; in Com. on B., 5215; 3°*, 5215 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 41.)

BILL (No. 119, from the Senate) To make certain provisions necessitated by the Demise of the Crown.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)

1°*, 2567 (i); 2° m., 3086; in Com., and 3°*, 3086 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 37.)

BILL (No. 120) Respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. *Heyd.*)

M. to receive Pet., 2382, 2701; 1°*, of B., 2702 (i); 2° m., 3220; in Com., 4015; 3° m., 4360; ref. back to Com., 4371; in Com., and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 101.)

BILL (No. 121) Further to amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford.*)

1° m., 2878 (i); 2° and in Com., 4241; 3°*, 4341 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 19.)

BILL (No. 122) Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Bernier.*)

1°*, 3085; 2°, and in Com., 4898; 3°*, 4901 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 25.)

BILL (No. 123) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Bernier.*)

1° m., 3085; wthdn., 5472 (ii).

BILL (No. 124) Respecting the Western Assurance Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)

M. to receive Pet., 3176; 1°*, 3268; 2°, 3421; in Com. and 3°, 4014 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 116.)

BILL (No. 125) Respecting the British American Assurance Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)

M. to receive Pet., 3177; 1°*, 3268; 2°, 3421; in Com., and 3°*, 4015 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 90.)

BILL (No. 126) To vest certain foreshores in the City of St. John and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Tucker.*)

M. to suspend Rule, 3536; 1°*, 3537; 2°*, 4360 (ii).

BILL (No. 127) To amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)

1°*, 3753; 2°*, 4667; in Com., 4667; 3°*, 4667 (ii).

BILL (No. 128, from the Senate) For the relief of Lilias Middleton.—(Mr. *Rosamond.*)
1°*, 4406; 2°*, 5093; in Com., and 3°, 5545 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 118.)

BILL (No. 129, from the Senate) Respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr *Monk.*)
1°*, 4406; 2°*, 5093; in Com., and 3°*, 5546 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 82.)

BILL (No. 130, from the Senate) For the relief of James Ward McDonald.—(Mr. *Lennox.*)
1°*, 4406; 2°*, 5093; in Com., and 3°*, 5546 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 117.)

BILL (No. 131) To amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
Res. prop., 3460; in Com. on Res., 4066, 4068, 4255; 1°*, of B., 4322; 2°, and in Com., 4668; 3°*, 4674 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 39.)

BILL (No. 132) Further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Bruneau.*)
1° m., 4323 (ii).

BILL (No. 133) Respecting pensions to officers of the Permanent Staff and officers and men of the Permanent Militia, and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Borden, King's*).
M. for Com. on Res., 4231; 1° m., 4342; 2°, and in Com., 4738; 3° m., 4875 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 17.)

BILL (No. 134, from the Senate) To amend the Interpretation Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 4535; 2°, and in Com., 4674; 3°*, 4674 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 11.)

BILL (No. 135) Respecting the Great Northern Railway of Canada.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
M. to receive Pet., 4406, 4534; 1°*, 4535; 2°*, 5093; in Com., and 3°*, 5546 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 62.)

BILL (No. 136) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*
1°*, 4752; 2°, and in Com., 5111; 3°*, 5117 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 31.)

BILL (No. 137) To amend the Act respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
M. for Com. on Res., 4535; in Com. on Res., 4667; 1°* m., 4874; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5215 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 18.)

BILL (No. 138) To provide for a further annual allowance for the Province of Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
M. for Com. on Res., 4535, 4675, 4702; in Com. on Res., 4722; 1°*, 4874; 2°, and in Com., 5326; 3°*, 5359 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 3.)

BILL (No. 139) To amend the Gas Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Bernier.*)
1°*, 5094; 2°, and in Com., 5359; 3°*, 5360 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 28.)

BILL (No. 140) To amend the Electric Light Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Bernier.*)
1°*, 5094; 2°, and in Com., 5365; 3°*, 5373 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 29.)

BILL (No. 141) Further to amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)
Res. prop., 4022; M. for Com. on Res., 5096; in Com. on Res., 5099; 1°* of B., 5110; 2°, and in Com., 5389; 3°*, 5393 (ii). (*Edward VII*, c. 6.)

BILL (No. 142) To provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Res. prop., 4870; M. for Com. on Res., 5117; in Com. on Res., 5128; 1°*, 5215; 2°, and in Com., 5471; 3°*, 5472 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 9.)

BILL (No. 143) Respecting the Ottawa Branch of the Royal Mint.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Res. prop., 4535; in Com. on Res., 5373; 1°*, 5389; 2° m., 5715; in Com., 5716; 3°*, 5716 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 4.)

BILL (No. 144) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. *Bernier.*)
1° m., 5470; 2°, and in Com., 5801; 3° m., 5825 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 23.)

BILL (No. 145) To further amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
1° m., 5470; 2°, and in Com., 5787; 3°*, 5825 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 32.)

BILL (No. 146) To authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
Res. prop., 5260; in Com. on Res., 5472, 5546; 1°*, 5577; 2°, and in Com., 5786; 3°*, 5786 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 7.)

BILL (No. 147, from the Senate) To further amend the North-west Territories Representation Act.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 5577; M. to wthdrw., 5829; wthdn., 5953 (ii).

BILL (No. 148, from the Senate) Further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 5577; 2°, and in Com., 5801; 3°*, 5801 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 42.)

BILL (No. 149, from the Senate) To amend an Act passed during the present session, intituled 'An Act to incorporate the Fort Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. *Douglas.*)
1°, 2°, 5713; M. for Com., 5713; in Com. and 3°*, 5892 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 59.)

BILL (No. 150) Further to amend the Act respecting the Judges of the Provincial Courts.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
In Com. on Res., 5593; 1°*, of B., 5599; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5801 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 40.)

BILL (No. 151) To amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
M. for Com. on Res., 5600; 1°*, 5715; 2°, and in Com., 5826; on M. to rep. B., 5827; 3°*, 5828 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 14.)

BILL (No. 152) To provide for the payment of bounties on lead refined in Canada.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Res. prop,, 5599; M. for Com. on Res., 5716; in Com. on Res., 5728; M. for 2° of Res., 5728; 1°*, of B., 5729; 2°, and in Com., 5828; 3°*, 5828 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 8.)

BILL (No. 153, from the Senate) To remove Doubts concerning the continuance in office of Judges of Dominion and Provincial Courts upon the Demise of the Crown.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1**, 2°*, 5711; in Com., and 3°* 5801 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 38.)

BILL (No. 154, from the Senate) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Eudora Sibbald.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
M. to receive Pet., 5471; 1°*. 5711; 2°*, and ref. to Sel. Com., 5713; 3°*, 5892 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 113.)

BILL (No. 155) Further to amend the Penitentiary Act.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
In Com. on Res., 5588; 1°* of B., 5715; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5825 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 43.)

BILL (No. 156) To amend the Customs Tariff, 1897.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Res. prop., 5802; 1°* of B., 5809; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5825 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 22.)

BILL (No. 157) To amend the Acts of 1899 and 1900 respecting the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 5823; 2°, and in Com., 5952; 3°*, 5952 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 10.)

BILL (No. 158) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1901, and the 30th June, 1902.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 2°*; in Com., 5951; 3°*, 5952 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 2.)

BINDER TWINE, CHANGE IN PRICE IN 1900: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1002, 1402 (i).
——— ENFORCEMENT OF LAW *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 507 (i).
——— MACHINERY ADMITTED FREE OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Cargill*) 606 (i).
——— MANUFACTURE: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 230 (i).
Debate: (Mr. *Hackett*) 548; (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 550; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 555; (Mr. *Heyd*) 557; (Mr. *Stephens*) 565; (Mr. *Henderson*) 565; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 568, 590; (Mr. *Northrup*) 577; (Mr. *Fraser*) 580; (Mr. *Monk*) 581; (Mr. *Sherritt*) 582; (Mr. *Oliver*) Amt., 584, 587; (Mr. *Clancy*) 588; (Mr. *Blain*) 593; (Mr. *Fielding*) 595; (Mr. *Ingram*) 596; (Mr. *Davis*) 598; (Mr. *Wallace*) 600; (Mr. *Scott*) 601 (i).
——— AMT., Mr. *Oliver*) agreed to (Y. 155; N. 0) 604 (i).

BINDER TWINE, MANUFACTURED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 107 (i).
——— PRICE ADDED FOR LABOUR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 5585 (ii).

BIOLOGICAL STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 265 (i).

BLACK ROCKS LIGHTHOUSE, B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 200 (i).

BLAKE, HON. EDWARD, LEGAL EXPENSES *re* FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 313 (i).

BLANKETS AND CLOTHING FOR INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 2753 (i).

BLIND RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5743 (ii).

'BLUE HILL,' STR., SUBSIDY, TONNAGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 3457 (ii).

BLUE SHANK, STRAIGHTENING LINE, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 4224 (ii).

BOBCAYGEON DAM: in Com. of Sup., 4384, 5631, 5634.

BOGART, MR., RESIGNATION FROM NAPANEE POSTMASTERSHIP: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3269 (ii).
——— *See* 'Napanee,' &c.

BOLSOVER P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 208 (i).

BOND-BLAINE TREATY *re* NEWFOUNDLAND AND U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) on conc., 5794 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5829 (ii).

BONDS AND SECURITIES, STMNT.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 51.

BONUSES TO RAILWAYS. *See* 'Subsidies,' &c.

BOULARDERIE CENTRE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).

BOUNDARY SURVEY, YUKON AND B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 2699 (i).

BOWMAN AND PORTER, DREDGING CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 204 (i).

BRAMPTON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4350, 5699.
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 3139 (ii).

BRANDON POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 110 (i).

'BRANT,' STR., MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 280 (i).

BRENNAN, J. ALBERT, PAYMENT OF FISHING BOUNTY, &C.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1424 (i).
——— *See* 'Fisheries,' &c.

BRIDGES, I. C. R., STRENGTHENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4123 (ii).

BRIDGETOWN, N.S., AND MIDDLETON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5569 (ii).

British American Assurance Co.'s B. No. 125 (Mr. *McCarthy*). M. to receive Pet., 3177; 1°*, 3268; 2°, 3421; in Com. and 3°*, 4015 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 90.)

BRITISH AMERICAN BANK NOTE CO., LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5457 (ii).

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 21 (Mr. *Prior*). 1°*, 420; 2°*, 731; in Com. and 3°*, 2200 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 49.)

BRITISH COLUMBIA:

ASHCROFT AND CARIBOO MAIL CONTRACT, MILEAGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1261, 1440, 2398 (i); 4194 (ii).
ASSAY OFFICE, EQUIPMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (ii).
BANFF HOT SPRINGS, ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 2698 (i).
BLACK ROCKS LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 200.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

BROCTON LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 287 (i).
BUBONIC PLAGUE, REPS., &C., PRECAUTIONS AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3642 (ii).
BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 3097 (ii).
CHINESE AND JAPANESE IMMIGRATION COMMISSION : Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3641 (ii).
——— *See* 'Mongolian,' &c.
CHINESE OR JAPANESE LABOUR, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1592, (i).
——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 2349.
CHINESE LEPERS : in Com. of Sup., 2867 (i).
——— *See* 'B. C. Japanese.'
CLAIMS OF PROVINCE AGAINST DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3459 (ii).
——— FOR INCREASED SUBSIDY : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4078 (ii).
CLAYQUOT INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL : in Com. of Sup., 2773 (i).
COLUMBIA RIVER DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 3514 (ii).
CROW'S NEST LINE, COAL LANDS, &C.: Ques.(Mr. *Sproule*) 4644 (ii).
CUSTOMS, CONTINGENCIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3848 (ii).
DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 4402 (ii).
ESQUIMALT DEFENCES : in Com. of Sup., 3785 (ii).
GREY, ROBT., LIGHTKEEPER, RETIRING ALLOWANCE : in Com. of Sup., 278 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Prior*) 1267 (i).
FISHERIES, PROVINCIAL JURISDICTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3459 (ii).
FISHERY LICENSES : in Com. of Sup., 305 (i).
FISH HATCHERIES : in Com. of Sup., 295, 312 (i); 4588 (ii).
FRASER RIVER CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 3514.
GOVT. VESSELS, CONTRACTS, SPECIFICATIONS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Prior*) 510, 2586 (i).
GREEN ISLET, ERECTION OF LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2407 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 3514.
HILL, ARTHUR E. B., CLAIMS *re* INVESTIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 4641 (ii).
HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS : in Com. of Sup., 292.
INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 2772 (i).
——— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS : in Com. of Sup., 2772 (i).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 2772 (i).
JAPANESE RESTRICTIONS AND B. C. LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 5586 (ii).
——— *See* 'B. C. Chinese.'
JUAN DE FUCA, SAILING DIRECTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2407 (i).
KAMLOOPS PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 3 97 (ii).
MACAULAY POINT, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2570 (i).
MINERAL RESOURCES, ADVERTISEMENT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1749 (i).
MINES, BUREAU OF, RES. RESPECTING : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2406 (i).
MINING INDUSTRIES, REP. OF INTERVIEW IN 'PROVINCE' : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1749 (i).
MONGOLIAN IMMIGRATION, COR. *re* : M. for Copy* (Mr. *Prior*) 224 (i).
NELSON PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 3097.
NEW WESTMINSTER PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 3097, 4392 (ii).
OBSERVATORY, SULPHUR MOUNTAIN, BANFF : in Com. of Sup., 5196 (ii).
PORT SIMPSON TO HAZLETON, TEL. LINE : in Com. of Sup., 5687 (ii).
PROSPECT POINT LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 287 (i).
QUESNELLE AND ATLIN TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 4271, 5687 (ii).
RY. LANDS, SALE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 4752 (ii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

ROSSLAND PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 3099 (ii).
SECHELT ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 200 (i).
SKEENA RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).
SONGHEES INDIAN RESERVE : in Com. of Sup., 2773 (i).
STEVESTON RIOTS, CALLING OUT MILITIA : Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 328 (i).
SULPHUR MOUNTAIN, BANFF, OBSERVATORY : in Com. of Sup., 5196 (ii).
SUPREME COURT JUDGES, RESIDENCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 194, 2664 (i).
TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 5687 (ii).
VANCOUVER COUNTY COURT JUDGE : prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5593 (ii).
——— *See* 'Judges of Provincial Courts B.'
VANCOUVER DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 3100.
——— FAULTY WORKMANSHIP, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1750 (i).
VICTORIA HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 4402 (ii).
VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4787 (ii).
'WILLAMETTE,' STR., WRECK AT DENMAN'S ISLAND : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 3643, 3983 (ii).
WILLIAM'S HEAD PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).
WORK POINT BARRACKS, EXPROPRIATION OF LAND : in Com. of Sup., 4352, 5314 (ii).
YUKON AND B. C. BOUNDARY SURVEY : in Com. of Sup., 2699 (i).

British Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. No. 40 (Mr. *Fraser*) 1° m., 893 ; 2°*, 1244 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2200 (i). *(1 Edward VII., c. 50.)*

BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL, OVERSEER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3111 (ii).
——— CLERK OF WORKS, SUSPENSION, &C : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 2398 (i).
——— CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 2205 (i).
BROCTON LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 287 (i).
BRONTE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 5722 (ii).
——— LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 288 (i).
BRUCE COUNTY POSTMASTERS : in Com. of Sup., 495.
BRUCE MINES : in Com. of Sup., 5730 (ii).
BRUCE, NORTH, ELECTION, TRANSFER OF MAIL CLERKS, &C.: Par. in Newspaper (Mr. *Sproule*) 1578, 1593 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 1578 (i).
——— CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2610 (i).
——— CERTIFICATE OF JUDGES : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 322 (i).
BUBONIC PLAGUE, REPS., &C., PRECAUTION AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3642 (ii).
BUCKINGHAM POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 1243 (i).
BUDGET, THE, INQUIRY FOR (Mr. *Maclean*) 1431 (i).
——— DATE OF DELIVERY : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1070 (i).
——— INQUIRY (Mr. *Tisdale*) 894 (i).
——— FINANCIAL STATEMENT (Mr. *Fieldiag*) 1441 (i).
Debate : (Mr. *Osler*) 1468 ; (Mr. *Clancy*) 1476 ; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1490, 1501 ; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 1515 ; (Mr. *Hyman*) 1540 ; (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 1549 ; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Notice of Amt., 1597 ; (Amt.) 1617 ; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1618 ; (Mr. *Wallace*) 1632 ; (Mr. *Russell*) 1663 ; (Mr. *Kemp*) 1686 ; (Mr. *Guthrie*)

BUDGET, THE—*Con.*
1702; (Mr. *Bennett*) 1714; (Mr. *Heyd*) 1725; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1734; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ques. of Order, 1741; (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 1800; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ques. of Order, 1812; (Mr. *Maclean*) 1815; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 1834; (Mr. *Brock*) 1850; (Mr. *Ross, South Ont.*) 1858; (Mr. *Vrooman*) 1866; (Mr. *Clare*) 1874; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1885; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1900; (Mr. *Wade*) 1924; (Mr. *Lennox*) 1939; (Mr. *Scott*) 2000; (Mr. *Lancaster*) 2020; (Mr. *Hughes, P. E.I.*) 2032; (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) 2040; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 2048; (Mr. *Hackett*) 2057; (Mr. *Dobell*) 2075; (Mr. *Monk*) 2082; (Mr. *Paterson*) 2106; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2137; (Mr. *Turgeon*) 2214; (Mr. *Kendry*) 2222; (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 2233; (Mr. *Lavell*) 2244; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 2254; (Mr. *Broder*) 2261; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 2273; (Mr. *Henderson*) 2292; (Mr. *Murray*) 2315; (Mr. *Pringle*) 2321; (Mr. *McLennan*) 2328; (Mr. *Calvin*) 2335; (Mr. *Puttee*) 2338; (Mr. *Kendall*) 2339 (i).

—— PERSONAL EXPLANATION *re* VOTE (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 2349 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 90 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 239 (i).

BUFFALO EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 928; conc., 2349 (i).

—— N.W.T. EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 5456 (ii).

—— *See* 'Agriculture,' 'Pan-American,' &c.

BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1240 (i).

—— B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3097 (ii).

—— MAN.: in Com of Sup., 5697 (ii).

—— N.B.: in Com of Sup., 5688 (ii).

—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 2547 (i), 4390, 5687 (ii).

—— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 4391 (ii).

—— OTTAWA, RENT, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 911 (i).

—— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 4391 (ii).

—— RENTS, LIGHTING, &C., YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 4304 (ii).

—— *See* 'Public Works,' &c.

BULL MR., CLAIMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4928 (ii).

BULWER POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup,, 480 (i).

BURLINGTON CHANNEL, REPAIRS TO PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (ii).

BURNT CHURCH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3473 (ii).

BURPEE, HON. CHARLES, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 110.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE *re* PRIVATE BILLS: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 3219 (ii).

—— PROCEDURE, &C., ON QUES. OF ORDER (Mr. *Charlton*) 4940 (ii).

—— PROCEDURE *re* PRIVATE BILLS: Remarks (Mr. *German*) 2922 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 692, 1390, 2700, 2872 (i), 3085, 3365, 3452, 4405, 4938 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 61, 2774, 2778 (i), 4323.

—— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 3175, 3867, 4192, 4640, 5824 (ii).

—— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) for Precedence on Mondays, 1497 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 95 (i).

—— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

BUTTER, CHEESE, &C., EXPORTS, QUANTITY: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1256 (i).

—— IMPORTED INTO UNITED KINGDOM: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1255 (i).

—— *See* 'Customs,' &c.

CAN. AND ALASKA PROVISIONAL BOUNDARY, REP. OF MR. KING: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 5587 (ii).

—— *See* 'Joint High Com.'

CANADA AND FRANCE SS. SUBSIDY, Res. prop. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4022; in Com. on Res., 5096.

—— *See* 'Ocean SS. Subsidy.'

CAN. AND G. B. SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (ii).

CANADA AND ITALY TRADE RELATIONS, COR. *re*: M. for Copies (Mr. *Monk*) 518 (i).

CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND, NEGOTIATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 1260 (i).

CAN. AND S. AFRICA SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4788 (ii).

CANADA ATLANTIC AND I.C.R. FREIGHT RATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 1590 (i).

CAN. CREEK BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).

CANADA EASTERN RY., RES. FROM N.B. BOARDS OF TRADE, RECEIVED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson*, N.B.) 3753 (ii).

—— STMNT. &C., TO A. GIBSON: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 1583 (i).

Canada Evidence Act (1893) Amt. B., No. 66 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 1424; 2°*, and in Com., 2455; 3°*, 2455 (i). *(1 Edward VII, c. 36).*

'CANADA GAZETTE': in Com. of Sup., 3448 (ii).

Canada National Ry. and Transport Co.'s B., No. 13 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 238; 2°*, 731; in Com., 1963; 3° m., 2384, 2743; agreed to (Y. 62; N. 45) 2749 (i). *(1 Edward VII, c. 51).*

Debate in Com. (Mr. *Blair*) 1963, 1968: (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1963; (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) 1963, 1984; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1964, 1978; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1964, 1974; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1964, 1988; (Mr. *Clarke*) 1964; (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria) 1969; (Mr. *Calvert*) 1972; (Mr. *Richardson*, Lisgar) 1972, 1982; (Mr. *Britton*) 1976; (Mr. *Cochrane*) 1977; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1977, 1986; (Mr. *Russell*) 1981; (Mr. *Cowan*) 1984; (Mr. *Gourley*) 1990 (i).

CAN. TEMPERANCE ACT: in Com. of Sup., 3449 (ii).

—— LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 337 (i).

—— RES. OF H. OF C., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3754.

CANADIAN CATTLE IMPORTED, IMP. SCHEDULING, &C.; Ques. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1004 (i).

—— QUARANTINED, AGREEMENT WITH U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 1797 (i).

—— EXHIBIT AT IMPERIAL INSTITUTE, ENGLAND: in Com. of Sup., 5179 (ii).

—— FISHERY EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 314 (i).

—— *See* 'Cattle,' &c.

CANADIAN FLAG, INSULT TO IN FOREIGN PORTS: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4648, 5970 (ii).

Canadian Mutual Aid Society's B., No. 50 (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 1°*, 1167; 2°*, 1431 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3454 (ii). *(1 Edward VII, c. 91).*

Canadian National Bank incorp. B. No. 109 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 2347; 2°*, 2923 (i); order for Com., 3909; in Com., 4014; 3°*, 4014 (ii). *(1 Edward VII, c. 114).*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B., No. 75 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 1574; 2°*, 1993 (i); in Com., and 3*, 3421 (ii). *(1 Edward VII, c. 52).*

Canadian Northern Ry.: *See* 'Man. Rys. Bill.'

Canadian Nurses Association incorp. B. No. 88 (Mr. *Clarke*) 1°*, 1881; 2°*, 2201 (i); M. to refund Fees, 4078; M. for Com., 4371; in Com., 4423, 5411, 5577 (ii).

CANADIAN ORDER OF NURSES BILL: M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to introduce B., 1881 (i).

—— M. (Mr. *Carroll*) to refund Fees, 4078 (ii).

CANADIAN OFFICERS IN IMP. ARMY, COMMISSIONS, &c.: M. for Cor.*, &c. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 1266 (i).

C.P.R. AND ICELANDIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5576 (ii).

C.P.R. Co.'s B. No. 26 (Mr. *Fortin*) 1°*, 420; 2°*, 731 (i); in Com., 3687; Order for 3°, 3908; ref. back to Com., 3983; 3° m., 4409; amt. (6 m.h.) 4413; 3°*, 4423 (ii). *(1 Edward VII, c. 54).*

C.P.R., CHARTER, JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION *re* EXEMPTION CLAUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*, *Lisgar*) 3459 (ii).

—— COAL BEARING LANDS, DISPOSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2776 (i).

C.P.R. Land Grant B. No. 17 (Mr. *Richardson*, *Lisgar*) 1° m., 325; 2° m, 1116; 6 m. h., 1130; agreed to (Y. 104; N. 8.) 1166 (i).

Debate (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1130; (Mr. *Maclean*) 1133, 1147; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1137; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1140; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1142; (Mr. *Sifton*) 1144; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1148; (Mr. *Fielding*) 1153; (Mr. *Robinson*, *Elgin*) 1158; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1159; (Mr. *Heyd*) 1161; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ruling, 1162; (Mr. *Puttee*) 1162; (Mr. *Scott*) 1163 (i).

C.P.R. LAND GRAFTS, TAXATION, &c., REF. TO JUDICIAL COURTS: Amt. (Mr. *Richardson*, Lisgar) to Com. of Sup., 5417; Neg. (Y. 12; N. 99) 5432.

—— LAND GRANTS, N.W.T. AND MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5207 (ii).

—— TAX EXEMPTION, REF. TO SUPREME COURT: Notice of Motion (Mr. *Davis*) 1168 (i).

—— REF. TO SUPREME COURT: Amt. (Mr. *Davis*) to Com. of Sup., 2492 (i).

Debate: (Mr. *Sifton*) 2494; (Mr. *Maclean*) 2496; (Mr. *Britton*) 2497; (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 2497 (i).

—— Tax Exemption, Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Com. of Sup., 2498 (i).

Debate (Mr. *Sifton*) 2516; (Mr. *Monk*) 2522, 2536; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2524; (Mr. *Oliver*) 2526; (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 2529; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2533; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2537; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2501, 2539; (Mr. *Davis*) 2499, 2541; (Mr. *Scott*) 2543; Neg. (Y. 7; N. 109) 2546 (i).

CANADIAN PATENTS, CLASSIFICATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2862 (i).

Canadian Patriotic Fund Association B., No. 34 (Mr. *Costigan*) 1°*, 605; 2°*, 1205; in Com., and 3°*, 2200 (i). *(1 Edward VII, c. 92).*

CANADIANS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES, RELIEF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2698 (i).

—— *See* 'Distressed,' &c.

CANALS:

BALSAM AND LAKE SIMCOE DIVISION, AMOUNT OF TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 810 (i).

BOBCAYGEON DAM: in Com. of Sup., 5631, 5634.

—— *See* 'Trent.'

BURLINGTON CHANNEL, REPAIRS TO PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (ii).

CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 4257, 4305 (ii).

—— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4305 (ii).

—— EXPENDITURE FROM 1897 TO 1900 BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith*, *Wentworth*) 1750 (i).

—— FREIGHT, QUANTITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 508 (i).

—— PROTECTION SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4636 (ii).

CARILLON AND GRENVILLE, REBUILDING GUIDE: in Com. of Sup., 5625 (ii).

—— GUIDE PIERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2988.

CHAMBLY, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4388.

—— ST. JOHNS DRAINAGE WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 5632 (ii).

CHEMONG LAKE BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 5625.

CORNWALL: in Com. of Sup., 4310, 5635 (ii).

—— DISMISSAL OF LOCK TENDER: in Com. of Sup., 4261 (ii).

—— ENLARGEMENT: conc., 5794 (ii).

—— SUPERINTENDENT, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Pringle*) 1584 (i).

CULBUTE, DAMAGES BY FLOODS: in Com. of Sup., 4383 (ii).

DOMINION POLICE, CANAL PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4636 (ii).

DUNNVILLE DAM: in Com. of Sup., 5626 (ii).

FARRAN'S POINT, ENLARGEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4311 (ii).

GALOPS: in Com. of Sup., 4311 (ii).

—— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 5619 (ii).

—— *See* 'North Channel.'

GILBERT DREDGING CO., CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5635-5649, 5665; conc., 5800 (ii).

GREAT LAKES WATER LEVEL: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 94 (i).

LACHINE, BUILDING NEW LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 5620 (ii).

—— CÔTE ST. PAUL BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4388 (ii).

—— COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 2586 (i).

—— MACADAMIZING ROAD: in Com. of Sup., 5624.

—— CANAL LOCK, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 1067 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1405 (i).

—— MASONRY WALL, PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4313 (ii).

—— MILL STREET PAVING: in Com. of Sup., 5621 (ii).

—— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4387 (ii).

—— SLOPE WALLS, PONTOON GATE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5621 (ii).

—— LOCKMEN, SUNDAY SERVICES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4389 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4643 (ii).

—— WEIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4380 (ii).

NORTH CHANNEL, GALOPS: in Com. of Sup., 4312, 5620 (ii).

PETERBOROUGH DAM, IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).

—— *See* 'Trent.' &c.

RAMSAY, MR. J. H., DISMISSAL FROM CORNWALL CANAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Pringle*) 1584 (i).

CANALS—*Con.*
RAPIDE PLAT CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 4311 (ii).
ROUND BAY BROOK, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2397 (i).
STE. ANNE'S LOCK, SUPT., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2705 (i).
ST. FRANCIS LAKE, PROTECTION WALLS : in Com. of Sup., 4383 (ii).
——— REMOVAL OF SHOALS : in Com. of Sup., 4309, 4381 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).
——— CONTRACT CHANGES, &c.: M. for O. C'.s* (Mr. *Haggart*) 815 (i).
——— DEPTH OF WATER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 205 (i).
——— QUES. OF ORDER (Mr. *Speaker*) 208 (i).
——— SURVEYS, BUOYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4312, 4382 (ii).
ST. PETER'S, MR. O'DONOGHUE'S CLAIM : in Com. of Sup., 5632 (ii).
SAULT STE. MARIE, DEEPENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
SOULANGES, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 4306 (ii).
SURVEYS AND INSPECTION OF CANALS : in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).
TRENT : in Com. of Sup., 5621 (ii).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4261, 4306 (ii).
——— DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4384 (ii).
——— MR. MAINGY'S REP., &c.: Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 5436 (ii).
——— *See* 'Balsam,' 'Young's,' &c.
——— SECTION 3. AMOUNT OF TENDER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 810 (i).
WATER LEVEL OF GREAT LAKES : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 94 (i).
WELLAND, DOCK RENEWALS : in Com. of Sup., 5632 (ii).
——— EXTRA PAY TO ROBT. COULTER : in Com. of Sup., 4389 (ii).
——— LOCK 24, NAME OF TENDERER : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1591 (i).
——— LOCK BREAKAGE : in Com. of Sup., 4308.
——— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4388 (ii).
——— PORT COLBORNE IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 4313 (ii).
——— QUANTITY OF WATER PASSING THROUGH : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1592 (i).
——— RAISING OLD LOCK WALLS : in Com. of Sup., 5625 (ii).
——— WATER POWER LEASES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *German*) 2609 (i).
WILLIAMSBURG, SUPT., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 3179 (ii).
YOUNG'S POINT DAM, TRENT : in Com. of Sup., 4384 (ii).
CANDIDATES, DEFEATED, APPNMT. TO OFFICES : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 199 (i).
CANSO STRAIT FERRY SERVICE, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 4379, 5217 (ii).
——— WHARF ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 4159 (ii).
CANTEENS FOR MILITIA CAMPS : in Com. of Sup., 3421 (ii).
'C' BATTERY PAY, APPLICATION TO RHODESIAN GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 504 (i).
——— PAY OF MEN BY IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3458 (ii).
——— BY CAN. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3459 (ii)
Debate : M.* (Mr. *Clarke*) for papers, 123; (Mr. *Northrup*) 130; (Mr. *Maclean*) 130; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 131 (i).
'C' BATTERY PAY, INCOMPLETE RET. : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 2056 (i).
——— *See* "Militia."
CADET CORPS, RIFLES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
CAMPBELLTON ROUNDHOUSE, I.C.R., REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 507 (i).
CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3473 (ii).
CAPE NEGRO ISLAND BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
CAPE TORMENTINE, REPAIR TO PIER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1585 (i).
CARDIGAN STATION, P.E.I., PURCHASE OF LAND : in Com. of Sup., 4380 (ii).
CARILLON CANAL, GUIDE PIERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2988 (ii).
——— REBUILDING GUIDE : in Com. of Sup., 5625 (ii).
CARS PURCHASED IN U S. FOR I.C.R., CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2162 (i).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.,' &c.
CARTER, MR. S. J., DEAD LETTER BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 191 (i).
CARTRIDGE FACTORIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3784, 5892 (ii).
——— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3461 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 207 (i).
——— LIGHTS : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 208 (i).
Casualties. *See* 'Shipping.'
CATTLE ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R., FEEDING PLACES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
CATTLE, &c., EXPORTS TO G.B., NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1254 (i).
——— EMBARGO IN G. B.: in Com. of Sup., 4777 (ii).
——— ENTERING U. S., TUBERCULINE TEST, COMPLAINTS AGAINST : Remarks (Mr. *McGowan*) 2354 (i).
——— INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 266 (i).
——— QUARANTINE : in Com. of Sup., 4611 (ii).
——— COMPENSATION FOR SLAUGHTER : in Com. of Sup., 3084 (ii).
——— SLAUGHTERED AT IRISH PORTS : in Com. of Sup., 4773 (ii).
——— *See* 'Can. Cattle,' 'Agriculture,' &c.
CAUGHNAWAGA MISSION HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 5319 (ii).
CAYOUETTE, ELIZABETH, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1405 (i).
CENSUS : in Com. of Sup., 2862 (i).
——— ADDITIONAL AMOUNT : in Com. of Sup., 5785.
——— CIRCULARS ISSUED, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3058, 3874-3976 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 2991 (ii).
——— COMMISSIONER FOR ADDINGTON, APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Addington*) 509 (i).
——— CARDWELL, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 329 (i).
——— CHARLOTTE, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 93 (i).
——— DORCHESTER : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 807 (i).
——— EAST ELGIN : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 65, 1263 (i).
——— SIMCOE, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 336 (i).

CENSUS, EAST SIMCOE, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 201 (i).
——— GREY COUNTY, APPNMT., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 335 (i).
——— COMMISSIONERS AND ENUMERATORS, ALLOWANCES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Martineau*) 812 (i).
——— INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3873 (ii).
——— INSTRUCTIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3867 (ii).
CENTRAL ONTARIO RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5562 (ii).
CENTRAL RY. AND HALIFAX RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5570 (ii).
CENTRAL RY., N.B., MAIL CONTRACT WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1593 (i).
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 14 (Mr. *Monk*) 1° m., 238, 731; 2°*, 807; in Com., and 3°*, 1993 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 93.)
CENTURY LIFE INSURANCE CO.'S B.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 731 (i).
CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2610 (i).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'
CHAMBERLAIN, MRS., GRATUITY TO: in Com. of Sup., 4386 (ii).
CHAMBLY CANAL, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4388 (ii).
——— ST. JOHNS DRAINAGE WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 5632 (ii).
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 173 (i), 4344 (ii).
CHARLESON, MR. and MR. TACHÉ, ACCOUNTS *re* TELEGRAPH CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4271-4291, 4298 (ii).
——— *See* "Public Works," &c.
CHARTERED BANKS OF CANADA: Rep. presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 2056 (i).
CHARTERED CORPORATIONS IN CAN.: M. for Lists (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 88, 94 (i).
CHEBOGUE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
CHEMONG LAKE BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 5625 (ii).
CHEVERIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
CHIEF ARCHITECT'S OFFICE, SALARIES, DISMISSALS: in Com. of Sup., 3531 (ii).
CHIEF CLERK, FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 5184.
——— *See* "Finance," &c.
CHIEF ENGINEER'S OFFICE, PUB. WORKS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3530, 5761 (ii).
CHIEFS, INDIANS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2754 (i).
——— *See* 'Indians,' &c.
CHINESE and JAPANESE IMMIGRATION COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3641 (ii).
——— IMMIGRATION, TAX COLLECTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 328 (i).
——— LABOUR ON GOVT. STEAMERS: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2349 (i).
——— LABOUR, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1592 (i).
CHINESE. *See* 'Japanese,' 'B.C.' &c.
——— LEPERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2867 (i).
CHIPMAN, N.B. and GIBSON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5535 (ii).
CHITTICK and POWELL, MESSRS., SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5165 (ii).
CHITTY, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR; in Com. of Sup., 2774 (i).
CINQMARS *vs.* SENECAL: M. for papers* (Mr. *Fortin*) 225 (i).
CIRCULAR FROM MR. CÔTÉ TO CENSUS ENUMERATORS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3874-3976 (ii).
——— *See* 'Census,' 'Agriculture Dept.,' &c.
CIRCUIT ALLOWANCES, *ad hoc* JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 2647 (i).
——— *See* 'Justice.'
CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 5165, 5182, 5183, 5309, 5758 (ii).
——— PRINTING AND STATIONERY: in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).
CIVIL SERVICE ATTACHMENT OF SALARIES: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2164 (i).
Debate: (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) 2169; (Mr. *Flint*) 2171; (Mr. *Blair*) 2174; (Mr. *McCreary*) 2176; (Mr. *Bureau*) 2178; (Mr. *Belcourt*) 2179; (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 2180; (Mr. *Britton*) 2182; (Mr. *Edwards*) 2184; (Mr. *German*) 2185; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2187; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 2189; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 2189; (Mr. *Ethier*) 2192; (Mr. *Monk*) 2188, 2193; (Mr. *Dugas*) 2194; (Mr. *Russell*) 2196; (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 2198; (Mr. *Davis*) 2199 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE, BOARD OF EXAMINERS: in Com. of Sup., 5310 (ii).
——— EMPLOYEES, ENGLISH AND FRENCH, &C.: M. for stmnt.* (Mr. *Angers*) 815 (i).
——— LIST: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 239 (i).
CLAIMS AGAINST DOM. GOVT., B.C.: Ques. (Mr *Morrison*) 3459 (ii).
——— INCREASED SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4078 (ii).
——— *See* 'B.C.'
CLAIMS OF N.S.: M. to print papers (Mr. *Haggart*) 2610 (i).
——— *See* 'Eastern Extension,' &c.
CLARENCEVILLE AND LACOLLE MAIL CARRIER, EXTRA PAY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 1248 (i).
CLARKE'S BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3163 (i).
CLAYQUOT INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2773 (i).
CLEMENT, W. H. P., RESIGNATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2657 (i).
CLERGUE'S CONTRACT FOR STEEL RAILS, &C., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2628, 2719 (i), 3537-3640, 3724-3752, 5228-5270, 5285-5309 (ii).
——— INQUIRY FOR PAPERS (Mr. *Haggart*) 4902 (ii).
——— REMARKS: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Haggart*) 5215.
——— *See* 'I.C.R.' 'Railways,' 'Steel Rails,' &c.
Clergue Iron and Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. No. 51 (Mr. *Dymen*) 1°*, 1167; 2°*, 1431; in Com., 2925; 3° 2927 (i) (1 *Edward VII, c.*, 89.)

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE, INTERIOR DEPT.: conc., 5789.
——— PUBLIC WORKS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5758.
——— *See* 'Supply,' &c.
CLERKS OF WORKS ON BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).
——— *See* 'Brockville.'
'CLEVELAND' CYLINDERS, EQUIPMENT. *re* I. C. R. LOCOMOTIVES: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3641.
CLINTON POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup.. 5695 (ii).
CLOTHING, &c., MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 3771 (ii).
COAL FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, TENDERS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3483 (ii).
——— AND WOOD TENDERS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clarke*) 225 (i).
——— INQUIRY FOR RETURN (Mr. *Clarke*) 2879 (i).
COAL CONTRACTS, I.C.R., WITH U.S. : in Com. of Sup., 5398 (ii).
COBOURG PIER : in Com. of Sup., 3500 (ii).
COE HILL MINES AND APSLEY MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 2989, 3179 (ii).
COGHLIN, MR. B., CONTRACT FOR SUPPLIES : in Com. of Sup., 257 (i).
COINS, MUTILATED : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 66 (i).
COLCHESTER INDIAN AGENT, SALARY, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2758 (i).
——— RESERVE, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 2760 (i).
COLD STORAGE : in Com. of Sup., 3016, 4609 (ii).
——— FOR BAIT : in Com. of Sup., 315 (i).
——— *re* FRUIT INSPECTION BILL : in Com. of Sup., 5165 (ii).
——— MEMORANDUM *re* BAIT FREEZERS BY (Mr. *Fraser*) 315 (i).
——— ON STRS. : in Com. of Sup., 5165 (ii).
——— PAPERS LAID ON TABLE (Mr. *Fisher*) 3537 (ii).
——— WEST INDIA STRS. : Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 334 (i).
——— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.
COLERAINE INDIAN LANDS, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 3457 (ii).
COLL. OF REV., HARBOURS and RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 3535 (ii).
——— TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 3536 (ii).
COLLIN, ELZEAR, FISHERY GUARDIAN, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Martineau*) 5213 (ii).
COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 1228 (i), 3500 (ii).
COLPOY'S BAY : in Com. of Sup., 3504 (ii).

Columbia and Kootenay Ry. and Navigation Co.'s B. No. 56 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 1244 ; 2°*, 1431 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3220 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 55.)

COLUMBIA RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 3514.

Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 22 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 420 ; 2°*, 731 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3697 (ii). (1 *Edward VII., c.* 56.)

COMEAUVILLE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4398.
COMMERCIAL AGENTS, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 4753 (ii).
COMMISSION *re* ACCIDENT CLAIMS, I.C.R., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 3753 (ii).
——— *re* DAMAGES TO PROPERTY, I.C.R. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 504 (i).
COMMISSIONS TO CAN. OFFICERS, COR. *re* S. A. WAR, &c : Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5883 (ii).

COMMITTEES :

AGRICULTURE, ON M. TO MEET DURING SESSION OF HSE. : Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) 4938 (ii).
DEBATES, 1ST REP. OF COM. : M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 102 (i).
——— 2ND REP. OF COM. : Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 5711 (ii).
——— M. to add Name (Mr. *Monk*) 238 (i).
INTERNAL ECONOMY : Mess. from His Ex. (Mr. *Speaker*) 8 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLT., JOINT COM. : List presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 102 (i).
——— JOINT REP. : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 8 (i).
PRINTING, JOINT : List presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 102 (i).
——— 5TH REP.: Presented (Mr. *Parmelee*) 5093.
——— M. to conc., 5198 (ii)
——— 6TH REP. OF COM. : Presented (Mr. *Parmelee*) 5712 (ii).
PRIVATE BILLS : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to add Names, 1961 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, ORGANIZATION, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 196 (i).
——— 1ST REP. : Presented (Mr. *Fraser*) 197 (i).
——— MEETINGS : Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 607, 1798, 1962 (i).
——— DELAY IN MEETING : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1661, 1390 (i), 3274 (ii).
——— M. to ref. Papers *re* Yukon Liquor Permits (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1065 (i).
——— POSTPONED MEETINGS : Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 3175 (ii).
RAILWAY : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to substitute Name, 1961 (i).
SEL. STANDING : Com. to prepare List, 752 (i).
——— List presented, 102 (i).
——— MEETING CONCURRENTLY WITH SITTINGS OF HSE. : M. (Mr. *Britton*) 4938, 5198 (ii).
——— M. to substitute Name (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 197 (i).
——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to add Names, 2702 (i).

Commodities Packing or Sale B. No. 117 (Mr. *Bernier*) 1° m., 2456 (i) ; 2°, and in Com., 4743, 4878 ; 3°*, 4898 ; Sen. Amts., 5829 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 26.)

COMMODITIES BILL : in Com. on Amt. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4878, 4882 (ii).
——— in Com. on Binder Twine, 4884 (ii).
——— in Com. on Salt, 4894 (ii).
COMPENSATION ALLOWANCES, N. W. MOUNTED POLICE : in Com. of Sup., 3447 (ii).
CONSOLIDATION : *See* 'Statutes.'
CONSTABULARY FOR SOUTH AFRICA, PENSIONS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
——— COR. WITH IMP. GOVT. : Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4409 (ii).
——— RECRUITING IN N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2204.
——— UNIFORMS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*)1580 (i).
——— *See* 'S. A. War, &c.'
CONSTITUTION OF COURTS, APPEALS, YUKON, &c. Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2382 (i).

CONTINGENTS, S. A. WAR, DIFFERENCE IN PAY, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3404 (ii).
——— FIRST, ADDITIONAL PAY : in Com of Sup., 3397 (ii).
——— PAR. *re* AUSTRALIAN CONTINGENT : Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) 135 (i).
——— SECOND, GOVT. INSURANCE : in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).
——— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
CONTRACT LABOUR ON PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
——— *See* 'Kingston Locomotive Works,' &c.
CONTROVERTED ELECTION, NORTH BRUCE, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 323 (i).
——— Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 326 (i).
——— *See* 'House of Commons,' &c.
COOCH, MR., DUTIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 191 (i).
CORNWALL AND YORK, DUKE OF, *re* VISIT TO CANADA: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1001, 1069 (i).
——— *See* 'York, Duke of.'
CORNWALL CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 5635 (ii).
——— DISMISSAL OF LOCK TENDER : in Com. of Sup., 4261.
——— ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 4310 ; conc., 5794 (ii).
——— SUPERINTENDENT, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Pringle*) 1584 (i).
——— *See* 'Canals,' 'Ramsay,' &c.
CORONATION OATH, ADDRESS TO HIS MAJ.: M. (Mr. *Costigan*) 431 (i).
——— Amt. to Com. of Sup., 694, 783 ; Agreed to (Y. 125 ; N. 19) 805 (i).
Debate : (Mr. *Kendall*) 698 ; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 700, 782 ; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 707 ; (Mr. *Charlton*) 712; (Mr. *Wallace*) 717; (Mr. *Speaker*) ruling, 724, 783; (Mr. *Emmerson*) 729, 732, 797 ; (Mr. *Monk*) 752; (Mr. *Haggart*) 737; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 739; (Mr. *Fielding*) 742 ; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 745; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 750 ; (Mr. *Blain*) 757 ; (Mr. *Pringle*) 760 ; (Mr. *Maclean*) 764 ; (Mr. *Flint*) 766 ; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 767 ; (Mr. *Northrup*) 770; (Mr. *Sproule*) 775 ; (Mr. *Lennox*) 784 ; (Mr. *Wade*) 788, 797 ; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 788 ; (Mr. *Fowler*) 792 ; (Mr. *Osler*) 794 ; (Mr. *Oliver*) 794 ; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 796 ; (Mr. *Douglas*) 798 ; (Mr. *Clarke*) 800 (i).
——— MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 5970.
CORRECTION OF SPEECH IN HANSARD *re* S. A. WAR (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1797 (i).
CÔTE ST. PAUL BRIDGE, LACHINE CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 4388 (ii).
——— COST OF CONSTRUCTION : M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 2586 (ii).
——— MACADAMIZING ROAD : in Com. of Sup., 5624.
——— *See* 'Lachine,' 'Canals,' &c.
CÔTÉ, MR., CIRCULAR *re* CENSUS : in Com. of Sup., 3874-3976 (ii).
——— *See* 'Census,' 'Agriculture,' &c.
COTTAGE HOSPITALS IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 5455 (ii).
COUNTRY POSTMASTERS: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).
COUTURE, J. A., VET. SURGEON, &c., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4193 (ii).
COWAN'S BRIDGE, GRANT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Vrooman*) 1748 (i).
CRAIG, MR. JOHN, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 91 (i).
CREAMERIES, BONUSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3051.
——— SALE OF PRODUCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5175.
Crédit Foncier du Bas-Canada B. 99 (Mr. *Geoffrion*): M. to refund Fees, 5471 (ii).
——— *See* 'Le Crédit,' &c.
Criminal Code Act Amt. B. No. 39 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1° m., 693 (i).
——— **B. No. 76** (Mr. *German*) 1° m., 1574 (i).
——— **B. No. 132** (Mr. *Bruncau*) 1° m., 4323 (ii).
——— **B. No. 148** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 5577 ; 2°, and in Com., 5801 ; 3°*, 5801 (ii). (*1 Edward VII, c.* 42.)
Crown. *See* 'Demise.'
CROW'S NEST LINE. COAL LANDS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4644 (ii).
Crow's Nest Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 57 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 1244 ; 2°*, 1451 (i) ; in Com., 3418 ; Order for 3°, 3908 ; wthdn., 5711 (ii).
CULBUTE CANAL, DAMAGES BY FLOODS : in Com. of Sup., 4383 (ii).
CULLING TIMBER. *See* 'Staple.'
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. No. 156 (Mr. *Fielding*). Res. prop., 5802 ; 1°* of B., 5809 ; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5825 (ii). (*1 Edward VII, c.* 22).
CUSTOMS :
AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS EXPORTED, REBATE, &c.: M. for ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 133.
BEET ROOT SUGAR MACHINERY : in Com. on Ways and Means, 5802 (ii).
BUTTER, CHEESE, &c., EXPORTS, QUANTITY : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1256 (i).
——— IMPORTED INTO UNITED KINGDOM : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1255 (i).
CATTLE &c., EXPORTS TO G. B., NUMBER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1254 (i).
——— CANADIAN CATTLE IMPORTED, IMP. SCHEDULING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1004 (i).
CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 185 (i).
——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 190 (i), 5466 (ii).
——— CONTINGENCIES, &c., B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3848 (ii).
——— CONTINGENCIES, &c., N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 3847 (ii).
——— CONTINGENCIES, &c., ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 3847 (ii).
——— INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3848 (ii).
——— SALARIES AT PORTS : in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
——— STATISTICAL STAFF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3848, 4627 (ii).
GERMAN DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 85 (i).
GERMANY, EXPORTS, &c., FROM 1897 TO 1900 : Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 1797 (i).
——— *See* 'Preferential,' 'Tariff.' &c.
GIBSON, JAS., CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4627 (ii).
HODGE, MR. D., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Tudor*) 1794 (i).
HOGS, LARD, &c. IMPORTED FROM U. S.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1255 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

IMPORTS FROM U. S., DUTIABLE, &C. DURING 1901 : Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 4020 (ii).

LUMBER DUTIES ON IMPORTS INTO CAN.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1267 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 218 (i).

MACINNIS, JOHN, SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2703 (i).

MONTREAL WATCH CASE CO.: in Com. of Sup., 268 (i).

MUTTON IMPORTED, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 335.

NELSON & SONS, REFUND TO : in Com. of Sup., 4726, 5468 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL CLAUSES *re* GERMAN GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 50[illegible] (i).

——— *See* 'Germany.'

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, CERTIFICATE OF PRODUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1252 (i).

——— DIRECT IMPORTATION : prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 2608 (i).

——— GOODS OF FOREIGN ORIGIN, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1002 (i).

——— PERCENTAGE VALUE, &C., FORM OF DECLARATION, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Clarke*) 1267 (i).

PREVENTIVE SERVICE, CUSTOMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3848, 3850 (ii).

P. E. I. EXPORTS TO G. B., COLD STORAGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1438 (i).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY, CUSTOMS DEPT., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).

RICE IMPORTS FOR 1900 FROM G. B.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 2000 (i).

SAW LOGS DUTY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 218, 223 (i).

SAW LOGS EXPORTED : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 64 (i).

SECRET SERVICE, PAYMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).

STATISTICAL BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 3818, 4627 (ii).

SUGAR MACHINERY. *See* 'Beet Root.'

TARIFF ACT AMT. *re* GERMAN GOODS : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 333 (i).

TARIFF. *See* 'Preferential,' 'Germany,' &c.

TOBACCO DUTIES, AMOUNT COLLECTED : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 84 (i).

TOMATOES IMPORTED, QUANTITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 1003 (i).

TROUT EXPORTED, LEGISLATIVE MEASURES *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2401 (i).

WABASH LOCOMOTIVES, DUTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 64 (i).

WEST BAY, C. B., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2703 (i).

YUKON CUSTOMS EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).

CYPRESS HILLS SURVEYS, SUBDIVISIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1387 (i).

DAGGETT, MR. M. G., ANTICOSTI ISLAND : Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1591 (i).

DAIRYING INTERESTS : in Com. of Sup., 2861, 3055 (i).

DALHOUSIE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 5706 (ii).

DAMAGES TO PROPERTIES, I.C.R., FRENCH-SPEAKING COMMISSIONER : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1004 (i).

——— *See* 'I.C.R.'

DANSEREAU, MR. LIONEL, APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 111 (i).

DAWSON CITY, ADDRESS TO HIS EX.: M. for Copy* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 80 (i).

——— GOV. GEN.'S VISIT, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1260 (i).

DAWSON CITY, PUBLIC BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 5672 (ii).

——— COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1586 (i).

——— M. for Papers, &c. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 80 (i).

——— THEATRE AND GAMBLING HOUSES, SUPPRESSION, &C.: Papers laid on Table (Mr. *Sifton*) 1580.

——— *See* 'Yukon.'

DEBATES, OFFICIAL, PUBLISHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 195 (i).

——— M. for Sel. Com. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 81 (i).

——— 1ST REP.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 102 (i).

——— 2ND REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 5711 (ii).

——— FRENCH TRANSLATION, DELAY IN PRINTING : Ques. (Mr. *Ethier*) 1994 (i).

——— M. to add Name (Mr. *Monk*) 238 (i).

——— TRANSLATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Ethier*) 1882.

DEBATES IN THE HOUSE. *See* 'Speeches of Members.'

Debenture and Securities Corporation incorp. B. No. 110 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 2347 ; 2°*, 2923 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3909 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 94.)

DEER ISLAND TEL. LINE : in Com. of Sup., 3529 (ii).

DEFICITS, &C., POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 435 (i).

DEMARCATION *re* DOM. LANDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup. 4928 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply, &c.'

Demise of the Crown B. No. 119 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 2567 (i) ; 2° m., 3086 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3086 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 37.)

——— *See* 'Judges of Dom., &c.'

DEPOT HARBOUR BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 5731 (ii).

——— CONSTRUCTION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *McCormick*) 1251 (i).

——— QUANTITY OF GRAIN SHIPPED : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2397 (i).

——— *See* 'I.C.R.' &c.

DESERONTO POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 2547 (i).

DES JOACHIMS BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 3523 (ii).

DESTITUTE HALF-BREEDS, RELIEF BY N.W.M.P.: in Com. of Sup., 5311 (ii).

——— *See* 'Interior. Half-breeds,' &c.

DEVLIN, MR. C. R., LETTERS CRITICISING MEMBERS : Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5611 (ii).

DINNER TO OPPOSITION LEADER : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. to adjn., 4230 (ii).

——— *See* 'Opposition,' &c.

DISMISSALS, P.E.I. RY., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4225.

DISTRESSED CANADIAN, RELIEF, &C.: conc., 5794 (ii).

——— *See* 'Canadians.'

DIVISIONS :

ALIEN LABOUR RESTRICTION ACT AMT. B. 47 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3°, amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) *re* Violation of Law ; neg. (Y. 37 ; N. 66) 5096 (ii).

DIVISIONS—*Con.*

BEET ROOT SUGAR BOUNTY: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) amt. agreed to (Y. 59; N. 50) 368 (i).

BINDER TWINE MANUFACTURE: amt. (Mr. *Oliver*) agreed to (Y. 155; N. 0) 604 (i).

——— M. (Mr. *Fielding*) agreed to (Y. 117; N. 65) 604 (i).

BUDGET, THE: amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) neg. (Y. 64; N. 118) 2343 (i).

CANADA NATIONAL RY. AND TRANSPORT CO.'S B. 13 (Mr. *Cowan*) amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) neg. (Y. 45; N. 62) 2748 (i).

C. P. RY. LANDS, TAXES, &C., REF. TO JUDICIAL COURTS: amt. (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) neg. (Y. 12; N. 99) 5432 (ii).

——— REF. TO SUPREME COURT: amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) neg. (Y. 7; N. 109) 2546 (i).

——— LAND GRANTS TAXATION B. 17 (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*): M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 m h. agreed to (Y. 104; N. 8) 1166 (i).

CORONATION OATH, ADDRESS TO HIS MAJ.: amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) agreed to (Y. 125; N. 19) 805.

FINANCIAL SITUATION, REVIEW, &C.: amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) neg. (Y. 51; N. 100) 5882.

GUELPH JUNCTION RY. CO.'S B. 23 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 2385; 3° m., 2392; agreed to (Y. 76; N. 41) 2396 (i).

MAN. RYS. LEASE B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) amt. (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) neg. (Y. 6; N. 80) 4534 (ii).

——— B. 103 (Mr. *McIsaac*) amt. (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) neg. (Y. 5; N. 107) 5090 (ii).

NIPISSING ELECTION, VALIDITY OF WRIT, &C.: amt. (Mr. *Northrup*) to Com. of Sup.; neg. (Y. 51; N. 94) 3722 (ii).

SEYBOLD BLOCK: amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 4758; neg. (Y. 48; N. 93) 4770 (ii).

S. A. WAR, CANADIAN INTERVENTION, &C.: amt. to Com. of Sup.; neg. (Y. 3; N. 144) 1366 (i).

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURT, N.B., APPNMT. OF JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 5778 (ii).

DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS, APPLICATION TO PARLT., &C.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Britton*) 1412 (i).

Divorce, McDonald, James Ward, Relief B. No. 130 (Mr. *Lennox*) 1°*, 4406; 2°*, 5093; in Com., and 3°*, 5546 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 117.)

Middleton, Lilias, Relief B. No. 128 (Mr. *Rosamond*) 1°*, 4406; 2°*, 5093; in Com., and 3°, 5545 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 118.)

DOCKS, GOVT. MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4801, 5701 (ii).

DOM. BUILDINGS, HEATING, LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3130, 4398 (ii).

——— *See* 'Ottawa,' &c., 'Pub. Works.'

Dom. Burglary Guarantee Co.'s B. No. 90 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 1881; 2°*, 2201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3455 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 95.)

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 18 (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) 1° m., 326; Order for 2°, 1792 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 2 (Mr. *Ingram*) 1° m., 20; 2° m., 211; M. for Com., 1051 (i).

——— **B. No. 9** (Mr. *Henderson*) 1° m., 198; 2° m., 1051; Order for Com., 1791 (i).

——— **B. No. 15** (Mr. *Clancy*) 1° m., 323; 2° m., 1061 (i).

Dom. Elections B. No. 64 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 1391; 2°*, 2809; in Com., 2809 (i), 4022, 4197, 4323; 3° m. 4341 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 16.)

——— **B. No. 96** (Mr. *Northrup*) 1° m., 2055 (i).

——— **B. No. 113** (Mr. *Wright*) 1° m., 2348 (i).

DOM. ELECTION OFFICIALS, NON-PAYMENT OF: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 2351, 2356 (i).

DOM. AND NOVA SCOTIA ARBITRATION, &C.: Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3753 (ii).

——— *See* 'Eastern Extension.'

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 29 (Mr. *Sifton*, 1° m., 421; 2°*, 2813; in Com., 2813; 3°*, 2820 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 20.)

——— **B. No. 30** (Mr. *Charlton*) 1° m., 424 (i).

DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 1371, 2670, 2689-2698 (i).

DOM. LANDS ACT, IRREGULARITIES, YUKON, &C.: M. for Reps., &c.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 133.

——— REDUCTION OF INTEREST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 66 (i).

——— EXTRA CLERKS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4921, 5450 (ii).

——— PRE-EMPTIONS, GRAZING LEASES, &C.: Ret. laid on Table, 3454 (ii).

——— SOUTH-EASTERN MAN. SURVEY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 82 (i).

——— SURVEYS, &C., in Com. of Sup., 4925, 5450 (ii).

——— IN MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).

DOM. NOTES, PRINTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup. 173 (i).

——— REDEMPTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4344 (ii).

DOM. POLICE, CANAL PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4636 (ii).

DOM. RIFLE ASSOCIATION, GRANTS TO, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5313 (ii).

DOM. STEEL WORKS. *See* 'Alien Labour.'

DONEGAL POST OFFICE, CLOSING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 459 (i).

DORCHESTER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (ii).

——— PENITENTIARY, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 2650 (i).

——— *See* 'Justice.'

DOUKHOBORS, DATE OF ARRIVAL, BONUS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1998 (i).

——— PET. TO GOVT. *re* CANADIAN TYRANNY: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1748 (i).

——— SCHOOL GRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1367 (i).

Drainage Across Ry. Lands. B. No. 16 (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*), 1° m., 324; 2° m., 1062 (i).

DRAINAGE ACROSS RAILWAYS B. 77 (Mr. *Stephens*) 1° m., 1576 (i).

——— *See* 'Ry. Act B 77.'

DRAW-BARS, I.C.R., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4156 (ii).

DRAYTON POSTMISTRESS, DATE OF APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 1439 (i).

DREDGES FOR ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).

DREDGING, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4402 (ii).

——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 3522 (ii).

——— NEW PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 3516, 5758 (ii).

DREDGING, ONTARIO AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 3516, 4400 (ii).
——— PLANT, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 3521 (ii).
——— VESSELS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).
DROUIN, MR. A., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 181 (i).
DRUMMONDVILLE, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 1243 (i).
——— ROAD DIVERSION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5216 (ii).
DUNDAS RIFLE ASSOCIATION, ANNUAL GRANT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 1440 (i).
DUNNVILLE DAM: in Com. of Sup., 5626 (ii).
DURHAM, WEST, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGMENT OF COURT OF APPEAL: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 5802 (ii).
——— ELECTION OF MR. THORNTON: Remarks in Com. on Bill 64 (Mr. *Maclean*) 4022 (ii).

EASTER ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2408 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 2202 (i).
——— *See* 'Adjournments,' &c.
Eastern Can. Savings and Loan Co.'s B. No. 19 (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1°*, 420; 2°*, 731; in Com., 2924; 3°*, 2924. (1 *Edward VII*, c. 96.)
EASTERN EXTENSION RAILWAY, N.B., AWARD, &c., in Com. of Sup., 5941 (ii).
——— N.B., CHARGED TO CAPITAL ACCOUNT: Ques. Mr. *Fowler*) 2162 (i).
——— N.S., I.C.R., ARBITRATORS' AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 5892 (ii).
——— N.S., ARBITRATION, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 203 (i).
——— INQUIRY FOR O. C.: (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1961 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3753 (ii).
EAST QUEEN'S, P.E.I., ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 136 (i).
——— REP. OF JUDGES: M. (Sir *Louis Davies*) 693 (i).
——— *See* 'P.E.I.,' &c.
EAST RIVER SHEET HARBOUR WHARF: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 224 (i).
E. B. Eddy Co.'s B. No. 70 (Mr. *Champagne*) 1°*, 1496; 2°*, 1790 (i); in Com., 3411; 3°*, 3418 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 97).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 48 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 1167; 2°*, 1431; in Com., and 3°*, 1914 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 57.)
EDUCATION, &c., YUKON INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 5449 (ii).
——— *See* 'Indians,' &c.
EDWARDSBURG POST OFFICE, PET., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 485 (i).
Edwards Co. B. *See* 'W. C. Edwards.'
EEL RIVER STATION, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 5226 (ii).
Elections in N.W.T. B. *See* 'North-west Ter.'
Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 5094; 2°, and in Com., 5365; 3°*, 5373 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 29.)
ELECTRIC LIGHTING, OTTAWA BUILDINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3152 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.
ELKHORN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, SALE OF PRINTING PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 2766 (i), 5321 (ii).
EMPLOYEES IN GOVT. SERVICE, CLASSIFICATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Kendall*) 5969 (ii).
——— I.C.R., NUMBER FROM 1892 TO 1900: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1582 (i).
ENGINEERS, DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3153.
ENGINE HOUSES, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2642 (i).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' 'Railways,' &c.
ENTRANCE ISLAND, B.C., SUPERANNUATION OF ROBT. GRAY: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Prior*) 1267 (i).
——— *See* 'Gray, R.'
ENUMERATORS, &c., N.W. TERS.: Remarks Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. on N.W.T. Representation B., 5829 (ii).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5953 (ii).
ESQUIMALT DEFENCES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3785, 5313 (ii).
ESTIMATES, THE: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 50 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 49 (i).
——— SUPPL. (1901): Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 136, 2628 (i), 5094 (ii).
——— SUPPL. (1902): Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 4898.
——— PROCEDURE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2752 (i).
EXCHEQUER COURT CASES FROM 1896–1900: Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 3178; conc., 5792 (ii).
——— *See* 'Justice,' &c.
EXCISE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3863 (ii).
——— *See* 'Inland Revenue,' &c.
EXHAUST FANS ON OCEAN STEAMERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 70, 334, 505 (i).
——— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.
EXPENDITURE, INDIANS, N.B., MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 2761 (i).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 2839 (i).
——— BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).
——— BULLETINS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2858 (i), 4591 (ii).
——— FRUIT STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4596 (ii).
——— REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 892 (i).
——— PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION, &c. (Ques.) Mr. *Bruneau*) 2705 (i).
——— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.
EXPORTS, I.C.R., &c. FROM ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 5218 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.
EXPORTS TO G.B. FROM P.E.I., COLD STORAGE, &c.: (Ques.) (Mr. *Hackett*) 1438 (i),
——— *See* 'P.E.I.,' &c.
EXTRA SALARIES, S.A. WAR: in Com. of Sup., 4347.
FABRE, HECTOR, FURNISHING OF APARTMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 953, 993 (i).
——— *See* 'Paris Agency,' &c.

FACILITIES, INCREASED, I.C.R., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4151, 4379 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
FAIR WAGE CLAUSE. *See* 'Govt. Contracts,' 'St. Andrews,' 'N.S., Sydney Engine House,' 'Kingston Locomotive Works,' 'Labour Clause,' &c.
FARM BULLETINS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION, &c.: in Com. of Supply, 2858 (i).
——— *See* 'Experimental,' &c.
FARRAN'S POINT, ENLARGEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4311 (ii).
FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3497.
FENIAN RAID PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4639 (ii).
FENWICK, J. A.: *See* 'Millstream.'

FINANCE:

ARBITRATION, DOMINION AND PROVINCIAL: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
ASSAY OFFICE, EQUIPMENT, &c., B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (ii).
AUD. GEN.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 184 (i), 5182 (ii).
BANKING ACT, AMT. *re* INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 814 (i).
——— AMT. *re* SAVINGS BANKS: Ques. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 814 (i).
BANK NOTE CO., LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5457 (ii).
BEET-ROOT SUGAR BOUNTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 337; neg. (Y. 59, N. 50) 367 (i).
B.C. CLAIMS AGAINST DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3459 (ii).
——— INCREASED SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4078 (ii).
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 173 (i), 4344 (ii).
CHARTERED CORPORATIONS IN CAN.: M. for Lists (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 88, 94 (i).
CHIEF CLERK, FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 5184 (ii).
COINS, MUTILATED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 66.
DOM. NOTES, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 173 (i).
——— REDEMPTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4344.
DOM. AND NOVA SCOTIA ARBITRATION, &c.: Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3753 (ii).
EASTERN EXTENSION RY., N.B., AWARD, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5941 (ii).
——— N.S., AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 5892 (ii).
——— *See* 'Dom. & N.S.', 'N.S. claims.'
FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4345, 5184 (ii).
FINANCE AND TREASURY BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 184 (i); Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) conc., 5788.
FINANCIAL SITUATION, REVIEW, &c.: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5835; neg. (Y. 51; N. 100) 5882 (ii).
HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 189 (i).
HUDSON, REID AND KEARNS, MESSRS., SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5182 (ii).
INSURANCE, SUPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 323 (i).
IRON ORE, BOUNTY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1253 (i).
IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES PAID BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 1168 (i).
LEATHER COMBINE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4629.
MENNONITES, LOAN TO.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 67.
METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE CO., LAPSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1262 (i).
MINES, B.C., BUREAU OF, RES. RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2406 (i).
MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, ALLOWANCES, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3178, 3270 (ii).
MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST BONDS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 203 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 545, 2571 (i).

FINANCE—*Con.*

NOVA SCOTIA, CLAIMS AGAINST FEDERAL GOVT., PAPERS *re*: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1790 (i).
——— M. to print Papers (Mr. *Haggart*) 2610 (i).
RY. CORPORATIONS, DOM. CHARTERS: M. for List* (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 132 (i).
ROYAL MINT ESTABLISHMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4535 (ii).
——— LOCATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4754 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 65 (i).
——— *See* general heading.
RYAN, MR. J. B., SUPERANNUATION, INTEREST ON AMOUNT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5312 (ii).
VILLE MARIE BANK, RELIEF TO DEPOSITORS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 332 (i).

FINANCIAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL STATUS, N.W.TER., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Scott*) 2608 (i).
FINANCIAL SITUATION, REVIEW, &c.: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup,, 5835; neg. (Y. 51; N. 100) 5882 (ii).

FISHERIES:

ANDERSON, W. P., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii).
ANTICOSTI, LICENSE FOR LOBSTER PACKING, AGENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1591 (i).
BAIT FOR DEEP SEA FISHERMEN: in Com. of Sup., 315 (i).
BOUNTIES IN TIGNISH COUNTY, PAYMENTS, &c.: M. for copies of Cor (Mr. *Hackett*) 1424 (i).
——— QUEEN'S CO., P.E.I., DISTRIBUTION OF CHEQUES: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2777 (i).
B.C., PROVINCIAL JURISDICTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3459 (ii).
CAN. FISHERY EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 314 (i).
COGHLIN, MR. B., CONTRACTS FOR SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 257 (i).
COLLIN, ELZEAR, FISHERY GUARDIAN, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martineau*) 5213 (ii).
DAGGETT, MR. M.G.: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1591 (i).
FISHERIES, DEPTL. VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 4345.
——— ACCOUNTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4587.
FRASER, B. H., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5183 (ii).
GASPÉ HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 4588 (ii).
GEORGIAN BAY FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 311 (i), 4590 (ii).
HATCHERIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 310 (i).
——— B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 295, 312 (i), 4588.
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 5197 (ii).
HURLEY, MR. J. M., FISHERY INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 296 (i).
INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 294 (i).
KING'S COUNTY FISHERY WARDEN, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 335 (i).
LEGAL EXPENSES *re* SEALING VESSELS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5197 (ii).
LICENSES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 305 (i).
LICENSES, JURISDICTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 297 (i).
——— DECISION OF PRIVY COUNCIL: in Com. of Sup., 304 (i).
LOBSTER INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 268.
——— PACKING, LICENSES GRANTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 1067 (i).
——— REGULATIONS, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2571 (i).
——— *See* 'Daggett, Mr.'
MEALEY, MR. J. W., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 809 (i).
MYERS, MR. GEO., FISHERY WARDEN, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 335 (i).
OVERSEERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4587 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 294, 307.

FISHERIES—*Con.*

OYSTER CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 314 (i).
PROTECTION SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 290 (i).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 306 (i).
QUEEN'S CO., P.E.I., FISHING BOUNTIES, DISTRIBUTION OF CHEQUES: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2777 (i).
QUODDY RIVER OVERSEER: in Com. of Sup., 4588 (ii).
SALMON RIVER SHED: in Com. of Sup., 3460 (ii).
SHAD AND EAST DOVER FISHING ASSOCIATION, ALLEGED INTERFERENCE, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 816 (i).
WEST HALIFAX SHORE FISHERY, RULES, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 1267 (i).
WHITEFISH HATCHERY IN N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 5197 (ii).

FOG ALARMS, INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 294.
——— MEMORIALS FROM BOARD OF TRADE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 294 (i).
——— *See* 'Marine,' &c.

FOREIGN AGENCIES, IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 4869 (ii).

Foresters, Subsidiary High Court B. No. 120 (Mr. *Heyd*) M. to receive Pet., 2382, 2701; 1°* of B., 2702 (i); 2° m., 3220; in Com., 4015; 3° m., 4360; ref. back to Com., 4371; in Com. and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 101.)

Foresters Supreme Court, Change of Title B. No. 6 (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1°, 198; 2°*, 327; in Com. and 3°*, 1244 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 100.)

FOREST INSPECTORS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2689 (i).
——— RANGERS, DUTIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1264 (i).
——— *See* 'Interior,' &c.

FORESTRY PROTECTION IN P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1439 (i).

Fort Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 54 (Mr. *Douglas*) 1°*, 1167; 2°*, 1431; in Com. and 3°*, 2200 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 58.)

——— **B. No. 149** (Mr. *Douglas*) 1°, 2°, 5713; M. for Com., 5713; in Com. and 3°*, 5892 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 59.)

FOSTER, MR. A., SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1795 (i).

FOUND'S MILL TO EMERALD JUNCTION MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 5211 (ii).
——— *See* 'P.E.I.'

FOX BAY SETTLERS. *See* 'Anticosti,' &c.

Franchise Act (1898) Amt. B. No. 63 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 1391; 2°*, 2782; in Com., 2782 (i), 4199; 3°*, 4341 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 15.)

FRANCHISE ACT, VOTERS' LISTS, PRINTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5310 (ii).

'FRANK PEREW,' TUG, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5624 (ii).

FRASER, B. H., SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5183.

FRASER RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3514 (ii).

FREDERICTON BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 3437 (ii).

FREEPORT POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).

FREE TRANSPORTATION TO MEMBERS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 528; Order called for resuming adjnd Deb., 1793 (i).

Freight and Passenger Rates on Rys. Regulation B. No. 28 (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 1° m., 420 (i).

FREIGHT RATES FOR GOVT. EMPLOYEES ON GOVT. RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1586 (i).

French SS. Subsidy. *See* 'Ocean.'

Fruit Inspection, Marking for Sale B. No. 32 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1° m., 502; 2°*, and in Com., 2360, 2408; ref. back to Com., 2611; 3° m., 2611, 2627; 3°*, 2706 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 27.)

Fruit Inspection. *See* 'Commodities.'

FUMIGATING STATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2865 (i); 4606 (ii).

FURNITURE, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3121 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.

GAGNÉ, MR. JUSTICE, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 4646 (ii).

GALLANT, MR. B., RETURNING OFFICER, WEST PRINCE, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1006 (i).
——— MR. F., TRAVELLING FEES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1404 (i).

GALOPS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4311 (ii).
——— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 5619 (ii).
——— *See* 'Canals.'

GAMBLING HOUSES, YUKON, &C., LETTER *re*: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1251 (i).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.

Game Preservation in Unorganized Ter. Act (1894) Amt. B. No. 46 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 1002; 2°*, 2820; in Com., 2820; 3°*, 2821 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 21.)

GANANOQUE LETTER BOXES, CONTRACT *re* COLLECTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2704 (i).

GAS AND ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION INSTRUMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 5778 (ii).

Gas Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 139 (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 5094; 2°, and in Com. 5359; 3°*, 5360 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 28.)

GAS INSPECTION, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4936 (ii).

GASPÉ HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 4588 (ii).

GENERAL EXPENSES, I.C.R., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4387 (ii).

GENERAL VOTE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5650 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

GENERAL OFFICER COMMANDING, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 337 (i).
——— *See* 'Hutton,' 'Militia, &c.'

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 188 (i), 5456 (ii).
——— COMPILATION OF MAPS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5315 (ii).
——— EXPLORATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3769 (ii).
——— EXPLORATIONS FOR DR. MOND, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5447 (ii).
——— REPORTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5315 (ii).
——— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 2778 (i).
——— SUPPLIED TO BOOK STORES: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 5447 (ii).

GEORGIAN BAY, BIOLOGICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5197 (ii).
——— FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 311 (i), 4590 (ii).
——— LIGHTHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4586 (ii).
GERMAN DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 85 (i).
——— *See* 'Customs,' &c.
GERMANY, EXPORTS, &c., FROM 1897 TO 1900: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 1797 (i).
GIBSON, JAS., CLAIMS, &c. *re* CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 4627 (ii).
GILBERT DREDGING CO., CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5635-5649, 5665; conc., 5800 (ii).
——— *See* 'Canals,' &c.
GLASGOW EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 4601 (ii).
GODERICH HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3504 (ii).
GONDOLA POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (ii).
GOODLANDS, MAN., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2776 (i).
GORDON POINT, P.E.I., PET. FOR PIER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2163 (i).
——— *See* 'P.E.I.'
GOVT. BUILDINGS IN OTTAWA, LEASES, CONTRACTS, &c.: M. (Mr. *Birkett*) for Copies, 2586 (i).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works.'
GOVT. BUSINESS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) for Morning Sittings, 4646 (ii).
——— PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1497 (i).
——— ON WEDNESDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2407 (i).
——— ON THURSDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 893 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 210, 1167 (i); 4902 (ii).
——— *See* 'Business.'
——— RY. SUBSIDIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4902 (ii).
GOVT. CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 3784, 5892 (ii).
GOVT. CONTRACTS AND WORKMEN'S CLAIMS UNSETTLED: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 3180.
——— *See* 'Kingston Locomotive Works,' &c.
GOVT. EMPLOYEES, FREIGHT RATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1586 (i).
GOV. GEN.'S CAR, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5632 (ii).
——— FOOT GUARDS, ACCOUTREMENTS, AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1587 (i).
——— SEC.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 177 (i); 4345.
GOVT. OF N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).
GOVT. RAILWAYS, EXPENDITURE FROM 1900 TO 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 2702 (i).
——— *See* 'I. C. R., &c.
GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 240 (i), 4584 (ii).
——— B.C., CONTRACTS, SPECIFICATIONS, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Prior*) 510, 2586 (i).
GRADES, &c., I.C.R., FROM MONTREAL TO HALIFAX, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1588 (i).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.', &c.
GRAIN CARGO RECEIVED AT MONTREAL, SIZE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 201 (i).
GRAIN COMMISSIONER: in Com. of Sup., 4937 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 327 (i).
GRAIN ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX, COST OF CONSTRUCTION, CAPACITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 1590 (i).
——— *See* 'Halifax,' &c.
GRAIN ELEVATOR, ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 89 (i).
——— *See* 'St. John,' &c.
GRAIN EXPORTATION, REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1798 (i).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. *Bernier*). *See* 'Inspection, General.'
GRAIN INSPECTION AT MONTREAL, APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 327 (i).
GRAIN RECEIVED AT CAN. PORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 66 (i).
GRAIN STANDARDS, INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3865 (ii).
GRAIN TRANSPORTATION FOR 1900: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 81 (i).
GRAIN TRANSPORTATION THROUGH CANADIAN CHANNELS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1007 (i).
Debate: (Mr. *Blair*) 1016; (Mr. *Dobell*) 1021, 1032; (Mr. *German*) 1024, 1045; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1036; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 1038; (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1041; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1044, 1098; (Mr. *Maclean*) 1071; (Mr. *Speaker*, Dep.) 1077; (Mr. *Kemp*) 1088; (Mr. *Blair*) 1095; (Mr. *Broder*) 1100; (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria) 1109; (Mr. *Bennett*) 1112 (i).
GRAND BEND, LAKE HURON, IMPROVEMENTS, &c., REPS., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1406 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 335 (i).
Grand Falls Water Power and Boom Co.'s B. No. 89 (Mr. *Costigan*) 1°*, 1881; 2°*, 2397 (i); Order for Com., 3454, 5270; in Com., and 3°*. 5270 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 99.)
GRAND FALLS POWER AND BOOM CO.'S PETITION: Presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 1660, 1662 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Costigan*) 3454 (ii).
GRANDIGUE FERRY, N.S., AND ARICHAT RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5561 (ii).
G.T.R. Co. of Can. B. No. 7 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 198; 2°*, 327; in Com., 1048; 3°*, 1050 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 60.)
——— **No. 8** (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 198; 2°*, 327; in Com., 1431; 3°*, 1431 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 61.)
G.T.R. AND MAGANETAWAN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5570 (ii).
——— AND MONTREAL, SHIPPING PORT: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 92 (i).
——— PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 108 (i).
——— RENTAL FROM I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4321 (ii).

GRAPES IN COLD STORAGE FOR EXPORT, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5179 (ii).
——— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.
GRATUITIES, COMPENSATIONS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4353 (ii).
GRATUITY TO MRS. D. L. CAVAN : in Com. of Sup., 4916 (ii).
G.B. AND P.E.I. SS. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 4787, 5778 (ii).
GREAT LAKES, WATER LEVEL : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 94 (i).
Great Northern Ry. of Can. B. No. 135 (Mr. *McCarthy*) : M. to receive Pet., 4406, 4534 ; 1°*, 4535 : 2°*, 5093 ; in Com., and 3°*, 5546 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, *c.* 62.)
Great Northern Transit Co. *See* 'Hudson Bay.'
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 36 (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 1°*, 693 ; 2°*, 1050 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1914 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, *c.* 63.)
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. LANDS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 809 (i).
GREEN ISLET, B.C., ERECTION OF LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2407 (i).
——— *See* 'Marine,' &c.
GREENVALE POSTMASTER, SALARY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, *Pictou*) 3458 (ii).
GREY, ROBT., LIGHT-KEEPER, RETIRING ALLOWANCE : in Com. of Sup. 278 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Prior*) 1267 (i).
GRIFFITH & Co., SALES OF N.W.T. CREAMERIES PRODUCE : Par in Nelson *Tribune*, 5175 (ii).
——— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.
GRIST AND SAW MILLS FOR INDIANS, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 2771 (i)
GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION : in Com. of Sup., 4391, 5689 (ii).
——— *See* 'Agriculture.'
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 23 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 420 ; 2°*, 731 ; in Com., 1914, 1993, 2385 ; on M. for 3°, 2392 ; agreed to (Y. 76 ; N. 41) 2396 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, *c.* 64.)

HACKETT,' DREDGE, NAMES OF OWNERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) 204 (i).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4929, 5453 (ii).
——— DESTITUTE, RELIEF BY N.W.M.P. : in Com. of Sup., 5311 (ii).
HALIFAX BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 1240 (i).
——— AND CANSO SS. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5776 (ii).
——— DREDGING AT I.C.R. TERMINUS : in Com. of Sup., 4134 (ii).
——— DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 5687 (ii).
——— ELEVATOR, COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 1590 (i).
——— ELEVATOR, I.C.R., EMPLOYEES, NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1585 (i).
——— *See* 'Grain, I.C.R., &c.
HALIFAX, HARBOUR LIGHTSHIP, MEMORIAL OF BOARD OF TRADE : in Com. of Sup 280 (i).
——— AND MANCHESTER SS. CONTRACT, PROTEST FROM HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE : Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 1501 (i).
——— NEWFOUNDLAND AND LIVERPOOL SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup. 4772 (ii).
——— PROVISIONAL GARRISON : in Com. of Sup., 5314 (ii).
——— RY. ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 2706 (i), 5216 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.
——— AND WEST INDIES SS. SUBVENTION : in Com., of Sup., 4783 (ii).
HAMILTON FIELD BATTERY, RETIREMENT OF COL. VAN WAGNER : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria) 1267 (i).
——— *See* 'Van Wagner,' &c.
HAMILTON SUB-POST OFFICE, &c. : M. for copies of Pets.,* (Mr. *Barker*) 1405 (i).
'HANDBOOK OF CANADA,' PRINTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke* 814 (i).
HANLON, B. J., SALARY, INCREASE : in Com. of Sup., 5458 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i) ; 4792 (ii).
——— B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 3514 (ii).
——— MAN., GENERAL REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 3513, 4399 (ii).
——— MAR. PROVS. : in Com. of Sup., 3496 (ii).
——— N.B., REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3473, 3496, 4399, 5705 (ii).
——— N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 3153, 4398, 5701 (ii).
——— ONT. : in Com. of Sup., 3500, 4399 (ii).
——— P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 3460, 5705 (ii).
——— QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 3497, 4399, 5707 (ii).
——— YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 5764 (ii).
——— *See* 'Public Works, &c.'
HARWOOD WHARF, RICE LAKE : in Com. of Sup., 5757 (ii).
HASTINGS, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, NOTIFICATION OF VACANCY : Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 4644 (ii).
——— ELECTORAL DISTRICT, RESIGNATION OF MEMBER : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2567 (i).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'
HATCHERIES, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 4588 (ii).
——— N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 5197 (ii).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
HAWKESTONE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4801, 4399.
HAWK ISLAND, N. S., LIGHTHOUSES, CONTRACTS, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1582 (i).
HEATING, OTTAWA BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 3130 (ii).
——— *See* 'Public Works, &c.
HENDERSON, MR. H. D., DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Brock*) 508 (i).
HENLY, MR. W. C., USE OF PRIVATE MAIL BAG ; in Com. of Sup., 5459 (ii).
'HERALD,' MONTREAL, LEASE OF OFFICE BY I.C.R. Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 605 (i).

HIGGIN'S SHORE, PIER, &c., PET., FROM SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4195 (ii).
HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 189 (i).
HILL, ARTHUR E. B., CLAIMS *re* INVESTIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 4641 (ii).
HILTZ NARROWS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).
HODGE, MR. D., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1794 (i).
HOGS, LARD, &c. IMPORTED FROM U. S.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1255 (i).
——— *See* 'Customs.'
HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS, SALARIES. &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1375 (i).
HOMESTEAD INSPECTOR THOMPSON, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 5212 (ii).
——— *See* 'Interior,' 'Dom. Lands,' &c.
HOPEWELL CAPE WHARF, CONTRACTORS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 810 (i).
HORSES FOR BRITISH ARMY, COM., FROM C. W. PETERSON: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1995 (i).
HOSPITALS, &c., INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 2773.
——— MARINE: in Com. of Sup., 293 (i).
——— *See* 'Louisburg,' 'Marine,' &c.
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
ADDITIONAL ROOMS: in Com. of Sup., 2553 (i), 5673 (ii).
ALLOTMENT OF ROOMS, H. OF C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 69 (i).
BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 2984, 2999, 5972 (ii).
——— *See* 'Private.'
BRUCE, N., CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2610 (i).
——— CERTIFICATE OF JUDGES: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 322 (i).
BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, PRIVATE BILLS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 5824 (ii).
——— PROCEDURE, &c.: on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Charlton*) 4940 (ii).
CANDIDATES, DEFEATED, APPNMT. TO OFFICES: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 199 (i).
CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2610 (i).
CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).
CONTROVERTED ELECTION, NORTH BRUCE, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 323.
——— Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 326.
DANSEREAU, MR. LIONEL, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 111 (i).
DEBATES, OFFICIAL, PUBLISHING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 195 (i).
——— *See* general heading.
DEBATES IN THE HOUSE. *See* 'Speeches of Members'
DURHAM, WEST, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGMENT OF COURT OF APPEAL: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 5802 (ii).
——— ELECTION OF MR. THORNTON: Remarks in Com. on Bill 64 (Mr. *Maclean*) 4022 (ii).
FRANCHISE ACT, VOTERS' LISTS, PRINTING, &c.: in Com of Sup., 5310 (ii).
FREE TRANSPORTATION TO MEMBERS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 528 (i).
GALLANT, MR. B., RETURNING OFFICER, WEST PRINCE, P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1006.
HASTINGS, ELECTORAL DISTRICT: NOTIFICATION OF VACANCY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 4644 (ii).
——— RESIGNATION OF MENBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2567 (i).
HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
INDEMNITY, INCREASE. *See* 'Senate and House of Commons.'
KING'S COUNTY VOTERS' LISTS: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2571 (i).
LAWS, BINDING AND DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 3910 (ii).
LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 3910, 4640, 5310, 5464 (ii).
——— SENATE CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5782 (ii).
——— SENATE INDEMNITY FOR LATE HON. J. J. ROSS: in Com. of Sup., 5781 (i).
MAIL DELIVERY: Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 100.
——— DELAYS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 1050.
MEMBERS, &c., APPNMT. TO OFFICES: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 199 (i).
——— INTRODUCED, 2567 (i).
——— Remarks checked (Mr. *Speaker*) 4872, 5070, 5435 (ii).
——— SPEECHES. *See* 'Speeches.'
MONTREAL CITY ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 331 (i).
NEWSPAPERS, HOUSE OF COMMONS: in Com. of Sup., 5464 (ii).
NIPISSING ELECTORAL DISTRICT, CERTIFICATE OF TRIAL JUDGE: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3177 (ii).
O'BRIEN, MR., SALARY INCREASE: in Com. of Sup., 5466 (ii).
OPPOSITION LEADER ON M. TO ADJN.: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7 (i).
——— DINNER TO: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. to adjn., 4230 (ii).
——— PRIVATE SECRETARY: in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).
PASSES TO MEMBERS. *See* 'Free Transportation.'
P. E. I., EAST QUEEN'S ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 136 (i).
——— PET., REP. OF JUDGES: M. (Sir *Louis Davies*) 693 (i).
——— WEST PRINCE BALLOT BOXES: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 83 (i).
——— RETURNING OFFICER, PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1006 (i).
PRINTING PAPER, BINDING, HOUSE OF COMMONS: in Com. of Sup., 5464 (ii).
PRIVATE BILLS, POSTING, &c.: M. (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) 5094 (ii).
——— PROCEDURE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Britton*) 5270 (ii).
——— SUSPENSION OF RULES: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 4939 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Charlton*) 4939 (ii).
PROCEDURE *re* BILLS ON ORDER PAPER, PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 731 (i).
PROROGATION, COM. FROM GOV. GEN'S. SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 5949 (ii).
QUEEN'S, P.E.I., RET. OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2567 (i).
——— *See* 'P.E.I.'
ROSS, HON. J. J., SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: in Com. of Sup., 5781 (i).
ROYAL ASSENT. *See* 'Bills.'
SERGEANT-AT-ARMS' ESTIMATES: in Com. of Sup., 196 (i).
SESSIONAL INDEMNITY, INCREASE. *See* 'Senate and House of Commons Bill.
SPEAKER, ELECTION OF, 1 (i).
——— DEPUTY, ELECTION: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 49 (i).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 5 (i).
——— Prorogation, 5972 (ii).
SPEECHES OF MEMBERS, LIMITATION, &c.: M. (Mr. *Charlton*) 73 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) to adjn., 5954 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

THORNTON, MR., INDEMNITY, &C.: in Com. of Sup.. 4640 (ii).
——— in Com. on the Election Bill, 4022 (ii).
VACANCY: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 326, 2567.
VENTILATION, H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 3123.
——— *See* 'Pub. Works.'
VOTERS' LISTS, KING'S CO., N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2571 (i).
VOTERS' LISTS, PRINTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5310 (ii).
WEST PRINCE ELECTION, BALLOTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 83 (i).
——— *See* 'P.E.I.'

HOUSTON PERMIT, YUKON, COR., &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1256 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1266 (i).
——— *See* 'Yukon.'

HOUSTON, REV. MR., IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 4853 (ii).

Hudson Bay and North-west Ry. Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 693; 2°*, 1050; M. to ref. back to Com., 2347, 2872 (i).

Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 71 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 1496; 2°*, 1790; in Com., and 3°*, 2397 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 65.)

HUDSON BAY RECORDS *re* LAND TITLES: conc., 5790.

HUDSON, REID AND KEARNS, MESSRS., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5182 (ii).

HULL LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3498, 5707 (ii).

HULL, MR. WM., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 333 (i).

HURD'S POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3462 (ii).

HURLEY, MR. J. M., FISHERY INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 296 (i).

HUTTON, GENL. AND LT.-COL. S. HUGHES: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 115, 368 (i).
——— *See* 'G. O. C., &c.'

HYDRAULIC LEASES, YUKON: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 224 (i).
——— Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 108 (i).
——— *See* 'Yukon.'

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 292.
——— *See* 'Marine,' &c.

ILE AUX GRUES, WHARF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5707.

IMMIGRATION:

AGENTS IN IRELAND, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4917 (ii).
AGENTS, NUMBER, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 80 (i).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4818-4870.
——— UNIFORMS: in Com. of Sup., 4857 (ii).
BUILDINGS AT PERIBONKA, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4391 (ii).
DEVLIN, MR. C. R., LETTERS CRITICISING MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5611 (ii).
DOUKHOBORS, DATE OF ARRIVAL, BONUS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1998 (i).
——— PET. TO GOVT. *re* CANADIAN TYRANNY: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1748 (i).
FOREIGN AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4869 (ii).
GRATUITY TO WIDOW OF D. L. CAVAN: in Com. of Sup., 4916 (ii).
HOUSTON, REV. MR., IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 4853 (ii).
IMMIGRANTS ENTERED AND SETTLED IN CAN., 1899-1900: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 202 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

IMMIGRATION POLICY OF GOVT.: Amt. (Mr. *Wilson*) to Com. of Sup., 2879 (i).
Debate (Mr. *McCreary*) 2895, 2977; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 2927; (Mr. *Oliver*) 2931; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2939; (Mr. *Puttee*) 2945; (Mr. *Davis*) 2955; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2960; (Mr. *Sifton*) 2970; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2976; (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) 2979; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2981 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) in Com. of Sup., 3768 (ii).
MONGOLIAN IMMIGRATION, COR. *re:* M. for Copy* (Mr. *Prior*) 224 (i).
PRESTON, W. T. R.: in Com. of Sup., 4822 (ii).
SETTLERS FOR 1900: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 86 (i).
——— *See* 'Interior.'

IMPORTS FROM U. S., DUTIABLE, &C., DURING 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 4020 (ii).

INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS, INCREASE. *See* 'Senate,' &c.

INDIAN CORN, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 84 (i).

INDIAN RIVER, DEVIL'S ELBOW DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5732 (ii).

INDIANS:

AGENCIES, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2761 (i).
——— N. W. T., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2764 (i).
AGENTS, DISMISSALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2772.
ANNUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 2761 (i).
BLANKETS AND CLOTHING: in Com. of Sup., 2753.
CAUGHNAWAGA MISSION HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 5319 (ii).
CHITTY, MR., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 2774.
CLAYQUOT INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2773 (i).
COLCHESTER AGENT, SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2758 (i).
——— RESERVE, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 2760 (i).
COLERAINE LANDS, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 3457 (ii).
ELKHORN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, SALE OF PRINTING PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 2766 (i), 5321 (ii).
GRIST AND SAW MILLS FOR INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2771 (i).
HOSPITALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2773 (i).
INDIAN AFFAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 184, 2753 (i), 5319 (ii).
INDIANS, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 2772 (i).
——— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 2772 (i).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 2772 (i).
INDIANS, CHIEFS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2754 (i).
——— LAND MANAGEMENT FUND, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2755.
——— LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5320.
INDIANS, MAN. AND N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 2761, 2771 (i), 5447 (ii).
INDIANS, N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 2759 (i).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: inCom. of Sup., 4932 (ii).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 2761 (i).
INDIANS, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 2758 (i).
INDIANS, ONT. AND QUEBEC, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2753 (i).
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 2772 (i).
——— N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 2767 (i).
——— *See* 'Interior,' &c.
KING'S COUNTY, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2760 (i).

INDIANS—*Con.*
LIVE STOCK FOR N. W. T. RESERVES : in Com. of Sup., 5320 (ii).
LUNENBURG RESERVES, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2759 (i).
MICMAC DICTIONARY, DR. RAND'S : in Com. of Sup., 5456 (ii).
MICMAC TRIBE, STE. ANNE DE RESTIGOUCHE, CHARGES AGAINST : in Com. of Sup., 2754 (i).
——— DUTIES OF AGENT : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Sprouie*) 816 (i).
OKA, REMOVAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2754 (i).
OXFORD HOUSE, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4933 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 336 (i).
PRINTING PLANT, ELKHORN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2766 (i), 5321 (ii).
RAMA, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2753 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McLeod*) 93, 200 (i).
RESERVES, SURVEYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2755.
ROSSEAU RIVER RESERVE : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 82 (i).
ST. REGIS LOCK-UP : in Com. of Sup., 2756 (i).
SAW LOGS EXPORTED FROM RESERVES : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 63 (i).
SEED GRAIN, N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 2760 (i).
——— N. S. : in Com. of Sup., 2758 (i).
SHIP HARBOUR LAKE, N.S., RESERVE, TIMBER CUTTING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2758 (i).
SIX NATION TRIBE, REP. OF DR. SECORD : in Com. of Sup., 5319 (ii).
SONGHEES RESERVE : in Com. of Sup., 2773 (i).
SUPPLIES : in Com. of Sup., 2770 (i).
SURVEYS OF RESERVES IN ONT. : in Com of Sup., 2755 (i).
SYDNEY RESERVE, COR. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Johnston, Cape Breton*) 1264 (i).
TIMBER CUTTING ON SHIP HARBOUR LAKE RESERVE : in Com. of Sup., 2758 (i).
WALPOLE ISLAND RESERVE, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2755 (i), 4930.
YUKON, EDUCATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5449.
——— *See* 'Indians.'
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS, B.C. INDIANS : in Com. of Sup. 2772 (i).
——— N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 2767 (i), 5447 (ii).
——— *See* 'Indians.'
INGONISH BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4398 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 144 (Mr. *Bernier*) 1° m., 5470 ; 2°, and in Com., 5801 ; 3° m., 5825 (ii). (1 *Edward VII. c.* 23.)
INLAND REVENUE :
BAKING POWDER CONDEMNED, CIRCULAR FROM DEPT. OF INLAND REV. : M. for Copy* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 815 (i).
CULLING TIMBER. *See* "Staple."
EXCISE, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3863 (ii).
GAS AND ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION INSTRUMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 5778 (ii).
GAS INSPECTION, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4936 (ii).
GRAIN COMMISSIONER : in Com. of Sup., 4937 (ii).
GRAIN EXPORTATION, REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1798 (i).
GRAIN INSPECTION AT MONTREAL, APPNMT. OF COMMISSION : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 327 (i).
GRAIN STANDARDS, INSPECTION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3865 (ii).
INLAND REVENUE DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 185 (i), 5184 (ii).
——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE : in Com. of Sup., 190 (i).
INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*
INLAND REVENUE DEPT., CONTINGENCIES, DEPTL. VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 4342 (ii).
——— DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Bernier*) 51, 239 (i),
——— PRINTING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 190 (i).
INSPECTION OF STAPLES : in Com. of Sup., 3865 (ii).
POTASH AND ASHES, INSPECTION, &C. : Ques. Mr. *Prefontaine*) 814 (i).
STAPLES INSPECTION : in Com. of Sup., 3865, 4936 (ii).
——— SALARIES OF INSPECTORS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5779 (ii).
TORONTO INLAND REVENUE COLLECTOR, QUALIFICATION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 3754.
WAREHOUSE COMMISSIONER, GRAIN, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4936 (ii).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3864, 4935 (ii).
WOOD NAPHTHA, ACETIC ACID, &C., QUANTITY PURCHASED, &C : Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 5208 (ii).
Inland Waters Seamen's Act Amt. B. No. 91 (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1° m., 1957 ; 2°*, and in Com., 2439 ; 3°*, 2440 (i). 1 *Edward VII, c.* 33.)
INSANE PATIENTS, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 1367 (i).
Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. *Bernier*) 1° m., 2456 (i) ; 2°*, 3094 ; in Com., 3094 ; 3°*, 3096 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c,* 24.)
——— **B. 122** (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 3085 ; 2°, and in Com., 4898 ; 3°*, 4901 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 25.)
INSPECTION. *See* 'Lumber Culling.'
INSPECTION OF STAPLES : in Com. of Sup., 3865, 4836 (ii).
INSPECTOR OF CROWN LANDS, &C., SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 1374 (i).
INSPECTORS, CUSTOMS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com., 3848.
INSURANCE, SUPT. OF, SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 323 (i).
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY :
ADDITIONAL SIDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 4145, 4379 (ii).
AIR BRAKES, FREIGHT CARS : in Com. of Sup., 4154 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 334 (i).
AMHERST SUBWAY, LAND DAMAGES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2715 (i).
BRIDGES, STRENGTHENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4123 (ii).
CAMPBELLTON ROUND HOUSE, REPAIRS, &C.: (Mr. *Fowler*) 507 (i).
CARS PURCHASED IN U. S., CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2162 (i).
CATTLE ACCOMMODATION, FEEDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
CLERGUE CONTRACT. *See* 'Steel Rails.'
COAL CONTRACTS WITH U. S.: in Com. of Sup., 5398 (ii).
COMMISSION *re* ACCIDENT CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 3753 (ii).
——— *re* DAMAGES TO PROPERTY : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 504 (i).
DAMAGES TO PROPERTIES, FRENCH-SPEAKING COMMISSIONER : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1004 (i).
DRAW-BARS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4156 (ii).
EASTERN EXTENSION RAILWAY, N. S., ARBITRATORS' AWARD : in Com. of Sup., 5892 (ii).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 5941 (ii).
EMPLOYEES, NUMBER FROM 1892 TO 1900 : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1582 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
EXPORTS, &C. FROM ST. JOHN : in Com. of Sup., 5218 (ii).
FACILITIES, INCREASED, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4151, 4379 (ii).
GENERAL EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4387.
GENERAL VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 5650 (ii).
GRADES, &C., FROM MONTREAL TO HALIFAX, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1588 (i).
HALIFAX ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 2706.
——— ELEVATOR, EMPLOYEES, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1585 (i).
——— *See* 'Grain Elevator,' 'Halifax,' &c.
'HERALD,' MONTREAL, LEASE OF OFFICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 605 (i).
I. C. R. AND CANADA ATLANTIC FREIGHT RATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 1590 (i).
JOUGHINS, G. R., SUPT., SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 3179 (ii).
KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS AND CONTRACT WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1068 (i).
LÉVIS, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 4124 (ii).
——— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 330 (i).
LOCOMOTIVE COUPLERS : in Com. of Sup., 4153.
——— EQUIPMENT, &C. (WITH 'CLEVELAND' CYLINDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3641.
——— FURNISHED BY KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS : M. for copies of O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Haggart*) 816 (i).
——— PURCHASE IN U. S., CONTRACTS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2162 (i).
——— PURCHASED: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 331 (i).
MACHINERY, CAR SHOPS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4158 (ii).
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SPANS : in Com. of Sup., 4162.
MONCTON SHOPS, DISMISSALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 815, 1004 (i).
MONTREAL AND CAMPBELLTON DIVISION, EXTENSION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Dechene*) 1999 (i).
MULGRAVE TURNTABLES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4158.
NET RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1267 (i).
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2719 (i).
PASSEKEAG STATION, ERECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 113 (i).
PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT : in Com. of Sup., 4158, 5217 (ii).
PRINCE, WM. L., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2702 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3180 (ii).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP DIVISION, FOREMAN, SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2989 (ii).
——— NEWS AGENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2988 (ii),
ROLLING STOCK, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4165, 4213, 4378 (ii).
RUSSELL, MR. E. G., EMPLYMT., SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3455 (ii).
ST. JOHN ELEVATOR, NAMES OF EMPLOYEES, DUTIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1584 (i).
ST. JOHN, LANDS PURCHASED : M. for O. C.'s* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 225 (i).
SECTION LIMITS AND EXTENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Martineau*) 1589 (i)
STEEL RAILS, CLERGUE'S CONTRACT : in Com. of Sup., 2628, 2719 (i), 3537-3640, 3724-52 (ii).
——— SALE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2203 (i).
SUMMERSIDE AND TIGNISH TRAIN ACCOMMODATION : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 3456 (ii).
——— *See* 'P. E. I.'
SYDNEY, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 4376 (ii).
——— PROPERTIES PURCHASED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper* 1005 (i).
——— *See* 'Railways,' &c.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
TICKET AGENTS, SALARIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Dechene*) 2399 (i).
TRAVELLING CRANES : in Com. of Sup., 4378 (ii).
TROIS PISTOLES STATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 504 (i).
VESTIBULES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4156 (ii).
——— *See* 'Railways,' &c.

INTERIOR :
ALASKAN BOUNDARY DISPUTE, COR. *re* MAP SENT TO PARIS EXPOSITION : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 4407 (ii).
ARSENAULT, MR., HOMESTEAD INSPECTOR, DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1383 (i).
ASTRONOMICAL AND DEMARCATION WORK : in Com. of Sup., 4928 (ii).
——— OBSERVATORY, PURCHASE OF TELESCOPE : in Com. of Sup., 5784 (ii).
BACTERIOLOGICAL DEPT. IN CONNECTION WITH GEOLOGICAL SURVEY : in Com. of Sup., 5456.
CAN. AND ALASKA PROVISIONAL BOUNDARY, REP. OF MR. KING : Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 5587.
CANADIANS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2698 (i).
——— *See* 'Distressed.'
C.P.R. COAL-BEARING LANDS, DISPOSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2776 (i).
COTTAGE HOSPITALS IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 5455 (ii).
DEMARCATION *re* DOM. LANDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4928 (ii).
——— *See* 'International.'
DESTITUTE HALF-BREEDS, RELIEF BY N.W.M. POLICE : in Com. of Sup., 5311 (ii).
DISTRESSED CANADIAN, RELIEF, &C.: conc., 5794.
——— *See* 'Canadians.'
DOM. LANDS : in Com. of Sup., 1371, 2670, 2689-98.
——— ACT, REDUCTION OF INTEREST : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 82 (i).
——— EXTRA CLERKS : in Com. of Sup., 4921, 5450 (ii).
——— PRE-EMPTIONS, GRAZING LEASES, &C.: Ret. laid on Table, 3454 (ii).
——— SOUTH-EASTERN MAN., SURVEY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 66 (i).
DOM. LANDS SURVEYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4925, 5450 (ii).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).
——— *See* 'School Lands,' 'Man. Settlers,' &c.
DOUKHOBORS, SCHOOL GRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1367 (i).
——— *See* general heading.
FOREST INSPECTORS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2689 (i).
——— RANGERS, DUTIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1264 (i).
——— *See* 'Stewart, Mr.'
FORESTRY PROTECTION IN P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1439 (i).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 188 (i), 5456.
——— COMPILATION OF MAPS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5315 (ii).
——— EXPLORATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3769.
——— EXPLORATION FOR DR. MOND, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5447 (ii).
——— REPORTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5315 (ii).
——— SUPPLIED TO BOOK STORES : Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 5447 (ii).
GOVT. OF N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS COMMISSION : in Com. of Sup., 4929 (ii).
——— EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5453 (ii).
HALF-BREEDS, DESTITUTE, RELIEF BY N. W. M. POLICE : in Com. of Sup., 5311 (ii).
'HANDBOOK OF CANADA,' PRINTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 814 (i).
HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1375 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

HOMESTEAD INSPECTOR THOMPSON, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 5212 (ii).
HYDRAULIC MINING LEASES, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 108 (i).
——— *See* 'Yukon.'
IMMIGRATION AGENTS, NUMBER, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 80 (i).
——— SETTLERS FOR 1900: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 86.
——— *See* 'Immigration, &c.
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 5447 (ii).
——— *See* 'Indians,' &c.
INSANE PATIENTS, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 1367 (i).
INTERIOR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 181 (i).
——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., conc., 5789 (ii).
——— DEP. MIN., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 181.
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 50.
——— LITIGATION EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2699 (i).
INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY, DEMARCATION, ASTRONOMICAL WORK, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5454.
——— FENCE RIDINGSTONE AND MILK RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 5451 (ii).
JARVIS, MR., DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1383 (ii).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2698 (i).
——— MAINTENANCE OF LUNATICS, &C.: in Com, of Sup., 2698 (i).
LAND GRANTS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: (Mr. *Scott*) 5207 (ii).
LIQUOR PERMITS, YUKON, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 72 (i).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
MACRAE, J. A., ALLOWANCE TO: in Com. of Sup., 4935 (ii).
MAN. AND N. W. T. COLONIZATION LANDS, SALE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 1249 (i).
——— HALF-BREEDS, SCRIP ISSUED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 1253 (i).
MAN. SCHOOL LANDS, FRAUDULENT SALES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 336 (i).
——— M. for Lists (Mr. *LaRivière*) 71 (i).
——— M. for Pets. *re* Transfer (Mr. *LaRivière*) 88.
——— COMMISSION: Inquiry (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Rep. of Judge Prendergast, 5714 (ii).
——— REP. OF JUDGE PRENDERGAST: Inquiry for (Mr. *LaRivière*) 4196 (ii).
——— REP. OF JUDGE: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 3454 (ii).
——— INQUIRY FOR RET.: (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2205.
MAN. AND N. W. T., PROTECTION TO TIMBER LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 2670 (i).
MAPS OF DOM., PRINTING, LITHOGRAPHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5452 (ii).
MINERAL RESOURCES, B. C., ADVERTISEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1749 (ii).
MINING INDUSTRIES, B. C., REP. OF INTERVIEW IN 'PROVINCE:' Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1749 (i).
N. W. T. GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 1367 (i).
——— *See* general heading.
——— SCHOOLS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5782 (ii).
OBSERVATORY, SULPHUR MOUNTAIN, BANFF: in Com. of Sup., 5196 (ii).
PURDY, MR., COMPENSATION TO, *re* DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 4828 (ii).
RIDINGSTONE AND MILK RIVER BOUNDARY FENCE: in Com. of Sup., 5451 (ii).
SCHOOL GRANTS, &C., IN N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 1368 (i).
SCHOOL LANDS, MAN., SALE, &C.: M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Lists, 71 (i).
——— TRANSFER, &C.: M. for Pets. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 88 (i).
——— *See* 'Man.', &c.

INTERIOR—*Con.*

SCHOOLS IN UNORGANIZED TERS.: in Com. of Sup., 1367 (i).
SEED GRAIN TO SETTLERS: in Com. of Sup., 4927.
SETTLERS, MAN., ADVANCES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 107 (i).
SMART, MR. JAS. *See* 'Interior, Deputy.'
STEWART, MR., SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 186, 2670, 2689, 2839 (i).
SULPHUR MOUNTAIN, BANFF, OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5196 (ii).
SURVEYOR GENERAL'S OFFICES, OTTAWA, FURNISHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (ii).
TESLIN LAKE AND ALSEK RIVER BOUNDARY: in Com. of Sup., 2699 (i).
THOMPSON, J. W., HOMESTEAD INSPECTOR, RESIGNATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1375 (i).
——— J. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 5212 (ii).
TIMBER LANDS, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1388, 2670 (i).
TREE CULTURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2670, 2689.
VIRDEN, QU'APPELLE, &C., TOWN SITES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Osler*) 881 (i).
WINNIPEG IMMIGRANT HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 5697 (ii).
WINNIPEG AND ST. BONIFACE HOSPITALS: in Com. of Sup., 2870 (i).
——— *See* 'Immigration,' 'Man.,' 'N.W.T.,' &c.
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMITTEE: Mess. from His Ex. (Mr. *Spcaker*) 9 (i).
INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY DEMARCATION ASTRONOMICAL WORK, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5454 (ii).
INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY FENCE, RIDINGSTONE AND MILK RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 5451 (ii).
INTERNATIONAL CATALOGUE, SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
——— COMMISSION *See* 'Alaskan, &c.'
Interpretation Act Amt. B. No. 134 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 4535; 2°, and in Com., 4674; 3°*, 4674 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 11.)
Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 111 (Mr. *Murray*) 1°*, 2347; 2°*, 2923 (i): in Com., and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 66.)
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5535 (ii).
IRON ORE, BOUNTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1253 (i).
IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES PAID BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 1168 (i).
JAPANESE COMMISSION, EXPENSES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 5311 (ii).
JAPANESE RESTRICTIONS AND B. C. LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 5586 (ii).
——— *See* 'Chinese.'
JARDINE, MR., PARIS COMMISSIONER: in Com. of Sup., 984, 993 (i).
JARVIS, MR., DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1383.
'JENNIE MAY,' INVESTIGATION *re* LOSS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2777 (i).
JOINT HIGH COMMISSION. *See* 'Alaskan,' &c.
JONES, RALPH, PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 509 (i).
JOUGHINS, G. R., SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 3179 (ii).
JUAN DE FUCA, SAILING DIRECTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2407 (i).

Judges of Dom. and Provincial Courts *re* **Demise of the Crown B. No. 153** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 2°*, 5711; in Com., and 3°*, 5801 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, *c.* 38.)

——— *See* 'Demise.'

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. No. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 3460; in Com. on Res., 4066, 4068, 4255; 1°* of B., 4322; 2°, and in Com., 4668; 3°*, 4674 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, *c.* 39.)

——— **(Vancouver) B. No. 150** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 5593; 1°* of B., 5599; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 5801 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, *c.* 40.)

JUDGES, MAN., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2647 (i).

——— N.W.T. AND YUKON, SALARY, &C.: in Com. on Res., 4068 (ii).

——— SALARIES, INCREASE OF: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 4902 (ii).

JUDICIAL APPNMTS. IN ONT., DELAY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 2821 (i).

JUDICIAL BUSINESS, QUEBEC, MONTREAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3177 (ii).

JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF PRIVY COUNCIL, CAN. REPRESENTATIVE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) 2401 (i).

JURISDICTION, FISHERIES, B.C., PROVINCIAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3459 (ii).

JURISDICTION OF MIN. OF INT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 67 (i).

JUSTICE. *See* 'Administration.'

JUSTICE:

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 194, 2647 (i), 5777 (ii).

——— LEGAL EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).

ALIEN LABOUR LAW, ENFORCEMENT, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 332 (i).

——— ENFORCEMENT *re* DOM. STEEL WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 200 (i).

ALIENS' ESTATES, CONVENTION BETWEEN G.B. AND U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Demers*, *St. John and Iberville*) 4755 (ii).

APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE MIN. OF THE INT.: (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 67 (i).

BILLS RESERVED FOR QUEEN'S PLEASURE: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3178 (ii).

BINDER TWINE, CHANGE IN PRICES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1002, 1402 (i).

——— ENFORCEMENT OF LAW *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson*, *Elgin*) 507 (i).

——— MACHINERY ADMITTED FREE OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Cargill*) 606 (i).

——— MANUFACTURED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 107 (i).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Blain*) 230 (i).

——— PRICE ADDED FOR LABOUR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 5585 (ii).

BLAKE, HON. EDWARD, LEGAL EXPENSES *re* FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 313 (i).

B.C. SUPREME COURT JUDGES, RESIDENCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 194, 2664 (i).

CAN. TEMPERANCE ACT: in Com. of Sup., 3449.

——— RES. OF H. OF C., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3754 (ii).

CINQMARS *vs.* SENECAL: M. for papers* (Mr. *Fortin*) 225 (i).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

CIRCUIT ALLOWANCES, *ad hoc* JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 2647 (i).

CONSOLIDATION. *See* 'Statutes.'

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURT, N.B., APPNMT. OF JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 5778 (ii).

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 2650 (i).

EXCHEQUER COURT OF CAN.: conc., 5792 (ii).

——— CASES FROM 1896-1900: Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 3178 (ii).

GAGNÉ, MR. JUSTICE, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 4646 (ii).

JAPANESE RESTRICTIONS AND B.C. LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) 5586 (ii).

JUDGES' SALARIES, INCREASE OF: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 4902 (ii).

JUDICIAL APPNMTS. IN ONT., DELAY, &C.: Ques. Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 2821 (i).

——— BUSINESS, QUEBEC, MONTREAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3177 (ii).

——— COMMITTEE OF PRIVY COUNCIL, CAN. REPRESENTATIVE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) 2401 (i).

JURISDICTION OF MIN. OF INT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 67 (i).

JUSTICE. *See* 'Administration.'

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 2649.

——— MCKAY, MR., ACCOUNT *re* PENITENTIARY INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4635 (ii).

LAW LIBRARY, LONDON: in Com. of Sup., 4637.

LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 4342 (ii).

MAN. JUDGES, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2647 (i).

MONTREAL DISTRICT JUDGES, INCREASE OF SALARY, &C.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 3460; in Com. on Res., 4066 (ii).

——— *See* 'Judges Bill.'

N.W.T. PROVINCIAL STATUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1368 (i).

——— SUPREME COURT JUDGES, &C., INCREASE OF SALARY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 3460.

——— AND YUKON JUDGES, SALARY, &C.: in Com. on Res., 4068 (ii).

PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 2649 (i), 4635.

QU'APPELLE *vs.* THE KING, LITIGATION EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5454 (ii).

QUEBEC ELECTION LAW, PET. FOR DISALLOWANCE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 5613, 5715 (ii).

REGINA JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 2650 (i).

REGISTRY OFFICE, N.W.T.: conc., 5794 (ii).

ROBERTSON, MR. JUSTICE, INFIRMITY, COMPLAINTS AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Stephens*) 5586 (ii).

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup, 2649 (i), 4636 (ii).

——— CHARGES AGAINST GUARDS: in Com. of Sup., 2649 (i).

——— INSPECTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 5823.

——— LUSSIER'S CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 4636.

SHERIFFS' FEES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2647.

STATUTES, CONSOLIDATION OF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2667 (i).

——— REVISION OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 66 (i).

SUPREME COURT OF CANADA: conc., 5792 (ii).

——— R. G. DAVIS, PROMOTION: in Com. of Sup., 5777 (ii).

——— VACANCY: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 5971.

TICKET-OF-LEAVE ACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 107 (i).

TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES FOR JUDGES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2647 (i).

YUKON SERVICES, ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 2650 (i).

——— PRISONERS, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5778 (ii).

——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 1205 (i).

Kamloops and Atlin Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 105 (Mr. *Prior*) 1°*, 2347 ; 2°*, 2923 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 67.)

KAMLOOPS PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 3097.

KAVANAGH, MR. JAMES, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 110 (i).

Keewatin Bishopric incorp. B. No. 37 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 693 ; 2°*, 1050 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2927 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 102.)

KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2698 (i).

——— MAINTENANCE OF LUNATICS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2698 (i).

KENNEBECASIS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3496 (ii).

KENSINGTON AND FRENCH RIVER, P.E.I., MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 809.

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 72 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 1496 ; 2°*, 1790 (i).

——— **B. No. 98** (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 2161 ; 2°*, 2397 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1, *Edward VII, c.* 68.)

KING, HON. MR. JUSTICE, DECEASE : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4672 (ii).

KING'S BIRTHDAY : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 503 (i).

——— *See* 'Queen's.'

KING'S COUNTY, N.B., FISHERY WARDEN, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 335 (i).

——— INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2760 (i).

———VOTERS' LISTS : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2571 (i).

KING'S PRINTER. *See* 'Public Printing and Stationery.'

KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360 ; in Com. on Res., 5563 (ii).

KINGSTON DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).

———LOCOMOTIVE WORKS AND CONTRACT WITH GOVT., CLAUSE *re* WAGES : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1994 (i).

——— CONTRACT WITH GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1068 (i).

——— CONTRACT *re* ROLLING STOCK : in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).

——— COR., &C. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 111 (i).

——— *See* 'I.C.R.' &c.

KINGSTON MILITARY BUILDINGS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5697 (ii).

——— *See* 'Militia,' &c.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 2649 (i).

KINNEAR'S MILLS, INVESTIGATION, &C.: M. for papers (Mr. *Turcot*) 86 (i).

KINSMAN, MR., APPNMT. AS HORTICULTURIST, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1438 (i).

Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B. No. 42 (Mr. *Fraser*) 1°*, 893 ; 2°*, 1205 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1914 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 69.)

KNOWLTON, MR. H. C. : in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 1244 ; 2°*, 1431 (i) ; in Com., 3223 ; 3°*, 3227 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 70.)

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Sincorp, B. No. 83 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 1747 ; 2°*, 1993 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3421 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 71.)

LABOUR CLAUSE, *re* CLERGUE'S CONTRACT : in Com. of Sup., 2646 (i).

——— *See* 'Fair Wage,' &c., 'St. Andrew,' &c.

LABOUR DEPT., FURNISHING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4392 (ii).

——— ORGANIZATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3787 (ii).

——— SALARIES, PRINTING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4789 (ii).

'LABOUR GAZETTE,' SALARIES, CONTRIBUTIONS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3787 (ii).

——— DISTRIBUTION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3808 (ii).

LABOUR ORGANIZATIONS AND BILL 47, APPROVAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2705 (i).

LACHINE CANAL, BRIDGE OVER CÔTE ST. PAUL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &C. : M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., &c., 2586 (i).

——— *See* 'Côte St. Paul,' 'Canals,' &c.

——— LOCK, CONTRACT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 1067 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1405 (i).

——— LOCKMEN, SUNDAY SERVICES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4389 (ii).

——— MASONRY WALL, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4313 (ii).

——— REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4387 (ii).

——— WEIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4380 (ii).

LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT R. R. SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 109 (i).

LAKE ERIE LIFE-SAVING STATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 260 (i).

LAKE MAN. OUTLET, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).

LAKE WINNIPEG HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY : in Com. of Sup., 5782 (ii).

——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).

LALONDE, DR., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4194 (ii).

LAND GRANTS IN MAN. AND N. W. T. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5207 (ii).

——— *See* 'Interior,' &c.

LANGELIER, MR. HAS., EXPENSES *re* PILOTAGE COMMISSION : in Com. of Sup., 269 (i).

LAWS, BINDING AND DISTRIBUTION : in Com. of Sup., 3910 (ii).

——— YUKON, FREIGHT, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2658.

LAW LIBRARY, LONDON : in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).

Lead (Refined) Bounties B. No. 152 (Mr. *Fielding*), Res. prop., 5599 ; M. for Com. on Res., 5716 ; in Com. on Res., 5728 ; M. for 2° of Res., 5728 ; 1°* of B., 5729 ; 2°, and in Com., 5828 ; 3°*, 5828 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 8.)

LEAMINGTON PIER : in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).

LEATHER COMBINE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4629 (ii).

Le Crédit Foncier du Bas-Canada B. No. 99 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 2161 ; 2°*, 2923 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 3909 ; wthdn., 5471 (ii).

LEGAL EXPENSES, INDIAN AFFAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 5320 (ii).

——— *re* MARINE DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 269 (i).
LEGISLATION : in Com. of Sup., 3910, 4640, 5310, 5464.
LEONARD, DR. R. A., POSTMASTER AT NAPANEE, PAYMENT OF SALARY, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5209 (ii).
——— *See* 'Napanee,' &c.
'LE PROGRÉS,' WINDSOR, PAYMENTS TO : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 3458 (ii).
LETTER CARRIERS, INCREASE OF SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 174, 481 (i) ; 5460 ; conc., 5792 (ii).
LEVIS, BRIGADE CAMP, IRREGULARITIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2994 (ii).
——— GRAVING DOCK, TRAVELLING CRANE : in Com. of Sup., 5709 (ii).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 4124 (ii).
——— LAND EXPROPRIATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5651 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 5690 (ii).
——— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, I. C. R. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 330 (i).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.
LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 4289, 5764 (ii).
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT REP. : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 8 (i).
——— LIST : Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 102.
LIFE-SAVING REWARDS : in Com. of Sup., 260 (i).
LIFE-SAVING STATIONS, &C., CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 5187 (ii).
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 270 (i), 4585 (ii).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 282 ; List, 286 (i).
——— SALARIES AT OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 284 (i).
——— *See* 'Marine,' &c.
LIGHT-KEEPERS, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 270.
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s B. No. 79 (Mr. *Vrooman*) 1°*, 1663 ; 2°*, 1993 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 3421 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, *c.* 72.)
LIQUOR IMPORTED BY ATLIN BREWING CO., YUKON, &C. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1256 (i).
——— PERMITS IN THE YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
——— QUANTITY SHIPPED TO YUKON : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 813, 1250 (i).
——— RET. *re* : Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 210 (i).
——— REGULATIONS : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1069 (i).
——— *See* 'Yukon.'
LITIGATION EXPENSES, INT. DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 2699 (i).
——— *See* 'Justice,' &c.
LITTLE BEAR CREEK : in Com. of Sup., 5734 (ii).
LIVE STOCK FOR N.W. T. INDIAN RESERVES : in Com. of Sup., 5320 (ii).
LOBSTER FISHERY REGULATIONS, P.E.I. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2571 (i).
——— INVESTIGATION : in Com. of Sup., 268 (i).
——— PACKING, LICENSES GRANTED, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 1067 (i).
——— *See* 'Fisheries,' &c.
LOCK, NEW, LACHINE CANAL : in Com. of Sup. 5620 (ii).
——— *See* 'Lachine.'
LOCKYER, H. J., LIQUOR PERMIT, YUKON : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1250 (i).
LOCOMOTIVE COUPLERS, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 4153.
LOCOMOTIVES EQUIPPED WITH 'CLEVELAND' CYLINDERS, I. C. R. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3641 (ii).
——— FURNISHED BY KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS : M. for copies of O. Cs., &c. (Mr. *Haggart*) 816 (i).
——— PURCHASE IN U. S., I. C. R. CONTRACTS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2162 (i).
——— KINGSTON, STRIKE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Puttee*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5433, 5442 (ii).
——— *See* 'Kingston.'
LONDON DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 2547 (i) ; 5691 (ii).
London Mutual Fire Insurance Co. B. No. 12 (Mr. *Hyman*) 1°*, 238 ; 2°*, 328 ; in Com., 2923 ; 3°*, 2924 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, *c.* 103.)
LONDON POSTMASTER, SALARY, INCREASE : in Com. of Sup., 5458 (ii).
LONG POINT LIFE-SAVING STATION, LAKE ERIE : in Com. of Sup., 260 (i), 5187 (ii).
LONG SERVICE DECORATIONS, DISTRIBUTION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1067 (i).
——— MEDALS, DELAY IN ISSUE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5213 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1259 (i).
——— *See* 'Militia.'
LONGUEUIL ORDNANCE LANDS, RENT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1796 (i).
LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN : M. for Cor., O. Cs., &c. (Mr. *Fowler*) 1266 (i).
——— *See* 'St. John,' &c.
LOUBET, PRES'DT., RECEPTION AT PARIS EXHIBITION : in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
LOUISBURG, N.S., MARINE HOSPITAL : in Com. of Sup., 5194 (ii).
LOUISE EMBANKMENT IMMIGRANT SHEDS, QUEBEC CITY : in Com. of Sup., 5688 (ii).
Lumber Culling and Staples Inspection B. No. 116 (Mr. *Bernier*) 1° m., 2456 (i) ; 2°*, 3096 ; in Com., 3096 ; 3°*, 3096 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, *c.* 30.)
LUMBER IMPORTED, DUTY, &C. : M. (Mr. *Bennett*) 115.
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 218 (i).
——— *re* Can. and U.S. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1267, 1751 (i).
Debate : (Mr. *Davis*) 1755 ; (Mr. *Prior*) 1759 ; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1761 ; (Mr. *Edwards*) 1765 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1769 ; (Mr. *Schell*) 1774 ; (Mr. *Scott*) 1776 ; (Mr. *Cargill*) 1781 ; (Mr. *Holmes*) 1786 ; (Mr. *Puttee*) 1788 (i).

LUNENBURG COUNTY BREAKWATERS : in Com. of Sup., 3165 (i).
——— *See* 'N.S.,' 'Public Works,' &c.
——— INDIAN RESERVES, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2759 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4390 (ii).
LURCHER SHOAL LIGHTSHIP : in Com. of Sup., 282, 284.
LUSSIER'S CLAIM *re* ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 4636 (ii).
MACAULAY POINT, B.C., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2570 (i).
MACINNIS, JOHN, SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2703 (i).
MACKENZIE AND MANN, YUKON RAILWAY, CLAIM *re*: (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1260 (i).
——— PAPERS *re* : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2611 (i), 4195, 4647, 4902 (ii).
——— Papers laid on Table, 5949 (ii).
MACKENZIE, CAPT., PENSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3394, 4353 (ii).
MACRAE, J. A., ALLOWANCE TO : in Com. of Sup., 4935 (ii).
MCAULEY, MR. J. E., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 113 (i).
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s B. No. 68 (Mr. *Hyman*) 1°*, 1496 ; 2°*, 1790 ; in Com., and 3°*., 2927 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 107.)
McDonald, James Ward, Relief. *See* 'Divorce.'
MCGIRR, MR. H. *See* 'Bolsover.'
MCGRADY, H., RY. MAIL SERVICE, SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5460 (ii).
MCGREGOR, MR., TELEGRAM *re* AUBURN MILLS: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Kendry*) 3365 (ii).
MCKAY, MR., ACCOUNT *re* PENITENTIARY INVESTIGATION : in Com. of Sup., 4635 (ii).
MCKNIGHT, MR. S. L. T., APPNMT., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5649 (ii).
MCLELLAN, JOHN B., SALE OF RY. TIES TO I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5633 (ii).
MCNAUGHTON, MR., COMPLAINT AGAINST : in Com. of Sup., 496 (i).
MACHINERY, I.C.R., CAR SHOPS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4158 (ii).
MACHINERY FOR SHOPS, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 4227 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.
MADOC MAIL CONTRACT, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 1441 (i).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3498 (ii).
——— SS. SERVICE, CONTRACT, ACCOMMODATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1795 (i).
——— WINTER TRIPS : in Com. of Sup., 251 (i).
MAGISTRATES, YUKON TER., SALARIES, &c. : prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5094 (ii).
——— *See* 'Yukon, B. 118,' &c.
MAIL CLERKS, MILEAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4405.
——— *See* 'Railways.' &c.
MAIL CLERKS IN S. AFRICA, PROMOTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1439 (i).
MAIL CONTRACTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup.. 435 (i).
MAIL DELIVERY, H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 100 (i).
MAIL EXPENDITURE, YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 449,473.
MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 501 (i).
——— P. E. I. : in Com. of Sup., 5463 (ii).
——— TELEGRAM READ (Mr. *Hackett*) 1498 (i).
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 4771, 5767 ; conc., 5794 (ii).
MAINLAND AND P.E.I. WINTER COMMUNICATION : in Com. of Sup., 252 (i).
——— *See* 'P.E.I.,' &c.
MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS, YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 4637, 2654 (i).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
MAJOR'S HILL PARK : in Com. of Sup., 5695 (ii).
MANCHESTER SS. LINE. *See* 'Trade and Com.,' &c.
MANHOOD SUFFRAGE REGISTRATION, REMUNERATION TO MUNICIPALITIES : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 2204.
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. *Bernier*) 1° m., 3085 ; wthdn., 5472 (ii).
Manitoba and North-west Loan Co.'s B. No. 53 (Mr. *Britton*) 1°*, 1167 ; 2°*, 1431 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2984 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 104.)
Manitoba Railway Leases B. No. 102 (Mr. *McIsaac*) 1°*, 2346 (i) ; 2° m.. 2986 ; wthdn., 4192.
——— **B. No. 103** (Mr. *McIsaac*) 1° m., 2346 (i) ; 2°*, 2989 ; M. for Com., 4372, 4436 ; in Com., 4534, 4688, 4902, 4940 ; 3° m., 5084 ; amt. (6 m. h.) 5085 ; neg. (Y. 5 ; N. 107) 5090 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 53.)
MANITOBA :
BRANDON POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 110 (i).
BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 5697 (ii).
C.P.R. LAND GRANTS : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5207 (ii).
CARTER, MR. S. J., DEAD LETTER BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 191 (i).
COOCH, MR., DUTIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 191.
DOM. LANDS, REDUCTION OF INTEREST : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 66 (i).
DOM. LANDS, SOUTH-EASTERN MAN., SURVEY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 82 (i).
DOUKHOBORS, DATE OF ARRIVAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1998 (i).
——— PET. TO GOVT. *re* CANADIAN TYRANNY : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1748 (i).
——— SCHOOL GRANTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1367 (i).
DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 3522 (ii).
ELKHORN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, SALE OF PRINTING PLANT : in Com. of Sup., 2766 (i), 5321 (ii).
GOODLANDS, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2776 (i).
HALF-BREEDS, SCRIP ISSUED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 1253 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 3513, 4399 (ii).
HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1375 (i).
INDIAN AFFAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 2761, 2771 (i), 5447 (ii).
——— AGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 2761 (i).
JARVIS, MR., DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1383 (i).
JUDGES, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2647 (i).

MANITOBA—*Con.*
LAKE MANITOBA, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4400 (ii).
—— PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1259 (i).
—— OUTLET, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).
LAKE WINNIPEG, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4399 (ii).
—— HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 5782 (ii).
—— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).
LANDS FOR COLONIZATION, SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 1249 (i).
LAND GRANTS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5207 (ii).
LETTER CARRIERS, WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 105 (i).
MAN. AND N. W. T. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 2761, 2771 (i).
ROSSEAU RIVER INDIAN RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 82 (i).
ST. ANDREW'S LOCK, CONSTRUCTION, LABOUR CONTRACT, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Puttee*) 1266 (i).
ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1205 (i), 4400 (ii).
SCARTH, MR. W. F., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1261 (i).
SCHOOL LANDS, SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 71 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 336 (i).
—— TRANSFER, &c.: M. for Pets. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 88 (i).
—— INVESTIGATION, &c., REP. OF JUDGE: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 3454 (ii).
—— INQUIRY FOR RET.: (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2205.
—— REP. OF JUDGE PRENDERGAST: Inquiry for (Mr. *LaRivière*) 4196, 5714 (ii).
SETTLERS, ADVANCES TO, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 107 (i).
STRATHCLAIR POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 489 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 91 (i).
SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).
THOMPSON, MR. J. W., HOMESTEAD INSPECTOR, RESIGNATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1375 (i).
TIMBER LANDS, PROTECTION TO: in Com. of Sup., 2670 (i).
VIRDEN, POSTMASTER W. F. SCARTH, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1261 (i).
VIRDEN, QU'APPELLE, &c., TOWN SITES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Osler*) 881 (i).
WINNIPEG IMMIGRANT HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 5697 (ii).
WINNIPEG AND ST. BONIFACE HOSPITALS: in Com. of Sup., 2870 (i).

Manitoulin North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 108 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 2347; 2°*, 2923 (i); in Com., and 3*., 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 74.)

MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5556 (ii).

Manufacturers and Temperance and General Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 97 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 2161; 2°*, 2397 (i); in Com., 2984; 3°*, 2986 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 105.)

MAPS OF DOM., PRINTING, LITHOGRAPHING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5452 (ii).
MAPS, S. A. WAR, DISTRIBUTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3787 (ii).
—— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.
MARBLE ROCK POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 467, 472 (i).
MARIA STREET BRIDGE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 3528 (ii).
MARINE:
'AMELIA' SS., TONNAGE, FREIGHT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1795 (i).
BERNIER, CAPT., EXPLORATION *re* NORTH POLE, GOVT. AID, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5191; on conc., 5790 (ii).
BIOLOGICAL STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 265 (i).
—— PROF. PRINCE'S REP.: in Com. of Sup., 267.
—— *See* 'Georgian,' &c.
BLACK ROCKS LIGHTHOUSE, B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 200 (i).
'BRANT,' STR., MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 280 (i).
BROCTON LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 287 (i).
BRONTE LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 288 (i).
CANADIAN FLAG IN FOREIGN PORTS, ACTION OF BRITISH CONSUL AT BRAZIL: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4648, 5970 (ii).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 208 (i).
DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Louis Davies*) 51 (i).
ENTRANCE ISLAND, B.C., SUPERANNUATION OF ROBT. GREY: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Prior*) 1267.
—— *See* 'Grey, Robt.'
FOG ALARMS, INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 294 (i).
—— MEMORIALS FROM BOARD OF TRADE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 294 (i).
GEORGIAN BAY BIOLOGICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5197 (i).
—— LIGHTHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4586 (ii).
GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 240 (i), 4584 (ii).
GREY, ROBT., LIGHT-KEEPER, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 278 (i).
—— SUPERANNUATION, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Prior*) 1267 (i).
HALIFAX HARBOUR LIGHTSHIP, MEMORIALS OF BOARD OF TRADE: in Com. of Sup., 280 (i).
HUDSON BAY RECORDS *re* LAND TITLES: in Com. of Sup., conc., 5790 (ii).
HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 292 (i).
'JENNIE MAY,' INVESTIGATION *re* LOSS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2777 (i).
JUAN DE FUCA, SAILING DIRECTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2407 (i).
LAKE ERIE LIFE-SAVING STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 260 (i), 5187 (ii).
LAKE WINNIPEG HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 5782 (ii).
LANGELIER, MR. CHAS., EXPENSES *re* PILOTAGE COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 269 (i).
LEGAL EXPENSES *re* MARINE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 269 (i).
LIFE-SAVING REWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 260 (i).
LIFE-SAVING STATIONS, &c., CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 5187 (ii).
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 270 (i), 4585 (ii).
—— SALARIES AT OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 284 (i).
—— *See* general heading.
LIGHTHOUSES, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 282 (i).
—— List (read) 286 (i).
LIGHT-KEEPERS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 270 (i).
LONG POINT LIFE-SAVING STATION, LAKE ERIE: in Com. of Sup., 260 (i), 5187 (ii).
LOUISBURG, N.S., MARINE HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 5194 (ii).
LURCHER SHOAL LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 282, 284 (i).
MARINE BIOLOGICAL STATIONS, PROF. PRINCE'S REP.: in Com. of Sup., 267 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*
MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 186 (i), 4345, 5183 ; conc., 5789 (ii).
——— LEGAL EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 269.
MARINE HOSPITALS : in Com. of Sup., 293 (i), 5194 (ii).
——— INSPECTION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5194 (ii).
MASTERS AND MATES : in Com. of Sup., 259 (i).
METEOROLOGICAL CHARTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 290 (i).
——— SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 289 (i).
MIDDLE GROUND LIGHTHOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 282 (i), 5187 (ii).
'MINTO,' STR., MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
MUSQUASH ISLAND LIGHT-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1251 (i).
NAVIGATION, AIDS TO, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4585, 5188 (ii).
'NEWFIELD,' STR., MAINTENANCE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 243 (i).
NORTH POLE EXPEDITION. *See* 'Bernier, Capt.'
OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 240, 260 (i), 4584, 5185 (ii).
PAQUET, JOS., PILOT, APPNMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2204 (i).
PILOTAGE INVESTIGATION : in Com. of Sup., 269 (i).
PILOTAGE RULES, CAN. AND U.S., UNIFORMITY, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5189 (ii).
POLAR EXPEDITION : in Com. of Sup., 5191 ; conc., 5790 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1798 (i).
PORT CREDIT LIFE-SAVING STATION : in Com. of Sup., 260 (i).
P.E.I. CLAIMS *re* MAINTENANCE OF STEAM COMMUNICATION : Res. prop. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4535 (ii).
——— *See* general heading.
——— MAINLAND WINTER COMMUNICATION : in Com. of Sup., 252 (i).
——— COR. WITH BOARDS OF TRADE, &c. : M. for copies of Reps., &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1268 (i).
——— *See* 'Stanley.'
PROSPECT POINT LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 287 (i).
REGISTRATION OF SHIPPING : in Com. of Sup., 261 (i).
RICHELIEU RIVER BEACONS, MAINTENANCE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2775, 2988 (i).
RUSSELL, MR. W. A., DISMISSAL, &c. : M. for Reps.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 816 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE, AIDS TO NAVIGATION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5188 (ii).
——— (LOWER) NAVIGATION, INVESTIGATION, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 4197 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4231 (ii).
——— LIGHTING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).
——— WINTER NAVIGATION : in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).
ST. LOUIS LAKE, HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY : in Com. of Sup.. 4309 (ii).
SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 289 (i), 5100 (ii).
SEAMEN, SHIPWRECKED AND SICK : in Com. of Sup., 293 (i).
SECHELT ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 200 (i).
'SHAMROCK,' STR., MAINTENANCE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 246, 254 (i).
SHIP-BUILDING INDUSTRY AT HALIFAX : in Com. of Sup., 245 (i).
SHIPPING REGISTRATION : in Com. of Sup., 261 (i).
'STANLEY,' STR., AND WINTER MAIL SERVICE WITH P.E.I., REPS., &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 544 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION : in Com. of Sup., 293 (i).
STEAMERS, CONSTRUCTION, &c., TO REPLACE OLD STRS. : in Com. of Sup., 5185 (ii).
——— GOVT., SUPPLIES : in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
THORNBURY LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 287 (i).
TIDAL SURVEY : in Com. of Sup., 262 (i).
'TYRIAN,' S.S., CHARTERED BY DOM. GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) Pictou) 5824 (ii).
VICTORIA BEACH LIGHTHOUSE, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 91 (i).
'WILLAMETTE,' STR., WRECK AT DENMAN'S ISLAND : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 3643, 3983 (ii).
WINTER MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 265 (i).
WRECKS, INVESTIGATION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 261 (i).
MARYSVILLE PUBLIC BUILDING, N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 5688 (ii).
MASTERS AND MATES : in Com. of Sup., 259 (i).
Mather Bridge and Power Co.'s B. No. 35 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 693 ; 2°*, 1050 ; in Com., and 3°* 1914 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, *c.* 106.)
MAXWELL, MAJ., GRATUITY TO : in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).
MEAFORD HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).
MEALEY, MR. J. W., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 809 (i).
MEDALS, LONG SERVICE, DELAY IN ISSUING FORMS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2567 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) wthdn., 2568 (i).
——— DELAY IN ISSUE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5213 (ii).
——— ISSUE TO VOLUNTEERS : Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1259 (i).
——— *See* 'Long Service,' 'Militia,' &c.
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, B.C. INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 2772 (i).
——— INDIANS, N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 4932 (ii).
——— INDIANS, ONT. AND QUE. : in Com. of Sup., 2753 (i).
——— *See* 'Indians,' &c.
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. No. 65 (Mr. *Roddick*) 1° m., 1392 (i).
MEMBERS, &c., APPNMT. TO OFFICES : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 199 (i).
——— INTRODUCED : 2567 (i).
——— REMARKS CHECKED (Mr. *Speaker*) 3768, 4872, 5070, 5435 (ii).
——— SPEECHES, LENGTH OF. *See* 'Speeches.'
MEMORIAL TABLETS IN R. M. COLLEGE : in Com. of Sup., 5314 (ii).
——— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
MEMORIAL TO HIS EX. *re* YUKON TERRITORY, REQUIREMENTS, &c. : M. for Copy* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 816 (i).
MENNONITES, LOANS TO : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 67 (i).
MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY :
MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 4, 50, 136, 1167, 2628 (i), 2984, 4898, 5095 (ii).
——— *re* DECLARATION OATH : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 5970 (ii).
——— QUEEN VICTORIA, DECEASE OF, MESS. FROM COL. OFFICE *re* ADDRESS : Presented 3454.

METEOROLOGICAL CHARTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 290.
—— SURVEYS : in Com. of Sup., 289 (i).
METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE CO., LAPSES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1262 (i).
MICMAC DICTIONARY, DR. RAND'S : in Com. of Sup., 5456 (ii).
MICMAC INDIANS, STE. ANNE DE RESTIGOUCHE, CHARGES AGAINST : in Com. of Sup., 2754 (i).
—— DUTIES OF AGENT : M. for Cor. * (Mr. *Sproule*) 816 (i).
MIDDLE GROUND LIGHTHOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 282 (i), 5187 (ii).
Middleton. *See* 'Divorce.'
MIDLAND, CUSTOMS PORT, COLLECTOR, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3847 (ii).
MIDLAND HARBOUR : Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bennett*) 89 (i).
MIDLAND AND VASEY MAIL SERVICE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2570 (i).
MILITIA :
AMMUNITION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3774, 3784, 3787, 5314 (i).
ANNUAL DRILL : in Com. of Sup., 3406, 3421, 4346 (ii).
ARMOURIES, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 5697 (ii).
—— *See* 'St. Thomas.'
BADEN-POWELL'S POLICE FORCE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 106 (i).
BATTALIONS IN ACTIVE MILITIA, NUMBER, &c. IN PROVS. : Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 2568 (i).
CADET CORPS, RIFLES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
CAN. AND IMP. GOVTS. : COR. *re* COMMISSIONS IN S. A. WAR : Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 106 (i).
—— M. for Cor.*, &c. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 1266.
CANTEENS FOR MILITIA CAMPS : in Com. of Sup., 3421 (ii).
CARTRIDGE FACTORIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3439, 3784, 5892 (ii).
'C' BATTERY, PAY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 81.
—— PAY OF MEN BY IMP. GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3458 (ii).
—— BY CAN. GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3459.
—— Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 84 (i).
—— M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Clarke*) 123 (i).
—— Incomplete Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2056 (i).
CLOTHING : in Com. of Sup., 3771, 4350 (ii).
DOM. RIFLE ASSOCIATION, GRANTS TO, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5313 (ii).
DUNDAS RIFLE ASSOCIATION, ANNUAL GRANTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 1440 (i).
ESQUIMALT DEFENCES : in Com. of Sup., 3785, 5313 (ii).
FENIAN RAID PENSIONS : in Com. of Sup., 4639.
GENERAL OFFICER COMMANDING, SALARY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 337 (i).
GOV. GEN.'S FOOT GUARDS, ACCOUTREMENTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1587 (i).
GRATUITIES, COMPENSATIONS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4353 (ii).
GRAVES OF CAN. SOLDIERS IN SOUTH AFRICA : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 64 (i).
HALIFAX PROVISIONAL GARRISON : in Com. of Sup., 5314 (ii).
HAMILTON FIELD BATTERY, RETIREMENT OF COL. VAN WAGNER : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1267 (i).
—— *See* 'Van Wagner,' &c.
HORSES FOR BRITISH ARMY, COM. FROM C. W. PETERSON : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1995 (i).
—— *See* 'Remounts,' &c.
MILITIA—*Con.*
HUTTON, GENL., AND LT.-COL. SAM. HUGHES : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 115, 368 (i).
KINGSTON MILITARY BUILDINGS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5697 (ii).
—— COLLEGE, KINGSTON : in Com. of Sup., 2547.
LÉVIS BRIGADE CAMP, IRREGULARITIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2994 (ii).
LONG SERVICE DECORATIONS, DISTRIBUTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1067 (i).
—— MEDALS, DELAY IN ISSUE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5213 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1259 (i).
—— *See* 'Medals.'
LONGUEUIL ORDNANCE LANDS, RENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1796 (i).
MACKENZIE, CAPT., PENSION, &c. : in Com of Sup., 3394, 4353 (ii).
MAXWELL, MAJ., GRATUITY TO : in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).
MEDALS, LONG SERVICE, DELAY IN ISSUE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5213 (ii).
—— DELAY IN ISSUING FORMS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2567 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) wthdn., 2568 (i).
—— ISSUE TO VOLUNTEERS : Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1259 (i).
MEMORIAL TABLETS IN R. M. COLLEGE : in Com. of Sup., 4351, 5314 (ii).
MILITIA, ACTIVE. *See* 'Battalions.'
MILITIA DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 5313, 5892 (ii).
—— CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 4346 (ii).
—— DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 694 (i).
—— OFFICERS TRAINING : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1070 (i).
—— PAY AND ALLOWANCE : in Com. of Sup., 3383 (ii).
—— PROPERTIES : in Com. of Sup., 3436, 4348, 5313 (ii).
—— PROVISIONS, SUPPLIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3772 (ii).
—— RETIRING ALLOWANCES : Remarks (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3373 (ii).
—— SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3435 (ii).
—— TRANSPORTATION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3773, 4638 (ii).
MONTGOMERY, GENL., MONUMENT TO IN QUEBEC CITY : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5211, 5587, 5824 (ii).
MONUMENTS ON BATTLEFIELDS : in Com. of Sup., 5314 (ii).
MULLOY, TROOPER : Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 43 (i).
MUSKETRY SCHOOL FOR MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 3383 (ii).
N. W. MOUNTED RIFLES, ARMS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).
OTTAWA MILITARY STORES : in Com. of Sup., 911, 1173 (i), 4390 (ii).
PENSIONS : in Com. of Sup., 4639 (ii).
—— TO HEADQUARTERS STAFF : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2994 (ii).
—— FOR PERMANENT CORPS, &c. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Prior*) 1281, 2608 (i).
—— *See* general heading.
—— TO S. A. SOLDIERS : in Com. of Sup., 4359.
QUEBEC CARTRIDGE FACTORY : in Com. of Sup., 3439 (ii).
REMOUNTS PURCHASED FOR IMP. GOVT. : in Com. of Sup., 3440 (ii).
REMOUNT STATIONS, GOVT. AID, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5154 (ii).
—— *See* 'Horses,' &c.
RIFLE ASSOCIATION, GOVT. GRANTS : in Com. of Sup., 3774, 3787 (ii).
RIFLE SHOOTING, ANNUAL PAYMENT, AMMUNITION, &c. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1281, 1286 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*
ROCKLIFFE RANGE, RY. EXTENSION, RATES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4348, 4639 (ii).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, KINGSTON : in Com. of Sup., 2547 (i), 3782 (ii).
——— EXTENSION, &c. : Letter from Robt. W. Saul, read (Mr. *Wallace*) 4871 (ii).
——— MEMORIAL TABLETS : in Com. of Sup., 4351, 5314 (ii).
——— *See* 'Kingston.'
ST. THOMAS BATTALION CLUB ROOMS, RENTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 506 (i).
SAUL, ROBT. W., LETTER *re* MILITARY COLLEGE : Read (Mr. *Wallace*) 4871 (ii).
SCRIP FOR S. A. CONTINGENTS : Ques. (Mr. *McCormick*) 93 (i).
SIEVERT, PTE., BRAVERY, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).
STAFF COLLEGE COURSE, BOOKS, DATA, &c. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1287 (i).
STEVESTON, B.C., RIOTS, CALLING OUT MILITIA : Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 328 (i).
STONEY CREEK MONUMENT, SUMS VOTED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 5210 (ii).
THOMPSON, SURGEON W. E., PAY, &c., IN S. A. WAR ; in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION CHARGES *re* MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 3773, 4638 (ii).
VAN WAGNER, COL., RETIREMENT, &c. : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1267 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 5890 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2568 (i).
WARLIKE STORES : in Com. of Sup., 3439, 4351.
WORK POINT BARRACKS, EXPROPRIATION OF LAND : in Com. of Sup., 4352, 5314 (ii).
ZONG, PTE., PAY DUE BY GOVT. : in Com. of Sup., 3395 (ii).
——— *See* 'S. A. War,' &c.
MILL COVE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).
MILLSTREAM POSTMASTER, N.B., DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 113, 209 (i).
MILL STREET PAVING, MONTREAL : in Com. of Sup., 5621 (ii).
——— *See* 'Lachine,' &c.
MIMINEGASH PIER : in Com. of Sup., 3462 (ii).
MINERAL RESOURCES, B.C., ADVERTISEMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1749 (i).
MINES, B.C., BUREAU OF, RES. RESPECTING : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2406 (i).
——— INDUSTRIES, B.C., REP. OF INTERVIEW IN 'PROVINCE' : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1749 (i).
——— LAWS, YUKON, &c., TELEGRAM OF SIR WILFRID LAURIER : M. for Cor. *re** (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 225 (i).
——— REGULATIONS, APPEALS, YUKON, &c. : M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 131 (i).
MINT, CAN., ESTABLISHMENT OF : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 65 (i).
Mint. *See* 'Royal.'
'MINTO,' STR., MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SPANS, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 4162 (ii).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.,' &c.
MISPEC, N.B., BREAKWATER, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 808 (i).
MONCTON SHOPS, I.C.R., DISMISSALS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 815, 1004 (i).
——— EXTENSION, &c., in Com. of Sup., 4153 (ii).
Money Lenders B. No. 3 (Mr. *Madore*) 1° m., 20 ; 2° m., 607 ; in Com., 635 ; ref. to Sel. Com., 1432 (i).
MONGOLIAN IMMIGRATION, COR. *re* : M. for Copy* (Mr. *Prior*) 224 (i).
——— *See* 'Chinese,' &c.
MONTGOMERY, GENL., MONUMENT TO, IN QUEBEC CITY : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5211, 5587, 5824 (ii).
MONTREAL AND CAMPBELLTON DIVISION, I.C.R., EXTENSION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Dechene*) 1999 (i).
MONTREAL AND MANCHESTER SS. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5768 (ii).
——— *See* 'Halifax,' &c.
MONTREAL AND PROVINCE LINE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360 ; in Com. on Res., 5531 (ii).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 112 (Mr. *Carroll*) 1°*, 2347 ; 2°*, 2923 (i) ; in Com., 5407 ; ref. back to Sel. Com., 5411 ; in Com., 5890 ; 3°*, 5892 (ii).
MONTREAL, ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 331 (i).
——— CUSTOM HOUSE, ALTERATIONS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5691 (ii).
——— DISTRICT JUDGES, INCREASE OF SALARY, &c. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 3460 ; in Com. on Res., 4066 (ii).
——— HARBOUR ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).
——— COMMISSIONERS, ALLOWANCES, EXPENDITURE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3178, 3270 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Further Provision B. No. 142 (Mr. *Fielding*), Res. prop., 4870 ; M. for Com. on Res., 5117 ; in Com. on Res., 5128 ; 1°*, 5215 ; 2°*, and in Com., 5471 ; 3°*, 5472 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 9.)
——— HARBOUR WORKS AND MALONE & CO.'S CONTRACT, SPECIFICATIONS, &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. *Haggart*) 1406 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 1068 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5688 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, ALTERATIONS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5689 (ii).
MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST BONDS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 203 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 545, 2571 (i).
MONTREAL WATCH CASE CO. : in Com. of Sup., 268.
MONUMENTS ON BATTLEFIELDS : in Com. of Sup., 5314 (ii).
MOORE, WM., DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Culbert*) 1403 (i).
MOTION, NOTICE OF *re* S. A. WAR : Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) 1069 (i).
MOUNTED POLICE BUILDINGS, N. W., &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3447 (ii).
——— CLOTHING, ARMS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3444.
——— PAY OF FORCE : in Com. of Sup., 3442 (ii).
MOUNTED RIFLES, N. W., ARMS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).
——— *See* 'Militia, &c.'

MULGRAVE TURNTABLES, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 4158 (ii).
MURRAY BAY HARBOUR BRANCH, P.E.I. RY. : in Com. of Sup., 4191, 4228 (ii).
MURRAY BAY, QUE., WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 5709 (ii).
MURRAY AND ROSS LIQUOR PERMITS, YUKON : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1250 (i).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
MUSKETRY SCHOOL FOR MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 3383 (ii).
——— *See* 'Militia, &c.'
MUSQUASH ISLAND LIGHT-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C. Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1251 (i).
MUTTON IMPORTED, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 335 (i).
MYERS, MR. GEO., FISHERY WARDEN, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 335 (i).
NAGLE BUILDINGS, &C., OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 913 (i).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' 'Pub. Works.'

Nakusp and Slocan Ry. Co.'s B. No. 20 (Mr. *Prior*) 1°*, 420 ; 2°*, 731 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1540 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 75.)

NAPANEE, HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 4401 (ii).
——— POSTMASTER, PAYMENT OF SALARY : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5202 (ii).
——— RESIGNATION OF MR. BOGART : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3269 (ii).
——— RIVER, SURVEY : M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 80 (i).
NATIONAL ART GALLERY, OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 3530 (ii).
NAVIGATION, AIDS TO, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4585, 5188 (ii).
——— *See* 'Marine, &c.'
NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3495.
NEILL'S BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
NELSON PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 3097.
NELSON & SONS, CUSTOMS REFUNDS ON ACCOUNT OF FIRE : in Com. of Sup., 4726, 5468 (ii).

NEW BRUNSWICK :
BACK BAY WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3473 (ii).
——— CONTRACT *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 5209.
BAY DU VIN WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3473 (ii).
BRIDGE REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 3498 (ii).
BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 5688 (ii).
——— *See* 'Supply.'
BURNT CHURCH WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3473.
CAMPBELLTON ROUND-HOUSE, REPAIRS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 507 (i).
CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3473 (ii).
CANADA EASTERN RY., RES. FROM N.B. BOARDS OF TRADE, RECEIVED BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Bobinson, N.B.*) 3753 (ii).
CENTRAL RY., N. B., MAIL CONTRACT WITH GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1593 (i).
CHARLOTTE CENSUS COMMISSIONER : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 93 (i).
CHIPMAN, N. B. AND GIBSON RY CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360 ; in Com. on Res., 5535 (ii).
DALHOUSIE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 5706 (ii).
DONEGAL POST OFFICE, CLOSING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 459 (i).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*
DORCHESTER BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 5705 (ii).
——— PENITENTIARY, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 2650 (i).
EASTERN EXTENSION RY., AWARD, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5941 (ii).
——— CHARGED TO CAPITAL ACCOUNT : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2162 (i).
EEL RIVER STATION, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 5226 (ii).
EXPORTS, &C. FROM ST. JOHN : in Com. of Sup., 5218 (ii).
FENWICK, J. A. *See* 'Millstream.'
FREDERICTON BARRACKS : in Com. of Sup., 3437.
GONDOLA POINT WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 5706.
HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 3473, 3496, 4399, 5705 (ii).
HOPEWELL CAPE WHARF, CONTRACTORS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 810 (i).
INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 2759 (i).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 4932 (ii).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 2761 (i).
KENNEBECASIS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3496.
KING'S COUNTY, FISHERY WARDEN, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 335 (i).
——— INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2760 (i).
——— VOTERS' LISTS : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2571.
MCAULEY, MR. J. E., DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 113 (i).
MARYSVILLE PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup. 5688 (ii).
MEALEY, MR. J. W., EMPLMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 809 (i).
MILLSTREAM P.O. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 113, 209.
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SPANS, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 4162 (ii).
MISPEC BREAKWATER, TENDERS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 808 (i).
MONCTON SHOPS, I. C. R., DISMISSAL OF MECHANICS : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 815, 1004 (i).
——— EXTENSION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4153 (ii).
MUSQUASH ISLAND LIGHT-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1251 (i).
MYERS, MR. GEO., FISHERY WARDEN, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 335 (i).
PASSEKEAG STATION, ERECTION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 113 (i).
PRINCE, WM. L., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2702 (i).
RICHIBUCTO PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 5688 (ii).
RIVER ST. JOHN BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3495 (ii).
ROTHESAY VOTERS' LIST, FRAUDULENT NAMES ADDED : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2571 (i).
ST. JOHN, DUBLIN AND BELFAST SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4773 (ii).
——— AND GLASGOW SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4773 (ii).
ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX GRAIN ELEVATORS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 89 (i).
——— AMOUNT OF GRAIN RECEIVED : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 810 (i).
——— GRAIN EXPORTS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1998 (i).
——— NAMES OF EMPLOYEES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1584 (i).
——— HARBOUR, FORT DUFFERIN : in Com. of Sup., 5706 (ii).
——— HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACT *re* CONNOLLY : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1581 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4399 (ii).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 1242 (i).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*
ST. JOHN, LANDS PURCHASED FOR I.C.R. : M. for O. C.'s* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 225 (i).
——— AND LIVERPOOL SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 3772 ; conc., 5794 (ii).
——— AND LONDON SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).
——— LONG WHARF : M. for Cor., O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Fowler*) 1266 (i).
——— RIVER TIDAL WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 5706 (ii).
——— WHARF, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 4136 (ii).
——— WHARF, CONVEYER : in Com. of Sup., 4378 (ii).
ST. STEPHEN, N.B. AND BLACK BAY SS. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5767 (ii).
SEED GRAIN FOR INDIANS : in Com. of Sup , 2760.
TRACADIE LAZARETTO : in Com. of Sup., 2867 (i).
VOTERS' LISTS, KING'S CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2571 (i).
WOODSTOCK, N.B., MAIL CONTRACT, &C. FOR 1900 : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4230 (ii).

'NEWFIELD,' STR., MAINTENANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 243 (i).

NEWFOUNDLAND, ADMISSION INTO CONFEDERATION : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 332 (i).
——— AND U. S. TREATY. *See* 'Bond-Blaine.'

NEW GERMANY, CALEDONIA AND SHELBURNE RY. SUBSIDY : Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5571 (ii).

NEW LONDON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3465.

NEWSPAPERS, HOUSE OF COMMONS : in Com. of Sup., 5464 (ii).
——— POSTAGE : in Com. of Sup., 446 (i).
——— SALES OF ON I.C.R., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2988 (ii).

NEW WESTMINSTER PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com of Sup., 3097, 4392 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. No. 49 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 1167 ; 2°*, 1431 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2200 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 76.)

NICOLET STATION, I.C.R., CONSTRUCTION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5226 (ii).

NIPISSING ELECTION, VALIDITY OF WRIT, &C. : M. to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections (Mr. *Northrup*) 3643 (i) ; (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3654 ; Neg. (Y. 51 ; N. 94) 3722 (ii).
Debate : (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 3658 ; (Mr. *Alcorn*) 3665 ; (Mr. *Marcil*) 3677 ; (Mr. *Monk*) 3678 ; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3681, 3715 ; (Mr. *Barker*) 3697 ; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3700, 3719 ; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3708 ; (Mr. *Haggart*) 3714 ; (Mr. *German*) 3718 (ii).
——— CERTIFICATE OF TRIAL JUDGE : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3177 (ii).

NORTH CHANNEL, GALOPS CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 4312, 5620 (ii).

Northern Pacific and Man. Ry. Co.'s Amalgamation B. No. 87 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 1880 ; 2°*, 2201 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3697 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 73.)

NORTH POLE EXPEDITION. *See* 'Bernier, Capt.'

NORTHRUP, W. B., PROMOTION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5184 (ii).

North-west Ter. Elections Amt. B. No 74 (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1° m, 1496 (i).

North-west Territories Representation Act Amt. B. No. 147 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 5577 ; M. to wthdw., 5829 ; wthdn., 5953 (ii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES :
ARSENAULT, MR., HOMESTEAD INSPECTOR, DISMISSAL, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1383 (i).
COTTAGE HOSPITALS : in Com. of Sup., 5455 (ii).
CREAMERIES, SALE OF PRODUCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5175 (ii).
CYPRESS HILLS SURVEYS, SUBDIVISIONS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1387 (i).
ENUMERATORS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. on N.W.T. Representation B., 5829 (ii).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5953 (ii).
EXHIBIT OF N. W. T. AT BUFFALO EXHIBITION : in Com. of Sup., 5456 (i).
GOVT. OF N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 1367 (i), 4918.
——— FINANCIAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL STATUS, &C. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Scott*) 2608 (i).
——— PROVINCIAL STATUS : Remarks, in Com. of Sup., 1368 (i).
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. LANDS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 809 (i).
GRIST AND SAW MILLS FOR INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 2771 (i).
HATCHERIES : in Com. of Sup., 5197 (i).
INDIAN AGENTS, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2764 (i).
——— *See* 'Indians,' &c.
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS : in Com. of Sup., 2767 (i), 5447 (ii).
INSANE PATIENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1367 (i).
INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY FENCE, RIDINGSTONE AND MILK RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 5451 (ii).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES, &C : in Com. of Sup., 2698 (i).
——— MAINTENANCE OF LUNATICS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2698 (i).
LIVE STOCK FOR INDIAN RESERVES : in Com. of Sup., 5320 (ii).
MOUNTED POLICE BUILDINGS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3447 (ii).
——— CLOTHING, ARMS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3444 (ii).
——— COMPENSATION ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3447 (ii).
——— PAY OF FORCE : in Com. of Sup., 3442 (ii).
——— REP. : Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 510 (i).
——— SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).
MOUNTED RIFLES, ARMS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).
OXFORD HOUSE INDIANS, RELIEF, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4933 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 336 (i).
QUARANTINE, CATTLE : in Com. of Sup., 3084 (ii).
REGINA JAIL : in Com. of Sup., 2650 (i).
REGINA, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. LANDS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 808 (i).
REGISTRY OFFICE : conc., 5794 (ii).
RIDINGSTONE AND MILK RIVER BOUNDARY FENCE : in Com. of Sup., 5451 (ii).
SCHOOLS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1368 (i), 5782 (ii).
SHERIFF'S FEES : in Com. of Sup., 2647 (i).
SUPREME COURT JUDGES, &C., INCREASE OF SALARY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 3460 (ii).
TIMBER LANDS PROTECTION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2670 (i).
WHITEFISH HATCHERY : in Com. of Sup., 5197 (ii).
See 'Indians,' 'Interior,' 'Manitoba,' &c.

NORTON STATION ACCIDENT : in Com. of Sup., 4227 (ii).

Nova Scotia Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 104 (Mr. *Fraser*) 1°*, 2347 ; 2°*, 2923 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 77.)

NOVA SCOTIA :

ABBOIT'S BEACH, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).
ALIEN LABOUR LAW, ENFORCEMENT *re* DOM. STEEL WORKS : Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 200 (i).
AMAGADUS POND WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 5701.
AMHERST SUBWAY, LAND DAMAGES : in Com. of Sup., 2715 (i).
ANNAPOLIS AND G. B. SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4789 (ii).
ARICHAT, PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 5687 (ii).
BADDECK, &C. TO EAST BAY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4788 (ii).
BATTERY POINT RETAINING WALL : in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
BEAVER RIVER, WHARF EXTENSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).
BIG BRAS D'OR WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
'BLUE HILL,' STR., SUBSIDY, TONNAGE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 3457 (ii).
BOULARDERIE CENTRE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
BRIDGETOWN AND MIDDLETON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360 ; in Com. on Res., 5569 (ii).
BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 2547 (i), 4390, 5687.
——— *See* 'Supply,' 'Public Works.'
CAN. CREEK BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
CANSO STRAIT FERRY SERVICE, I.C R.: in Com. of Sup., 4379, 5217 (ii).
——— WHARF ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 4159 (ii).
CAPE NEGRO ISLANDS BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
CENTRAL RY. AND HALIFAX RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360 ; in Com. on Res., 5570 (ii).
CHEBOGUE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
CHEVERIE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3154.
CLARKE'S BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
COLCHESTER INDIAN AGENT, SALARY, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2758 (i).
——— RESERVE, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup , 2760 (i).
COMEAUVILLE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4398 (ii).
CUSTOMS, SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3847 (ii).
DOM. STEEL WORKS. *See* 'Alien Labour.'
DOM. AND NOVA SCOTIA ARBITRATION, &C. : Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3753 (ii).
EASTERN EXTENSION RY., ARBITRATOR'S AWARD : in Com. of Sup., 5892 (ii).
——— ARBITRATION, &C. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 203 (i).
——— Inquiry for O. C. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1961 (i).
EAST RIVER SHEET HARBOUR WHARF : M. for Cor.* (Mr *Borden, Halifax*) 224 (i).
GRANDIGUE FERRY AND ARICHAT RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360 ; in Com. on Res., 5561 (ii).
GREENVALE POSTMASTER, SALARY, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 3458 (ii).
HALIFAX, BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 1240 (i).
——— AND CANSO SS. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5776 (ii).
——— DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 5687 (ii)
——— DREDGING AT I.C.R. TERMINUS : in Com. of Sup., 4134 (ii).
——— GRAIN ELEVATOR, CAPACITY, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 1590 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

HALIFAX, ELEVATOR, EMPLOYEES, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1585 (i).
——— HARBOUR LIGHTSHIP, MEMORIAL OF BOARD OF TRADE : in Com. of Sup., 280 (i).
——— MANCHESTER LINE, PROTEST *re* CONTRACT, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1501 (i).
——— PROVISIONAL GARRISON : in Com. of Sup., 5314 (ii).
——— NEWFOUNDLAND AND LIVERPOOL SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4772 (ii).
——— RY. ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 2706 (i), 5216 (ii).
——— AND W. INDIES SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4783 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, MAR. PROVS. : in Com. of Sup., 3496 (ii).
——— N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 3153, 4398, 5701 (ii).
HAWK ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1582 (i).
HILTZ NARROWS BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).
INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 2758 (i).
INGONISH BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4398 (ii).
I. C. R. AND WINDSOR JUNCTION AND MUSQUODOBOIT RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360 ; in Com. on Res., 5531 (ii).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360 ; in Com. on Res., 5535 (ii).
LOBSTER PACKING, LICENSES GRANTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 1967 (i).
LOUISBURG MARINE HOSPITAL : in Com. of Sup., 5194 (ii).
LUNENBURG COUNTY, BREAKWATERS : in Com. of Sup., 3165 (i).
——— INDIAN RESERVES, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C., in Com. of Sup., 2759 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 4390.
LURCHER SHOAL LIGHTSHIP : in Com. of Sup., 282, 284 (i).
MACINNIS, JOHN, SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2703 (i).
MACKENZIE, CAPT., PENSION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3394, 4353 (ii).
MCLELLAN, JOHN B., SALE OF RY. TIES TO I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 5633 (ii).
MAXWELL, MAJ., GRATUITY TO : in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).
MIDDLE GROUND LIGHTHOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 282 (i).
MILL COVE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3164.
MULGRAVE, TURNTABLES, &C., I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 4158 (ii).
NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3495 (ii).
NEILL'S BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
NEW GERMANY, CALEDONIA AND SHELBURNE RY. SUBSIDY : Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5571 (ii).
NOVA SCOTIA, CLAIMS AGAINST FEDERAL GOVT., PAPERS *re* : Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1790 (i).
——— M. to print Papers (Mr. *Haggart*) 2610 (i).
——— *See* 'Dom.', &c.
PARKERS COVE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4398.
PARRSBORO' BEACH : in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
PETIT RIVIÈRE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).
PICTOU COUNTY, MAIL CONTRACTS : in Com. of Sup., 479 (i).
——— DISMISSALS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 1244 (i).
——— POSTMASTERS, DISMISSALS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 606 (i).
PICTOU HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS *vs.* THE QUEEN : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 816 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

PICTOU, INQUIRY FOR RET. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 3271.
PICTOU ISLAND WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3461.
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 5216 (ii).
PUBNICO, N.S., AND PORT CLYDE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360 ; in Com. on Res., 5533 (ii).
QUODDY RIVER, FISHERY OVERSEER : in Com. of Sup., 4588 (ii).
ROCKY LAKE BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 2642 (i).
ROUND BAY BROOK, CONSTRUCTION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2203, 2397 (i).
ST. PETER'S CANAL, MR. O'DONOGHUE'S CLAIM : in Com. of Sup., 5632 (ii).
SALMON RIVER SHED : in Com. of Sup., 3460 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 208 (i).
SCOTT'S BAY HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3174.
SEED GRAIN, INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 2758.
SHAD AND EAST DOVER FISHING ASSOCIATION, ALLEGED INTERFERENCE, &C. : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 816 (i).
SHEET HARBOUR MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 5461 (ii).
SHIP-BUILDING INDUSTRY AT HALIFAX : in Com. of Sup., 245 (i).
SHIP HARBOUR LAKE, INDIAN RESERVE, TIMBER CUTTING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2758 (i).
SIEVERT, PTE., BRAVERY, &C. : in Com. of Sup,, 3408 (ii).
STELLARTON STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 5216 (ii).
SUNNY BRAE AND COUNTRY HARBOUR RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360 ; in Com. on Res., 5472 (ii).
SYDNEY AND BAY ST. LAWRENCE SS. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5768 (ii).
——— COAL MINES, STRIKE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5300 (ii).
——— AND EAST BAY RY., COR., &C. : M. for Copy* (Mr. *Johnston, Cape Breton*) 1266 (i).
——— ENGINE HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 2644.
——— INDIAN RESERVE, COR. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Johnston, Cape Breton*) 1264 (i).
——— RY. ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 2716 (i), 4376 (ii).
——— PROPERTIES PURCHASED BY GOVERNMENT : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1005 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1267 (i).
TIMBER CUTTING ON SHIP HARBOUR LAKE, INDIAN RESERVE : in Com. of Sup., 2758 (i).
'TYRIAN' SS. CHARTERED BY DOM. GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 5824 (ii).
VICTORIA BEACH LIGHTHOUSE, TENDERS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 91 (i).
WEST BAY, C.B., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2703 (i).
WEST HALIFAX SHORE FISHERY, RULES, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 1267 (i).
WINDSOR, HARBOUR DAMS : in Com. of Sup., 3175 (ii).
ZONG, PTE., PAY DUE BY GOVT. : in Com. of Sup., 3345 (ii).

OAKVILLE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5743.

Oaths of Office. *See* 'Administration.'

O'BRIEN, A. H., SALARY, INCREASE : in Com. of Sup., 5466 (ii).

O'BRIEN, COL., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 4602 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1999 (i).

OBSERVATORY, SULPHUR MOUNTAIN, BANFF : in Com. of Sup., 5196 (ii).

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 240, 260 (i), 4584, 5185 (ii).

OCEAN STEAMERS, VENTILATION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 70 (i).

Ocean SS. Subsidies Act Amt. P No. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*). M. for Com. on Res., 5096 ; in Com. on Res., 5099 ; 1°* of B., 5110 ; 2°, and in Com., 5389 ; 3°*, 5393 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 6.)

O'DONOGHUE, D. J., APPNMT. BY GOVT., SALARY, &C : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1586 (i).

OKA INDIANS, REMOVAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2754.

O'LEARY AND WEST POINT RY. : in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).

O'LEARY STATION, P.E.I. RY., PET. *re* CONSTRUCTION AT : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1795 (i).

Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 95 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 2055 ; 2°*, 2397 (i) ; in Com., 5091 ; 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 78.)

ONTARIO :

ALGOMA AND C. P. RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360 ; in Com. on Res., 5575.
ALLISTON AND ROSEMOUNT MAIL CONTRACTS, DATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1591 (i).
ALMA MAIL CONTRACT : in Com. of Sup., 470 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 811 (i).
ANDERSON, MR. DUNCAN C., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1999 (i).
ARMOURY. *See* 'St. Thomas.'
ATHENS POSTMASTER, COMPLAINT AGAINST : in Com. of Sup., 496 (i).
BALSAM AND LAKE SIMCOE DIVISION, AMOUNT OF TENDER : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 810 (i).
BLIND RIVER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 5743 (ii).
BOBCAYGEON DAM : in Com. of Sup., 4384, 5631, 5634 (ii).
BOGART, MR., RESIGNATION FROM NAPANEE POSTMASTERSHIP : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3269 (ii).
——— *See* 'Napanee,' &c.
BOLSOVER P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 208.
BOWMAN & PORTER, DREDGING CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 204 (i).
BRAMPTON DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 4350, 5699 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 3139.
BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 3111.
——— CONTRACT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 2205, 2398 (i).
BRONTE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 5729 (ii).
——— LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 288 (i).
BRUCE, N., ELECTION CERTIFICATE OF JUDGES : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 323 (i).
——— CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2610 (i).
——— TRANSFER OF MAIL CLERKS, &C.: Par. in Newspaper (Mr. *Sproule*) 1578, 1593 (i).
——— QUES. OF ORDER : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 1578 (i).
——— POSTMASTER : in Com. of Sup., 495 (i).
BRUCE MINES : in Com. of Sup., 5730 (ii).
BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 4391 (ii).
——— *See* 'Supply,' 'Pub. Works.'
BURLINGTON CHANNEL, REPAIRS TO PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 5731 (ii).
'C' BATTERY, PAY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 81 (i) 3458, 3459 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 84 (i).
——— M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Clarke*) 123
——— Incomplete Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2056 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR ADDINGTON, APPNMT: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Addington*) 509 (i).
——— CARDWELL, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 329 (i).
——— EAST ELGIN: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1263 (i).
——— GREY COUNTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 335 (i).
——— SIMCOE: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 336 (i).
——— EAST SIMCOE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 201 (i).
CENTRAL ONTARIO RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5562.
CHEMONG LAKE BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 5625.
CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5695 (ii).
COBOURG PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3500 (ii).
COE HILL MINES AND APSLEY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 2989, 3179 (ii).
COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (i), 3500 (ii).
COLPOY'S BAY: in Com. of Sup., 3504 (ii).
CORNWALL CANAL ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4310, 5635; conc., 5794 (ii).
——— LOCK TENDER, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 4261 (iii).
——— SUPERINTENDENT, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Principle*) 1584 (i).
COWAN'S BRIDGE, GRANT BY GOVT.: (Mr. *Vrooman*) 1748 (i).
DEPOT HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (ii).
——— CONSTRUCTION OF LOCK, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McCormick*) 1251 (i).
——— QUANTITY OF GRAIN SHIPPED: (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2397 (i).
——— *See* 'Parry Sound.'
DESERONTO POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2547.
DRAYTON POSTMISTRESS, DATE OF APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 1439 (i).
DREDGING, ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 4400 (ii).
——— NEW PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 3516 (ii).
DUNDAS RIFLE ASSOCIATION, ANNUAL GRANT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 1440 (i).
DUNNVILLE DAM: in Com. of Sup., 5626 (i).
DURHAM, WEST CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGMENT OF COURT OF APPEAL: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 5802 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on Election Bill, 4022 (ii).
EDWARDSBURG POST OFFICE, PET., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 485 (i).
FARRAN'S POINT CANAL, ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4311 (ii).
FREEPORT POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
GALOPS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4311, 5619 (ii).
GANANOQUE LETTER BOXES, CONTRACT *re* COLLECTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2704 (i).
GEORGIAN BAY, BIOLOGICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5197 (ii).
——— HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 3114, 4590.
——— LIGHTHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4586 (ii).
GILBERT DREDGING CO., CLAIMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5635-5649, 5665; conc., 5800 (ii).
GODERICH HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3504 (ii).
GRAND BEND SURVEY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 335 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1406 (i).
G.T.R. AND MAGANETAWAN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5570 (ii).
'HACKETT' DREDGE, NAMES OF OWNERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 204 (i).
HAMILTON FIELD BATTERY, RETIREMENT OF COL. VAN WAGNER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1267 (i).
——— *See* 'Van Wagner,' &c.
——— SUB-POST OFFICE, &C.: M. for copies of Pets.* (Mr. *Barker*) 1405 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 3500, 4399 (ii).
——— *See* 'Supply,' 'Pub. Works.'
HARWOOD WHARF, RICE LAKE: in Com. of Sup., 5757 (ii).
HASTINGS, WEST, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, RESIGNATION OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2567 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 4644 (ii).
HAWKESTONE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4399, 4801 (ii).
HENDERSON, MR. H. D., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Brock*) 508 (i).
HODGE, MR. D., DISMISSAL, &C.: (Mr. *Taylor*) 1794 (i).
HULL, MR. WM., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 333 (i).
HURLEY, MR. J. M., FISHERY INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 296 (i).
INDIANS, ONT. AND QUEBEC, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2753 (i).
INDIAN RIVER, DEVIL'S ELBOW, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5732 (ii).
JUDICIAL APPNMTS, DELAY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 2821 (i).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1205 (i).
KINGSTON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 3534.
KINGSTON, LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACT *re* ROLLING STOCK: in Com. of Sup. 4165 (ii).
——— COR., &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 111 (i).
——— M. for copies of O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Haggart*) 816 (i).
——— GOVT. CONTRACT WITH I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1068, 1994 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Puttee*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5433, 5442 (ii).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5697 (ii).
——— MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 2547 (i), 3782 (ii).
——— AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5563.
——— PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 2649 (i).
LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RY. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 109 (i).
LAKE ERIE LIFE-SAVING STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 260 (i).
LEAMINGTON PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).
LEONARD, DR. R. A., POSTMASTER AT NAPANEE, PAYMENT OF SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5209 (ii)
——— *See* 'Napanee,' &c.
'LE PROGRÈS,' WINDSOR, PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 3458 (ii).
LITTLE BEAR CREEK: in Com. of Sup., 5734 (ii).
LONDON, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 2547 (i), 5691 (ii).
——— POSTMASTER, SALARY INCREASE: in Com. of Sup., 5458 (ii).
LONG POINT, LAKE ERIE LIFE-SAVING STATION: in Com. of Sup., 260 (i), 5187 (ii).
MCGIRR, MR. H. *See* 'Bolsover.'
MCGREGOR, MR., TEL. *re* AUBURN MILLS: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Kendry*) 3365 (ii).
——— MCKAY, MR., ACCOUNT *re* INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4635 (ii).
MCNAUGHTON, MR., COMPLAINT AGAINST: in Com. of Sup., 496 (i).
MADOC MAIL CONTRACT, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 1441 (i).
MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5556 (ii).
MARBLE ROCK POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 467, 472 (i).
MEAFORD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

MIDDLE GROUND LIGHTHOUSE, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 5187 (ii).
MIDLAND, CUSTOMS PORT, COLLECTOR, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3847 (ii).
——— HARBOUR, PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Bennett*) 89 (i).
——— AND VASEY MAIL SERVICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2570 (i).
MOORE, WM., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Culbert*) 1403 (i).
NAPANEE, HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4401 (ii).
——— POSTMASTER, PAYMENT OF SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5209 (ii).
——— RESIGNATION OF MR. BOGART: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3269 (ii).
——— RIVER SURVEY: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 80 (i).
NORTH CHANNEL, FORMING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4312, 5620 (ii).
OAKVILLE PIER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5743 (ii).
O'DONOGHUE, D. J., APPNMT. BY GOVT., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1586 (i).
ONTARIO RY. SUBSIDIES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 5585 (ii).
ORILLIA ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 5693 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2555 (i).
OTTAWA AND C.P.R. CROSSINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 95 (i).
——— GOV. GEN.'S FOOT GUARDS, ACCOUTREMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1587 (i).
——— SUPPLY CO., GOODS PURCHASED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1794 (i).
OWEN SOUND DREDGE AND CONSTRUCTION CO., NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 204 (i).
OWEN SOUND HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3569 (ii).
PACAUD, MR. A., APPLICATION FOR GOVT. POSITION: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 3457 (ii).
——— LEASE OF GOVT. BUILDING: Ques. Mr. *Clancy*) 2775 (i).
PARIS PUBLIC BUILDING, GOV. GEN.'S WARRANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4391 (ii).
PARRY SOUND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).
——— DOCKS: in Com. of Sup., 4805, 4811 (ii).
PEARL STREET POST OFFICE, HAMILTON: M. for copies of Pets.* (Mr. *Barker*) 1405 (i).
PENE'ANGUISHENE DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5757 (ii).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4794 (ii).
PETERBOROUGH DAM, IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).
PICTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2554 (i).
POINT PELEE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3509 (ii).
PORT ARTHUR BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5687 (ii).
PORT BRUCE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 507 (i).
PORT BURWELL HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3160, 4399 (ii).
——— EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 506.
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3509 (ii).
PORT COLBORNE, ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 5617 (ii).
——— EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1404, 2161 (i).
——— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 811.
——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1175 1182, 1207 (i).
PORT CREDIT LIFE-SAVING STATION: in Com. of Sup., 260 (i).
PORT HOPE HARBOUR, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 807 (i).
PORTSMOUTH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4811 (ii).
PORT STANLEY HARBOUR, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 506 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

PROVIDENCE BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3510.
PRESQU'ILE, PURCHASE OF WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5750 (ii).
RAINY RIVER LOCK AND DAM: in Com. of Sup., 5686 (ii).
——— MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 477 (i).
RAMA INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2753 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McLeod*) 200 (i).
——— TAXES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McLeod*) 93 (i).
RAMSAY, MR. J. H., DISMISSAL FROM CORNWALL CANAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Pringle*) 1584 (i).
RAPIDE PLAT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4311 (ii).
RICE LAKE AND PORT HOPE, SURVEY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 607 (i).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, EXTENSION, &c.: Letter from Robt. W. Saul read (Mr. *Wallace*) 4871 (ii).
——— *See* 'Kingston.'
——— MEMORIAL TO S. A. CADETS: in Com. of Sup., 4351 (ii).
RONDEAU HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
ST. CATHARINES WATER SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 109 (i).
ST. FRANCIS LAKE, PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 4383 (ii).
——— REMOVING SHOALS: in Com. of Sup., 4309, 4381 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, CONTRACT CHANGES, &c.: M. for O. C.'s* (Mr. *Haggart*) 815 (i).
ST. THOMAS, BATTALION CLUB ROOMS, RENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 506 (i).
——— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 2555 (i), 3104, 3110, 5693 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 505.
——— LETTER FROM MR. GREEN: in Com. of Sup., 3479, 5693 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Clancy*) 'Bourinot,' quoted, 3481 (ii).
SARNIA POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2555 (i).
SAUL, ROBT. W., LETTER *re* MILITARY COLLEGE: Read (Mr. *Wallace*) 4871 (ii).
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, DEEPENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 5732 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5692.
SCHNEIDER, MISS, APPNMT. AS POSTMISTRESS: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 1439 (i).
SCUGOG RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4401 (ii).
SEVERN RIVER FLOODS, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McLeod*) 201 (i).
SHEGUIANDAH PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
SIMCOE LAKE, LOWERING, PAPERS *re*: M. for Ret.* 224 (i).
SIMCOE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1405 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Halliday*) 2778 (i).
SOUTH NATION RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).
SPEECHES OF P. M. G. AT MEAFORD: in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
STEWART, MR., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 186, 2689, 2839 (i).
STONEY CREEK MONUMENT, SUMS VOTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 5210 (ii).
STRATFORD POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL OF: Ques. (Mr. *Maclaren, Perth*) 90 (i).
STUBBS, WM., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).
SYDENHAM HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 5733 (ii).
——— RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3506.

THAMES RIVER, OBSTRUCTION ON BAR: Remarks (Mr. *Stephens*) 2779 ( ).
THORNBURY LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 287 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*
THORNTON, MR., INDEMNITY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
——— Remarks *re*, 4022 (ii).
TORONTO DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 2562 (i), 3101 (ii).
TORONTO HARBOUR: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Kemp*) 77 (i).
——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i), 3512 (ii).
——— EASTERN ENTRANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5734 (ii).
TORONTO INLAND REVENUE COLLECTOR, NAME, QUALIFICATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 3754 (ii).
——— LEVEL CROSSING *re* APPLICATION TO RY. COM.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3456 (ii).
——— LINDSAY AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5534 (ii).
——— MAIL ROOM AT STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4392 (ii).
——— OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 289 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, STATION 'B,' LEASE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1995 (i).
TORONTO JUNCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3107, 5691, 5701 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 86, 2401 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 2402 (i).
TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4206, 4261, 5621.
——— DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4384 (i).
——— MR. MAINGY'S REP. &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Ward*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5436 (ii).
——— TENDER FOR 3RD DIVISION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 810 (i).
VAN WAGNER, COL., RETIREMENT, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1267 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2568 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 5890 (ii).
VICTORIA COUNTY DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 3104 (ii).
WALPOLE INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 2755 (i), 4930 (ii).
WASHAGO DAM, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McLeod*) 201 (i).
WELLAND CANAL, DOCK RENEWALS: in Com. of Sup., 5632 (ii).
——— EXTRA PAY TO ROBT. COULTER: in Com. of Sup., 4389 (ii).
——— LOCK BREAKAGES: in Com. of Sup., 4308.
——— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4388 (ii).
——— LOCK 24, NAME OF TENDERER: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1591 (i).
——— PORT COLBORNE IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4313 (ii).
——— QUANTITY OF WATER PASSING THROUGH: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1592 (i).
——— RAISING OLD LOCK WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 5625 (ii).
——— WATER POWER LEASES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *German*) 2609 (i).
WENDOVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5749 (ii).
WIARTON PIER: in Com. of Sup, 3513 (ii).
WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, SUPT., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 3179 (ii).
WINDSOR DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 2564.
——— GOVT. BUILDINGS, LEASE TO MR. A. PACAUD: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 2775 (i).
WINONA POSTMASTER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 2400 (i).
WOODSTOCK POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2566 (i), 5692 (ii).
YOUNG'S POINT DAM, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4384 (ii).

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT. *See* 'Parliament.'
OPPOSITION LEADERS, PRIVATE SECRETARY: in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).
OPPOSITION LEADER, APPNMT. OF, ON M. TO ADJN.: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7 (i).
——— DINNER TO: on M. to adjn., 4230 (ii).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s B. No. 31 (Mr. *Parmelee*) 1°*, 502; 2°*, 807; in Com., and 3°*, 1430 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 79.)
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION, I. C. R., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2719 (i).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.,' &c.
ORILLIA ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 5698 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2556 (i).
OTTAWA BUILDINGS LEASED BY GOVT., TAXES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1583 (i).
——— *See* 'Supply.'
OTTAWA DEPTL. BLOCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2554; conc., 2349 (i).
——— STEEL SHELVING: in Com. of Sup., 5692 (ii).
——— TAXES, RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3112, 3131, 4391, 4393 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works.'
OTTAWA AND C.P.P. CROSSINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 95 (i).
Ottawa and Gatineau Ry. Co.'s B. No. 44 (Mr. *Champagne*) 1°*, 893; 2°*, 1244 (i); in Com., 3220; 3°*, 3223 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 80.)
Ottawa and Hull Power and Manufacturing Co. P. No. 25 (Mr. *Champagne*) 1°*, 420; 2°*, 731; in Com., 2750, 2920; 3°*, 2922 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 108).
OTTAWA MILITARY STORES: in Com. of Sup., 911, 1173 (i), 4390 (ii).
OTTAWA SUPPLY CO., GOODS PURCHASED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1794 (i).
OVERSEERS, &c. OF FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 4587.
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
OWEN SOUND DREDGE AND CONSTRUCTION CO., NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 204.
OWEN SOUND HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3509 (ii).
OXFORD HOUSE INDIANS, RELIEF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4933 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 336 (i).
OYSTER CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 314 (i).
PACAUD, MR. A., APPLICATION FOR GOVT. POSITION: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 3457 (ii).
——— LEASE OF GOVT. BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 2775 (i).
Pacific Cable Act (1899) Amt. B. No. 45 (Mr. *Mulock*). Res. prop., 431; in Com. on Res., 896; 1°* of B., 910 (i); 2°, and in Com., 5393; 3°*, 5394 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 5.)
Debate (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 898, 909; (Mr. *Maclean*) 899, 909; (Mr. *Haggart*) 903; Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 904; (Mr. *Sproule*) 905; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 905; (Mr. *Osler*) 906; (Mr. *Hackett*) 907; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 908 (i).
PACIFIC CABLE, AGREEMENT LAID ON TABLE, 806 (i).
PAN-AMERICAN EXHIBIT FROM N.W. TER. GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).
——— EXPOSITION MAP: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
——— SUNDAY CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2400.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2401 (i).
——— *See* 'Buffalo,' &c., 'Agriculture,' &c.

PAPER COMBINE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4628, 5783
PAQUET, JOS., PILOT, APPNMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2204 (i).
PARCEL DELIVERY, MAIL SYSTEM : in Com. of Sup., 457 (i).
PARIS AGENCY, FRANCE : in Com. of Sup , 3449 (ii).
——— CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 4342 (ii).
PARIS EXPOSITION : in Com. of Sup., 923; conc., 2349,
——— AMOUNTS PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 114.
——— BUIES' PAMPHLET, PRINTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1265 (i).
——— BUILDINGS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 930 (i).
——— CAN. REPRESENTATION : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 132 (i).
——— HONORARY DECORATIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1005 (i).
——— PRINTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 337 (i).
——— PRINTING OF OFFICIAL CATALOGUE, PAR. IN 'FREE PRESS' : Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1265 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1007 (i).
PARIS, ONT., PUBLIC BUILDING, GOV. GEN.'s WARRANT, &c : in Com. of Sup., 4391 (ii).
PARKER'S COVE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4398 (ii).
'PARLIAMENTARY GUIDE' : in Com. of Sup., 5457 (ii).
PARLIAMENT, HOUSE OF COMMONS, ADDITIONAL ROOMS : in Com. of Sup., 5673 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works.'
——— OPENING, 1.
——— PROROGATION, 5949 (ii).
PARRSBORO BEACH : in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
PARRY SOUND BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1176.
——— DOCKS : in Com. of Sup., 4305, 4811 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ontario.'
PASPEBIAC AND CAPLIN (HAMILTON BRIDGE CO.) RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360 ; in Com. on Res., 5535 (ii).
PATENTS, &c : in Com. of Sup., 4609 (ii).
PATENT BRANCH DOM. LANDS : in Com. of Sup., 4921.
——— REVENUE, COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1257 (i).
'PATENT RECORD,' : in Com. of Sup., 2825 (i).
Patents. *See* 'Abell,' 'Sibbald.'
PAY AND ALLOWANCE, MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 3383 (ii).
——— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
PAY OF CONTINGENTS, S. A. WAR, PAR. IN 'LONDON TIMES' : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 911 (i).
PAYMENTS TO POST OFFICE *re* SERVICES &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4404 (ii).
——— *See* 'Post Office,' &c.
PEARL STREET POST OFFICE, HAMILTON : M. for copies of Pets.* (Mr. *Barker*) 1405 (i).
PENITENTIARIES : in Com. of Sup., 2649 (i), 4635 (ii).
Penitentiary Act (Second Inspector. Amt. B. No. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 558 ; 1°* of B., 5715 ; 2°* ; in Com., and 3°*, 5825 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 43.)
PENITENTIARIES REP. : Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 80 (i).
——— *See* 'Justice.'
PENETANGUISHENE DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 5757.
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4794 (ii)
PENSIONS, MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 4639 (ii).
——— TO FAMILIES OF DECEASED SOLDIERS : in Com. of Sup., 3396 (ii).
PENSIONS TO HEADQUARTERS STAFF : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2994 (ii).
Pensions to Officers of Permanent Staff, &c., B. No. 133 (Mr. *Borden, Kings*), Res. prop., 3270 ; M. for Com. on Res., 4231 ; 1° m., 4342 ; 2°, and in Com., 4738 ; 3° m., 4874 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 17.)
PENSIONS FOR PERMANENT CORPS, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Prior*) 1281, 2603 (i).
——— TO S. A. SOLDIERS : in Com. of Sup., 4359 (ii).
——— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
PERIBONKA IMMIGRANT BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4391 (ii).
PETERBOROUGH DAM, IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).
PETIT RIVIÈRE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3164.
PICTON POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 2554 (i).
PICTOU HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS *vs.* THE QUEEN : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 816 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 3271 (i).
PICTOU ISLAND WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3461 (ii).
PICTOU COUNTY, MAIL CONTRACTS : in Com. of Sup., 479 (i).
——— DISMISSALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 606, 1244 (i).
——— *See* 'Greenvale,' &c.
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 5216 (ii).
PILOTAGE INVESTIGATION : in Com. of Sup., 269 (i).
——— RULES, CAN. AND U.S., UNIFORMITY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5189 (ii).
PINEAU, MR., AND RUMOURED APPNMT. TO PARIS EXPOSITION : in Com. of Sup., 940, 958 (i).
——— *See* 'Marine,' &c.
PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT FOR I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 4158, 5217 (ii).
PLAINS OF ABRAHAM, PURCHASE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5809 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 2989, 3641 (ii).
POINTE CLAIRE, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 4400.
POINT PELEE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3509 (ii).
POLAR EXPEDITION, EQUIPMENT BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1798 (i).
——— *See* 'Marine,' &c.
POLITICAL PARTISANSHIP OF POSTMASTERS : in Com. of Sup., 489 (i).
POLSON & CO., TORONTO, *re* STEAMER CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 5191 (ii).
Pontiac Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 62 (Mr. *Murray*) 1°*, 1244 ; 2°*, 1540 (i) ; wthdn., 4752 (ii).
PONTIAC COUNTY, RY., INDEBTEDNESS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Murray*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5611 (ii).
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360 ; in Com. on Res., 5555 (ii).

PORT ARTHUR BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5687 (ii).
PORT BRUCE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 507 (i).
PORT BURWELL HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3160, 3509, 4399 (ii).
——— EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 506.
PORT COLBORNE, ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 5617.
——— EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1404, 2161 (i).
——— HARBOUR WORKS, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 811 (i).
——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1175, 1182, 1207 (i)
PORT CREDIT LIFE-SAVING STATION: in Com. of Sup., 260 (i).
PORTER'S LAKE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3166.
PORT HOPE HARBOUR, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 807 (i).
PORT SIMPSON TO HAZLETON, TELEGRAPH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5687 (ii).
PORTSMOUTH WHARF: in Com. of Sup, 4811 (ii).
PORT STANLEY HARBOUR, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 506 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 121 (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1° m., 2878 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 4241; 3°*, 4341 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 19.)

POST OFFICE:
ABRAMS VILLAGE MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 488 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2163 (i).
ALBERTON, P.E.I., POSTMASTER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1404 (i).
ALLISTON AND ROSEMOUNT MAIL CONTRACTS, DATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1591 (i).
ALMA MAIL CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 470.
——— DATE OF CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 811 (i).
ASHCROFT AND CARIBOO MAIL CONTRACTORS, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1261, 1440, 2398 (i), 4194 (ii).
ATHENS, POSTMASTER, COMPLAINT AGAINST: in Com. of Sup., 496 (i).
BOGART, MR., RESIGNATION FROM NAPANEE POSTMASTERSHIP: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3269.
——— *See* 'Napanee.'
BOLSOVER P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 208 (i).
BRANDON POSTMASTER, MAN., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 110 (i).
BRUCE COUNTY, POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup.,
BRUCE, NORTH, ELECTION, TRANSFER OF MAIL 495 (i).
CLERKS, &c.: Par. in Newspaper (Mr. *Sproule*) 1578, 1593 (i).
BULWER, POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 480 (i).
CARTER, MR. S. J., DEAD LETTER BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 191 (i).
CAYOUETTE, ELIZABETH, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1405 (i).
CENTRAL RY., N.B., MAIL CONTRACT WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1593 (i).
CLARENCEVILLE AND LACOLLE MAIL CARRIER, EXTRA PAY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 1248 (i).
COE HILL MINES AND APSLEY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 2989, 3179 (ii).
COOCH, MR., DUTIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 191.
COUNTRY POSTMASTERS: in Com. of Sup., 487.
POST OFFICE—*Con.*
CRAIG, MR. JOHN, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 91 (i).
——— *See* 'Strathclair.'
DONEGAL POST OFFICE, CLOSING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 459 (i).
DRAYTON, POSTMISTRESS, DATE OF APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 1439 (i).
DRUMMONDVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 1243 (i).
EDWARDSBURG POST OFFICE, PET., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 485 (i).
FOSTER, MR. A., SUPERANNUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1795 (i).
FOUND'S MILL TO EMERALD JUNCTION MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 5211 (ii).
FREEPORT POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 481.
GANANOQUE LETTER BOXES, CONTRACT *re* COLLECTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2704 (i).
GOODLANDS, MAN., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2776 (i).
GREENVALE POSTMASTER, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 3458 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pictou.'
HAMILTON, SUB-POST OFFICE, &c.: M. for copies of Pets.* (Mr. *Barker*) 1405 (i).
HENDERSON, MR. H. D., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Brock*) 508 (i).
HENLY, MR. W. C., USE OF PRIVATE MAIL BAG.: in Com. of Sup., 5459 (ii).
HULL, MR. WM., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 333 (i).
KAVANAGH, MR. JAS., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 110 (i).
KENSINGTON AND FRENCH RIVER, P.E.I., MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 809 (i).
KINNEAR'S MILLS, INVESTIGATION, &c.: M. for Papers (Mr. *Turcot*) 86 (i).
LEONARD, DR. R. A., POSTMASTER AT NAPANEE, PAYMENT OF SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5209 (ii).
LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 174, 481 (i), 5460; conc., 5792 (ii).
——— WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 105 (i).
LONDON POSTMASTER, SALARY INCREASE: in Com. of Sup., 5458 (ii).
MCGIRR, MR.: *See* 'Bolsover.'
MCGRADY, H., RY. MAIL SERVICE, SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5460 (ii).
MCNAUGHTON, MR., COMPLAINT AGAINST: in Com. of Sup., 496 (i).
MADOC MAIL CONTRACT, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 1441 (i).
MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 501 (i); conc., 5792 (ii).
——— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 5463 (ii).
——— DELAY, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 100.
MARBLE ROCK POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 467, 472 (i).
MIDLAND AND VASEY MAIL SERVICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2570 (i).
MILLSTREAM POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 113, 209 (i).
NAPANEE POSTMASTER, PAYMENT OF SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5209 (ii).
——— RESIGNATION OF MR. BOGART: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3269 (ii).
NEW POST OFFICES ESTABLISHED SINCE 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2704 (i).
NEWSPAPER POSTAGE: in Com. of Sup., 446 (i).
NORTHRUP, W. B., PROMOTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5184 (ii).
PARCEL DELIVERY SYSTEM: in Com. of Sup., 457.
PICTOU COUNTY MAIL CONTRACTS: in Com. of Sup., 479 (i).
——— CONTRACTORS, DISMISSALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr *Bell, Pictou*) 1244 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

PICTOU POSTMASTERS, DISMISSALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pic'ou*) 606 (i).

——— *See* 'Greenvale.'

POLITICAL PARTISANSHIP OF POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 489 (i).

POSTMASTERS, SAFES FURNISHED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1404 (i).

——— SALARIES, COMMISSIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5458 (ii).

POST OFFICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 188 (i), 5184, 5791 (ii).

——— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4791 (ii).

——— DEFICITS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 435 (i).

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Mulock*) 50.

——— OUTSIDE SERVICE, MAIL CONTRACTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 435 (i).

——— PAYMENTS *re* SERVICES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4494 (ii).

——— PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 193 (i).

——— REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES: in Com. of Sup., 435 (i).

——— SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5458 (ii).

P.E.I. RY. MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Hackett*) 1498 (i).

RY. MAIL CLERKS, MILEAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4405 (ii).

——— INSUFFICIENT NUMBER, &c.: Ques. Mr. *Monk*) 4019 (ii).

RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 477.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY: in Com. of Sup., 483 (i).

——— POSTAL DELIVERY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 68 (i).

SCARTH, MR. W. F., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1261 (i).

SCHNEIDER, MISS, APPNMT. AS POSTMISTRESS: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 1439 (i).

SHEET HARBOUR MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5461 (ii).

SIMCOE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1405 (i).

SOREL POST OFFICE, REVENUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2705 (i).

SOUTH AFRICAN MAIL CLERKS, PROMOTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1439 (i).

SPEECHES OF P. M. G. AT MEAFORD: in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).

STRATFORD POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL OF: Ques. (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) 90 (i).

STRATHCLAIR POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 489 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 91 (i).

SUMMERSIDE AND CAPE TORMENTINE MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 252 (i).

TIGNISH AND NAIL POND MAIL CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 3269 (ii).

VIRDEN, MAN., POSTMASTER W. F. SCARTH, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1261 (i).

WALLACE, MR., SUPERANNUATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4342 (ii).

WINONA POSTMASTER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 2400 (i).

WOODSTOCK, N.B., MAIL CONTRACT, &c., FOR 1900: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4230 (ii).

POTASH AND ASHES, INSPECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 814 (i).

POULTRY FATTENING STATIONS, P.E.I., NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2703 (i).

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, CERTIFICATE OF PRODUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1252 (i).

——— CLAUSES *re* GERMAN GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 508 (i).

——— DIRECT IMPORTATION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 2608 (i).

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, GOODS OF FOREIGN ORIGIN, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1002 (i).

——— PERCENTAGE OF VALUE, &c., FORM OF DECLARATION, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Clarke*) 1267 (i).

PRESQU'ILE, PURCHASE OF WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5750 (ii).

PRESTON, W. T. R., IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 4822 (ii).

PREVENTIVE SERVICE, CUSTOMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3848, 3859 (ii).

P. E. I. Increased Subsidy B. No. 138 (Mr. *Fielding*). M. for Com. on Res., 4535, 4675, 4702; in Com. on Res., 4722; 1°*, 4874; 2°, and in Com., 5326; 3°*, 5359 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 3.)

Debate: (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4677, 4702; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 4677, 4679; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4678, 4738; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4678, 4686; (Mr. *Maclean*) 4682, 4713; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4683, 4727; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4685; (Mr. *Clancy*) 4685, 4733; (Mr. *Clarke*) 4687; (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) 4688; (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 4704; (Mr. *Kemp*) 4711; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 4712; (Mr. *Fraser*) 4713, 4715; (Mr. *Hackett*) 4717; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4721, 4736; (Mr. *Henderson*) 4723; (Mr. *Tarte*) 4726; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 4729; (Mr. *Monk*) 4732 (ii).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:

ABRAMS VILLAGE MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 488 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2163 (i).

ALBERTON, P.E.I., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1404 (i).

——— SANDY ISLAND, REMOVAL OF STONES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1993 (i).

'AMELIA,' SS., TONNAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1795 (i).

BRENNAN, J. ALBERT, PAYMENT OF FISHING BOUNTY, &c.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1424 (i).

CAPE TORMENTINE, REPAIR TO PIER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1585 (i).

CARDIGAN STATION, PURCHASE OF LAND: in Com. of Sup., 4380 (ii).

CASCUMPEC HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3461 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 207 (i).

——— LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 208 (i).

CLAIMS *re* MAINTENANCE OF STEAM COMMUNICATION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4535 (ii).

DREDGING PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 3521 (ii).

EAST QUEEN'S ELECTION PET., REP. OF JUDGES: M. (Sir *Louis Davies*) 193 (i).

——— JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 136 (i).

EXPORTS TO G.B., COLD STORAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1438 (i).

FISHING BOUNTIES, QUEEN'S CO., DISTRIBUTION OF CHEQUES: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2777 (i).

——— TIGNISH COUNTY, PAYMENTS, &c.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1424 (i).

——— PROTECTION, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 306 (i).

FORESTRY PROTECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1439 (i).

FOUND'S MILL TO EMERALD JUNCTION MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 5211 (ii).

GALLANT, MR. B., RETURNING OFFICER, WEST PRINCE, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1006 (i).

GALLANT, MR F., TRAVELLING FEES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1404 (i).

GORDON POINT, PET. FOR PIER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2163 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 3460, 5705 (ii).
HIGGIN'S SHORE, PIER, &c., PET. FROM SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4195 (ii).
HURD'S POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3462 (ii).
'JENNIE MAY,' SCHR., INVESTIGATION *re* LOSS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2777 (i).
KENSINGTON AND FRENCH RIVER MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 809.
KINSMAN, MR., APPNMT. AS HORTICULTURIST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1438 (i).
LOBSTER FISHERY REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2571 (i).
MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5463 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 109 (i).
——— WINTER COMMUNICATION, &c., ON ORDER OF DAY BEING CALLED: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3271 (ii).
——— Remarks (Sir *Louis Davies*) 3275 (ii).
MIMINEGASH PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3462 (ii).
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 4191, 4228 (ii).
NEW LONDON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3465 (ii).
NORTON STATION ACCIDENT: in Com. of Sup., 4227 (ii).
O'LEARY AND WEST POINT RY.: in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).
PINEAU, MR., RUMOURED APPNMT. TO PARIS EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 940, 958 (i).
POSTAL SERVICE FROM ABRAMS VILLAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2163 (i).
POULTRY FATTENING STATIONS, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2703 (i).
P.E.I. AND G. B. SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4787, 5776 (ii).
——— MAINLAND WINTER COMMUNICATION: in Com. of Sup., 252 (i).
P.E.I. RY., BLUE SHANK, STRAIGHTENING LINE: in Com. of Sup, 4224 (ii).
——— DISMISSALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4225.
——— MACHINERY FOR SHOPS: in Com. of Sup, 4227 (ii).
——— MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Hackett*) 1498 (i).
——— PET. *re* CONSTRUCTION AT O'LEARY STATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1795 (i).
——— PET. FROM VICTORIA COUNTY FOR BRANCH: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2163 (i).
——— SIDINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4219 (ii).
——— STEEL RAILS: in Com. of Sup., 4226, 4380.
——— TRAIN MEN, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4194, 4196 (ii).
P.E.I., SUBSIDIES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5584 (ii).
PRINCE, WM. J., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2702 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3180 (ii).
QUEEN'S COUNTY, FISHING BOUNTIES, DISTRIBUTION OF CHEQUES: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2777.
——— RET. OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2567 (i).
RY. SERVICE: M. (Mr. *Hackett*) to adjn., 1493 (i).
ROCKY POINT BREAKWATER EXTENSION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2571 (i).
RUSTICO PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3465 (ii).
SANDY ISLAND, ALBERTON HARBOUR, REMOVAL OF STONES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1993.
SKINNER'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 3464 (ii).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 68 (i).
SOURIS KNIGHT'S POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3466 (ii).
'STANLEY,' STR. AND WINTER MAIL SERVICE, REPS, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 544.
SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*
SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 83 (i).
——— HARBOUR SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 83 (i).
——— AND CAPE TORMENTINE MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 252 (i).
——— TIGNISH TRAIN ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 3456 (ii).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3472.
——— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 105 (i).
TIGNISH AND NAIL POND, MAIL CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 3269 (ii).
TRAVERSE (LOWER) PIER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5187 (ii).
WEST POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).
WEST PRINCE ELECTION BALLOTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 83 (i).
——— RETURNING OFFICER, PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1006 (i).
WINTER COMMUNICATION, COR. WITH BOARDS OF TRADE, &c.: M. for Copies, &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1268 (i).
——— MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 265 (i).
——— REPAIRS TO BOATS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1585 (i).
WOOD ISLAND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).

PRINCE, WM. L., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2702 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3180 (ii).
PRINTING, ADVERTISING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 176.
PRINTING BUREAU, PLANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5456 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENT OF, &c.: on M. to conc. in 5th Rep. of Com, 5198 (ii).
——— FINANCES. *See* 'Public Printing.'
PRINTING COM., JOINT: List Presented, 102 (i).
——— 5TH REP.: Presented (Mr. *Parmelee*) 5093 (ii).
——— M. to conc., 5198 (ii).
——— 6TH REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Parlemee*) 5712 (ii).
PRINTING, GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 114 (i).
——— MISCELLANEOUS VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 3448.
——— PAPER, BINDING, HOUSE OF COMMONS: in Com. of Sup., 5464 (ii).
——— PLANT, ELKHORN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, SALE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2766 (i).
——— *See* 'Elkhorn,' &c.
——— AND STATIONERY, CUSTOMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).
——— AND STATIONERY DEPT., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).
PRISONERS IN YUKON, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5778 (ii).
——— TRANSPORTS, &c., YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 2654 (i).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
PRIVATE BILLS COM.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to add Names, 1961 (i).
——— EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Flint*) 419 (i), 3536 (ii).
——— EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Heyd*) 2382 (i).
——— POSTING, &c.: M. (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) 5094 (ii).
——— PROCEDURE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Britton*) 5270.

PRIVATE BILLS, SUSPENSION OF RULES: M. (Mr. *Britton*) 4939 (ii).
——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 731 (i), 4939 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Charlton*) 4939 (ii).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF: *re* Vote on Coronation Oath (Mr. *Henderson*) 895 (i).
——— (Mr. *McCarthy*) 895 (i).
——— (Mr. *Kendry*) Tel. *re* Auburn Mills, 3365 (ii).
PRIVY COUNCILLOR, TITLE CONFERRED ON PRIME MINISTER: Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) 2348 (i).
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 4345 (ii).
PROCEDURE *re* BILLS ON ORDER PAPER, PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 731 (i).
——— *See* 'Private Bills.'
PROPERTIES, MILITIA, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3436 (ii).
——— *See* 'Militia.'
PROROGATION, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 5949 (ii).
PROSPECT POINT LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 287 (i).
PROVIDENCE BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3510 (ii).
PROVINCIAL VOTERS' LISTS: in Com. of Sup., 3911 (ii).
PROVISIONS, MILITIA, SUPPLIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3772 (ii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 50.
PUB. ACCOUNTS COM., 1ST REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fraser*) 197 (i).
——— MEETINGS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 196, 1390, 1661 (i), 3274 (ii)
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 3175 (ii).
——— Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 607, 1798, 1962 (i).
——— M. to ref. Papers *re* Yukon Liquor Permits (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1065 (i).
PUBLIC HEALTH: in Com. of Sup., 4610, 5182 (ii).
——— INSPECTION, APPNMT. OF COM.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 332 (i).

Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. B. No. 137 (Mr. *Fielding*). M. for Com. on Res., 4535; in Com. on Res., 4667; 1°, 4874; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 5215 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 18.)

PUBLIC WORKS:
ABBOTT'S BEACH, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).
ALBERTON, P.E.I., SANDY ISLAND, REMOVAL OF STONES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1993 (i).
AMAGADUS POND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (ii).
ARICHAT, N.S., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5687 (ii).
ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 5767 (ii).
BACK BAY, N.B., WHARF, CONTRACT *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 5209 (ii).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).
BANFF HOT SPRINGS, ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 2698 (i).
BATTERY POINT RETAINING WALL: in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
BAY DU VIN, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3473 (ii).
BEAVER WHARF, EXTENSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
BELL TELEPHONE CO., MILEAGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4645 (ii).
BIG BRAS D'OR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3154.
BLIND RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5743 (ii).
BOBCAYGEON DAM: in Com of Sup., 4384 (ii).
BOULARDERIE CENTER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
BOWMAN AND PORTER, DREDGING CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 204 (i).
BRAMPTON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 4350, 5699 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3139 (ii).
BRUCE MINES: in Com. of Sup., 5739 (ii).
BRIDGE REPAIRS, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 3498.
BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL, CLERK OF WORKS, SUSPENSION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 2398.
——— *See* 'Clerks.'
——— CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 2250.
——— OVERSEER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3111 (ii).
BRONTE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 5729 (ii).
BUCKINGHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 1243 (i).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1240 (i).
——— B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 3097 (ii).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5697 (ii).
——— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 5688 (ii).
——— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 2547 (i), 4390, 5687.
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 4391 (ii).
——— OTTAWA, RENT, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 911 (i).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 4391 (ii).
BURNT CHURCH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3473.
CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3473 (ii).
CAN. CREEK BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3154.
CAPE NEGRO ISLANDS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
CAPE TORMENTINE, REPAIR TO PIER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1585 (i).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3461 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 207 (i).
CHARLESON AND TACHE, MESSRS., ACCOUNTS *re* TELEGRAPH CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4271, 4291, 4298 (ii).
CHEBOGUE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
CHEVERIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii)
CHIEF ARCHITECT'S OFFICE, SALARIES, DISMISSALS: in Com. of Sup., 3531 (ii).
CHIEF ENGINEER'S OFFICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3530 (ii).
CHINESE AND JAPANESE LABOUR ON GOVT. STEAMERS: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2349 (i).
——— EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1592 (i).
CLARKE'S BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
CLERKS OF WORKS ON BUILDINGS: in Com., of Sup., 3106 (ii).
——— *See* 'Brockville.'
CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5695 (ii).
COAL FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3483 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clarke*) 225 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2879 (i).
COBOURG PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3500 (ii).
CONTRACT LABOUR ON PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup. 3154 (ii).
COLL. OF REV., HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 3535 (ii).
——— TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3536.
COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (i), 3500 (ii).
COLPOY'S BAY: in Com. of Sup., 3504 (ii).
COLUMBIA RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3514 (ii).
COMEAUVILLE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4398 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

COWAN'S BRIDGE, GRANT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Vrooman*) 1748 (i).
DALHOUSIE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (ii).
DAWSON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5672 (ii).
DEPOT HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McCormick*) 1251 (i).
——— *See* 'Parry Sound.'
DESERONTO POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2547 (i).
DES JOACHIMS BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3523 (ii).
DOCKS, GOVT., MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup , 4801, 5701 (ii).
DOMINION BUILDINGS, HEATING, LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3130 (ii).
——— LIGHTING, FUEL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4398 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
DORCHESTER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (ii).
DREDGES FOR ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).
DREDGING, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4402 (ii).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 3522 (ii).
——— NEW PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (ii).
——— ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 4400 (ii).
——— PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 3516 (ii).
——— PLANT, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 3521 (ii).
——— VESSELS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).
EAST RIVER SHEET HARBOUR WHARF: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 224 (i).
ELECTRIC LIGHTING, OTTAWA BUILDINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3152 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' &c
ENGINEERS, DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup , 3153 (ii).
EXPERIMENTAL FARM BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).
FAIR WAGE CLAUSE. *See* 'Contracts,' 'St. Andrews,' &c.
FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3497 (ii).
FRASER RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3514.
FREDERICTON BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 3437.
FURNITURE, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3121 (ii).
GODERICH HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3504 (ii).
GONDOLA POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5706.
GORDON POINT PIER. *See* 'P. E. I.'
GOVT. BUILDINGS IN OTTAWA, LEASES, CONTRACTS, &C.: M. (Mr. *Birkett*) for Copies, 2586 (i).
——— *See* 'Seybold.'
GOVT. VESSELS, B.C., CONTRACTS, SPECIFICATIONS, &C.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Prior*) 510, 2586 (i).
GRAND BEND, LAKE HURON, IMPROVEMENTS, &C., TELS., REPS., &C.: M. for copies * (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1406 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 335 (i).
GREEN ISLET, B.C., ERECTION OF LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2407 (i).
GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4391 (ii).
'HACKETT,' DREDGE, NAMES OF OWNERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 204 (i).
HALIFAX, BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1240 (i).
——— DREDGING AT I.C.R. TERMINUS: in Com. of Sup., 4134 (ii).
——— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 5687 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i), 1792 (ii).
——— B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3514 (ii).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).
——— GENERAL REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4399.

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 3496 (ii).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 3473, 4399, 5705.
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3496 (ii).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 3153, 4398, 5701.
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 3509, 4399 (ii).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 3460, 5705 (ii).
——— QUEBEC: in Com of Sup., 3497, 4399, 5707.
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 5764 (ii).
HARWOOD WHARF, RICE LAKE: in Com. of Sup., 5757 (ii).
HAWK ISLAND, N.S., LIGHTHOUSES, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1582.
HAWKSTONE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4399, 4801 (ii).
HEATING, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3130 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
HIGGIN'S SHORE PIER, PET. FROM SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4195 (ii).
HILL, ARTHUR E. B., CLAIMS *re* INVESTIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 4641 (ii).
HILTZ NARROWS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).
HOPEWELL CAPE WHARF, CONTRACTORS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 810 (i).
HULL PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3498, 5707 (ii).
HURD'S POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3462 (ii).
ILE AUX GRUES WHARF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5707 (ii).
IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4391.
——— LOUISE EMBANKMENT, QUEBEC CITY: in Com. of Sup., 5688 (ii).
INDIAN RIVER, DEVIL'S ELBOW DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5732 (ii).
INGONISH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4398.
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1205 (i).
KAMLOOPS PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 3097 (ii).
KENNEBECASIS WHARF: in Com. of Sup.. 3496.
KINGSTON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 3534.
LAKE WINNIPEG WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3513.
LEAMINGTON PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).
LÉVIS PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5690.
LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4289 (ii).
LITTLE BEAR CREEK: in Com. of Sup., 5734 (ii).
LONDON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 2547 (i), 5691 (ii).
LUNENBURG COUNTY BREAKWATERS: in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).
LUNENBURG PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup. 4390 (ii).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3498 (ii).
MAJOR'S HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 5695 (ii).
MANITOBA LAKE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4400 (ii).
——— PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1259 (i).
MARIA STREET BRIDGE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 3528 (ii).
MARYSVILLE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5688 (ii).
MEAFORD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).
MIDLAND, CUSTOMS PORT, COLLECTOR, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3847 (ii).
MILITARY STORES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 911, 1173 (i), 4390 (i).
MILL COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3164.
MIMINEGASH PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3462 (ii).
MISPEC, N.B., BREAKWATER, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 808 (i).
MINT, CONSTRUCTION OF. *See* 'Royal.'
MONTREAL, CUSTOMS HOUSE, ALTERATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5691 (ii).
——— HARBOUR ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

MONTREAL, MALONE & CO.'S CONTRACT, SPECIFICATIONS, &C. : M. for Copies* (Mr. *Haggart*) 1406 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 1068 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5688 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, ALTERATIONS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5689 (ii).
MOORE, WM., DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Culbert*) 1403 (i).
MURRAY BAY WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 5709 (ii).
NAGLE BUILDINGS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 913 (i).
NAPANEE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 4401 (ii).
——— RIVER SURVEY : M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 80 (i).
NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3495 (ii).
NEILL'S BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
NELSON PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 3097.
NEW LONDON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3465 (ii).
NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C., PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 3097, 4392 (ii).
OAKVILLE PIER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5743 (ii).
ORILLIA ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 5698 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 2556 (i).
OTTAWA BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 911 (i). 4391 (ii).
OTTAWA BUILDINGS LEASED BY GOVT., TAXES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1583 (i).
——— RENTALS, ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4393 (ii).
——— REPAIRS, BENTS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 911 (i), 3112 (ii).
——— STEEL SHELVING : in Com. of Sup., 5692.
——— TAXES, RENTALS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3131 (ii).
——— DEPTL. BLOCKS : in Com. of Sup., 2554 ; conc., 2349 (i).
——— *See* 'Dom. Buildings,' 'Electric,' 'Govt. Buildings,' 'Heating,' 'Major's Hill Park,' 'Maria St. Bridge,' 'Nagle Buildings,' 'Military Stores,' 'Parliament,' &c., 'Rideau Hall,' 'Royal Mint,' 'Telephones,' &c.
OTTAWA SUPPLY CO., GOODS PURCHASED, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1794 (i).
OWEN SOUND DREDGE AND CONSTRUCTION CO., NAMES, &C : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 204.
OWEN SOUND HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3509.
PACAUD, MR. A., LEASE OF GOVT. BUILDING : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 2775 (i).
PARIS EXPOSITION, FRANCE, BUILDINGS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 930 (i).
PARIS, ONT., PUBLIC BUILDING, GOV. GEN.'S WARRANT, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4391 (ii).
PARKER'S COVE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4398.
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, HOUSE OF COMMONS, ADDITIONAL ROOMS : in Com. of Sup., 5673.
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
PARRSBORO BEACH : in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
PARRY SOUND BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).
——— DOCKS : in Com. of Sup., 4805, 4811 (ii).
——— *See* 'Depot Harbour.'
PENETANGUISHENE DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 5757 (ii).
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4794 (ii).
PERIBONKA IMMIGRANT BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4391 (ii).
PETIT RIVER BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).
PICTON POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 2554 (i).
PICTOU ISLAND WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3461.
POINTE CLAIRE, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 4400 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

POINT PELEE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3509 (ii).
POLSON & CO., TORONTO, *re* STEAMER CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 5191 (ii).
PORT ARTHUR BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 5687 (ii).
PORT BRUCE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, &C. : Ques. (Mr, *Ingram*) 507 (i).
PORT BURWELL HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3160, 4399 (ii).
——— EXPENDITURE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 506.
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3509 (ii).
PORT COLBORNE IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1175, 1182, 1207 (i).
——— EXPENDITURE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1404, 2161 (i).
——— ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 5617 (ii).
——— TENDERS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 811.
PORTER'S LAKE, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 3166.
PORT HOPE HARBOUR, REPAIRS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 807 (i).
PORT SIMPSON TO HAZLETON, TELEGRAPH LINE : in Com. of Sup., 5687 (ii).
PORT STANLEY HARBOUR, EXPENDITURE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 506 (i).
PORTSMOUTH WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4811 (ii).
PRESQU'ILE, PURCHASE OF WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 5750 (ii).
P.E.I., GORDON POINT PIER : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2163 (i).
——— SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER, TENDERS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 83 (i).
——— SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR SURVEY : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 83 (i).
——— TIGNISH BREAKWATER, TENDERS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 105 (i).
——— WINTER COMMUNICATION, REPAIRS TO PIERS, BOATS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1585.
PROVIDENCE BAY WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3510.
PUBLIC WORKS, DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 188, 911, 1173, 2547 (i), 4791, 5672 (ii).
——— CHIEF ENGINEER'S OFFICE, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5761 (ii).
——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5758 (ii).
QUEBEC POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5688 (ii).
——— WHARFS : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) in Com. of Sup. 5708 (ii).
——— *See* 'Immigrant.'
QUESNELLE AND ATLIN TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 4271, 5687 (ii).
RAINY RIVER LOCK AND DAM : in Com. of Sup., 5686 (ii).
RICHIBUCTO PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 5688 (ii).
RIDEAU HALL, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3147 (ii).
——— REPAIRING DAMAGES BY FIRE : in Com. of Sup., 4391 (ii).
RIVER ST. JOHN BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3495 (ii).
RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS : in Com. of Sup., 3498 (ii).
ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 3523 (ii).
——— OTTAWA, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4402 (ii).
——— *See* 'Maria St.'
ROCKY POINT, P.E.I., BREAKWATER, EXTENSION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2571 (i).
RONDEAU HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
ROSSLAND PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 3099 (ii).
ROUND BAY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2203 (i).
ROURKE, WM., CONTRACT, &C. : M. for Copies (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 80 (i).
ROY, L. G., INCREASE OF SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 5184 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

ROYAL MINT, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 5672.
RUSTICO PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3465 (ii).
ST. ALEXIS PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3498 (ii).
ST. ANDREWS LOCK, CONSTRUCTION, LABOUR CONTRACT, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Puttee*) 1266 (i).
——— RAPIDS, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4400 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1205 (i).
STE. ANNE DE SOREL ICE GUARFS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2775 (i).
STE. EMILIE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4399 (ii).
ST. HYACINTHE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 5690 (ii).
ST. JEROME WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3498 (ii).
ST. JOHN HARBOUR, FORT DUFFERIN: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (ii).
——— HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACT *re* CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1581 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4399 (ii).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 1242 (i).
ST. JOHN RIVER TIDAL WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (ii).
ST. LAMBERT PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 3499 (ii).
ST. LAURENT PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4392 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE AND BELLE ISLAND TELEGRAPH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 3529 (ii).
ST. MAURICE SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 927 (i), 3523, 5767 (ii).
——— conc., 2349 (i).
ST. THOMAS DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 2555 (i), 3104, 3110, 5693 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 505.
——— LETTER FROM MR. GREEN: in Com. of Sup., 3479, 5693 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Clancy*), 'Bourinot' quoted, 3481 (ii).
SALMON RIVER WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 208 (i).
SANDY ISLAND, ALBERTON HARBOUR, P.E.I., REMOVAL OF STONES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1993 (i).
SARNIA POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2555 (i).
SAULT STE. MARIE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 5732 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com of Sup., 5692.
SCOTT'S BAY HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3174 (ii).
SCUGOG RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4401 (ii).
SEVERN RIVER FLOODS, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McLeod*) 201 (i).
SEYBOLD BLOCK, RENTAL, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 911 (i), 3131 (ii).
——— Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 4758; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 93) 4770 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Taylor*) 4196 (ii).
——— Remarks postponed (Mr. *Taylor*) 4256 (ii).
——— *See* 'Govt. Buildings,' &c.
SHEGUIANDAH PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
SKEENA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).
SKINNER'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 3464 (ii).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 68 (i).
SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 927 (i), 3523, 5767 (ii).
SOREL WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3499, 4791 (ii).
——— HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 1067 (i).
——— WORKSHOPS FOR DREDGE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 1193 (i).
See general heading.
SOURIS, KNIGHT'S POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3466 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Halliday*) 2778 (i).
SOUTH NATION RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).
STEEL SHELVING: in Com. of Sup., 5692 (ii).
SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 3530, 4403 (ii).
SURVEYS, &C. IN MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).
SYDENHAM HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 5733 (ii).
——— RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3506.
TADOUSAC WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3500 (ii).
TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3528 (ii).
——— B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 5687 (ii).
——— TO DAWSON, DATE OF COMMENCEMENT, TARIFF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4021 (ii).
——— SERVICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3532 (ii).
TELEPHONES, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3117, 4392 (ii).
THAMES RIVER, OBSTRUCTION ON BAR: Remarks (Mr. *Stephens*) 2779 (i).
THREE RIVERS, HARBOUR, DEEP WATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5709 (ii).
——— PUBLIC OFFICES, CARETAKERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2775 (i).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).
TORONTO DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 2562 (i).
——— COP., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3101 (ii).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i), 3512.
——— M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Kenp*) 77 (i).
——— EASTERN ENTRANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5734 (ii).
——— JUNCTION PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 3107, 5691, 5701 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 86, 2401 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 2402 (i).
——— MAIL ROOM AT STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4392 (ii).
——— OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 289 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, STATION 'B,' LEASE, RENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1995 (i).
TRAVERSE (LOWER) PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5187 (ii).
VANCOUVER DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 3100.
——— FAULTY WORKMANSHIP, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1750 (i).
VICTORIA COUNTY DRILL HALL in Com. of Sup., 3104 (ii).
VICTORIA HARBOUR, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4402.
VICTORIA MEMORIAL MUSEUM, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 5681 (ii).
VICTORIAVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2547 (i).
WASHAGO DAM, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McLeod*) 201 (i).
WENDOVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5749 (ii).
WEST POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).
WHARFS AND DOCKS, GOVT. MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 5743 (ii).
WHARFS FOR LIGHTHOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 289 (i).
WHITE HORSE BOAT BUILDING AND ALIEN LABOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 813 (i).
WIARTON PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).
WILLIAMS HEAD, B.C., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).
WINDSOR DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 2564 (i).
——— GOVT. BUILDING, LEASE TO MR. A. PACAUD: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 2775 (i).
WINDSOR, N.S., HARBOUR DAMS: in Com. of Sup., 3175 (ii).
WINNIPEG LAKE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4399 (ii).
WOOD ISLAND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

WOODSTOCK POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2566 (i), 5692 (ii).

YUKON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4268.

——— RENTS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4304, 5763 (ii).

PUBNICO, N.S., AND PORT CLYDE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5533 (ii).

PURDY, MR., COMPENSATION TO *re* DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 4928 (ii).

QU'APPELLE VS. THE KING, LITIGATION EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5454 (ii).

QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 4610, 5182 (ii).

QUARANTINE, CATTLE IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 3084 (ii).

QUARANTINE REGULATIONS WITH U.S.: in Com. of Sup., 4613 (ii).

——— BETWEEN U.S. AND CANADA: Papers laid on Table, 1962 (i).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. No. 157 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 5823; 2°, and in Com., 5952; 3°*, 5952 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 10.)

Quebec Terminal and Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 67 (Mr. *Malouin*) 1°*, 1438; 2°*, 1790 (i); in Com., 5540; 3°*, 5545 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 81.)

QUEBEC:

ABRAHAM PLAINS. *See* 'Plains.'

ANTICOSTI ISLAND, COR. WITH IMP. GOVT., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Taylor*) 1406 (i).

——— LICENSE FOR LOBSTER PACKING, AGENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1591 (i).

——— *See* 'Fox Bay."

BENNETT'S CUTTING, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4379.

BUCKINGHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 1243.

BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4391 (ii).

BULWER POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 480 (i).

CARILLON AND GRENVILLE CANAL, REBUILDING GUIDE: in Com. of Sup., 5625 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2988 (ii).

CAUGHNAWAGA MISSION HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 5319 (ii).

CAYOUETTE, ELIZABETH, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1405 (i).

CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR DORCHESTER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 807 (i).

CHAMBLY CANAL, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4388 (ii).

——— ST. JOHNS DRAINAGE WORKS: in Com. of Sup, 5632 (ii).

CINQMARS *vs.* SENECAL: M. for Papers* (Mr. *Fortin*) 225 (i).

CLARENCEVILLE AND LACOLLE MAIL CARRIER, EXTRA PAY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 1248 (i).

COGHLIN, MR. B., CONTRACTS FOR SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 257 (i).

COLERAINE INDIAN LANDS, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 3457 (ii).

COLLIN, ELZEAR, FISHERY GUARDIAN, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martineau*) 5213 (ii).

CÔTE ST. PAUL BRIDGE, LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4388 (ii).

——— COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 2586 (i).

——— MACADAMIZING ROAD: in Com. of Sup., 5624 (ii).

——— *See* 'Lachine,' 'Canals,' &c.

QUEBEC—*Con.*

CULBUTE CANAL, DAMAGES BY FLOODS: in Com. of Sup., 4383 (ii).

DAGGETT, MR. M. C., ANTICOSTI ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1591 (i).

DES JOACHIMS BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3523.

DREDGES FOR ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).

DRUMMONDVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 1243 (i).

——— ROAD DIVERSION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5216 (ii).

FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3497 (ii).

FOX BAY SETTLERS: in Com. of Sup., 2968, 2981.

'FRANK PEREW,' TUG, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5624 (ii).

GAGNÉ, MR. JUSTICE, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 4646 (ii).

GASPÉ HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 4588 (ii).

GRAIN CARGO RECEIVED AT MONTREAL, SIZE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 201 (i).

GRAIN INSPECTION AT MONTREAL, APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 327 (i).

G.T.R. AND MONTREAL SHIPPING PORT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 92, 108 (i).

GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4391, 5689 (ii).

——— TUBERCULINE TEST: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 85 (i).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 3497, 4399, 5707 (ii).

HULL LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3498, 5707 (ii).

ILE AUX GRUES WHARF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5707 (ii).

IMMIGRANT SHEDS, LOUISE EMBANKMENT, QUEBEC CITY: in Com. of Sup., 5688 (ii).

I.C.R., COMMISSIONS *re* DAMAGES TO PROPERTY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 504, 1004 (i).

——— 'HERALD,' MONTREAL, LEASE OF OFFICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 605 (i).

——— LÉVIS INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4124 (ii).

——— MONTREAL AND CAMPBELLTON DIVISION, EXTENSION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dechene*) 1999 (i).

JUDICIAL BUSINESS, QUEBEC, MONTREAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3177 (ii).

KINNEAR'S MILLS, INVESTIGATION, &c.: M. for Papers (Mr. *Turcot*) 86 (i).

KNOWLTON, MR. H. C.: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).

LACHINE CANAL, BRIDGE OVER CÔTE ST. PAUL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c.: M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., &c., 2586 (i).

——— *See* 'Côte St. Paul.'

——— BUILDING NEW LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 5620 (ii).

——— CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 1067.

——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1405 (i).

——— LOCKMEN, SUNDAY SERVICES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4389 (ii).

——— MASONRY WALL, PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4313 (ii).

——— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4387 (ii).

——— SLOPE WALLS, PONTOON GATE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5621 (ii).

——— WEIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4380 (ii).

LÉVIS BRIGADE CAMP, IRREGULARITIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2994 (ii).

——— GRAVING DOCK, LAND EXPROPRIATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5651 (ii).

——— TRAVELLING CRANE: in Com. of Sup., 5709.

——— LAND EXPROPRIATED FOR I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5651 (ii).

——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5690.

LONGUEUIL ORDNANCE LANDS, RENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1796 (i).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

MAGDALEN ISLANDS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3498 (ii).
——— SS. SERVICE, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1795 (i).
——— WINTER TRIPS: in Com. of Sup., 251 (i).
MICMAC INDIANS, STE. ANNE DE RESTIGOUCHE, CHARGES AGAINST: in Com. of Sup., 2754 (i).
——— DUTIES OF AGENT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Sproule*) 816 (i).
MONTREAL, CUSTOM HOUSE, ALTERATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5691 (ii).
——— DISTRICT JUDGES, INCREASE OF SALARY, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 3460; in Com. on Res., 4066 (ii).
——— ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 331 (i).
——— HARBOUR ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).
——— HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, ALLOWANCES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3178, 3270 (ii).
——— HARBOUR LOAN: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4870; in Com. on Res., 5289 (ii).
——— HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 1068 (i).
——— CONTRACT, SPECIFICATIONS, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Haggart*) 1406 (i).
——— AND MANCHESTER SS. SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5768 (ii).
——— MILL STREET PAVING: in Com. of Sup., 5621 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5688 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, ALTERATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5689 (ii).
——— AND PROVINCE LINE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5531 (ii).
——— TURNPIKE TRUST BONDS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 263 (i).
——— RECEIPTS, &c.: M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 545, 2571 (i).
——— WATCH CASE CO.: in Com. of Sup., 268 (i).
MURRAY BAY WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5709 (ii).
NELSON & SONS, REFUND TO: in Com. of Sup., 4726, 5468 (ii).
NICOLET STATION, I.C.R. CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5226 (ii).
OKA INDIANS, REMOVAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2754 (i).
PAQUET, JOS., PILOT, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2204 (i).
PASPEBIAC AND CAPLIN (HAMILTON BRIDGE CO.) RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5535 (ii).
PERIBONKA IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4391 (ii).
PLAINS OF ABRAHAM, PURCHASE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5809 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 2989, 3641 (ii).
POINTE CLAIRE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4400.
PONTIAC COUNTY, RY. INDEBTEDNESS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Murray*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5611 (ii).
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5555 (ii).
QUEBEC AND BLANC SABLON SS. SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5767 (ii).
——— CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 3439 (ii).
——— CENTRAL RY., TRAIN SERVICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 4643 (ii).
——— COLD STORAGE CO.: in Com. of Sup., 5179.
——— DAIRY INDUSTRY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Angers*) 5586 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

QUEBEC, ELECTION LAW, PET. FOR DISALLOWANCE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 5613, 5715 (ii).
——— AND LAKE ST. JOHN COLONIZATION RY.: in Com. of Sup., 4857 (ii).
——— AND MURRAY BAY WINTER SERVICE, SS. SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5777 (ii).
——— AND NEW BRUNSWICK RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5519 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5688 (ii).
——— WHARFS: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Monk*) 5708 (ii).
——— *See* 'Immigrant Sheds.'
RESTIGOUCHE AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5554 (ii)
RETURNING OFFICERS IN QUEBEC, MILEAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1589 (i).
RICHELIEU RIVER BEACONS, MAINTENANCE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2775, 2988 (ii).
RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS: in Com. of Sup., 3498.
ROBERVAL, QUEBEC AND JAMES BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res, 5575 (ii).
ST. ALEXIS PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3498 (ii).
STE. ANNE'S LOCK, SUPT., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2705 (i).
STE. ANNE DE SOREL ICE GUARDS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2775 (i).
STE. EMILIE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4399.
ST. HYACINTHE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 5690 (ii).
ST. JEROME WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3498 (ii).
ST. LAMBERT PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 3499 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE AND BELLE ISLAND TELEGRAPH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 3529 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).
——— AID TO NAVIGATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5188 (ii).
——— DEPTH OF WATER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 205 (i).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 206 (i).
——— LIGHTING, &c: in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).
——— NAVIGATION, INVESTIGATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 4197 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4231 (ii).
——— SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4312, 4382 (ii).
——— WINTER NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).
ST. LAURENT PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4392 (ii).
ST. LOUIS LAKE, HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 4309 (ii).
ST. MAURICE SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 927 (i), 3523, 5767 (ii); conc., 2349 (i).
ST. REGIS INDIAN LOCK-UP: in Com. of Sup., 2756 (i).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 2649 (i), 4636 (ii).
——— CHARGES AGAINST GUARDS: in Com. of Sup., 2649 (i).
——— INSPECTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 5823.
——— LUSSIER'S CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 4636.
SOREL HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 1067 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, REVENUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2705 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3499, 4791 (ii).
——— WORKSHOPS FOR DREDGE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 1193 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4306 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

TADOUSAC WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3500 (ii).

THREE RIVERS, &c., PUBLIC OFFICES, CARETAKERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2775 (i).

TROIS PISTOLES STATION, I. C. R. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 504 (i).

VALLEYFIELD RIOTS : Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 85 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 2588, 2601 (i).

——— Affidavits read (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4536 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Loy*) to M for Com. of Sup., 3754 ; affidavits read, 3756 (ii).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sutherland*) 3755 ; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3756 (ii).

VICTORIA BRIDGE, PAYMENT TO G. T. R. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 108 (i).

VICTORIAVILLE POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 2547 (i).

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY BILL, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 3537 (ii).

——— *See* 'Victoria Day.'

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY, PERPETUATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bruce*) 333 (i).

QUEEN VICTORIA, DECEASE OF, MESS. FROM COLONIAL OFFICE *re* ADDRESS : Presented, 3454 (ii).

——— *See* 'Address,' &c.

——— VICTORIA STATUE : in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).

QUEEN'S COUNTY, P.E.I., FISHING BOUNTIES, DISTRIBUTION OF CHEQUES : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2777 (i).

QUEEN'S, P.E.I., RET. OF MEMBER : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2567 (i).

QUEEN'S, EAST. *See* 'P. E. I.'

QUESNELLE AND ATLIN TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 4271, 5687 (ii).

QUODDY RIVER, OVERSEER : in Com. of Sup., 4588.

RAILS : *See* 'Steel,' &c.

Railway Act Amt. B. No. 4 (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1° m., 103 ; 2° m., 213 (i).

——— **B. No. 77** (Mr. *Stephens*) 1° m., 1576 ; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2202 (i).

——— **B. No. 94** (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) 1° m., 1960 (i).

——— **B. No. 136** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 4752 ; 2°, and in Com., 5111 ; 3°*, 5117 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 31.)

——— **B. No. 145** (Mr. *Blair*) 1° m., 5470 ; 2°, and in Com., 5787 ; 3°*, 5825 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 32.)

Railway Rates, &c. *See* 'Freight.'

Railway Subsidies Authorization B. No. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) Res. prop., 5360 ; in Com. on Res., 5472, 5546 ; 1°*, 5577 ; 2°, and in Com., 5786 ; 3°*, 5786 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 7.)

Debate in Com. on Res. : (Mr. *Blair*) 5472-5577 ; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5472-5577 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 5472, 5504, 5515, 5553, 5557 ; (Mr. *Wilson*) 5473, 5547 ; (Mr. *Bennett*) 5474 ; (Mr. *Ross*, N.S.) 5474 ; (Mr. *Cowan*) 5475 ; (Mr. *Brock*) 5476 ; (Mr. *Fielding*) 5478 ; (Mr. *Wade*) 5481, 5516 ; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 5482, 5513, 5517, 5556 ; (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) 5483 ; (Mr. *Fraser*) 5486, 5499 ; (Mr. *Maclean*) 5486, 5501, 5520, 5529, 5547, 5563 ; (Mr. *Haggart*) 5473, 5494 ; (Mr. *Clancy*) 5495, 5502 ; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5495, 5532 ; (Mr. *Wallace*) 5498, 5547 ; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5502, 5506, 5552 ; (Mr. *Puttee*) 5507 ; (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 5507, 5519, 5554 ; (Mr. *Talbot*) 5520 ; (Mr. *Costigan*) 5526 ; (Mr. *Fowler*) 5530 ; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 5532 ; (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) 5553, 5560 ; (Mr. *Murray*) 5555 ; (Mr. *Vrooman*) 5561 ; (Mr. *Britton*) 5564 ; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5570, 5571 ; (Mr. *McCormick*) 5570 ; (Mr. *McCreary*) 5576 ; (Mr. *Monk*) 5578 (ii).

——— *See* 'Subsidies,' &c.

RAILWAYS :

AMHERST SUBWAY, LAND DAMAGES : in Com. of Sup., 2715 (i).

BENNETT'S CUTTING, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 4379 (ii).

BLUE SHANK, STRAIGHTENING LINE : in Com. of Sup., 4224 (ii).

CANADA ATLANTIC AND I. C. R. FREIGHT RATES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 1590 (i).

CANADA EASTERN RY., RES. FROM N. B. BOARDS OF TRADE, RECEIVED BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N.B.*) 3753 (ii).

CANADA EASTERN RY., STMNT., &c., TO A. GIBSON : Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 1583 (i).

C. P. R. CHARTER, JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION *re* EXEMPTION CLAUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) 3459 (ii).

——— LAND GRANTS, N.W.T. AND MAN. : Ques. (Mr *Scott*) 5207 (ii).

——— TAX EXEMPTION, REF. TO SUPREME COURT : Notice of Motion (Mr. *Davis*) 1168 (i).

CANSO FERRY SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4379, 5217 (ii).

——— WHARF ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 4159 (ii).

CARDIGAN STATION, P.E.I., PURCHASE OF LAND : in Com. of Sup., 4380 (ii).

CHAMBERLAIN, MRS., GRATUITY TO : in Com. of Sup., 4386 (ii).

CLERGUE'S CONTRACT FOR STEEL RAILS, &c., I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 2628, 2719 (i), 3537-3640, 3724-52, 5309 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Haggart*) 4902, 5215 (ii).

——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

'CLEVELAND' CYLINDERS, EQUIPMENT *re* I. C. R. ENGINES : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3641.

CROW'S NEST LINE, COAL LANDS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4644 (ii).

DISMISSALS, &c., P.E.I. RY. : in Com. of Sup., 4225 (ii).

DRUMMONDVILLE ROAD DIVERSION, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 5216 (ii).

EASTERN EXTENSION AWARD, N.B., CHARGED TO CAPITAL ACCOUNT : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2162.

EASTERN EXTENSION RY., N.S., ARBITRATION, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 203.

——— Inquiry for O. C. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1961 (i).

——— *See* general heading.

EEL RIVER STATION, I.C.R., CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 5226 (ii).

ENGINE HOUSES, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 2642.

FREIGHT RATES FOR GOVT. EMPLOYEES ON GOVT. RYS. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1586 (i).

GORDON POINT, P.E.I., PET. FOR PIER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2163 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S CAR, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5632 (ii).

GOVT. EMPLOYEES, FREIGHT RATES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1586 (i).

GOVT. RAILWAYS, EXPENDITURE FROM 1900 TO 1901 : Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 2702 (i).

G. T. RY., RENTAL, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4321.

——— PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 108 (i).

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. LANDS, &c. : Ques. : (Mr. *Davis*) 809 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

HALIFAX ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (i), 5216 (ii).
——— *See* 'Halifax,' 'I.C.R.,' &c.
JONES, RALPH, PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 509 (i).
KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACT *re* ROLLING STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).
——— CLAUSE *re* WAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1994 (i).
——— COR., &C.: M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 111 (i).
——— GOVT. CONTRACT WITH I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1068 (i).
——— STRIKE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Puttee*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5433, 5442 (ii).
LABOUR CLAUSE *re* CLERGUE'S CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 2646 (i).
LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT R.R. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 109 (i).
LANDS OF RYS., B.C., SALE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 4752 (ii).
LAND EXPROPRIATED AT LEVIS FOR I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5651 (ii).
LEVIS GRAVING DOCK, TRAVELLING CRANE: in Com. of Sup., 5709 (ii).
MACKENZIE & MANN CLAIM, PAPERS *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2611 (i), 4195, 4647, 4902 (ii).
MCKNIGHT, MR. S. L. T., APPNMT., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5649 (ii).
MCLELLAN, JOHN B., SALE OF RY. TIES TO I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5633 (ii).
MACHINERY FOR SHOPS, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 4227 (ii).
MONCTON CAR SHOPS, EXTENSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4153 (ii).
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 4191, 4228 (ii).
NEWSPAPERS, SALE OF, ON I. C. R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2988 (ii).
NICOLET STATION, I.C.R., CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5226 (ii).
NORTON STATION, P.E.I., ACCIDENT: in Com. of Sup., 4227 (ii).
N. S. SOUTHERN RY.: in Com. of Sup., 4315 (ii).
O'LEARY AND WEST POINT RY.: in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).
——— PET. *re* CONSTRUCTION AT O'LEARY STATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1795 (i).
ONTARIO, RY. SUBSIDIES, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 5585 (ii).
OTTAWA AND C. P. R. CROSSINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 95 (i).
PASSEKEAG STATION, I. C. R., ERECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 113 (i).
PICTOU STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 5216 (ii).
PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT FOR I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 4158, 5217 (ii).
PONTIAC COUNTY, RY. INDEBTEDNESS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Murray*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5611 (ii).
QUEBEC CENTRAL, RY. TRAIN SERVICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 4043 (ii).
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN COLONIZATION RY.: in Com. of Sup., 4857 (ii).
RAILWAY AND CANAL COLLECTIONS, PAPERS *re*: in Com. of Sup., 2645 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 105.
——— DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 187, 2628 (i) 3537, 3724, 4124, 4318, 5617 (ii).
——— I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 3537, 3724, 5213 (ii).
RYS. AND CANALS, REPAIRING, WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 4322 (ii).
RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS, BOARD OF: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 816 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Debate (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) 829, 861; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 834; (Mr. *Scott*) 840; (Mr. *Oliver*) 844; (Mr. *Holmes*) 845; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 847; (Mr. *Galliher*) 848; (Mr. *Puttee*) 850; (Mr. *Sproule*) 851; (Mr. *McCreary*) 857; (Mr. *Kendall*) 862; (Mr. *Blair*) 862, 872; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 877; (Mr. *Osler*) 880 (i).
RY. COMMISSION, INFORMATION, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5633 (ii).
——— RY. COM.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to substitute Name, 1961 (i).
RY. COM. PRIVY COUNCIL, APPLICATION FROM TORONTO *re* LEVEL CROSSINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3456 (ii).
——— *See* 'Toronto.'
RY. CORPORATIONS, DOM. CHARTERS: M. for List.* (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 132 (i).
RY. LANDS, B.C., SALE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 4752 (ii).
RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS, INSUFFICIENT NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4019 (ii).
RAILWAY QUESTION: on M. to adjn. (Mr. *Maclean*) 52 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 52 (i).
——— Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Maclean*) 137; Debate (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 154; (Mr. *Blair*) 158; (Mr. *Heyd*) 160; (Mr. *Monk*) 161; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 165; (Mr. *Wallace*) 168; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 172 (i).
RY. SERVICE, P.E.I.: Telegram read (Mr. *Hackett*) 1498 (i).
——— *See* 'P.E.I.' &c.
RAILWAY SUBSIDIES: in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 5472 (i).
——— VOTED BY PARLT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 87 (i).
——— AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5584 (ii).
——— BY MUNICIPALITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 202, 329 (i).
REGINA, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. LANDS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 808 (i).
ROCKY LAKE BRIDGE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2642 (i).
ST. JOHN WHARF, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4136 (ii).
ST. JOHN, I. C. R. AND G. T. R., TERMINALS, EXPORTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5218 (ii).
——— WHARF, CONVEYER: in Com. of Sup., 4378 (ii).
——— COR. O.C.'s, &C.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Fowler*) 1266 (i).
SERVIS RAILROAD TIE PLATES, PURCHASES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fowler*) 1267 (i).
SIDINGS, &C., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 4219 (i).
STEEL RAILS AND FASTENINGS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2628 (i), 5218, 5225 (ii).
——— P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 4226, 4380.
——— *See* general heading.
STELLARTON STATION ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5216 (ii).
SYDNEY COAL MINES, STRIKE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5300 (ii).
SYDNEY AND EAST BAY RY., COR., &C.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Johnston, Cape Breton*) 1266 (i).
——— ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 2644 (i).
——— RY. ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 2716 (i).
——— YARD IMPROVEMENTS, CONTRACTS, &C.: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1267 (i).
——— *See* 'N.S.' &c.
TELEPHONE COMPANIES, MILEAGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5585 (ii).
TORONTO LEVEL CROSSING, *re* APPLICATION TO RY. COM.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3456 (ii).
——— *See* general heading.

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
TRAINMEN, P.E.I. RY., NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4194 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 4196 (ii).
TRAIN PORTERS FOR MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5462 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: in Com. of Sup., 1207 (i).
VAN HORNE'S STMNT. *re* RAILWAYS: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Maclean*) 209 (i).
VICTORIA BRIDGE, PAYMENTS TO G. T. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 108 (i).
VICTORIA COUNTY, P E.I. RY., PET. FOR BRANCH: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2163 (i).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
RAINY RIVER, LOCK AND DAM: in Com. of Sup., 5686 (ii).
——— MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 477 (i).
RAMA INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2753 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McLeod*) 200 (i).
——— TAXES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McLeod*) 93 (i).
RAMSAY, MR. J. H., DISMISSAL FROM CORNWALL CANAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Pringle*) 1584 (i).
RAPIDE PLAT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4311 (ii).
Rathbun Co.'s B. No. 82 (Mr. *Britton*) 1°*, 1747; 2°*, 1993; in Com., 2925; 3°*, 2925 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, *c.* 109.)
RECEIPTS, AND EXPENDITURES, NET, I.C.R., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1267 (i).
REGINA JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 2650 (i).
REGINA, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. LANDS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 808 (i).
REGISTRY OFFICE, N.W.T.: conc., 5794 (ii).
REGISTRATION OF SHIPPING: in Com. of Sup., 261 (i).
REMOUNTS PURCHASED FOR IMP. GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 3440 (ii).
REMOUNT STATIONS, GOVT. AID, &c., ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 5154 (ii).
REPAIRING, WORKING EXPENSES, RYS. AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 4322 (ii).
REPORTS: Inquiry for, 49 (i).
——— PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 92 (i).
REPORTS PRESENTED:
AGRICULTURE (Mr. *Fisher*) 51 (i).
BONDS AND SECURITIES, STMNT. (Mr. *Fielding*) 51 (i).
CHARTERED BANKS OF CANADA (Mr. *Fielding*) 2056 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE LIST (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 239 (i).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS (Mr. *Fisher*) 892 (i).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY (Mr. *Sifton*) 2778 (i).
INLAND REVENUE (Mr. *Bernier*) 51 (i).
INTERIOR (Mr. *Sifton*) 50 (i).
MARINE (Sir *Louis Davies*) 51 (i).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 694
NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 510 (i).
PENITENTIARIES (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 80 (i).
POST OFFICE (Mr. *Mulock*) 50 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Mr. *Fielding*) 50 (i).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. *Blair*) 105 (i).
SEC. OF STATE (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 136 (i).
TRADE AND COMMERCE (Mr. *Fielding*) 1390 (i).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETS. (Mr. *Paterson*) 62.
RESTIGOUCHE AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5554 (ii).
RETIRING ALLOWANCES, MILITIA, ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP.: Remarks (Mr. *Thompson*) 3373 (ii).
——— *See* 'Militia.'
RETURNS, INQUIRY FOR, 694 (i).
——— (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1961 (i).
——— (Mr. *Wilson*) 895, 1432 (i).
RETURNING OFFICERS IN QUEBEC, MILEAGE, &c. Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1589 (i).
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 435 (i).
RICE IMPORTS FOR 1900 FROM G. B.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 2000 (i).
RICE LAKE AND PORT HOPE, SURVEY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 607 (i).
RICHELIEU RIVER BEACONS, MAINTENANCE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2775 (i), 2988 (ii).
RICHIBUCTO PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5688 (ii).
RIDEAU HALL, REPAIRING DAMAGES BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup., 4391 (ii).
——— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3147 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works.'
RIDINGSTONE AND MILK RIVER BOUNDARY FENCE: in Com. of Sup., 5451 (ii).
RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, GOVT. GRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 3774 (ii).
——— RANGES, GRANTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3787.
——— SHOOTING, ANNUAL PAYMENT, AMMUNITION, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1281, 1286 (i).
——— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
RIVER ST. JOHN BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3495 (ii).
——— *See* 'St. John,' &c.
RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS: in Com. of Sup., 3498 (ii).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP BRANCH, FOREMEN, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2989 (ii).
——— NEWS AGENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2988 (ii).
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3523 (ii).
——— OTTAWA, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4402 (ii).
——— YUKON, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1252 (i).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.
ROBERTSON, MR. JUSTICE, INFIRMITY, COMPLAINTS AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Stephens*) 5586 (ii).
ROBERVAL, QUEBEC AND JAMES BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5575 (ii)
ROCKLIFFE RANGE, RY. EXTENSION, RATES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4348, 4639 (ii).
ROCKY LAKE BRIDGE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2642.
ROCKY POINT, P.E.I., BREAKWATER, EXTENSION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2571 (i).
ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4165, 4213, 4378 (ii).
——— LOCOMOTIVES, &c. PURCHASED: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 331 (i).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' 'Railways,' &c.

RONDEAU HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
ROOMS IN H. OF C., ALLOTMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 69 (i).
ROSSEAU RIVER INDIAN RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *La-Rivière*) 82 (i).
ROSS, HON. J. J., SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: in Com. of Sup., 5781 (ii).
ROSSLAND PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 3099.
ROTHESAY VOTERS' LIST, FRAUDULENT NAMES ADDED: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2571 (i).
ROUND BAY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2203, 2397 (i).
ROURKE, WM., CONTRACTS, &c.: M. for Copies (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 80 (i).
ROYAL ASSENT. *See* 'Bills.'
ROYAL HIGHNESSES. *See* 'York.'
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, KINGSTON: in Com. of Sup., 3782 (ii).
—— EXTENSION, &c.: Letter from Robt. W. Saul, read (Mr. *Wallace*) 4871 (ii).
—— MEMORIAL TO S. A. CADETS: in Com. of Sup., 4351, 5314 (ii).
—— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
Royal Mint Establishment B. No. 143 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 4535; in Com. on Res., 5373; 1°*, 5389; 2° m., 5715; in Com., 5716; 3°*, 5716 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 4.)
ROYAL MINT, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 5672 (ii).
—— LOCATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) M. for Com. of Sup., 4754 (ii).
ROY, L. G., INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 5184 (ii).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY: in Com. of Sup., 483 (i).
—— *See* 'Postal.'
RUSSELL, MR. E. G., EMPLYMT., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3455 (ii).
RUSSELL, MR. W. A., DISMISSAL, &c.: M. for Reps.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 816 (i).
RUSTICO PIER: in Com. of Sup, 3465 (ii).
RYAN, Mr. J. B., SUPERANNUATION, INTEREST ON AMOUNT: in Com. of Sup, 5312 (ii).
ST. ALEXIS PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3498 (ii).
ST. ANDREW'S LOCK, CONSTRUCTION, LABOUR CONTRACT, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Puttee*) 1266 (i).
ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4400 (ii).
—— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1205 (i).
STE. ANNE'S LOCK, SUPT., SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2705 (i).
STE. ANNE DE SOREL ICE GUARDS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2775 (i).
ST. CATHARINES WATER SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 109 (i).
STE. EMILIE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4399 (ii).
ST. FRANCIS LAKE, PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 4383 (ii).
—— REMOVING SHOALS: in Com. of Sup., 4309, 4381 (ii).
STE. HYACINTHE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 5690 (ii).
ST. JEROME WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3498 (ii).
St. John City Foreshores B. No. 126 (Mr. *Tucker*). M. to suspend Rule, 3536; 1°*, 3537; 2°*, 4360 (ii).
ST. JOHN, DUBLIN AND BELFAST SS SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4773 (ii).
—— BREAKWATER: *See* 'River St. John,' &c.
—— ELEVATOR, AMOUNT OF GRAIN RECEIVED: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 810 (i).
—— NAMES OF EMPLOYEES, DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1584 (i).
—— AND GLASGOW SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4773 (ii).
—— AND HALIFAX ELEVATORS, GRAIN EXPORTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1998 (i).
—— *See* 'Halifax,' &c.
—— HARBOUR, FORT DUFFERIN: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (ii).
—— HARBOUR REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4399
—— CONTRACT *re* CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1581 (i).
—— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 1242 (i).
—— I.C.R. AND G.T.R. TERMINALS, EXPORTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5218 (ii).
—— LANDS PURCHASED, I.C.R.: M. for O. C.'s* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 225 (i).
—— AND LIVERPOOL SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4772 (ii).
—— LIVERPOOL AND G.B. SS. SUBVENTION: conc., 5794 (ii).
—— AND LONDON SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).
—— TIDAL WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (ii).
—— WHARF, COR., O. C.'s, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Fowler*) 1266 (i).
—— CONVEYER: in Com. of Sup., 4378 (ii).
—— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4136 (ii).
ST. LAMBERT PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 3499 (ii).
St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s B. No. 129 (Mr. *Monk*) 1°*, 4406; 2°*, 5093; in Com., and 3°*, 5546 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 82.)
St. Lawrence Lloyds incorp. B. No. 43 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 893; 2°*, 1205; in Com., 2923 (i); 3°* 2984 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 110.)
St. Lawrence Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 69 (Mr. *Logan*) 1°*, 1496; 2°*, 1790 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.*, 111.)
ST. LAWRENCE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4392 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE AND BELLE ISLAND TELEGRAPH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 3529 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, CONTRACT CHANGES, &c.: M. for O C.'s* (Mr. *Haggart*) 815 (i).
—— AIDS TO NAVIGATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5188 (ii).
—— DEPTH OF WATER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 205.
—— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 208 (i).
—— CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).
—— LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel Surveys, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4312, 4382 (ii).

——— (Lower) Navigation, Investigation, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 4197 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4231 (ii).

——— Winter Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 276.

St. Louis Lake, Hydrographic Survey : in Com. of Sup., 4309 (ii).

St. Mary River Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 80 (Mr. *Lyment*) 1°*, 1663 ; 2°*, 1993 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5091 (ii). (1 *Edawrd VII, c.*, 112.)

St. Maurice Slides : in Com. of Sup., 927 (i), 3523.

——— Working Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 5767 (ii) ; conc., 2349 (i).

St. Peter's Canal, Mr. O'Donoghue's Claim : in Com. of Sup., 5632 (ii).

St. Regis Indian Lock-up : in Com. of Sup., 2756.

St. Stephen, N.B. and Black Bay SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 5767 (ii).

St. Thomas Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 2555 (i), 3104, 3110, 5693 (ii).

——— contracts, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 505 (i).

——— letter from Mr. Green : in Com. of Sup., 3479, 5693 (ii).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Clancy*), 3481 (ii).

——— Battalion Club Rooms, Rents, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 506 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 2649 (i), 4636 (ii).

——— Charges against Guards : in Com. of Sup., 2649 (i).

——— *See* 'Justice.'

——— Inspector, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 5823 (ii).

Safes for Postmasters, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1404 (i).

Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. No. 92 (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1° m., 1958 ; 2°*, and in Com., 2440 ; 3°*, 2443 (i) ; Sen. Amt., 4207 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 34.)

Salmon River Shed : in Com. of Sup., 3460 (ii).

——— Wharf : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 208 (i).

Sandy Island, Alberton Harbour, P.E.I., Removal of Stones, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1993 (i).

San José Scale, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2865 (i).

Sarnia Post Office : in Com. of Sup., 2555 (i).

Saskatchewan and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 41 (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1°*, 893 ; 2°*, 1205 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3220 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 83.)

Saul, Robt. W., Letter *re* Military College : Read (Mr. *Wallace*) 4871 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Deepening, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).

——— Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 5732 (ii).

——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup , 5692 (ii).

Saw Logs, Duty : prop Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 218, 223.

——— Exported : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 64 (i).

——— on Indian Reserves : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 63.

Saw Logs. *See* 'Lumber,' &c.

Scarth, Mr. W. F., Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1261 (i).

Schneider, Miss, Appnmt. as Postmistress : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 1439 (i).

Schomberg and Aurora Ry. Co.'s Subsidy : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360 ; in Com. on Res., 5546 (ii).

School Grants, &c., in N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 1368 (i).

School Lands, Man., Sale, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 71 (i).

——— Transfer, &c. : M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 88 (i).

——— inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2205 (i).

——— rep. of Judge Prendergast : Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *LaRivière*) 4196, 5714 (ii).

——— *See* 'Man.'' &c.

Schools in Unorganized Ters. : in Com. of Sup., 1367 (i).

Scientific Institutions and Hydrographic Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 289 (i), 5100 (ii).

Scott's Bay Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 3174 (ii).

Scugog River, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 4400 (ii).

Seamen's Act. *See* 'Inland Waters.'

Seamen, shipwrecked and sick : in Com. of Sup., 293 (i).

Sechelt Island Lighthouse : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 200.

SECRETARY OF STATE :

'Animals of Canada,' Printing, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1265 (i).

'Canada Gazette' : in Com. of Sup., 3448 (ii).

Chinese and Japanese Immigration Commission : Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3641 (ii).

Civil Service Board of Examiners : in Com. of Sup., 5310 (ii).

Dom. Election Officials, non-payment of : on M. for Com. of Ways and Means (Mr. *Davis*) 2351 (i).

Japanese Commission, Expenses *re* : in Com. of Sup., 5311 (ii).

King's Printer. *See* 'Public Printing and Stationery.'

Manhood Suffrage Registration, Remuneration to Municipalities : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 2204 (i).

Printing, Advertising, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 176 (i).

Printing Bureau, Improvement of, &c., on M. to conc. in the Rep. of Com. : Remarks (Mr. *Parmelee*) 5198 (ii).

——— Plant, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5456 (il).

Printing, Govt. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 114 (i).

——— Printing and Stationery : in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).

——— Miscellaneous Vote : in Com. of Sup., 3448 (ii).

——— Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).

Returning Officers in Quebec, Mileage, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1589 (i).

Rothesay Voters' List, Fraudulent Names added : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2571 (i).

Sec. of State Dept. : in Com. of Sup., 181 (i), 5309 (ii).

——— Deptl. Vote : in Com. of Sup., 5309 (ii).

See 'H. of C.,' &c.

Secret Service, Customs, Payments, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).

Section Limits, I.C.R., Extent, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Martineau*) 1589 (i).

SEED GRAIN, INDIANS, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 2760.
——— N.S. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 2758 (i).
——— TO SETTLERS: in Com. of Sup., 4927 (ii).
SEL. COMS.: M. to prepare Lists (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 52 (i).
——— M. to conc., 102 (i).
——— *See* 'Committees,' &c.

Senate and House of Commons (Increased Indemnity) Act Amt. B. No. 151 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*). M. for Com. on Res., 5600; 1°*, 5715; 2°, and in Com., 5826; on M. to rep. B., 5827; 3°*, 5828 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 14.)

SENATE CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5782 (ii).
——— INDEMNITY FOR LATE HON. J. J. ROSS: in Com. of Sup., 5781 (ii).
SERGEANT-AT-ARMS' ESTIMATES: in Com. of Sup., 196 (i).
SERVIS RAILROAD TIE PLATES, PURCHASES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fowler*) 1267 (i).

Sessional Indemnity. *See* 'Senate and House of Commons.'

SEVERN RIVER FLOODS, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McLeod*) 201 (i).
SEYBOLD BLOCK, OTTAWA, GOVT. BUILDINGS, &C., RENTALS, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 4758; neg. (Y. 48; N. 93) 4770 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Taylor*) 4196 (ii).
——— REMARKS *re*: Postponed (Mr. *Taylor*) 4256 (ii).
——— RENTAL, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 911 (i), 3131 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works.'
SHAD AND EAST DOVER FISHING ASSOCIATION, ALLEGED INTERFERENCE, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 816 (i).
'SHAMROCK' STR., MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 246, 254 (i).
SHEET HARBOUR MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5461 (ii).
SHEGUIANDAH PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
SHERIFF'S FEES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2647, 2652 (i).
SHIP-BUILDING INDUSTRY AT HALIFAX: in Com. of Sup., 245 (i).

Shipping Casualties Investigatian B. No. 93 (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1°*, 1958; 2° m., 2443; in Com., 2445; 3°*, 2628 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 35.)

SHIP HARBOUR LAKE, N.S. INDIAN RESERVE, TIMBER CUTTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2758 (i).
SHIPPING REGISTRATION: in Com. of Sup., 261 (i).

Sibbald, Eudora Patent Relief B. No. 154 (Mr. *Fielding*). M. to receive Pet., 5471; 1°*, 5711; 2°*, and ref. to Sel. Com., 5713; 3°*, 5892 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 113.)

SIDINGS, ADDITIONAL, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4379.
SIDINGS, P.E.I. Ry., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4219 (ii).
SIEVERT, PTE., BRAVERY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3408.
SIMCOE LAKE, LOWERING, PAPERS *re*: M. for Ret.* 224 (i).
SIMCOE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1405 (i).

Similkameen and Keremeos Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 59 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 1244; 2°*, 1431 (i); in Com., and 3°, 3697 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 84.)

SIX NATION INDIANS, REP. OF DR. SECORD: in Com. of Sup., 5319 (ii).
SKEENA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).
SKINNER'S POND, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 68 (i), 3464 (ii).
SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 927 (i), 3523, 5767 (ii).
SLOPE WALLS, PONTOON GATE, &C., LACHINE CANAL: In Com. of Sup., 5621 (ii).
SMART, MR. JAS. *See* 'Interior, Deputy.'
SONGHEES INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 2773.
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 3499, 4791 (ii).
——— HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 1067 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, REVENUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2705 (i).
——— WORKSHOPS FOR DREDGE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 1193 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4306 (ii).
SOURIS, KNIGHT'S POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3466 (ii).
SOUTH AFRICAN WAR:
AXES SUPPLIED TO BRITISH WAR OFFICE, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593 (i).
BADEN-POWELL'S POLICE FORCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 106 (i).
'C' BATTERY PAY, APPLICATION TO RHODESIAN GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 504 (i).
——— M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Clarke*) 123 (i).
Debate: (Mr. *Northrup*) 130; (Mr. *Maclean*) 130; (Mr. *Hughes*) 131 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 81 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 84 (i).
CAN. AND IMP. GOVTS. COR., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 106 (i).
CAN. INTERVENTION: Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 1290 (i).
——— NOTICE OF MOTION: (Mr. *Bourassa*) 1069.
——— COR. *re* COMMISSIONS TO CAN. OFFICERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5883 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Bousassa*) 4409.
CONSTABULARY PENSIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
——— RECRUITING IN N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2204 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 1266 (i).
——— UNIFORMS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1580 (i).
CONTINGENTS, DIFFERENCE IN PAY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3404 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pay.'
——— FIRST, ADDITIONAL PAY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3397 (ii).
——— PAR. *re* AUSTRALIAN CONTINGENT: Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) 135 (i).
——— SECOND, GOVT. INSURANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).
CORRECTION OF SPEECH IN HANSARD: (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1797 (i).
EXTRA SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4347 (ii).
GRAVES OF CAN. SOLDIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 64 (i).
MAIL CLERKS IN SOUTH AFRICA, PROMOTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1439 (i).

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—*Con.*
MAPS, S. A. WAR, DISTRIBUTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3787 (ii).
PAY OF CONTINGENTS, PAR IN LONDON 'TIMES': on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Hughes Victoria*) 911 (i).
——— *See* 'Contingents.'
PENSION TO FAMILIES OF DECEASED SOLDIERS: in Com. of Sup., 3396 (ii).
SCRIP FOR CONTINGENTS; Ques. (Mr. *McCormick*) 93 (i).
VOLUNTEERS, TRANSPORTATION, PAY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4623 (ii).
See 'Militia,' &c.
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Halliday*) 2778 (i).
SOUTHERN RY., N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 4315 (ii).
SOUTH NATION RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).
South Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. No. 24 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 420; 2°*, 731; in Com. and 3°*, 1430 (i). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 85.)
South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 106 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 2347; 2°*, 2923 (i); in Com., 5092, 5271, 5406; 3°*, 5407 (ii).
SPEAKER, ELECTION OF, 1 (i).
——— DEPUTY, ELECTION OF: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 49 (i).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 5 (i).
——— Prorogation, 5972 (ii).
SPEECHES OF MEMBERS, LIMITATION, &c.: M. (Mr. *Charlton*) 73 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) on M. to adjn., 5954 (ii).
SPEECHES OF P. M. G. AT MEAFORD: in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
STAFF COLLEGE COURSE, IMPERIAL, BOOKS, DATA, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1287 (i).
——— *See* 'Militia.'
STANDING COMMITTEES, MEETING CONCURRENTLY WITH SITTINGS OF HSE.: M. (Mr. *Britton*) 4938, 5198 (ii).
——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to add Names, 2702.
——— *See* 'Committees,' &c.
'STANLEY,' STR., AND WINTER MAIL SERVICE WITH P. E. I., REPS., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 544 (i).
STAPLES INSPECTION; in Com. of Sup., 4936 (ii).
——— *See* 'Commodities.'
——— SALARIES OF INSPECTORS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5779 (ii).
STATISTICAL BRANCH, CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 3848 (ii).
STATUTES, CONSOLIDATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2667 (i).
——— DOM., REVISION OF: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 66 (i).
'STATISTICAL YEAR BOOK': in Com. of Sup., 2828.
——— *See* 'Year Book.'
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 293 (i).
STEAM COMMUNICATION, P.E.I., CLAIMS *re* MAINTENANCE OF: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4535 (ii).
STEAMERS, CONSTRUCTION, TO REPLACE OLD STRS.: in Com. of Sup., 5185 (ii).
——— GOVT., SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
——— *See* 'Marine,' &c.
STEEL RAILS, I.C.R., CLERGUE'S CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 2628, 2719 (i), 3537-3640, 3724-3752, 5218, 5225 (ii).
——— SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2203 (i).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'
STEEL RAILS, FASTENINGS, &c., P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 4226, 4380 (ii).
STEEL SHELVING: in Com. of Sup., 5692 (ii).
STELLARTON STATION ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5216 (ii).
STENOGRAPHERS, YUKON, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2658 (i)
STEVESTON, B.C., RIOTS, CALLING OUT MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 328 (i).
STEWART, MR., TIMBER INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 186, 2689, 2839 (i).
STONEY CREEK MONUMENT, SUMS VOTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 5210 (ii).
STRATFORD POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) 90 (i).
STRATHCLAIR POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 489 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 91 (i).
STUBBS, WM., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1999 (i).
STUART, MR., COMMISSIONER TO PARIS EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
SUBSIDIES, P. E. I. RY., AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5584 (ii).
SUBSIDIES. *See* 'Railways, Ry. Subsidies,' &c.
SUBSIDIES: *See*
Algoma and C. P. Ry. Co.
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.
Bridgetown, N.S., and Middleton Ry. Co.
C.P.R. and Icelandic Ry. Co.
Central Ry. and Halifax Ry. Co.
Central Ontario Ry. Co.
Chipman, N.B., and Gibson Ry. Co.
Grandigue Ferry, N.S., and Arichat Ry. Co.
G.T.R. and Maganetawan Ry. Co.
I.C.R. and Windsor Junction and Musquodoboit Ry. Co.
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co.
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.
Montreal and Province Line Ry. Co.
New Germany, Caledonia and Shelburne Ry.
Paspebiac and Caplin (Hamilton Bridge Co.) Ry. Co.
Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.
Pubnico, N.S., and Port Clyde Ry. Co.
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.
Restigouche and Western Ry. Co.
Roberval, Quebec and James Bay Ry. Co.
Schomberg and Aurora Ry. Co.
Sunny Brae and Country Harbour Ry.
Toronto, Lindsay and Pembroke Ry. Co.
SUGAR MACHINERY. *See* 'Beet Root.'
SULPHUR MOUNTAIN, BANFF, OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5196 (ii).
SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
——— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 83 (i).
——— HARBOUR SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 83.

SUMMERSIDE AND CAPE TORMENTINE MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 252 (i).

——— AND TIGNISH TRAIN ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 3456 (ii).

——— *See* 'P. E. I., &c.'

SUNNY BRAE AND COUNTRY HARBOUR RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5472 (ii).

Supply B. No. 114 (Mr. *Fielding*). M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 2349; 1°*, 2°*, 2359; in Com., 2359; 3°*, 2359 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 1.)

——— **B. No. 158** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 2°*, and in Com., 5951; 3°*, 5952 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 2).

SUPPLY, CONC.: M. (Mr. *Fielding*), 2340 (i); 5787 (ii).

SUPPLY:

(Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head).

AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) Railway Question, 137; Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) Coronation Oath, 431, 694; agreed to (Y. 125; N. 19) 805; Remarks, (Mr. *Prior*) York, Duke of, Visit to Pacific Coast, 433; Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) Iron and Steel Bounties, 1168; Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) S. A. War, Canadian Intervention, 1290; Neg. (Y. 3; N. 144) 1367; Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) C.P. Ry. Contract, 2492; Neg. (Y. 7; N. 109) 2546; Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) Appointment of Judges in Ontario, 2821 (i); Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) Militia Pensions to Headquarters Staff, 3000; Personal Explanation (Mr. *Kendry*) *re* Telegram, &c., 3365; Remarks (Mr. *Thompson*) Militia Retiring Allowances, &c., 3373; Remarks (Mr. *Loy*) Valleyfield Riots, Affidavits read, &c., 3754; Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), Affidavits read, &c., 4536; Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) Royal Mint, Location, &c., 4754; Remarks (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) G.B. and U.S., Convention, *re* Aliens' Estates, 4755; Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) Seybold Block, and Rental by Govt. of Private Building, 4758, Neg. (Y. 48; N. 93) 4770; Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), *re* Govt. Business, 4901; Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) Remount Stations, 5154; Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) Bell Telephone, Defective Legislation, 5394; Amt. (Mr. *Richardson, Lisgar*) C.P. Ry. Taxation, 5417; Neg. (Y. 12; N. 99) 5432; Remarks (Mr. *Puttee*) Kingston Locomotive Works, Strike, &c., 5433; Remarks (Mr. *Ward*) Trent Valley Canal, 5436; Remarks (Mr. *Britton*) Kingston Locomotive Works, Strike, &c., 5442; Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) Devlin, Mr. C. R., Attack on Members of H. of C., 5611; Remarks (Mr. *Murray*) Pontiac County Ry. Indebtedness, 5611; Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) Quebec Election Law, 5613; Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) Bond-Blaine Treaty, 5829; Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Financial Situation, Review, &c., 5835; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 100) 5882; Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) S. A. War, and Ministerial Responsibility, 5883 (ii),

MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Transmitting Estimates for (1902) 50; Suppl. (1901) 136; 2628 (i); (1902) 4898 (ii).

Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com., 137, 431, 694, 1168, 1200, 2492, 2628, 2821 (i), 2994, 3000, 3365, 3754, 4256, 4536, 4754, 4901, 5154, 5394, 5417, 5611, 5729, 5829 (ii).

In. Com., 173, 239, 435, 1173, 1367, 2628, 2706, 2825 (i), 3016, 3097, 3383, 3460, 3768, 4213, 4257, 4342, 4584, 4771, 4916, 5165, 5215, 5447, 5617, 5729, 5809, 5892 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice. See 'Justice.'

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:

Aid to Agricultural Societies, 2837 (i).
Archives, 4607 (ii).
Buffalo Exposition, 928 (i).
Census, 2862 (i), 3058, 3867, 3912, 5785 (ii).
Cold Storage, &c., 2861 (i), 3016, 5165 (ii).
Dairying Interests, &c., Promotion of, 3055 (ii).
Experimental Farms, 2839 (i), 4591 (ii).
Farm Bulletins, Printing and Distribution, 2858 (i).
Fumigating Stations, 2865 (i), 4606 (ii).
Glasgow Exhibition, 4601 (ii).
Imperial Institute, London, Improving Can. Exhibit, 5179 (ii).
Paris Exposition, 928 (i).
Patents, Classifying Canadian, 2862 (i).
Patent Record, 2825 (i).
Year Book, 2828 (i), 4607, 5182 (ii).

Charges of Management:

Additional Amount for Dom. Notes, 4344 (ii).
General Vote, 173 (i).

Civil Government:

Agriculture, 186 (i), 4591, 5165 (ii).
Auditor General's Office, 184 (i), 5182 (ii).
Contingencies:
Auditor General, 5182 (ii).
Board of Civil Service Examiners, 5310 (ii).
Customs, 190 (i), 4627 (ii).
Finance, 189 (i), 4345 (ii).
Governor General's Office, 189 (i), 4345 (ii).
Inland Revenue, 190 (i), 4342 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, 4345, 5183 (ii).
Militia and Defence, 4345 (ii).
Post Office, 191 (i), 4791 (ii).
Privy Council Office, 4345 (ii).
Public Printing and Stationery, 3910 (ii).
Secretary of State, 5309 (ii).
Trade and Commerce, 193 (i).
Customs, 185 (i).
Finance, 184 (i), 5184 (ii).
Geological Survey, 188 (i).
Governor General's Office, 177 (i), 4345 (ii).
High Commissioner's Office, 189 (i).
Indian Dept., 184 (i).
Inland Revenue, 185 (i), 5184 (ii).
Interior, 181 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 186 (i), 5183 (ii).
Post Office Dept., 188 (i), 5184 (ii).
Public Printing and Stationery, 3909 (ii).
Public Works, 188 (i).
Railways and Canals, 187 (i), 5649 (ii).
Secretary of State, 181 (i).

Collection of Revenues:

Customs:
B. C., 3848 (ii).
N. S., 3847 (ii).
Ont., 3847 (ii).
Salaries, Contingencies, 3848, 4625, 5466 (ii).
Secret Service, 3861 (ii).
To pay H. A. Nelson, 5468 (ii).
Excise:
General Vote, 3863 (ii).
Salaries, &c., 3863 (ii).
Post Office, Outside Service, 435 (i).
General Vote, 4404 (ii).
Hanlon, B. J., Salary, 5458 (ii).
London P. O., Salary of Postmaster, 5458 (ii).
McGrady, H. A., Salary, 5459 (ii).
Mail Service, 501 (i).
Miscellaneous, 501 (i).
Train Porters, Appnmt., 5461 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Collection of Revenues—Con.
Public Works:
Harbours, Docks and Slides, &c., 3535 (ii).
Slides and Booms, St. Maurice District, 5767.
Telegraph Lines of Eastern Provs., 3535 (ii).
Telegraph Lines of Yukon, &c., 4303 (ii).
Weights and Measures, Gas, &c.:
Further Amount required, 4936 (ii).
Salaries of Officers, Inspectors, &c., 3864, 4935 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Capital:
Further Amount for Surveys, 5450 (ii).
General Vote, 1371 (i).
To build Fence, Ridingstone and Milk River, &c., 5451 (ii).
To complete Surveys, 4925 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Income:
Board of Examiners, Dom. Land Surveyors, &c., 1387 (i).
General Vote, 4921 (ii).
Inspectors' Salaries, &c., Timber Agents, &c., 1374 (i), 4925 (ii).
Contingencies, 1387 (i).
Patents for Railway Land Grants, 1388 (i), 5450 (ii).
Tree Culture and Protection of Timber Lands, 1388, 2670 (i).
Dominion Police:
Canal Protection Service, 4636 (ii).
Excise. See 'Collection of Revenues.'
Fisheries:
Biological Laboratory in Georgian Bay, 5197.
Can. Fishery Exhibit, 314 (i).
Cold Storage for Bait for Deep-sea Fishermen, 315 (i).
Fish-breeding Establishments, &c., 310 (i).
Fisheries Protection Service, 312 (i).
Fish Hatcheries, B.C., 4588 (ii).
Whitefish Hatchery, N.W.T., 5197 (ii).
Legal Expenses, 313 (i).
Oyster Culture, 314 (i).
Salaries, &c. of Fishery Officers, 294 (i), 4587.
Seizure of Can. Sealing Vessels by Russian Cruisers, 5197 (ii).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection:
Purchase of Electrical Instruments, 5778 (ii).
Geological Survey:
Compiling of Surveys, &c., 5315 (ii).
Govt. of North-west Territories:
Expenses of Exhibit at Pan-American Exposition, 4918, 5456 (ii).
Grants for Schools, &c., 1368 (i), 5782 (ii).
Insane Patients, 1367 (i).
School in unorganized districts, &c., 1367 (i).
Govt. of the Yukon Provisional District:
Salaries and Expenses of Administration, 1369.
Further Amount required, 4918 (ii).
——— *See* 'Yukon.'
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, Can., G. B,, and Foreign Countries, 4818 (ii).
Contingencies, Agencies, &c., 4869 (ii).
Gratuity to Mrs. D. L. Cavan, 4916 (ii).
Indians:
British Columbia:
Industrial and Boarding Schools, 2772 (i).
Miscellaneous, 2773 (i).
Indian Dept., General, 2774 (i).
Allowance to J. A. Macrae, 4935 (ii).
Manitoba and N. W. T., General Expenses, 2771 (i).
General Vote, 2761 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Indians—Con.
Manitoba—*Con.*
Grist and Saw-mills, 2771 (i).
Industrial Schools, &c., 5321, 5447 (ii).
Purchase of Live Stock for Reserves, 5320 (ii).
Relief to Indians, 4933 (ii).
New Brunswick, Medical Attendance, 2760 (i), 4932 (ii).
Miscellaneous and Unforeseen, 2761 (i).
Relief and Seed Grain, 2760 (i).
Salaries, 2759 (i).
Nova Scotia, Salaries, 2758 (i).
Seed Grain, 2758 (i).
Ontario and Quebec:
Blankets and Clothing, 2753 (i).
Caughnawaga Mission House, Repairs, &c., 5319 (ii).
Indian Lake Management Fund, 2755 (i).
Legal Expenses, 5320 (ii).
Medical Attendance, 2753 (i), 4930 (ii).
Oka Indians, Removal, 2754 (i).
St. Régis, Salaries, 2754 (i).
Lock-up, 2756 (i).
Survey of Reserves, 2755 (i).
Yukon:
Education, &c., 5449 (ii).
Inspection of Staples:
Additional Amount for Salaries, 4938 (ii).
Expenses of Grain Inspection, &c., 4936, 5779.
Grain Commission, Montreal, 4936 (ii).
Purchase and Distribution of Grain Standards, 3865 (ii).
Insurance:
General Vote, 323 (i).
Justice, Administration of:
Circuit Allowances to Judges *ad hoc*, 2647 (i).
Divorce Court Judge, N.B., 5778 (ii).
Enforcement of Alien Labour Law, 2648 (i).
General Legal Expenses, 4634 (ii).
Miscellaneous, including N.W.T., 2647 (i).
Supreme Court, R. G. Davis' Salary, 5777 (ii).
Travelling Allowances, Man., 2647 (i).
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Contingencies, &c., 194 (i).
Franchise Act, Printing of Voters' Lists, 5310 (ii).
General Vote, 4640 (ii).
Increases to certain Officers, 5466 (ii).
Newspapers, Additional Amount for, 5464.
Printing, Additional Amount for, 5464 (ii).
Printing and Binding of Laws, &c., 3910 (ii).
Publishing Debates, 195 (i).
Sergeant-at-Arms' Estimates, 196 (i).
Voters' Lists, 3910, 5310 (ii).
Provincial Voters' Lists, 3911 (ii).
Senate:
Salaries, &c., 5782 (ii).
Sessional Indemnity, Senator Ross, 5781 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 279 (i).
Construction of Lighthouses, 282, 286 (i).
Improvements to St. Lawrence Navigation, &c., 5188 (ii).
Lower Traverse Light, &c., 5187 (ii).
Lurcher Shoal Lightship, 284 (i).
Maintenance, &c., 282 (i).
Maintenance and Repairs to Lighthouses, 280.
Middle Ground Lighthouse, &c., 5187 (ii).
St. Lawrence Navigation, Improvement, &c., 4585 (ii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 270 (i).
Salaries of Temporary Officers, &c., 284 (i).
Wharf Repairs, 289 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Annapolis and London, 4789 (ii).
Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona, 4788 (ii).
Can. and Great Britain, 4771 (ii).
Can. and South Africa, 4788 (ii).
Great Britain and P.E.I., 4787, 5776 (ii).
Halifax and Canso, 5776 (ii).
Halifax, St. Johns, Nfld., and Liverpool, 4772.
Manchester and Canada, 5768 (ii).
P.E.I. and Great Britain, 4787, 5776 (ii).
Quebec and Blanc Sablon, &c., 5767 (ii).
Quebec to Lower St. Lawrence Ports, 5777 (ii).
St. Croix River Points and St. Stephen, N.B., 5767 (ii).
St. John, Dublin and Belfast, 4773 (ii).
St. John and Glasgow, 4773 (ii).
St. John and Liverpool, 4772 (ii).
St. John, &c., and London, 4781 (ii).
St. John, &c., West Indies and South America, 4783 (ii).
Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence, 5768 (ii).
Victoria, B.C., and San Francisco, 4787 (ii).
Marine Hospitals:
Louisburg, 5194 (ii).
Sick Seamen, 293 (i).
Militia—Capital:
Arms, Ammunition, &c., 5314 (ii).
Govt. Cartridge Factory, 5892 (ii).
Rifle Ranges, 3787 (ii).
Militia—Income:
Annual Drill, 3406, 3421, 4346 (ii).
Clothing and Necessaries, 3771, 4350 (ii).
Defences of Esquimalt, 3785, 5313 (ii).
Dom. Rifle Association Grant, 5313 (ii).
Extension of Ry. to Rockcliffe Rifle Range, 4348 (ii).
Government Cartridge Factory, 3784 (ii).
Grants to Associations, 3774 (ii).
Gratuities, &c., 4353 (ii).
Halifax Provisional Garrison, 5314 (ii).
Militia Properties, 3436, 5313 (ii).
Monuments for Battlefields, 5314 (ii).
Pay, Allowances, &c., 3383 (ii).
Provisions, Supplies and Remounts, 3772 (ii).
Royal Military College, 3782, 4351 (ii).
Salaries and Wages, 3435, 4347 (ii).
Transport and Freight, 3774, 4638 (ii)
Warlike and other Stores, 3439, 4351 (ii).
Work Point Barracks, 4352, 5314 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
Academy of Arts, 3452 (ii).
Arbitration *re* Ont. and Que. Accounts, 3452.
Assay Office, B.C., 5783 (ii).
Astronomical Work of Interior Dept., 4928.
Observatory, Telescope, &c., 5784 (ii).
Canada Gazette, 3448 (ii).
Canada Temperance Act, Expenses *re*, 3449.
Canadian Law Library, London, Eng., 4637.
Chinese Commission, 5311 (ii).
Compensation to N.W.M.P. for Injuries, 3447.
For Relief to destitute Half-breeds, 5311.
Compensation to Wm. Purdy, 4928 (ii).
Distressed Canadians in Foreign Countries, Relief, 2698 (i).
Dominion Statutes, Consolidation, 2667 (i).
Engraving, &c., of Dominion Maps, 5452 (ii).
Expenses of Hon. Wm. Mulock to Australia, 4638 (ii).
Gibson, Jas., Payment to, 4627 (ii).
Half-breeds Claims Commission, 4929, 5453.
Interest on Amounts contributed to Superannuation Fund by Messrs. Ryan and Kelly, 5312 (ii).
Interior Dept., Litigation, 2699 (i).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Miscellaneous—Con.
International Boundary, Demarcation, &c., 5454 (ii).
International Catalogue of Scientific Literature, 3453 (ii).
Keewatin Govt., Expenses, 2698 (i).
Maintenance of Lunatics, 2698 (i).
Labour Gazette, 3787, 4789 (ii).
Legal Expenses *re* 'The King *vs.* British American Bank Note Co., 5457 (ii).
——— 'Qu'Appelle *vs.* The King,' Costs, 5454.
Litigation of Justice Dept., 4342 (ii).
Maintenance of Roads, Banff, 2698 (i).
Nelson, H. A., Refund to, 4626 (ii).
N.W.T. Exhibit at Buffalo Exposition, 4918, 5456 (ii).
Paper Combine, Judicial Inquiry, 5783 (ii).
Paris Agency, Salaries, &c., 3449, 4342 (ii).
Parliamentary Guide, Purchase of Copies, 5457.
Plains of Abraham, Purchase, 5809 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Additional Plant, 5456 (ii).
Printing Dr. Rand's English-Micmac Dictionary, 5456 (ii).
Printing, Miscellaneous, &c., 3448, 4626 (ii).
Privy Council Records, Classifying of, 3453.
Seed Grain to Settlers, 4927 (ii).
S. A. War Maps, 3787 (ii).
Survey of Boundary between B.C. and Yukon, 2699 (i).
To pay J. Beatty, Gratuity, 5812 (ii).
To provide Aid to Cottage Hospitals, N.W.T., 5455 (ii).
York, Duke of, Provision *re* Visit to Canada, 5457 (ii).
Mounted Police:
Clothing, Arms, &c., 3444 (ii).
General Service, 4622 (ii).
New Buildings and Repairs, 3447 (ii).
Pay of Force, 3442 (ii).
See Yukon.
Ocean and River Service:
Cattle Inspection, 268 (i).
General Vote, 240 (i), 4584 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Repairs, &c., 4584 (ii).
Long Point Life-saving Station, 5187 (ii).
Marine Biological Station, 266 (i).
Masters and Mates, Examination, 259 (i).
Registration of Shipping, 261 (i).
Rewards for saving Life, 260 (i).
Steamer to replace the *Bayfield*, 5185 (ii).
Steamer to replace the *Druid*, 5186 (ii).
Tidal Services, &c., 262 (i).
Unforeseen Expenses, 268 (i).
Winter Mail Service, 265 (i).
Penitentiaries:
Dorchester, 2650 (i).
Generally, 2649 (i).
Kingston, 2649 (i).
To pay John McKay, 4635 (ii).
Regina Jail, 2650 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul, 2649 (i).
To pay Hector Lussier, 4636 (ii).
Pensions:
Fenian Raid Pensions, 4639 (ii).
Post Office. See 'Collection of Revenues.'
Public Works—Capital:
Buildings:
Ottawa Astronomical Observatory, 5767 (ii).
——— *See* 'Miscellaneous Astronomical.'
Military Stores, 911, 1173 (i), 4390 (ii).
Parliament Buildings, Addition, 5673 (ii).
Royal Mint, 5672 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 5681 (ii).
Yukon, Dawson Public Building, 5672 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Capital—Con.
Harbours and Rivers:
Port Arthur, Breakwater, 5687 (ii).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 1207.
Rainy River, Lock and Dam, 5686 (ii).
River Kaministiquia, 1205 (i).
St. Andrews Rapids, 1205 (i).
St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, 1173 (i).
Miscellaneous:
Trails, Roads and Bridges in Yukon, 5764.
Telegraph Lines:
Port Simpson *via* Port Essington to Hazelton, 5687 (ii).
Quesnelle-Atlin, &c., to Manson Creek, 5687.
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
Kamloops, Public Building, 3097 (ii).
Nelson, Public Building, 3097 (ii).
New Westminster, Public Building, 3097, 4392 (ii).
Rossland, Public Building, 3099 (ii).
Vancouver, Drill Hall, 3100 (ii).
William's Head, Second Disinfecting Chamber, 3106 (ii).
Generally:
Construction of Armouries, 5697 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Generally, 3106 (ii).
Salaries to Resident Clerks of Works, &c., 3106 (ii).
Surveyor General's Offices, 5700 (ii).
Manitoba:
Winnipeg, Public Buildings, 5697 (ii).
New Brunswick:
Marysville, Public Building, 5688 (ii).
Richibucto, Public Building, 5688 (ii).
St. John, Immigrant Building, 1242 (i).
Nova Scotia:
Arichat Public Buildings, 5687 (ii).
Halifax, Drill Hall, 5687 (ii).
Public Building, 1240 (i).
Lunenburg, Public Building, 4390 (ii).
Ontario:
Clinton, Public Building, 5695 (ii).
Deseronto, Public Building, 2547 (i).
Kingston, Military Buildings, 5697 (ii).
Military College, 2547 (i).
London, Drill Hall, &c., 2547 (i), 5691 (ii).
Ottawa:
Major's Hill Park, 5695 (ii).
Public Buildings, 2553 (i), 5692 (ii).
Paris, Public Building, 4391 (ii).
Picton, Public Building, 2554 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie, Public Building, 5692 (ii).
St. Thomas, Drill Hall, 2555 (i), 5693 (ii).
Sarnia, Public Building, 2555 (i).
Toronto, Dom. Buildings, &c., 2562 (i), 4392 (ii).
Toronto Junction, Public Building, 5691.
Windsor, Drill Hall, 2564 (i).
Woodstock, Public Building, 2566 (i), 5692.
Quebec:
Buckingham Public Building, 1243 (i).
Drummondville, Public Building, 1243 (i).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, 4391, 5689.
Lévis, Public Building, 5690.
Montreal Custom House, 5691 (ii).
Post Office, 5688 (ii).
Public Buildings, 5689 (ii).
Quebec, Immigrant Buildings, 5688 (ii).
Post Office, 5688 (ii).
Roberval, Immigrant Building, 4391 (ii).
St. Hyacinthe, Drill Hall, 5690 (ii).
Victoriaville, Public Building, 2547 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
Rents, repairs, &c.:
Ottawa, Dominion Buildings, 3112 (ii).
Labour Dept., 4392 (ii).
Gas and Electric Light, &c., 3152, 4398 (ii).
Heating, &c., 3130 (ii).
Rideau Hall, 3147, 4391 (ii).
Salaries of Caretakers, &c., 3153 (ii).
Telephones, 4392 (ii).
Yukon, 5763 (ii).
Dredging, 5758 (ii).
B.C., 3516, 4402 (ii).
Manitoba, 3522 (ii).
Maritime Provinces, 3521 (ii).
Ont. and Quebec, 4400 (ii).
New Plant, 3516, 5758 (ii).
Repairs, &c., 3515 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia:
Columbia River, Improvements above Golden, 3514 (ii).
Fraser River, Channel Improvements, &c., 3514 (ii).
Skeena River, 3515 (ii).
Manitoba and General Repairs, 4399 (ii).
Lake Manitoba, Outlets, 3513 (ii).
Lake Winnipeg, Wharf, 3513 (ii).
Maritime Prov., General Repairs to Harbours, &c., 349 (i).
New Brunswick, 5705 (ii).
Back Bay, Wharf Extension, 3473 (ii).
Bay du Vin, Wharf Extension, 3473 (ii).
Burnt Church, Wharf, 3473 (ii).
Campobello (Wilson's Beach) Breakwater, 3473 (ii).
River St. John, including Tributaries, 3495, 5706 (ii).
St. John Harbour, Negro Point Breakwater, 3495, 4399 (ii).
Groynes at Base of Fort Dufferin, 5706.
Nova Scotia:
Abbott's Harbour, Beach Protection Works, 3153 (ii).
Amagadus Pond, Wharf, 5701 (ii).
Beaver River, Wharf Extension, 3153 (ii).
Big Bras d'Or, Wharf Repairs, 3154 (ii).
Boularderie Centre, Wharf, 3154 (ii).
Canada Creek Breakwater, New Block, 3154 (ii).
Cape Negro Island, Breakwater Repairs, 3154 (ii).
Chebogue, Harbour, 3154 (ii).
Cheverie, Breakwater, 3154 (ii).
Clark's Harbour, Breakwater, &c., 3163.
Comeauville, Breakwater, 4398 (ii).
Ingonish, North Bay, Breakwater, 4398.
Neil's Harbour, Breakwater, 3163 (ii).
Parker's Cove, Wharf, 4398 (ii).
Parrsborough, Wharf, 3163 (ii).
Beach Protection Works, 3163 (ii),
Porter's Lake, Dredging, &c., 3166 (ii).
Scott's Bay, Repairs to Pier, 3174 (ii).
Windsor, Harbour, &c., 3175 (ii).
Ontario:
Blind River, Wharf, 5743 (ii).
Bronte Harbour, 5729 (ii).
Bruce Mines, Wharf, 5730 (ii).
Burlington Channel, 5731 (ii).
Cobourg, Harbour, &c., 3500 (ii).
Collingwood, Harbour Improvements, 3500.
Colpoy's Bay, Extension of Pier, 3504 (ii).
Depot Harbour, Breakwater, 5731 (ii).
General repairs to Harbours, &c., 3506 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Goderich Harbour, Dredging, 3504 (ii).
Harwood, Wharf, 5757 (ii).
Hawkestone, Wharf, 4399 (ii).
Indian River, Dredging, &c., 5732 (ii).
Leamington, Pier, 3507 (ii).
Meaford Harbour, Dredging, &c., 3507 (ii).
Oakville, East Pier Repairs, 5743 (ii).
Owen Sound Harbour, Dredging, &c., 3509 (ii).
Penetanguishene, Dredging, 5757 (ii).
Point Pelee Island, Wharf, 3509 (ii).
Port Burwell, Harbour Improvement, 3509, 4399 (ii).
Presqu' Ile, Wharf, &c., 5750 (ii).
Providence Bay, Wharf, 3510 (ii).
Rondeau Harbour, Dredging, 3511 (ii).
Repairs to Pier, 3511 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Harbour Improvements, 5732 (ii).
Sheguiandah, Landing Pier, 3511 (ii).
South Nation River, Improvements at the Pitch-off, 3512 (ii).
Sydenham, Dredging, 5733 (ii).
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, &c., 3512, 5734 (ii).
Wendover, Wharf, 5749 (ii).
Wiarton Landing Pier, 3513 (ii).
Prince Edward Island :
Cascumpec Harbour, 3461 (ii).
General Vote, 3460, 5705 (ii).
Hurd's Point, Repairs to Pier, 3462 (ii).
Miminegash Breakwater, &c., 3462 (ii).
New London, Breakwater, 3465 (ii).
Rustico (South), Repairs to Pier, 3465 (ii).
Souris, Knight's Point, Strengthening Breakwater, 346 (i).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 3471 (ii).
Tignish, Breakwater, &c., 3472 (ii).
West Point, Extension of Pier, 3472 (ii).
Wood Island South, Extension of Breakwater, 3472 (ii).
Quebec :
Father Point, Landing Pier, 3497 (ii).
General Vote, 3498 (ii).
Hull, Landing Pier, 3498, 5707 (ii).
Isle aux Grues, Wharf, &c., 5707 (ii).
Lake Temiscamingue, Dredging, 5709 (ii).
Levis, Graving Dock, 5709 (ii).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater, 3498 (ii).
Murray Bay, Extension of Wharf, 5709 (ii)
Rivière aux Renards, Pier. 3498 (ii).
St. Alexis, Baie des Ha ! Ha !, Pier, 3498.
St. Emilie, Wharf, 4399 (ii).
St. Jerome, Lake St. John, Wharf, 3498.
St. Lambert, Protection Wall, 3499 (ii).
Sorel, Deep Water, Wharf, 3499, 4791 (ii).
Tadousac, Repairs to Wharf, 3500 (ii).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Wharf, 5709 (ii)
Yukon :
Lewes and Yukon, River Improvements, &c., 5764 (ii).
Miscellaneous :
Chief Architect's Office, Salaries, &c., 3531.
Chief Engineer's Office, Salaries, &c. 3530, 5761 (ii).
Clerical Assistance, 5758 (ii).
National Art Gallery, Ottawa, 3530 (ii).
Surveys and Inspection, 3530, 4403 (ii).
Telegraph Service, Salaries, &c., 3531 (ii).
To cover insufficient Appropriations for Works, 3534 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Roads and Bridges :
Des Joachims, Reconstruction of Bridge, 3523 (ii).
Ottawa, Maria Street Bridge, 3528 (ii).
Ottawa River and Rideau Canal Bridges, &c., 4402 (ii).
Slides and Booms :
St. Maurice River, 927 (i), 3523 (ii).
Telegraph Lines :
Belle Isle Extension, 3528 (ii).
British Columbia, 3529 (ii).
Quarantine :
Cattle quarantine, 3084 (ii).
Compensation for slaughtered Hogs and Sheep, 3084 (ii).
Public Health, &c., Salaries, &c., 3083, 4610, 5182 (ii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 2867 (i).
Tuberculosis, Prevention, &c., 3084, 4611 (ii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals, 2870 (ii).
Railways and Canals :
Canals :
Carillon and Grenville, 5625 (ii).
Chambly, 4388, 5632 (ii).
Cornwall, Enlargement, &c., 4310, 4388 (ii).
Coulter, Robert, Salary, 4389 (ii).
Culbute, 4383 (ii).
Farran's Point Enlargement, 4311 (ii).
Galops, 4311, 5619 (ii).
Gilbert Dredging Co.'s Claim, 5635 (ii).
Gratuity to Mrs. Chamberlain, 4386 (ii).
Lachine, 4313, 4380, 4387, 5620-25 (ii).
Lake St. Francis, Removing Shoals, &c., 4309, 4381, 4383 (ii).
Lake St. Louis, Hydrographic Survey, 4309.
North Channel, Forming, 4312, 5620 (ii).
Rapide Plat, 4311 (ii).
Repairs and Operating Expenses, 4322 (ii).
St. Lawrence River, &c., Surveying, &c., 4312, 4382 (ii).
St. Peter's, Claim of S. O'Donohue, 5632 (ii).
Salaries of Engineers, Draughtsmen, &c., 4318 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, 4257 (ii).
Soulanges, 4306 (ii).
Surveys and Inspections, 4314 (ii).
Trent, 4261, 4305, 5621 (ii).
Peterborough Dam, 4314 (ii).
Rebuilding Bridge over Chemong Lake, 5625 (ii).
Young's Point Dam, 4384 (ii).
Welland, 4313 (ii).
Deepening Portions of Long Level, 5618.
Port Colborne Entrance, 5617 (ii).
To raise walls of Old Canal Locks, 5625.
To rebuild dam at Dunnville, 5626 (ii).
To renew Docking below Lock 1, 5632 (ii).
Railways :
Grand Trunk Ry., Rental, 4321 (ii).
Intercolonial Ry.:
Additional Sidings, 4145, 4379 (ii).
Amherst, Subway at Christy's Brook, 2715.
Bennett's Cutting, Lévis, 4379 (ii).
Canso Strait, Ferry Service, 4379, 5217 (ii).
Clergue's Contract, 2628, 2719 (i), 3537, 3724, 5215, 5217, 5228, 5285 (ii).
Drawbars on Freight Cars, 4156 (ii).
Drummondville, Overhead Bridge, &c., 5216 (ii).
Eastern Extension, N.B., Award, 5941.
——— N.S., Award, 5892 (ii).
Eel River Station, 5226 (ii).
Engine Houses, &c., 2642 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—Con.
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial Ry.—*Con.*
Facilities increased along Ry., 4151, 4379.
General Vote, 4387, 5650, 5672 (ii).
Halifax Accommodation, 2706 (i), 5216 (ii).
To Dredge and Blast Rock, 4134 (ii).
Land Damages, 2719 (i).
Lévis Accommodation, 4124 (ii).
Moncton, Car Shop Extension, 4153 (ii).
Nicolet Station, 5226 (ii).
Original Construction, 2719 (i).
Pictou Accommodation, 5216 (ii).
Pintsch Gas, &c., 4158, 5217 (ii).
Ry. Commission, 5633 (ii).
Repairs to Gov. Gen.'s Car, 5632 (ii).
Rocky Lake, Highway Bridge, 2642 (i).
Rolling Stock, 4165, 4213, 4378 (ii).
St. John Accommodation, 4136, 4378 (ii).
Steel Rails, 2628, 2719 (i), 3537, 3724, 5217, 5228, 5285 (ii).
Stellarton Accommodation, 5216 (ii).
Strengthening Bridges, 4123 (ii).
Superstructure of Miramichi Bridge, 4162.
Sydney Accommodation, 2644 (i), 4376 (ii).
To provide Air Brakes on Freight Cars, 4154 (ii).
——— M. C. B. Couplers, 4153 (ii).
——— New machinery for Shops, 4158 (ii).
——— Turntables, 4158 (ii).
Travelling Cranes, 4378 (ii).
Vestibules on Passenger Cars, 4156 (ii),
Watering places for Stock, 4218 (ii).
Prince Edward Island Railway :
Blue Shank, Straightening Line, 4224 (ii).
Machinery, New, 4227 (ii).
Murray Bay Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, 4228 (ii).
Sidings, Increase in Length, 4219 (ii).
Steel Rails, 4380 (ii).
To provide and lay Steel Rails and Fastenings, &c., 4226 (ii).
To purchase Land for Repair Building, 4380 (ii).
Scientific Institutions :
Bayfield, To replace, 5190 (ii).
Hydrographic Survey, Lake Winnipeg, 5782.
Meteorological Service, 289 (i).
Toronto Observatory, 289 (i).
Steamboat Inspection :
Fog Alarms, 294 (i).
Inspection, 293 (i).
Superannuation :
Extra Allowance to Mr. Wallace, 4342 (ii).
Yukon Provisional District :
Administration of Justice :
Judge's Salary, Additional, 2650 (ii).
Jury and Witness Fees, 2655 (i).
Law Books, Freight Charges, &c., 2658 (i).
Maintenance of Prisoners, 2654 (i), 4637, 5778 (ii).
Miscellaneous Expenses, 2658 (i).
Sheriff's Salary, 2652 (i).
Living Allowance, 2653 (i).
Transport of Prisoners, 2654 (i).
Customs Service, 3862 (ii).
Mail Service, 501 (i).
Mounted Police, Maintenance of, 3447 (ii).
Salary to Asst. Surgeon W. E. Thompson, 4625 (i).
Public Works :
Buildings, 4268, 4304 (ii).
Dawson to Fort Egbert Telegraph Line, 4288 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Yukon Provisional District—Con.
Public Works—*Con.*
Lewes and Yukon River Improvements, &c., 4289 (ii).
Quesnelle to Atlin, B.C., Telegraph Line, 4271 (ii).
Trails, Roads and Bridges, 4289 (ii).
See 'Govt. of Yukon.'

CONCURRENCE :

Cornwall Canal, Enlargement, 5794 (ii).
Distressed Canadians in Foreign Countries, Relief, 5794 (ii).
Exchequer Court, 5792 (ii).
Finance and Treasury Board, 5788 (ii).
Gilbert Dredging Co.'s Claim, 5800 (ii).
Interior, 5789 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, 5789 (ii).
Sundries, &c., 5790 (ii).
N.W.T., Court House, &c., 5794 (ii).
Post Office, 5791 (ii).
Mail Service, 5792 (ii).
Procedure, 5950 (i).
St. John and Liverpool, Winter SS. Service, 5794 (ii).
Supreme Court, 5792 (ii).

SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES FOR MR. WALLACE : in Com. of Sup., 4342 (ii).
——— FUND, INTEREST ON J. B. RYAN'S AMOUNT : in Com. of Sup., 5312 (ii).
SUPREME COURT, B.C., RESIDENCE OF JUDGES, &C. : in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 2664 (i).
——— N.B., &C., INCREASE OF SALARY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 3460 (ii).
——— *See* 'Judges' Bill.'
——— OF CANADA : conc., 5792 (ii).
——— R. G. DAVIS, PROMOTION : in Com. of Sup., 5777 (ii).
——— VACANCY : Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 5971 (ii).
——— *See* 'Justice.'
SURVEYOR GENERAL'S OFFICES, OTTAWA, FURNISHING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5700 (ii).
SURVEYS OF INDIAN RESERVES IN ONT. : in Com. of Sup., 2755 (i).
——— MAN. : in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i),
SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 3530.
——— OF CANALS : in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).
——— *re* PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 4403 (ii).
SYDENHAM HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 5733 (ii).
——— RIVER DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 3506 (ii).
SYDNEY COAL MINES, STRIKE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5300 (ii).
——— INDIAN RESERVE, COR. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Johnston, Cape Breton*) 1264 (i).
——— AND BAY ST. LAWRENCE SS. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5768 (ii).
——— AND EAST BAY RY., COR., &C. : M. for Copy* (Mr. *Johnston, Cape Breton*) 1266 (i).
——— ENGINE HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 2644 (i)
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 2716 (i), 4376 (ii).
——— PROPERTIES PURCHASED BY GOVT., I.C.R. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1005 (i).

SYDNEY YARD IMPROVEMENTS, CONTRACTS, &c. : M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1267 (i).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.', 'N.S,' &c.

TACHÉ, MR., ENGINEER, YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 5764 (ii).
TADOUSAC WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 3500 (ii).
TARIFF ACT, AMT. *re* GERMAN GOODS : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 333 (i).
TARIFF. *See* 'Preferential.' 'Customs,' &c.
TECHNICAL EDUCATION, JURISDICTION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1263 (i).
TELEGRAPH CONSTRUCTION, YUKON, PAPERS, TO BE SUBMITTED TO PUB. ACCTS. COM. : Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1880 (i).
TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 3528 (ii).
——— B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 5687 (ii).
——— TO DAWSON, DATE OF COMMENCEMENT, &C. TARIFF, &C., Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4021 (ii).
——— SERVICE, SALARIES, &C : in Com. of Sup., 3532 (ii).
——— YUKON : in Com of Sup., 4271 (ii).
TELEPHONE COMPANIES, MILEAGE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5585 (ii).
TELEPHONES, OTTAWA BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 3117, 4392 (ii).
TERRITORIAL COURT, YUKON, LIVING ALLOWANCES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2653 (i).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
TESLIN LAKE AND ALSEK RIVER BOUNDARY : in Com. of Sup., 2699 (i).
THAMES RIVER OBSTRUCTION ON BAR : Remarks (Mr. *Stephens*) 2779 (i).
THOMPSON, MR. J. R., APPNMT. BY GOVT. : M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 77 (i).
——— DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 5212 (ii).
THOMPSON, MR. J. W., HOMESTEAD INSPECTOR, RESIGNATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1375 (i).
THOMPSON, SURGEON, W. E., PAY, &C., IN S.A. WAR : in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
THORNBURY LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 287 (i).
THORNTON, MR., INDEMNITY, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on Election Bill, 4022 (ii).
THREE RIVERS, HARBOUR, DEEP WATER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 5709 (ii).
——— &C., PUBLIC OFFICES, CARETAKERS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2775 (i).
TICKET AGENTS, I.C.R., SALARIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Dechene*) 2399 (i).
TICKET-OF-LEAVE ACT, &C. : (Mr. *LaRivière*) 107 (i).
TIDAL SURVEY : in Com. of Sup., 262 (i).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 105 (i).
——— *See* 'P.E.I.', &c,
TIGNISH AND NAIL POND MAIL, P.E.I., CONTRACTS : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 3269 (ii).
TIMBER CUTTING ON SHIP HARBOUR LAKE INDIAN RESERVE : in Com. of Sup., 2758 (i).
TIMBER LANDS, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1388, 2670 (i).
——— MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2670 (i).
TOBACCO DUTIES, AMOUNT COLLECTED : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 84 (i).
TOMATOES IMPORTED, QUANTITY, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 1003 (i).
TORONTO DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 2562 (i).
——— COR., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3101 (ii).
TORONTO HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).
——— EASTERN ENTRANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5734 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i).
——— M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Kemp*) 77 (i).
TORONTO, INLAND REVENUE COLLECTOR, NAME, QUALIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 3754.
TORONTO JUNCTION PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 3107, 5691, 5701 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 86, 2401 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 2402 (i).
TORONTO, LEVEL CROSSING, *re* APPLICATION TO RY. COM.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3456 (ii).
——— LINDSAY AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360 : in Com. on Res., 5534 (ii).
——— MAIL ROOM AT STATION : in Com. of Sup., 4392 (ii).
——— OBSERVATORY : in Com. of Sup., 289 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, STATION 'B,' LEASE, RENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1995 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO : in Com. of Sup., 2867 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE :

ANNAPOLIS AND G.B. SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4789 (ii).
ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE : in Com. of Sup. on SS. Subsidies, 5768 (ii).
AUSTRALIAN AND IMPERIAL TRADE WITH CAN.: Par. in London 'Times' *re* Mr. Mulock's Conference, 5326 (ii).
BADDECK, &C. TO EAST BAY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4788 (ii).
'BLUE HILL,' STR., SUBSIDY, TONNAGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 3457 (ii).
BOND-BLAINE TREATY : Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5829 (ii).
——— on conc., 5794 (ii).
CANADA AND FRANCE SS. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4022 ; in Com. on Res., 5096 (ii).
——— *See* general heading.
——— AND G.B. SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4771 (ii).
——— AND ITALY TRADE RELATIONS, COR. *re* : M. for Copies (Mr. *Monk*) 518 (i).
——— AND NEWFOUNDLAND, NEGOTIATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 1260 (i).
——— AND SOUTH AFRICA SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4788 (ii).
CHINESE AND JAPANESE IMMIGRATION, TAX COLLECTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 328 (i).
COMMERCIAL AGENTS, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 4753 (i).
HALIFAX AND CANSO SS. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5776 (ii).
——— MANCHESTER LINE, PROTEST *re* CONTRACT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1501 (i).
——— NEWFOUNDLAND AND LIVERPOOL SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4772 (ii).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
HALIFAX AND WEST INDIES SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4783 (ii).
MAGDALEN ISLAND SS. SERVICE, CONTRACT. ACCOMMODATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1795.
——— WINTER TRIPS : in Com. of Sup., 251 (i).
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 4771, 5767 ; conc., 5794 (ii).
MONTREAL AND MANCHESTER SS. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5768 (ii).
NEWFOUNDLAND, ADMISSION INTO CONFEDERATION : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 332 (i).
——— AND U.S. TREATY. *See* 'Bond-Blaine.'
P.E.I. AND G. B. SS. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 4787, 5776 (ii).
QUEBEC AND BLANC SABLON SS. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5767 (ii).
——— AND MURRAY BAY WINTER SERVICE SS. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5777 (ii).
ST. JOHN, DUBLIN AND BELFAST SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4773 (ii).
——— AND GLASGOW SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4773 (ii).
——— AND LIVERPOOL SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4772 (ii).
——— LIVERPOOL AND G. B. SS. SUBVENTION : conc. ,5794 (ii).
——— AND LONDON SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).
ST. STEPHEN, N.B., AND BLACK BAY SS. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5767 (ii).
SYDNEY, N.S., AND BAY ST. LAWRENCE SS. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5768 (ii).
TRADE AND COMMERCE, DEPTL. CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 193 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1390 (i).
U. S. TRADE RELATIONS, PAR. IN 'N. Y. TRIBUNE' ON M. TO ADJN. : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 133 (i).
VICTORIA, B.C., AND SAN FRANCISCO SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4787 (ii).

TRADE AND NAV. RET. : Inquiry for (Mr. *Clancy*) 210.
——— Inquiry (Mr. *Sproule*) 239 (i).
——— Presented (Mr. *Paterson*) 62 (i).
TRAILS AND BRIDGES, &C., YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 4289, 5764 (ii).
——— *See* 'Public Works,' 'Yukon,' &c.
TRAINMEN, P.E.I., NUMBER, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4194 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 4196 (ii).
TRAIN PORTERS FOR MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup , 5462 (ii).
Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. No. 86 (Mr. *Malouin*) 1°*, 1747 ; 2°*, 2201 (i) ; wthdn., 5584.
TRANSPORTATION CHARGES *re* MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 3773 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES : in Com. of Sup., 1207.
TRANSPORTATION QUESTION : Remarks (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 2779 (i).
TRANSPORTATION QUESTION *re* ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE : on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 3181 (ii).
Debate : (Mr. *Roddick*) 3199 ; (Mr. *Edwards*) 3206 ; (Mr. *Rosamond*) Ques. of Order, 3210 ; (Mr. *Fortin, Chairman*) Ruling, 3210 ; (Mr. *Gallery*) 3212 ; (Mr. *Dobell*) 3213 ; (Mr. *Gourley*) 3218 ; (Mr. *Monk*) 3230 ; (Mr. *Charlton*) 3240 ; (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 3249 ; (Mr. *Ganong*) 3256 ; (Mr. *Brock*) 3259 ; (Mr. *Wright*) 3262 ; (Mr. *Ross, N. S.*) 3265 ; (Mr. *Maclean*) 3266, 3314 ; (Mr. *Fowler*) 3266 ; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 3277 ; (Mr. *Haggart*) 3291 ; (Mr. *Clarke*) 3301 ; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 3301 ; (Mr. *German*) 3324 ; (Mr. *Tarte*) 3330 ; (Mr. *Kemp*) 3340 ; (Mr. *Bureau*) 3346 ; (Mr. *Morin*) 3348 ; (Mr. *Talbot*) 3350 ; (Mr. *Kendall*) 3359 ; (Mr. *Murray*) 3363 (ii).
——— *See* 'Rys.,' &c.
TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES, FOR JUDGES, &C.: in Com of Sup., 2647 (i).
TRAVELLING CRANES, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 4378.
TRAVERSE (LOWER) PIER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5187 (ii).
TREE CULTURE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2670, 2689, 2839 (i).
TRENT CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 5621 (ii).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4261 4305 (ii).
——— DREDGING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4384 (ii).
——— DIVISION NO. 3, AMOUNT OF TENDER, &C. Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 810 (i).
——— MR. MAINGY'S, REP., &C. : on M. for Com. o Sup., 5436 (ii).
TROIS PISTOLES STATION, I.C.R. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 504 (i).
TROUT EXPORTED, LEGISLATIVE MEASURES *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 2401 (i).
TUBERCULINE TEST AT GROSSE ISLE : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 85 (i).
——— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.
TUBERCULOSIS, CATTLE : in Com. of Sup., 3684, 4611.
'TYRIAN,' SS., CHARTERED BY DOM. GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 5824 (ii).

United Empire Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 60 (Mr. *Birkett*) 1°*, 1244 ; 2°*, 1540 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1993 (i). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 115.)
U. S. TRADE RELATIONS, PAR. IN 'N.Y. TRIBUNE,' ON M. TO ADJN. : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 133 (i).
UNION MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO., GOVT. DEPOSIT : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1589 (i).
Union Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 78 (Mr. *Demers, St. Johns and Iberville*) 1°*, 1663 ; 2°*, 1924 (i).
Unorganized Territories. *See* 'Game.'
URSULINES, DAMES. *See* 'Plains of Abraham.'
Usury Act. *See* 'Money Lenders.'
VACANCY : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 326, 2567 (i).
VALLEYFIELD RIOTS : Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 85 (i).
——— SETTLEMENT BY GOVT : M. for Co r (Mr. *Monk*) 2588, 2601 (i).
——— Affidavits read (Mr. *Monk* on M. f Com. of Sup., 4536 (ii)
——— Remarks (Mr. *Loy*) on M. fo Com of Sup., 3754 Affidavits read, 3756 (ii)
——— Ques. of Order (Mr *Sutherland*) 3755 : Ruli (Mr. *Speaker*) 3756 (ii).
VANCOUVER COUNTY COURT JUDGE : prop. Res. (S *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5593 (ii).
——— *See* 'Judges of Provincial Courts Bill.'
VANCOUVER DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 3100 (ii).

VANCOUVER DRILL HALL, FAULTY WORKMANSHIP, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1750 (i).

VAN HORNE'S STMNT. *re* RAILWAYS: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Maclean*) 209 (i).

Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.'s B. No. 52 (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1°*, 1167; 2°*, 1431 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3220 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 86.)

Vancouver, Westminster, Northern and Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. No. 73 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 1496; 2°*, 1790 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3697 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 87.)

VAN WAGNER, COL., RETIREMENT, &c.: M. for Cor.,* &c. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1267 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2568 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5890 (ii).

VENTILATION, H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 3123, 5679.

——— ON OCEAN SS.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 70, 505 (i).

——— *See* 'Agriculture,' 'Exhaust Fans.'

VESTIBULES, &c.: in Com. of Sup,, 4156 (ii).

VICTORIA BEACH LIGHTHOUSE, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 91 (i).

VICTORIA BRIDGE, PAYMENTS TO G.T.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 108 (i).

VICTORIA, B.C. AND SAN FRANCISCO SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4787 (ii).

——— HARBOUR, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4402 (ii).

VICTORIA, PET. FOR BRANCH OF P. E. I. RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2163 (i).

VICTORIA COUNTY, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 3104 (ii).

Victoria Day B. No. 33 (Mr. *Horsey*) 1° m., 503; 2° m., 1432; in Com., 2201 (i); (remarks) 3537, 3983, 5214, in Com., 4255; 3°*, 4256 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 12.)

VICTORIA DAY BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. to adjn., 5093 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 3271 (ii).

——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 3983 (ii).

——— STATEMENT FROM GOVT.: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5214 (ii).

VICTORIA, QUEEN, DECEASE OF, MESS. OF CONDOLENCE: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 17, 20 (i).

——— *See* 'Queen's.'

VICTORIA MEMORIAL MUSEUM, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 5681 (ii).

VICTORIAVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2547.

VILLE MARIE BANK, RELIEF TO DEPOSITORS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 332 (i).

VIRDEN, MAN., POSTMASTER W. F. SCARTH, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1261 (i).

VIRDEN, QU'APPELLE, &c., TOWN SITES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Osler*) 881 (i).

VOLUNTEERS, S. A. WAR, TRANSPORTATION, PAY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4623 (ii).

VOTERS' LISTS, KING'S CO., N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2571 (i).

——— PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3910, 5310 (ii).

——— *See* 'H. of C.,' &c.

WABASH LOCOMOTIVES, DUTY, &c.: Ques. (Mr, *Ingram*) 64 (i).

WADE, MR. F. C., CHARGES AGAINST: in Com. of Sup., 2656, 2660 (i).

WALKER, MR. W. H., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

WALLACE, MR., SUPERANNUATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4342 (ii).

WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2755 (i), 4930 (ii).

WAREHOUSE COMMISSIONER, GRAIN, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4936 (ii).

WARLIKE STORES: in Com. of Sup., 3439, 4351 (ii).

WASHAGO DAM, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McLeod*) 201 (i).

WATER LEVEL OF GREAT LAKES: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 94 (i).

WAYS AND MEANS: M. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 2349 (i); in Com., 5802 (beet-root sugar machinery); in Com. on Res., 5950 (ii).

W. C. Edwards & Co. (Limited) B. No. 61 (Mr. *Rosamond*) 1°*, 1244; 2°*, 1431 (i); in Com., 3227; 3°*, 3421 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 98.)

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. No. 10 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 1° m., 198; 2° m., 1057; M. for Com., 1432, 1791 (i).

——— *See* 'Commodities.'

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: in Com. of Sup., 3864, 4935 (ii).

WELLAND CANAL, DOCK RENEWALS: in Com. of Sup., 5632 (ii).

——— EXTRA PAY TO ROBT. COULTER: in Com. of Sup., 4389 (ii).

——— LOCK BREAKAGES: in Com. of Sup., 4308 (ii).

——— LOCK GATES, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4388 (ii).

——— LOCK 24, NAME OF TENDERER: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1591 (i).

——— LOCKS, RAISING OLD WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 5625 (ii).

——— PORT COLBORNE IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4313 (ii).

——— QUANTITY OF WATER PASSING THROUGH: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1592 (i).

——— WATER POWER LEASES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *German*) 2609 (i).

WENDOVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5749 (ii).

WEST BAY, C.B., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2703 (i).

Western Assurance Co.'s B. No. 124 (Mr. *McCarthy*) M. to receive Pet., 3176; 1°*, 3268; 2°, 3421, in Com., and 3°, 4014 (ii). (1 *Edward VII*, c. 116.)

WEST HALIFAX SHORE FISHERY, RULES, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 1267 (i).

WEST POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).

WEST PRINCE ELECTION BALLOTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 83 (i).

——— P. E. I., RETURNING OFFICER, PAYMENT TO: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1006 (i).

——— *See* 'P. E. I.,' &c.

WHARVES AND DOCKS, GOVT. MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 5743 (ii).
WHARVES FOR LIGHTHOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 289.
WHITEFISH HATCHERY IN N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 5197 (ii).
——— *See* 'Fisheries,' &c.
WHITE HORSE BOAT-BUILDING AND ALIEN LABOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 813 (i).
WIARTON PIER: in Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).
'WILLAMETTE,' STR., WRECK AT DENMAN'S ISLAND: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 3643, 3983 (ii).
WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, SUPT., SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 3179 (ii).
WILLIAM'S HEAD, B. C., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).
WINDSOR, ONT., DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 2564 (i).
——— GOVT. BUILDING, LEASE TO MR. A. PACAUD: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 2775 (i).
WINDSOR JUNCTION AND MUSQUODOBOIT AND I. C. RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5360; in Com. on Res., 5531 (ii).
WINDSOR, N.S., HARBOUR DAMS: in Com. of Sup., 3175 (ii).
WINNIPEG IMMIGRANT HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 5697 (ii).
WINNIPEG AND ST. BONIFACE HOSPITALS: in Com. of Sup., 2870 (i).
——— LAKE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4399 (ii).
——— LETTER CARRIERS: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 105 (i).
WINONA POSTMASTER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 2400 (i).
WINTER MAIL SERVICE, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 265 (ii).
WINTER COMMUNICATION, P. E. I., COR. WITH BOARD OF TRADE, &C.: M. for copies of Rep. &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1268 (i).
——— REPAIRS TO PIERS, BOATS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1585 (i).
——— *See* 'P.E.I., &c.
WITNESS AND JURY FEES, &C., YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 2655 (i).
WOOD ISLAND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).
WOOD NAPHTHA, ACETIC ACID, &C., QUANTITY PURCHASED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 5208 (ii).
WOODSTOCK, N.B., MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4230 (ii).
WOODSTOCK, ONT., POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2566 (i), 5692 (ii).
WORK POINT, B.C., PURCHASE OF PROPERTY: in Com. of Sup., 4352, 5314 (ii).
WRECKS, INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 261.
'YEAR BOOK': in Com. of Sup., 2828 (i), 4607, 5182.
YORK, DUKE OF, VISIT TO CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 5457 (ii).
——— COMMUNICATIONS *re* ARRIVAL AT HALIFAX: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5324 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 5214 (ii).
YORK, DUKE OF, PAR. IN VICTORIA TIMES: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1289 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 509 (i).
——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 1289 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 433, 807 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 4873 (ii).
——— *See* 'Cornwall.'
YOUNG'S POINT DAM, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4384 (ii).

Yukon Territory Act Amt. B. No. 118 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°*, 2567 (i); 2°*, 3086; in Com., 3086, 4876; in Com. on Res., 5214; in Com. on B., 5215; 3°*, 5215 (ii). (1 *Edward VII, c.* 41.)

YUKON:
ADMINISTRATION, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1369 (i), 4918 (ii).
ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS: M. for Reps., &c. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 132.
BENNETT AND DAWSON TEL. LINES, REPS., &C.: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 116 (i).
CLEMENT, W. H. P., RESIGNATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2657 (i).
CONSTITUTION OF COURTS, APPEALS, &C.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2383 (i).
DAWSON CITY, ADDRESS TO HIS EX.: M. for Copy* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 80 (i).
——— GOV. GEN.'S VISIT, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1260 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1586 (i).
——— GAMBLING HOUSES, &C., LETTER *re:* Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1251 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table, 1580 (i).
DOM. LANDS ACT, IRREGULARITIES, &C.: M. for Reps., &c.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 133.
EXPENDITURE, SALARIES, POPULATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 5213 (ii).
HOUSTON PERMIT, COR., &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1256 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1266 (i).
HYDRAULIC LEASES: M. for Copies* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 224 (i).
JUDGE, ADDITIONAL, SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2650 (i).
JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 5778 (ii).
LAW BOOKS, FREIGHT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2658.
LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 5764 (ii).
LIQUOR IMPORTED BY ATLIN BREWING CO., &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1256 (i).
LIQUOR PERMITS IN THE YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
——— M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 72 (i).
——— Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1250 (i).
——— QUANTITY SHIPPED: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 813 (i).
——— RET. *re:* Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 210 (i).
——— REGULATIONS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1069 (i).
LOCKYER, H. J., LIQUOR PERMIT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1250 (i).
MACKENZIE AND MANN, CLAIM *re* YUKON RY.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1260 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table, 5949 (ii).
MAGISTRATES' SALARIES: prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5094 (ii).
——— *See* 'Yukon B. 118.'
MAIL EXPENDITURES: in Com. of Sup., 449, 473.

YUKON—*Con.*

MINING LAWS, &c., TELEGRAM OF SIR WILFRID LAURIER: M. for Cor. *re*,* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 225 (i).

MINING REGULATIONS, APPEALS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 131 (i).

——— CHANGES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 114 (i).

MURRAY AND ROSS LIQUOR PERMITS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1250 (i).

N. W. MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 3447.

OGILVIE, MR., REP.: M. for Copies (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 73 (i).

——— Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 93 (i).

PRISONERS, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2654 (i), 4637 (ii).

——— TRANSPORT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2654 (i).

REQUIREMENTS, &c., *re* MEMORIAL TO HIS EX.: M. for Copy* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 816 (i).

ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 4289, 5764.

——— CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1252 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*

SHERIFF'S FEES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2652 (i).

STENOGRAPHERS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2658 (i).

TACHÉ, MR.: in Com. of Sup., 5764 (ii).

TELEGRAPH CONSTRUCTION, PAPERS TO BE SUBMITTED TO PUB. ACCTS. COM.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1880 (i).

——— Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 67 (i).

TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4271 (ii).

TERRITORIAL COURT, LIVING ALLOWANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2653 (i).

WADE, MR. F. C., CHARGES AGAINST: in Com. of Sup., 2656, 2660 (i).

WITNESS AND JURY FEES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2655 (i).

YUKON AND B.C. BOUNDARY SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 2699 (i).

ZONG, PTE., PAY DUE BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 3395 (ii).